

PROPOSAL 1 — 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Provide a registration hunt for caribou in Unit 12 as follows:

Reinstate the registration hunt in Unit 12 with a September 1 - 25 season, a bag limit of 1 bull and an annual quota of up to 20 bulls.

ISSUE: Data collected by the U.S. Geological Service on the Chisana Caribou Herd indicted a high bull cow ratio and a stabilizing population trend. A limited bull harvest on the Chisana Caribou Herd should be reinstated beginning in the fall of 2008 now that biological data indicates the herd can withstand a limited harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Surplus caribou will not be utilized and hunter opportunity to hunt this herd will be lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. A limited harvest will allow traditional use of this herd to occur.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters wishing to hunt this herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who are opposed to any hunting of this herd.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/ Fortymile Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-037)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Fairbanks AC3 Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8		National Park Service PC18 Harvey Jessup PC49

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 2 —5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the season dates and antler restriction for moose in Unit 12 as follows:

I would “prefer” going back to the “**one bull**” for residents unless there is evidence or proof that the spike, fork or 50 inch antlers increases the moose population in rural, limited hunting pressure areas. I don’t believe the hunter’s moose harvest has much impact on population when compared to the wolf and bear predation upon the moose in this Unit. (The Department of Fish and Game suggests 80%.)

My second preference would read:

Upstream from the Tok Cutoff Bridge, spike, fork, **50 inch with 3 brow tine.**

Season dates would be: **September 15 – 30.**

This change would give hunters at least a better chance of harvesting a bull with antlers over 50 inches because there are very few if any spike fork.

ISSUE: Changing the moose hunting opening and closing season to a later date in the month. Since the spike, fork, 50 went into effect, we have not been able to harvest any moose. This is with 8-10 hunters there the entire season. Given the limited number of hunters who actually hunt the upper Tok River I would ask the Board to address providing hunters a better chance of taking a required moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Because of the extreme difficulty of harvesting a required moose, I believe that most hunters will find a different location to hunt. The lack of any hunters will allow more bears and wolves to survive and thus equate to fewer moose population. I’ve hunted this area for over 20 years and there are very few if any calves ever seen even though there are more cows the past few years. This lack of calves eliminates the possibility of harvesting any spike or fork moose. In 20 years I’ve only seen two moose that would meet the spike/fork requirement. I would prefer a spike/fork. I would have harvested them. Look at the harvest report history. About every three-four years, someone kills a moose over 50 inch antlers and this area does not produce the required four brow tine moose. In our harvest reports, we have claimed 50 inch moose because we were measuring them widest to widest point until two years ago.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The Department of Fish & Game goal is to harvest the young or the older bulls, increasing our harvest possibility for these would have no impact on the remaining breeding stock. The later dates would provide better temperatures to properly take care of any meat harvested. Less blow flies that can potentially spoil meat. It would only increase our possibility to harvest a moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The limited number of hunters that have depended upon this area to provide meat for their families would benefit from this change. I would enjoy discussing this change with someone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I don’t know of any individuals who will suffer or have any changes because of this change. Hunters would only take moose that are not in the primary breeding pool.

PROPOSAL 2 CONTINUED

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered suggesting that the board completely close the Upper Tok River area and not have me waste my time hunting in an area that there are few to none of the moose that are legal to harvest. I rejected it.

PROPOSED BY: Bart Browning (HQ-08S-G-004)

Favor Neutral Oppose

Tommy Geyer w/Am. PC11		Ahtna Inc. PC7 Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8
------------------------	--	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 3 —5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear, and 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend the regulations as follows.

5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear.(a)

...

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
----------------------	---	----------------------------

(3)

...

<u>Unit 16(B), that portion within a one - mile radius of the mouth of Wolverine Creek at 60.80° N. lat., 152.31° W. long.</u>	<u>Sept. 15 - May 31</u>	<u>Sept. 15 - May 31</u>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------

3 bears

Units 9, 11 - 13, **Remainder of Unit** 16, 18, 19(B), 19(C), 20 – 24 , 25(A), 25(B), 25(C), and 26

3 bears	No closed season. (General hunt only)	No closed season.
---------	--	-------------------

...

ISSUE: In March, 2007 the Board of Game considered proposal 23 which requested an extension of the “closure for hunting brown and black bear.” This proposal requested 1.) an extension of the delayed opening from September 15 to November 15, 2.) an extension of the area to three miles from the current one mile and 3.) the addition of black bear to this area “closed” to hunting. The department’s Analysis and Recommendations addressed the first two items, but did not specifically discuss black bear. The board failed to pass the proposal which requested additional restrictions but the record is unclear if the board clearly addressed black bear. The original closure occurred in 2003 and at that time black bear was not included, but the original 2003 and 2005 dialog often referenced brown bear or the generic term “bears.” This oversight did not become evident until 2007 when black bear hunters were hunting in an area that many thought was closed to all bear hunting.

PROPOSAL 3 CONTINUED

The current regulations provide for a two bear bag limit for brown bear from August 10–May 31. There is a delayed opening of the brown bear season within one mile of the mouth of Wolverine Creek to seasonally separate brown bear hunters from the sport fishing/bear viewing industry. For black bear there is presently a year round hunting season with a three bear bag limit throughout Unit 16, along with a black bear predator control program in Unit 16B. This proposal implements a similar restriction for black bear that is already in place for brown bear within one mile of the mouth of Wolverine Creek.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be conflicts between black bear hunters and others at the mouth of Wolverine Creek.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bear viewers who would prefer not to see bears shot in front of them.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who would prefer to hunt black bear during summer and early fall at this particular site.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Board of Game (HQ-08S-G-082)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Kneeland Taylor PC52 Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Fairbanks AC3	Alaska Travel Industry Association PC53	Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Mat Valley AC12
---	--	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

The Board of Game considered this proposal during the Fall 2007 regional meeting and voted to defer it to the Spring 2008 meeting.

PROPOSAL 4 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Close the nonresident caribou season as follows:

Close the nonresident caribou season in Unit 18, initiate a Tier I hunt and develop a comprehensive and cooperative Mulchatna Caribou Herd rebuilding plan.

ISSUE: The current Amount Necessary for Subsistence determinations are not being met; the caribou population is well below the management objective of 100,000-150,000 animals, the large bull composition consists of 9%, and the bull to cow ratio is 15:100 (management objective is 35:100).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The subsistence hunter will not be able to meet their needs for caribou, the Mulchatna Caribou Herd will continue to decline due to the small composition of large breeder bulls, the bull to cow ratio will continue to decline, and we will not meet our population objective to keep the herd at sustainable populations.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The nonresident hunter is not interested in harvesting cows or small bull caribou. They primarily pursue the large breeding bulls which are important for the recovery of the herd. A small composition (9%) of large bulls in the herd exposed to additional harvest will only contribute further to the population decline of the herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters as a result of a more sustainable herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Association of Village Council Presidents (HQ-08S-G-075)

Favor Neutral Oppose

Native Village of Nunapitchuk PC12 USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30 Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Mat Valley AC12		Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51
---	--	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

The Board of Game considered this proposal during the Fall 2007 regional meeting and voted to defer it to the Spring 2008 meeting.

PROPOSAL 5 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Close the nonresident caribou hunting season.

The Board of Game is requested to eliminate the nonresident hunting season that provides for the taking of caribou in Unit 18 until the Mulchatna Caribou Herd rebounds.

ISSUE: Rural residents who rely on the Mulchatna Caribou Herd for subsistence uses have dire concerns about this declining caribou populations and the ability to fulfill their subsistence needs. The department has documented a 62% decline in caribou harvest that occurred between 1999 and 2004. The reported harvest during the 2005-2006 season for resident and nonresident hunters totaled 1,991 caribou. This harvest was below the state’s Amounts Necessary for Subsistence (ANS) of 2,100-2,400 caribou (5 AAC 99.025), meeting the criteria of a Tier I situation. Current harvest data for the 2006-2007 regulatory year indicate that the harvest remains below the board’s ANS finding for caribou. Rural Alaskan residents must compete with other user groups during this period of substantive decline in Mulchatna caribou. Current state hunting regulations provide for nonresident hunting seasons in multiple units.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Because it is generally recognized that nonresident hunters primarily harvest large bulls from the herd, elimination of the nonresident caribou seasons within the Mulchatna Caribou Herd’s range is crucial for the conservation and continued benefit of this resource. A delay in the requested regulatory action could be detrimental to the Mulchatna Caribou Herd and the availability of Mulchatna caribou for subsistence users.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Retention of the large bull caribou, which are generally targeted by nonresident hunters, should facilitate herd growth.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The resource and resident hunters

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident hunters

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lester Wilde, Sr. (HQ-08S-G-076)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Native Village of Nunapitchuk PC12 USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30 Mat Valley AC12		Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51

PROPOSAL 5 CONTINUED

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____
ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

The Board of Game considered this proposal during the Fall 2007 regional meeting and voted to defer it to the Spring 2008 meeting.

PROPOSAL 6 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Modify the caribou hunting season as follows:

Provide two caribou seasons in Unit 18: August 1 - October 15 and February 1 - March 15.

ISSUE: Caribou season for Unit 18.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Caribou herds have continuous hunting pressure throughout the season.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, winter harvested animals would be potentially less stressed from constant hunting/moving.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents of Unit 18.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? To adjust the current regulations to say any caribou instead of one bull. I rejected this idea because this is a long hunting season for a herd that appears to be crashing.

PROPOSED BY: Patrick Jones (HQ-08S-G-077)

Favor Neutral Oppose

		USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30
--	--	-------------------------------------

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

The Board of Game considered this proposal during the Fall 2007 regional meeting and voted to defer it to the Spring 2008 meeting.

PROPOSAL 7 - 5 AAC 99.025. Customary and traditional uses of game populations. Revise the Amount Necessary for Subsistence for moose in Unit 18.

The Alaska Board of Game is requested to work with the department toward revising the existing Unit 18 Amount Necessary for Subsistence (ANS) for moose that is based upon the amounts needed for all the communities in Unit 18.

ISSUE: The Alaska Board of Game has made an Amount Necessary for Subsistence finding, for Unit 18 moose of 80 to 100 moose for the entire Unit. The board based its 1992 finding on outdated and incomplete harvest data that do not represent the individual community harvest amounts that are currently taken by the local subsistence moose hunters of Unit 18. The ANS for moose harvested by Unit 18 residents is grossly underestimated and, as a result, inaccurately misrepresents the needs of the residents within the unit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the ANS for Unit 18 moose is not revised to reflect the amount of moose needed by Unit 18 communities, then it is unlikely that reasonable opportunity can be evaluated and will not be provided through the state hunting regulations for the unit. Additionally, the Unit 18 moose population may not be able to provide for all subsistence uses. If the Unit 18 ANS finding for moose is not revised to reflect the moose harvest needed by each individual Unit 18 community, it will be difficult for the department to determine if “local and non-local” harvests of moose in Unit 18 are sustainable – especially during periods of declining and low moose populations and during periods of decline of other subsistence resources. Unit 18 hunters also hunt in the neighboring Units of 17, 19, and 21E. Even with some of the hunter effort distributed to other Units, hunting in some areas within Unit 18 is fairly competitive. Thus, the existing ANS cannot be used for sound conservation management when the harvestable supply and demand of Unit 18 moose must be evaluated.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The establishment of accurate, community-based ANS findings for Unit 18 communities will provide the department with the tools necessary to help manage the moose populations within the Unit and will lead to better informed regulatory decisions concerning changes made to seasons and harvest limits for moose in Unit 18. Accurate ANS findings for Unit 18 communities will also help the department to meet the management objectives for Unit 18 moose populations, by providing the state with a tool to evaluate whether reasonable opportunity has been provided. The information gathered to revise the ANS will provide additional insights including harvest use patterns, hunter distributions, and customary and traditional use determinations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The users and the managers will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSAL 7 CONTINUED

PROPOSED BY: Lester Wilde, Sr.

(HQ-08S-G-078)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Native Village of Nunapitchuk PC12 USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30	Stoney Holitna AC7	Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Alaska Outdoor Council PC65
---	--------------------	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 8 —5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping; 92.085(6). Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions; and 92.990(21). Definitions. Establish a trapping season for black bear in Unit 19.

Three black bears may be taken every season; no more than two may be taken by trapping between April 1 and May 31 in Unit 19.

ISSUE: Not maximizing the optimal sustained yield with black bear harvest in Unit 19.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Department of Fish and Game is not fulfilling its' legal obligation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it provides a more realistic opportunity for black bear harvest it also provides more options to target nuisances and potential nuisances.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All residents of Unit 19.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I also considered a fall trapping season and still consider this a possibility.

PROPOSED BY: Patrick Jones (HQ-08S-G-016)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Red Devil Traditional Council PC23 Alaska Trappers Association - Randy Zarnke PC45 Stoney River Traditional Council PC54 Lime Village Traditional Council PC55 Fairbanks AC3 Stoney Holitna AC7 Mat Valley w/Am. AC12		USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Kneeland Taylor PC52 Defenders of Wildlife PC56

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 9 — 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Modify the brown bear season dates for Unit 19 as follows:

Brown/Grizzly Bear:

Residents and nonresidents, Unit 19 B and 19C: One bear every regulatory year; [SEPTEMBER 1] **August 10** - May 31

ISSUE: Bear season in Units 19B and 19C. The season does not open early enough in the fall to provide bear harvesting opportunities to people in the area in August. Unit 19A and 19D to the north and west of this area and Unit 16B to the east of this area are already open to bear hunting in August for the same reasons that is needed in Units 19B and 19C.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the season is not changed, there will continue to be a population increase in the brown/grizzly bear population in the area and a decrease of moose and caribou populations in the area.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The people who will benefit are hunters that hunt in Units 19B and 19C in August.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions considered.

PROPOSED BY: Rob Jones Jr. (SC-08S-G-005)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Rob Jones PC19 Red Devil Traditional Council PC23 Stoney River Traditional Council PC54 Lime Village Traditional Council PC55 Fairbanks AC3 Stoney Holitna AC7		Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Defenders of Wildlife PC56

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 10 — AAC 85.045. Seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulations as follows:

Holitna River: Upstream of Titnuk Creek including Titauk Creek, Hoholitna River: Upstream of Little Diamond Mountain: One bull spike fork, or 50 inch antlered bull, or 4 or more brow tines on each side.

ISSUE: Closed portion of 19A, upriver of but not including George River in the Holitna and Hoholitna River. In the Holitna River, confluence of Titauk Creek and Holitna River upstream, Hoholitna River, Little Diamond Mountain and up river.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bears, wolves will keep growing in population numbers.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It does not only improve quality of the resource, it will have nearby villages to be able to hunt moose, and as well as controlling bear and wolf numbers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The residents of Sleetmute, Red Devil, Crooked Creek, Tuluksak, Akiak, Akiachak, Kwethluk, Bethel, Napaskiak, Kipnuk, and others who were not fortunate in obtaining a Tier II permit as well as sports hunters on the Holitna River.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Harry Jackson (INT-08S-G-008)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
	Stoney Holitna AC7	USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____
 ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 11 — 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Amend the regulations for Unit 19 caribou as follows:

Eliminate the nonresident hunting seasons that provide for the taking of caribou in Units 19A and 19B. The requested closure includes the units that include the range of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd within the Western Interior Region.

ISSUE: Over the past few years the Council has become extremely concerned about the Mulchatna Caribou Herd; it has declined from 200,000 to less than 43,000 in the past ten years. This herd uses parts of Units 9, 17, 18 and 19; this includes the Lake Clark Park and Preserve.

The Council's concern is over the over harvest of the bull component, especially large bulls. The over-harvest was primarily done by clients of hunting guides, outfitters and transporters. The data shows the herd was healthy and increasing and when the bull/cow ratio was over 40 bulls per 100 cows. Once this ratio fell below 30 bulls per 100 cows, the herd decline increased dramatically. The survey last fall shows a pathetic 14.4 bulls per 100 cows and only 1.33 large bulls per 100. In no way is this anywhere close to natural and healthy population as the park lands are to be managed nor is it close to healthy populations that refuge and other lands require and nor is it sustainable. This is clearly over-harvest by humans. Predators don't affect bull/cow ratios to a large degree; humans do when the bulls are singled out.

It is recognized management principle that moose and caribou bull/cow ratios minimums need to be maintained and these are 20 to 30 bulls per 100 cows for moose and 30 to 40 bulls per 100 cows for caribou. The biological reality is that small bulls, younger than three years old, propagate light weight calves. Small calves are subject to higher and longer predation factors and over winter survivorship is low. Small and weak calves also are more susceptible to disease and parasites. The cows that do survive from this cohort as adults have less fecundity. The moose and caribou herd declines are from the induced lack of recruitment. Most areas in the intensive management (predator control) have these poor bull/cow ratios and poor survivorship.

The Department of Fish and Game and the Board of Game have ignored this fact and continued a non-resident hunt, September 1 to 15th this season for most of the area where the Mulchatna Caribou Herd can be found. The Board of Game, even when requested by the Federal Subsistence Board not to allow non-residents to harvest one caribou, most of which would be bulls, took no action to protect the ailing bull component. It is regrettable the Mulchatna Caribou Herd situation and it may take decades to recover to their previous population levels. It is the Council's hope that action now will provide a healthy caribou herd population for the entire range of the Mulchatna caribou herd in the future.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Mulchatna Caribou Herd will continue to crash and the herd's recovery will take longer. With a prolonged recovery all hunters will suffer but especially the subsistence hunters who depend on the caribou for nutritional and culturally needs. Portions of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd's range include areas of depressed moose populations and hunting moratoriums. Immediate action now will affirm the Board of Game's mandate to maintain sustainable wildlife populations.

PROPOSAL 11 CONTINUED

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Retention of the large bull caribou, which are generally targeted by nonresident hunters, would facilitate herd growth.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The resource and resident hunters in the short term will benefit; all hunters will benefit in the long term with the return of a healthy caribou herd for all to benefit from.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Non-resident hunters during the herd's time of recovery.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Western Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Council (HQ-08S-G-001)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
USFWS-Subsistence Management PC30		Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Stoney Holitna AC7

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 12 — 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the season dates and antler restriction for moose in Unit 19B.

Subsistence hunters may bag any antlered moose, August 25 – September 25.

ISSUE: Subsistence hunters in Unit 19B should be able to bag any antlered bull and not regulated like trophy hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Since gas prices in Yukon/Kuskokwim Delta area are very expensive and because it takes two days to get to hunting camp, we don't want to go home to family with out getting meat for the table.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? We don't go for trophy moose because of quality of the meat. Big antlered moose mean nothing; they are the last resort.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence hunters in the Kuskokwim region who will be able to bag any antlered moose by following regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, maybe trophy hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Gas prices and oil.

PROPOSED BY: Max D. Olickso (HQ-08S-G-003)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
		Red Devil Traditional Council PC23 USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Stoney River Traditional Council PC54 Lime Village Traditional Council PC55 Stoney Holitna AC7

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 13 — 5 AAC 85.045. **Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Close the Holitna-Hoholitna Controlled Use Area to moose hunting in 19B as follows:

Unit 19B within the Holitna-Hoholitna Controlled Use Area:

Residents and Nonresidents:	<u>No open season</u>
Remainder of 19B:	
Residents:	September 1- 20
Nonresidents:	September 5- 20

With this sort of closure, enforcement can be done at one place – the mouth of the Holitna River. The intent of this proposal is to make the moose closure as effective as possible and to prevent abuse by making the closure enforceable. With the present Unit 19A predator management program in place for two more years, the state can take advantage of using all these tools at once to allow the quickest population recovery possible. It is not the intent of this proposal to limit legal subsistence and commercial moose hunting in the upland Holitna drainage of Unit 19B.

ISSUE: At the March, 2006 Board of Game meeting, the board adopted Department of Fish and Game proposal 70, which closed the upriver portion of Unit 19A to moose hunting. That proposal and similar proposals from the Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee and the Sleetmute Traditional Council included portions of Unit 19B in the river corridor in this closure. The inclusion of the Unit 19B portion was overlooked and left out when the final proposal was adopted.

The moose hunting closure for residents and nonresidents in Unit 19A is unenforceable in the Holitna drainage at present. There have been violations where hunters have hunted in Unit 19A, but claimed to have hunted in Unit 19B. Two of these violations are documented and are available to board members today. Also, there are no clear geographical landmarks in the present regulations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be violations of this sort. The moose populations on the streams of the Holitna River Basin will take longer to recover – both in Units 19A & 19B.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes it does – These moose populations need all the help available to give them a chance to recover.

- In the rest of Alaska, there were 11 plus years of no predator management.
- The predator management program in Unit 19A was not as effective last season due to poor weather conditions and the cost of fuel.
- There have been few moose surveys done in Unit 19B due to poor weather/snow conditions, and lack of funding for the Department of Fish and Game.
- There has been continued hunting in Unit 19B, both commercial and subsistence, on the rivers themselves.
- There is no predator management program in Unit 19B.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The moose population will benefit.

PROPOSAL 13 CONTINUED

All user groups will benefit if this closure is kept in place until moose numbers can support a general hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? All user groups will suffer to some degree until moose populations increase. These closures originated with the subsistence hunters who live in Unit 19A and depend on this resource the most, and they will suffer the most. They are the most dependent on the moose in the area, and they fully support these measures.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Extend the boundaries of the nonresident closed area on the Hoholitna River to the mouth of the South Fork. Have no open season for moose in the Holitna Drainage portion of the nonresident Closed Area.

PROPOSED BY: Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-017)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Red Devil Traditional Council PC23 Stoney River Traditional Council PC54 Lime Village Traditional Council PC55 Fairbanks AC3 Stoney Holitna AC7		<u>Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51</u>

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 14 — 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Eliminate antler restrictions for moose in Unit 19B as follows:

Residents, Unit 19B: One antlered bull, September 1- September 25.

ISSUE: Hunter restrictions and open season within Unit 19B. Currently, the area is designed to benefit trophy hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? I will experience what I went through like this year (2007) not bagging a moose, as I did not see a moose as specified under special instructions, but saw other moose (bull) that I could not shoot.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Antlers mean nothing to subsistence hunters because they are not edible. More chance of harvesting a moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence hunters who should be able to shoot any antlered bull, benefiting their families and after all the expenses, especially fuel, as it takes me two days to get there from Bethel.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Other hunters who only hunt for antlers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Fuel/oil (would consider.)

PROPOSED BY: Johnny Evan (HQ-08S-G-002)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
		<u>Red Devil Traditional</u> <u>Council PC23</u> <u>Alaska Professional Hunters</u> <u>Association PC51</u> <u>Stoney River Traditional</u> <u>Council PC54</u> <u>Lime Village Traditional</u> <u>Council PC55</u> <u>Stoney Holitna AC7</u>

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 15 — 5 AAC 85.045. Seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish a winter moose season in Unit 19D as follows:

Unit 19D, that portion between and including Cheeneetnuk and Gagaryah River drainages excluding that portion within two miles of the Swift River:

Residents: One bull harvest, September 1-20 **and December 1-31.**

Nonresidents: One bull harvest with 50” antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on at least one side, September 1-20.

Unit 19D Remainder:

Residents: One bull harvest, September 1-20 **and December 1-31.**

ISSUE: The problem is the lack of winter moose hunting opportunities in Unit 19.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A continued lack of moose hunting opportunities in Unit 19.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who want to winter moose hunt in Unit 19.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions considered.

PROPOSED BY: Rob Jones Jr. (SC-08S-G-003)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Rob Jones PC19		USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 16 — 5 AAC 85.057. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolverine. Lengthen the wolverine hunting season in Unit 19.

Unit 19: Residents and nonresidents, one wolverine, September 1-[MARCH 31] **May 15.**

ISSUE: The length of the wolverine hunting season in the spring.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A continued lack of late spring hunting opportunity for wolverine.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who like to hunt in April and May in Unit 19.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None considered.

PROPOSED BY: Rob Jones Jr. (SC-08S-G-004)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Rob Jones PC19		Alaska Trappers Association - Randy Zarnke PC45 Kneeland Taylor PC52 Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Mat Valley AC12

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 17 — 5 AAC 84.260. Furbearer trapping. Modify the season for trapping lynx in Unit 20 as follows:

Unit 20: A three month season [December 1 – February 28(29)] with a bag limit of five lynx during November to allow for incidental harvest.

ISSUE: The unnecessarily restrictive Lynx Tracking Harvest Strategy in most subunits of Unit 20.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The opportunity for trappers to harvest lynx at the optimal level will be lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Most lynx harvested during the new season will have prime pelts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Essentially all lynx trappers in the road-connected portions of Interior Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Probably nobody. If Unit 20C is included in the new season, then some trappers will have a slightly shorter season.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1.) No change; retain current system. Rejected because season does not routinely open early enough in years when lynx are abundant. In essence, the current system restricts trappers in some stages of the cycle, without any perceived benefit in other stages of the cycle. Some of the assumptions upon which the Lynx Tracking Harvest Strategy was based when it was first adopted are no longer valid (high prices & abundant trappers). 2.) A four-month season (November – February). Rejected because most Interior lynx pelts are not yet prime during November. 3.) Three month season without five lynx bag limit in November. Rejected because unfair to trappers and difficult to enforce. 4.) Three month season with other opening & closing dates. Rejected because the November – February season would standardize the remainder of Unit 20 with current system in Unit 12 & 20E. 5.) Allowing for shorter season during low stage of lynx population cycle. Rejected because (considering today’s moderate fur prices & low trapper density) we don’t believe that a shorter trapping season significantly affects lynx population dynamics and because trappers already routinely limit harvest of lynx when the population is low.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Trappers Association (INT-08S-G-021)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Ahtna Inc. PC7 Alaska Trappers Association - Randy Zarnke PC45 Larry Dalrymple PC59 Fairbanks AC3 Middle Nenana AC5		<u>Kneeland Taylor PC52</u> <u>Delta AC2</u>

Upper Tanana 40 mile w/Am. AC8 Mat Valley AC12		
--	--	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 18 — 5 AAC. 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Modify the trapping season for lynx in Unit 20F as follows:

In Unit 20F, change the lynx trapping season to **December 1 to February 28** (November 1 to February 28 currently).

ISSUE:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unprime skins on the fur market.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, lynx don't get prime until December, why send unprimed fur to the fur auctions?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Greg Gau (INT-08S-G-024)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Alaska Trappers Association - w/Am. Randy Zarnke PC45 Defenders of Wildlife PC56		

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 19 —5 AAC 85.045. Seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the season dates in Unit 20.

Move the dates of the hunting season to later time to allow decrease in temperature.

ISSUE: Progressive increase of temperature during hunting season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More game meat lost due to spoilage.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We can't change the weather, only adapt to it.

PROPOSED BY: Rich Anderson (INT-08S-G-004)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
		Allen Avinger PC6 Ahtna Inc. PC7 Middle Nenana AC5 Mat Valley AC12

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 20 — 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.

Amend the regulations to provide the following:

Taking of adult grizzly bears permitted over bait at a registered bait station, within 10 miles of state maintained roadways in Unit 20B. Bag limit to remain one bear every regulatory year. All other baiting restrictions remain the same. Season: March 1 – May 31.

ISSUE: A noticeable increase in grizzly bear activity in populated areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More bear-human encounters in populated human areas such as residential recreational areas.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who live outside the “city limits” on the road system within Unit 20B. Users of recreation areas within Unit 20B.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Opening entire Unit 20B – only trying to target road system.

PROPOSED BY: Caleb Herkstroeter (INT-08S-G-060)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Larry Dalrymple PC59 Delta AC2 Fairbanks AC3	Yukon Flats AC9	Betsy Chronic PC29 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51
--	-----------------	---

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 21 — 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Amend the caribou registration hunt for nonresidents in Unit 20E as follows:

The current regulations provide an open season of August 10 – September 30 for residents in the registration hunt (RC860) and a season of August 1- September 20 for nonresidents. I propose that the season for nonresidents open 10 days later than the season for residents, providing nonresidents a season of August 20 – September 30. This does not shorten the season for nonresidents, but gives residents the first chance to harvest a limited number of caribou before the quota is met and the season is closed.

ISSUE: Hunting pressure for caribou in Unit 20E has resulted in emergency closures the last few years, with the seasons being opened for very short periods. Before then, I used to be able to take my children caribou hunting there the last week of August, right before school started. That is impossible now. As best as I can determine, many of the hunters participating in this hunt are nonresidents. In an area with limited game that can be taken, I think residents should have a chance to harvest game before it is opened to nonresidents.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? With the registration hunt on a current trend of closing well within a week of opening, many Alaska residents who can not hunt during the first few days of the season will miss the opportunity to participate in that hunt at all.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposal provides Alaskan residents a better opportunity to harvest caribou in an area which is road accessible and where a limited number of animals can be taken. It also increases the quality of the hunt by reducing the need for all hunters who want to participate in the hunt to be in the field the first day of the hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskan residents, especially those who do not have the means to hunt caribou in less accessible areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresidents.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Restricting the registration hunt to residents only. Rejected because residents should have an opportunity to harvest caribou after Alaskan residents have had a fair chance first at taking the limited number of caribou which are available.

PROPOSED BY: John Jordan (HQ-08S-G-030)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Ahtna Inc. PC7		Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Fairbanks AC3 Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____
ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 22 – 5 AAC 85.025(a)(15). Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou.
Increase the allowable harvest for the Macomb caribou herd.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
-----------------------------	---	------------------------------------

...

Unit 20 (D) south of the
Tanana River

RESIDENT HUNTERS
1 bull by registration
permit only; up to **100** [50]
bulls may be taken in combination
with Unit 12 in that portion west
of the Glenn Highway (Tok
Cutoff) and south of the
Alaska Highway, excluding
the Tok River drainage.

Aug. 10–Sept. 30

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS

No open season.

ISSUE: The Macomb caribou herd population objective is 600–800, with a harvest objective of 30–50. A fall 2007 Macomb caribou herd census resulted in an estimate of 1,305 caribou. This is the largest herd size that has been documented, and it is now possible to allow additional harvest. However, regulations currently restrict the harvest to up to 50 bull caribou. This proposal will allow the flexibility to take additional bulls, as appropriate.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters may not have the opportunity to harvest the additional surplus.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, hunters will be able to harvest additional bull caribou, as appropriate.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The hunting public will benefit by having increased hunting opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to increased hunting opportunity.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No change to the current regulation.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08S-G-043)

PROPOSAL 22 CONTINUED

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Ahtna Inc. PC7 Alaska Professional Hunters Association w/Am. PC51 Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Backcountry Hunters and Anglers - Mark Richards PC66 Delta AC2 Fairbanks AC3 Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8		

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 23 —5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the antler restrictions for moose in Unit 20 as follows:

Resident: Legal bull is one with 50 inches or greater antler spread. or three brow tines on at least one side.

ISSUE: Taking of small spike and fork antler bull moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The herd will never attain the desired ratio of bull to cows which is the goal of the Department of Fish and Game, but erroneously by killing cows to reach said goal.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by sustaining a larger total herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaska resident hunters/sportsmen who esteem the value of the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those hunters that want the easy fix (i.e. shooting cows and baby bulls.)

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Consider taking bulls with two brow tines but only when bull ratio shows a vast improvement to overall percent of herd.

PROPOSED BY: William I. Ristow (HQ-08S-G-028)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
		Ahtna Inc. PC7 Delta AC2 Middle Nenana AC5

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 25 — 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. End the antlerless moose hunt in Units 20A and 20B.

Stop the antlerless moose hunts in Units 20A and 20B.

Unit 20A: Bull hunt only.

ISSUE: Stopping the antlerless moose hunts and the over-harvesting of cow moose in Units 20A and 20B.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Declining moose population in Unit 20A and other Units that border Unit 20A. Killing of cows which may be pregnant continues.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? All hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Dale Winther

(INT-08S-G-027)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Allen Avinger PC6 Ahtna Inc. PC7	John Morak PC2 Larry Dalrymple PC59	Alaska Outdoor Council PC65
-------------------------------------	--	-----------------------------

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 26 — 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the antler restrictions for Unit 20A as follows:

Define a legal bull moose in the general hunt as spike-fork, 36 inch or greater antler spread, three brow tines.

ISSUE: Antler restrictions in Unit 20A. The spike-fork 50” three brow tine “legal” bull may be more restrictive on bull harvest than necessary. Seen as the most hunter abusive regulation by moose hunters, as well as the high bull/cow ratio and the need to take more bulls, make it a subject for review during the March 2008 board meeting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The hunters will be restricted unnecessarily from harvesting bull moose in the general hunt. The harvest includes “any bull” drawing permits which were underutilized in 2007. In an intensive management program moose reduction, it makes sense to harvest more bulls.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? A change in definition of legal bull in the general hunt would improve the harvest and success rate. The issue is to reduce the 50 inch restriction. Something in between 36 inch and 50 inch should also be considered to allow harvest to maximize the harvest of bulls and still maintain a safe bull/cow ratio.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters, all of whom hate the 50 inch regulation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Specifying dropping spike-fork or other width, such as 40 inches rejected because the board discussion should bring out the relative number of bulls expected to be harvested for 36 and that number can be compared to present numbers.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-055)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Allen Avinger PC6	John Morak PC2 Larry Dalrymple PC59	Ahtna Inc. PC7 Deborah Waugaman PC48 Larry Dalrymple PC59 Marty Lambert PC62 Delta AC2 Fairbanks AC3 Middle Nenana AC5 Mat Valley AC12
-------------------	--	---

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 27 - 5 AAC 85.045. Seasons and bag limits for moose. Terminate the antlerless moose hunt in Units 20A and 20B.

Stop antlerless moose hunts - bulls only.

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be fewer moose for a sustainable yield.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, there would be more moose for a higher yield.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters would have a better chance to harvest a bull moose without antler restrictions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Cow hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Ronald and Sue Bless (HQ-08S-G-039)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Allen Avinger PC6 Ahtna Inc. PC7	John Morak PC2 Alaska Outdoor Council PC65	

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 28 — 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Close the antlerless moose hunts in Unit 20 as follows:

Remove the antlerless moose hunts in Units 20A and 20B. No need for new regulation.

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting in Unit 20 except in the Fairbanks Management Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose populations will continue to crash. Already there are few smaller bulls of 30” or less and the cow population is down in areas where there were many five years ago.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Allow the moose population to stabilize and keep the harvest for good meat in the fall. Killing a bull in November or December when they have lost their antlers does not make for quality meat. Neither does chasing cows on snow machines.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All interior moose hunters that will have moose in the future, trappers who will not have to put up with their traps and game stolen during the late season and their trails made into highways for hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who want to kill regardless of quality of game and don’t care if it is a pregnant cow or a bull with dropped antlers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Extend the regular season to end of October, but this does not solve the problem of fewer moose.

PROPOSED BY: LeRoy Wiedeman (INT-08S-G-053)

Favor Neutral Oppose

Allen Avinger PC6 Ahtna Inc. PC7		
-------------------------------------	--	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 29 — 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the season dates for moose in Unit 20B as follows:

I recommend that the season start September 10 and go through September 25 in Unit 20B “Remainder”.

ISSUE: For years the moose season has begun and ended too early.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The bulls are not moving yet and if one is shot it’s too warm to keep the meat from spoiling or there is a greater risk of spoiling.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bull hunters using guns in Unit 20B

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The borough dumpsters and those opposed to moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Dave Eberhardt (INT-08S-G-005)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____
ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 30 — 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose, and 92.530(10). Management areas. Modify the regulations as follows:

Bow hunting for bull moose in Unit 20B from September 16 to September 30; bow hunters must have IBEP card to hunt with bow and arrow.

ISSUE: Moose hunting in Fairbanks Management Area is over crowded due to increased number of bow hunters and less of habitat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting pressure will increase and land owners and hunters could have conflicts and possible more hunting accidents could occur.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Reduce over crowding and make it safer in the field.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bow hunters, and people driving highway vehicles, as there are many moose vehicle accidents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: George Pearson

(INT-08S-G-011)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 31 — 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting Seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the moose season dates in the Fairbanks Management Area as follows:

Unit 20B (Fairbanks Management Area):

Open to archery **September 16 – September 25, one bull.**

ISSUE: To many bow hunters in the Fairbanks Management Area with the loss of the haul road, congestion from new homes, private land etc. We need to expand again. Too many moose are dying in people’s yards. Too many hunters in a small area. There are a lot of moose/vehicle accidents which still occur, some of which were fatal this year, just outside the Fairbanks Management Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bow hunters look bad to the general public, home owners, landowners and this gives those who do not approve of hunting ammo to use against hunters. It also causes unintentional game violations.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bow hunters, land owners, vehicles the image of archery in a whole.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Grady Brown Jr. and Bart Colledge (INT-08S-G-030)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
		Fairbanks AC3

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 32 — 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the moose hunt regulations in Unit 20 B as follows:

Keep the existing Fairbanks Management Area archery only. Cow moose (permit) September 1 – 30, borough-wide. Archery only September 16 – 30, one bull, borough-wide.

ISSUE: Too many bow hunters in the Fairbanks Management Area, congestion from new homes, and private land etc. We need to expand. Too many moose die in people yards that the hunter doesn't know from running after being shot with a bow and too many hunters in small area moose/vehicle accidents.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bow hunters look bad to the general public, home owners, and land owners.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Grady Brown Jr. , Bart Colledge (INT-08S-G-031)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
		Fairbanks AC3

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 33 — 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose, and 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures. Modify the moose permit hunt conditions for the Fairbanks Management Area as follows:

If you draw a tag for moose in the Fairbanks Management Area in Unit 20B, you must hunt it in that area only.

ISSUE: People draw tags and don't hunt the tag they have drawn. For example the bull moose hunt in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area and the cow moose hunt in the Fairbanks Management Area. At present if you draw a tag you can get a regular tag and hunt. You draw a tag as a last resort.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Quotas are not met. Tags are wasted and kept from hunters who want to hunt that animal in that Unit. We lost the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area because of incidental take. People who intended to hunt caribou and stumble upon a moose.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who want to hunt that animal in that area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who want to feed their family and didn't draw, people who want to hunt that area, and people who want to hunt that particular animal.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Bart Colledge and Grady Brown Jr. (INT-08S-G-033)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
		Allen Avinger PC6 Larry Dalrymple PC59 Fairbanks AC3

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 34 —5 AAC 85.045. Seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the season dates for moose in Unit 20C.

Unit 20C: September 5 – 25

Subsistence: September 5 to 30, at least the Kantishna River area.

ISSUE: Moose season opens too early and closes too soon.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? What does happen is residents who live in the bush without electricity don't dare take their moose until the end of season because of warm temperatures, even if harvested the last day it can be a tough job to keep without spoilage.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Better chance of harvesting when meat will keep.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everybody.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Mike Turner

(INT-08S-G-012)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

		Ahtna Inc. PC7 Middle Nenana AC5
--	--	-------------------------------------

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 35 — 5 AAC 95.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Extend the moose season in Unit 20D as follows:

Extend hunting season for moose in northeastern Unit 20D from September 1 – 15 to September 1-20. That portion of northeastern Unit 20D which is east of the Volkmar drainage, (and including the Volkmar drainage) and north of the south bank of the Tanana River. It would be important that the south bank of the Tanana River be the boundary, so that the islands along the Tanana River might be included.

ISSUE: We believe there is no reason to have such a short hunting season in this area, as it is basically accessible only by boat or float plane. There is relatively little hunting pressure in this area, with few trails, and it is heavily wooded. There is also a good bull/cow ratio in this area.

An extended hunting season (September 1 – September 20) would allow a few additional hunters an opportunity to harvest a bull. As recent burns mature, (The Billy Creek Burn) and the possibility of wolf harvest in the area, (the impact of the Fortymile Caribou Herd Recovery Plan), moose populations in this area should increase in the future.

Due to high hunting pressure and high harvest of moose in southern Unit 20D, moose population surveys have been concentrated there, instead of in this northern region. Because of this, the Department of Fish and Game has not surveyed northern Unit 20D in several years.

Having the season open until the 20th in this area would allow hunters to possibly call in a bull down along the river where it is heavily wooded and there is little visibility. We believe that even with the season open later, the impact of this proposal on the moose population would be minimal, due to the inaccessibility of the area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity will be lost. Hunters will be crowding other areas late in the season.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and their families may benefit due to increased opportunity to harvest. It would also be beneficial to spread some of the hunters in Unit 20D around a little.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Stretching the area that is open to the 20th to the Goodpastor River, or including all of northern Unit 20D

PROPOSED BY: Delta Junction Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-023)

PROPOSAL 35 CONTINUED.

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Allen Avinger PC6 Tommy Geyer PC11 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Delta AC2 Fairbanks AC3 Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8		
--	--	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 36 — 5 AAC 95.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Eliminate the antlerless moose hunt in Unit 20.

No antlerless moose hunt.

ISSUE: The moose count is not up to date or accurate antlerless moose hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The bull cow ratio is out of balance. The cow population will be desecrated.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It will help sustain the moose herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Loren Hite

(INT-08S-G-022)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Allen Avinger PC6 Ahtna Inc. PC7	John Morak PC2 Larry Dalrymple PC59	
-------------------------------------	--	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC 85.055(a)(8). Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Clarify Mount Harper Sheep Permit (DS206) hunt area description.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(8) ...	Aug. 10 – Sept. 20 (General hunt only)	
Unit 20(D), that portion north of the Alaska Highway, and that portion of Unit 20E <u>within the Middle Fork of the Fortymile River drainage north and west of the north bank upstream from and including the Joseph Creek drainage</u> [ENCOMPASSING MT. HARPER SOUTH OF JOSEPH CREEK AND THE HEADWATERS OF THE CHARLEY RIVER]		

ISSUE: The current description for the portion of the Mount Harper Sheep Permit Hunt (DS206) in Unit 20E is unclear. While the Unit 20D portion of the hunt area is large for ease of describing the area, the Unit 20E portion is intended to be specific to Mount Harper itself to allow sheep hunting under general season harvest tickets to the north. Therefore, the hunt area should include the entire Joseph Creek drainage, but not any portion of the Charley River Drainage. This intent is reflected in the hunt area map which includes the entire Joseph Creek Drainage but not the upper Charley River Drainage.

The current hunt area description includes only a portion of the Joseph Creek drainage and includes the headwaters of the Charley River, even though the Charley River Drainage was originally intended to remain in the general hunt area. This proposal revises this regulation to 1) clarify the entire Unit 20E portion of the hunt boundary and 2) remove the Charley River portion from the codified description.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The hunt area description will continue to confuse hunters and result in harvest of sheep within the DS206 hunt area by hunters without a DS206 permit or loss of general hunter opportunity by some hunters who think they need a DS206 permit to hunt sheep within the Charley River drainage.

PROPOSAL 37 CONTINUED

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It will eliminate confusion for sheep hunters and ensure proper management of the sheep population in this permit area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who draw DS206 sheep permits. General season hunters who hunt just outside the DS206 hunt boundary.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G-045)

Favor Neutral Oppose

Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Fairbanks AC3 Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8		Vickie Greenleaf PC38
--	--	-----------------------

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 38 — 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Establish a controlled use area in Unit 20A as follows:

The Delta Creek Controlled Use Area: That area within Unit 20A that is drained by Delta Creek upstream from its junction with the 100 Mile Creek is closed to the use of land motorized vehicles, for big game hunting, including transportation of big game hunters, their hunting gear, and/or parts of big game, from August 1 through September 30.

ISSUE: Hunters on all terrain vehicles (ATVs) are causing destruction of habitat, environmental degradation, deterioration of quality hunting experience, game and hunter harassment, unsportsmanlike conduct, and unsightliness of trails. This has already resulted in many states restricting the use of ATVs for recreational uses.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? ATV hunters will continue to increase their presence with subsequent loss of habitat and increased environmental degradation through the destructive nature of unrestricted ATV trails across the fragile landscape. They also increase competition among hunters often resulting in unsportsmanlike conduct, harassment, and even herding of game animals thereby lowering the overall quality of a hunting experience.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Eliminating the use of ATVs for hunting big game will preserve the integrity of the habitat and environmental quality, while reducing the occurrence of game and hunter harassment, preserve the scenic value of the area and maintain a quality hunting experience in this one small watershed of Unit 20A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaskans who oppose the widespread destructive and unsightly nature of ATV trails carved into the pristine landscape; plus all hunters that have traditionally accessed the area with aircraft: the only method that has been utilized in the past.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The ATV operators who indiscriminately scar the countryside with trails under the guise of hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Restrict ATVs to established trails. This would be costly to initiate and would be time consuming to identify, document and publicize the list of established trails. Prohibit hunting the same day that one has ridden an ATV. This would reduce some of the negative impact of ATVs but would still create significant habitat and environmental degradation.

PROPOSED BY: Delta Advisory Committee

(INT-08S-G-050)

PROPOAL 38 CONTINUED

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Allen Avinger PC6 Betsy Chronic PC29 Kneeland Taylor PC52 Middle Nenana AC5 Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8		Tommy Geyer PC11 John Greenleaf PC32 Nathan Miller PC33 Joshua Lawhorne PC34 J. Thomas Porter PC35 Peter Rotandi PC36 Jack Fredrick PC37 Ron Greenleaf PC39 Joseph Brooks PC40 Mark Selvagg PC41 James Greenleaf PC42 Donald Winston PC43 Banjo Mcgeiff PC44 Oscar Chavez PC46 Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Delta AC2 Fairbanks AC3 Mat Valley AC12 Nelson Grier PC68

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____
 ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 39 — 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the archery season for moose in Unit 20B as follows:

Allow archery hunting in all of 20B from September 1-30. Bow hunters must be IBEP certified.

ISSUE: The Fairbanks Management Area has become overcrowded. Loss of huntable areas due to the commercial and residential construction boom have effectively reduced the Fairbanks Management Area to the dyke and the pipeline. With an increased number of bow hunters, especially from September 16-30, these two areas have become overcrowded.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? With increased hunting pressure, land owner and hunter conflicts could increase. Hunting accidents and traffic accidents could increase. Quality hunting experiences will and have decreased.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It would improve the product and quality hunting experience. It would reduce land owner and hunter tensions and reduce the number of interrupted stalks by allowing hunters to spread out more.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone in the Fairbanks Management Area. Hunters, land owners, drivers, even retailers. A longer hunting season would increase sales of sporting goods, food etc.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. All hunters have the opportunity to become IBEP certified.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Earlier season was rejected because meat would spoil due to heat. Later season was rejected due to loss of meat quality due to the rut.

PROPOSED BY: Lee Masters (INT-08S-G-016)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 40 — 5 AAC 92.165(5). Sealing of bear skins and skulls. Amend the regulation for sealing brown bear hides in Unit 20E as follows:

Hunters using aircraft to access Unit 20E for grizzly bear must seal hides either in Tok, Delta Junction, 20E or Fairbanks within 30 days of harvest.

ISSUE: Having to seal grizzlies in Tok or in Unit 20E when hunter using aircraft lives in Delta Junction or Fairbanks or somewhere else where Tok is out of the way from home.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Inconvenience for the aircraft hunter. Up to 200 more miles to travel which means more fuel used, possible bad weather and wasted time.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No except maybe hunting pressure more evenly spread out.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters using aircraft not living in Tok.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fuel industry and vendors, engine rebuilders.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Martin Recknagel (HQ-08S-G-018)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8		

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 41 – 5 AAC 92.165(a)(5). Sealing of bear skins and skulls. Simplify sealing requirements for brown bears taken in Unit 20E.

(a) Sealing is required for brown bear taken in any unit in the state...

...

[(5) IN UNIT 20(E), BROWN BEAR TAKEN MAY NOT BE TRANSPORTED FROM THAT UNIT, EXCEPT TO TOK, UNTIL SEALED;]

ISSUE: The current brown bear sealing regulation is intended to allow for the timely and close tracking of harvest by requiring in-unit sealing (including Tok). It was also intended to reduce the likelihood of bears taken in other units from being sealed under the more liberal Unit 20E bag limit.

The 2 bear bag limit has been in place for several years now, with no increase in harvest and no apparent abuse of the liberal regulations. Successful hunters who float the Charley and Yukon Rivers downstream to Circle and those who fly into Unit 20E from Fairbanks currently need to travel back to Tok from Fairbanks to seal their bear. This is an unnecessary burden, as there is no evidence that hunters who take bears in areas of the state with more restrictive regulations are attempting to pass their bears off as 20E bears.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to be burdened with the requirement to travel to Tok to seal their bear.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Hunters will no longer have to spend additional time and money to travel to Tok to seal their bear.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bears hunters returning from the field that do not pass through Tok on their way home.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Retain the Tok sealing requirement.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G-046)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Delta AC2 Fairbanks AC3 Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8		Mat Valley AC12

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 42 — 5 AAC 85.020. Seasons and bag limits for brown bear; and 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Establish a brown bear baiting season in Unit 20B.

I suggest the board adopt the taking of brown/grizzly bears over bait in Unit 20B and extend season dates to close season on June 30, same as last day of baiting season. I also suggest opening the season on August 10.

ISSUE: Over the past couple years the number of grizzly bear versus human encounters has risen substantially. To date, there have been 10 defense of life and property grizzly bears killed within the Fairbanks North Star Borough and I believe all have been justified shootings. It seems to me the population numbers of grizzly bears in Unit 20B has risen to a number greater than the area can sustain. This causes bears to look outside their “normal habitat” to other areas for food to survive. That in turn is causing increased bear vs. human contact. Just this year we noticed and have picture proof of at least eight different grizzly bears using our bait station. This number is up from the one we had in 2006. The bait station is located approximately 2.2 miles from two different public camping/day use areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the problem persists we will definitely have more human vs. bear encounters which will increase the likelihood of bear attacks on humans and livestock/pets, leading to loss of life

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it would increase hunting opportunities and increase the likelihood of harvesting mature boars. It would also improve bear habitat by reducing the impact on the bear’s home range.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All people utilizing the area of 20B would benefit. If the population is reduced then the chance of bear vs. human encounters will be reduced. Hunters will also benefit due to increased chance of harvesting a mature grizzly bear. The limit in 20B is one bear per year anyway, so why should it matter how the bear is harvested?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer from this proposal

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions. If this proposal is not adopted then the likelihood of bear vs. human conflict will only increase.

PROPOSED BY: Dustin Hopkins and Martin Cooper (INT-08S-G-002)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
		Betsy Chronic PC29 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Defenders of Wildlife PC56

PROPOSAL 42 CONTINUED.

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____
ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 43 — 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.

Establish access restrictions for Unit 20 as follows:

You may not hunt or help someone else take big game until 3:00 a.m. the day following the day you have traveled in an air boat more that 1/4 mile outside of navigable (can be traveled by jet boat, stern driven boat, paddled or floated) waterways in Unit 20B south of the south bank of the Salcha River or Unit 20D north of the north bank of the Tanana River.

ISSUE: There has been a significant increase in airboats hunting large swampy drainages which were previously inaccessible during moose hunting season. New technology such as bottom coatings, multi-blade variable pitch propellers, increased horsepower, etc. have made this possible. These new airboats can access far beyond the limits of the best track rigs to areas even a float plane cannot utilize.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Over-harvest of these areas will result in lower moose populations. There and in the more accessible hunting areas which rely on surplus animals from the healthy, previously inaccessible populations of these swampy flats. Of special concern is maintaining the number of breeding age bulls in these remote areas whose rutting season travels help sustain the outlying populations.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This will reduce the over-harvest of moose in these areas and preserve the quality of the resource and the hunt. Herding and harassment of big game and other hunters will be reduced.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All big game hunters who access these areas by conventional means.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The airboat traveler who is hunting big game other than moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Totally prohibiting airboats in these areas during moose season. This idea was rejected because airboats have been used on navigable waterways, prior to the advent of new technology, long enough to be considered traditional. Restrictions prohibiting hunting the same day as traveling by airboat outside of navigable waterways could present enforcement problems.

PROPOSED BY: Delta Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-051)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Allen Avinger PC6 Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Delta AC2		Ahtna Inc. PC7 Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Fairbanks AC3 Mat Valley AC12
--	--	---

FINAL ACTION: Carries _____ Fails _____ Tabled _____ No Action _____ See Prop. # _____
 ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 44 — 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.

Establish access restrictions for Unit 20 as follows:

From August 1 through September 30, you may not hunt big game or assist someone in the taking of big game until 3:00 AM of the day following the day in which you have ridden a motorized land vehicle off of an established trail above the normal high-water mark of any stream. (In Units 20D, 20A, and 20E).

ISSUE: Riders on motorized land vehicles are causing destruction of habitat, environmental degradation, impaired scenic values of the land, deterioration of quality hunting experiences, harassment of other hunters and game animals, unsportsmanlike conduct, and complicating the department's management of large game on a sustained yield basis. These negative effects of unrestricted motorized land vehicles have already resulted in many states limiting their use for recreational purposes.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Motorized land vehicle operators will continue to increase their presence with subsequent loss of habitat and increased environmental degradation through the destructive nature of unrestricted trails across Alaska's fragile landscape. They will also continue to increase competition among hunters often resulting in unsportsmanlike conduct, harassment, even herding of game animals thereby lowering the overall quality of a hunting experience and complicating the management of the game resource on a sustained yield basis.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This will certainly reduce the amount of motorized land vehicular activity that results in habitat and environmental degradation. It also will reduce the "running and gunning" actions of some riders, thereby reducing hunter and game harassment, as well as improving the quality of the hunt for the real hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaskans who oppose the widespread destructive and unsightly nature of motorized land vehicle trails carved into the pristine landscape; plus all ethical hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Motorized land vehicle operators (runners and gunners) who indiscriminately scar the countryside with trails under the guise of hunting. They, being too lazy to walk, prefer to ride up to game animals and shoot them. These shooters may also interfere with other hunters by riding in to intercept game animals that other hunters are stalking on foot. Such over-competitiveness actually constitutes harassment.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Restrict motorized land vehicles to designated trails. Rejected because this would be costly and time consuming to accomplish. Prohibit hunting the same day that one has ridden a motorized land vehicle. This would reduce some of the negative impact, but would still allow habitat and environmental degradation. Ban motorized land vehicle use for hunting big game. Rejected because many hunters ride them responsibly.

PROPOSED BY: Don Quarberg

(INT-08S-G-020)

PROPOSAL 44 CONTINUED

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Allen Avinger PC6 Kneeland Taylor PC52 Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Delta AC2 Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8		Ahtna Inc. PC7 Larry Dalrymple PC59 Central AC1 Fairbanks AC3 Middle Nenana AC5 Mat Valley AC12

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 45 — 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting. Close the city limits of Delta Junction to big game hunting.

Emergency and permanent closure of big game hunting within the city limits of the City of Delta Junction (the only jurisdiction the City Council has).

ISSUE: Emergency petition regarding big game hunting within city limits of Delta Junction, Alaska.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There is potential hazard of people being shot.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The citizens living within Delta Junction city limits, particularly in residential areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Big game hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A.

PROPOSED BY: City of Delta Junction, Mike Tvenge (INT-08S-G-003)

Note: The Department of Law advises that the Board is not authorized to adopt regulations limiting means and methods based primarily on a public safety rationale. The Board's regulations must be for the purposes of conserving or developing Alaska's game resources.

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
	Kneeland Taylor PC52	Delta AC2 Fairbanks AC3

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 46 — 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Modify the bag limit for brown bear in Unit 21 as follows:

Units 21A and 21D: **2 bear every regulatory year.**

ISSUE: Brown/grizzly bear bag limit. Bear numbers in Units 21A and 21D are at an all time high, while moose numbers are steadily decreasing. Current laws and methods have been unsuccessful in reducing the increased bear predation problem on moose and other large game animals in these areas. Moose meat is a critical food supplement to the individuals who use and live in these remote bush areas.

It has been proven in other areas that moose populations respond well to a decrease in predator numbers. In this case, Units 21A and 21D bear numbers are at an all time high, and are currently increasing. We should take advantage of the surplus of bear population and help the moose population at the same time. Additionally, the local communities will benefit economically from the increased hunter traffic this would bring. This is a win for all.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose numbers will continue to decline and there will be a missed opportunity to help with an authorized and accepted way of reducing an ever increasing bear predation problem.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Having this limit in place will help relieve some of the stress off the stressed moose resource and greatly improve the experiences in the field of user groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The moose population, all user groups, local individuals and businesses that provide services to hunters in these remote areas. Long term, the residents of Units 21A and 21D with an increase moose population from a lower stable bear population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Don Schwandt (HQ-08S-G-007)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Fairbanks AC3 Middle Yukon AC6		USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30 Defenders of Wildlife PC56

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 47 — 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Shorten the resident and nonresident moose seasons in Unit 21A by five days and add antler restrictions for residents as follows:

Unit 21A - Resident moose seasons dates: **September 5-20**. Legal take: **one bull moose with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 brow tines on at least one side.**

Unit 21A - Nonresident moose season dates: **September 5-15**.

ISSUE: Even with the past moose season length change and the increase in the wolf harvest bag limits, there is still a continual steady decline of overall moose numbers, age structures, and calf production. Along with this issue, hunting pressure and predator numbers in Unit 21A are at an all time high. There needs to be additional steps taken to help turn around the alarming decline of the Unit 21A moose population. The moose population continues to be stressed beyond its ability to meet demands on the current low and declining population. Additionally, the current 2007-2008 Alaska hunting regulations authorize a resident hunter to harvest “one antlered bull” in Unit 21A. This gives users the perception there is a high level of moose numbers which is a false indication.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will see increased challenges with increased hunter migration, increased predator problems, less mature bull moose to breed and the continued decline of Unit 21A overall stressed moose population. The combination of low moose density, declining population, lower age structure of adult male moose, and low numbers of yearly moose requires reducing and regulating human harvest to allow for conservation of the herd so that hunting and viewing opportunity will not be lost. Plus, continued unnecessary loss of moose has already created heightened tension amongst users.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, reduces pressure off the moose population to over-harvesting during the peak mating season when they are the most vulnerable reduces the disruption of the herd during peak breeding season to help ensure cows are bred and enough mature bulls are left in the herd to breed during this time. Long term, this will help maintain a healthy balanced sustainable population for all user groups to take advantage of continually each year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups that use Unit 21A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who want to continue to harvest moose under the current guidelines in the regulations.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Don Schwandt

(HQ-08S-G-008)

PROPOSAL 47 CONTINUED

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
	Middle Yukon AC6	USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Representative Mike Kelly and 34 signatories PC64 Fairbanks AC3

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 48 — 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose; and 92.003. Hunter education and orientation requirements. Require nonresidents to have hunter education and orientation before hunting moose in Unit 21 as follows:

Modify game regulations in Units 21A and 21E to make mandatory the orientation requirement for nonresident moose hunters to read as follows: A nonresident hunter must attend an Alaska Department of Fish & Game approved hunter orientation course or must be accompanied in the field by a registered guide or a resident family member within the second-degree of kindred.

ISSUE: Modify game regulations in Units 21A and 21E to make mandatory the orientation requirement for nonresident moose hunters there is currently in Units 17B and 19B. Nonresident hunters should contact the Department of Fish and Game offices in Anchorage or Fairbanks.

Over the years there have been many citations issued to nonresident drop off hunters for shooting illegal moose or the wonton waste of moose meat. Making the orientation requirement for nonresident moose hunters in Units 21A and 21E will help educate the many nonresident unguided drop-off moose hunters that come to Units 21A and 21E each year. The moose population is stressed already beyond its ability to meet current demands. We need to do anything we can to protect the resource. Plus, we will at the same time help educate this nonresident of hunters so they can protect themselves and our moose resource by having better knowledge of identifying a legal moose and the proper field care of moose meat in the remote Alaska bush.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Needless illegal moose each year will continue to be shot or the wanton waste of meat that contributes to the decline of the overall moose population will take place. Additionally, these acts make all us hunters look bad. This is a problem area, so any preventative measures we can do will help.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will help educated nonresident hunters and help prevent moose being shot each year that are no legal, or the spoiling of prized moose meat from nonresidents that are dealing with large moose for the first time. In the long term it will help the population numbers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters that use Unit 21A moose population and law enforcement offices.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Don Schwandt

(HQ-08S-G-010)

PROPSOAL 48 CONTINUED.

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Middle Yukon w/Am. AC6		Fairbanks AC3
---	--	---------------

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 49 — **5 AAC 85.045. Seasons and bag limits for moose.** Establish a winter moose season in Unit 21B as follows:

Unit 21B, that part of the Nowitna River drainage downstream from (and including) the Little Mud River drainage, on Native lands: 1 antlered bull, December 1 – March 31, to be announced. A federal registration permit is required during the five day season and shall be limited to one per household. The five-day season may be announced by the Koyukuk/Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge Manager after consultation with the Department of Fish and Game and the chairs of the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council and the Ruby Fish and Game Advisory Committee.

ISSUE: Allow a concurrent state hunt with the existing federal winter bull moose hunt on Native Corporation lands and Native allotments that are contiguous to the described federal conservation area of the Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge. Winter moose hunting is a customary and traditional time to take moose. Rural residents are incurring very high fuel and other costs. There has been a 10% decline in human population within the census statistical area since 2000.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Native Alaskans will continue to be excluded from the opportunity to subsistence hunt on their own lands as provided by Congress in ANILCA Title VIII, Sec. 801(1). The federal public lands and Native lands are to have a rural priority. The State of Alaska is the managing agency on private lands currently, the Board of Game must provide subsistence opportunity on the Native lands. The Federal Subsistence Board has recognized a need for a winter bull moose season for the described area. The owners of the adjacent Native lands should not have to incur great expense crossing, and be excluded from opportunity of using their own lands during a federal hunt. A contiguous and concurrent state hunt will be easier and more economical for the hunters and enforcement to delineate and participate in.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? An antlered bull only hunt provides an opportunity for winter moose on Native lands without risk to harvesting cows.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska Native land owners who have been excluded from winter moose harvest on their private lands. The expense to participate would be reduced as most Native lands are closer to villages. Winter moose hunting is a customary time of year to harvest and is necessary to those who were unsuccessful during the fall.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those hunters who would not gain permission to hunt on private lands associated to the described hunt. All hunters are subject to being excluded from hunting on private lands during open seasons in every state, if the owners so wish.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Providing a Unit 21B general hunt for residents only during the described time. The bull/cow ratios are too low at this time to provide an unlimited resident opportunity.

PROPOSAL 49 CONTINUED.

PROPOSED BY: Western Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
(HQ-08S-G-036)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Koyukuk AC4	Middle Yukon AC6	Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Fairbanks AC3

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 50 — 5 AAC 85.045. Seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish a fall moose season in Unit 21B as follows:

Unit 21B, that part of the Nowitna River drainage downstream from (and including) the Little Mud River drainage, on Native lands: 1 bull September 1 – October 1. A state registration permit is required during September 5 – 25. A federal registration permit is required during the September 26 – October 1 season.

ISSUE: Allow concurrent state hunt with the existing federal season to the fall bull moose hunt on Native Corporation lands and Native allotments that are contiguous to the described federal conservation area of the Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge. Rural residents are incurring very high fuel and other costs. There has been a 10% decline in human population within this census statistical area since 2000.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Native Alaskans will continue to be excluded from the opportunity to subsistence hunt of their own lands as provided by Congress in ANILCA Title VIII, Sec. 801(1). The federal public lands and Native lands are to have a rural priority. The State of Alaska is the managing agency on private lands currently, the Board of Game must provide subsistence opportunity on the Native lands. The Federal Subsistence Board has recognized a need for a bull moose season extension for the described area. The owners of the adjacent Native lands should not have to incur great expense crossing, and be excluded from opportunity of using their own lands during a Federal hunt. A contiguous and concurrent State hunt will be easier and more economical for the hunters and enforcement to delineate and participate in.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Hunting closer to the village on native lands would allow for shorter transportation of moose resulting in less undue spoilage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska Native land owners who need additional moose harvest season opportunity on their private lands. The expense to participate would be reduced as most Native lands are closer to villages.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those hunters who would not gain permission to hunt on private lands associated to the described hunt. All hunters are subject to being excluded from hunting on private lands during open seasons in every state, if the owners so wish.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Providing a Unit 21B general hunt extension from September 25 – October 1. The Board of Game rejected that proposal. This proposal narrows the participation to stay within sustainability. The bull/cow ratios are too low at this time to provide an unlimited resident opportunity.

PROPOSED BY: Western Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
(HQ-08S-G-037)

PROPOSAL 50 CONTINUED.

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Koyukuk AC4	Middle Yukon AC6	

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 51 — 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish a spring season for moose in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area in Unit 21D as follows:

For those who did not take a moose in the fall, allow a “to be announced” March hunt from March 1 – 5 for bulls only.

ISSUE: Many families do not get their moose in the fall because of bad hunting conditions. They would like to have more opportunity in the spring.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Local hunters who cannot find moose in the fall really do need to have meat by spring.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This would give extended opportunity to a few people who did not get moose in the fall. This would be a second chance to those who did not get a moose if the 7% harvest rate has not been reached.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who do not get a moose in the fall and who still need meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The resource, if people are not careful to get bulls only and get cows instead.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Middle Yukon Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-042)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Middle Yukon AC6		Fairbanks AC3

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 52 — 5 AAC 85.056. Seasons and bag limits for wolf. Modify the resident and nonresident hunting season dates and bag limit for wolf in Unit 21A as follows:

1. No nonresident tag required.
2. Unit 21A: 10 wolves per day from August 10 – May 31st.

ISSUE: The overall Unit 21A moose population is still in a steady decline and at the same time a large increase in the numbers of wolves. The current over-population of wolves in Unit 21A is having a detrimental effect on large game animals.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Without changes, the Unit 21A moose population will continue to decline and be unable to support sport hunting, subsistence hunting, or viewing opportunities. The over-population of wolves will continue to rise. Additionally, there will be a missed opportunity to harvest wolves when hunters are in the field during spring bear hunting, concurrent with the month of May.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the increase of large game animal recovery will be able to take place.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Year-around wolf season, but I didn't think this would be acceptable.

PROPOSED BY: Don Schwandt (HQ-08S-G-013)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Larry Dalrymple w/Am. PC59 Fairbanks w/Am. AC3		Betsy Chronic PC29 Defenders of Wildlife PC56

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 53 — 5 AAC 85.060. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals. Modify the season and bag limit for beaver in Unit 21A as follows:

Unit 21A: No limit and no closed season for residents and nonresidents.

ISSUE: Establish a no closed season and no limit for Beaver in Unit 21A. The beaver population has exploded in Unit 21A with the no open season regulation along with very few folks trapping them anymore because of extreme remoteness of this unit. This is a very healthy resource not being made available to users.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The beaver population will continue to grow and be over-populated.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will help keep the population healthier from over-populating.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups that use or desire beaver.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Don Schwandt (HQ-08S-G-005)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
	Middle Yukon AC6	Alaska Trappers Association - Randy Zarnke PC45 Mat Valley AC12

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 54 — 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou; and 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Close the nonresident seasons for moose and caribou in Unit 21A.

Nonresident closed areas in Unit 21A: Closed to taking of caribou and moose by nonresidents in the following areas extending two miles on either side of the, and including the following rivers: 1) Dishna River and its tributaries 2) Innoko River upstream to its head waters from the confluence of the Dishna where it meets the Innoko River.

ISSUE: To date there is continued well known decline of overall moose numbers, age structures, and calf production that is still taking place at an alarming rate in Unit 21A. Along with this issue, huge increases in nonresident drop off hunting pressure and predator numbers in Unit 21A are at an all time high. The moose population is stressed beyond its ability to meet demands on the current low and steadily declining population.

Nonresident closed areas need to be established like the ones in Units 19A and 19B on the Dishna River and its tributaries and along the Innoko River upstream to head waters from the confluence of the Dishna and Innoko River.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The combination of low moose density, declining population, lower age structure of adult male moose, and low numbers of yearly moose. The moose population will continue to decline at the alarming rate.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will take pressure off the moose population so it can rebound from the extreme amount of nonresident moose hunting pressure in these areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All resident hunters that use Unit 21A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident hunters who want to continue to harvest moose under the current guidelines in the regulations.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Don Schwandt (HQ-08S-G-009)

Favor Neutral Oppose

		Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Fairbanks AC3
--	--	---

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 55 — 5 AAC 92.69. Special provisions for moose drawing permit hunts, and 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures. Allocate nonresident permits for moose in for Unit 21B as follows:

Apply an allocation for guided nonresident drawing permits for moose within that portion of the current moose drawing boundaries (DM810) that also lie within the boundaries of the Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge in Unit 21B, as follows:

The new section would allocate 50 percent of the total permits offered in DM810 (Nowitna River drawing permit) to nonresident hunters, and that 50 percent of the nonresident allocation within the boundaries of the Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge shall then be required to be accompanied by a licensed guide. The remaining applicants who are drawn for the resident and nonresident permits would not be forbidden to enter into contract for big game services with a licensed guide, nor would these permits count against the total guided allocation. It may be determined that it is necessary to form a separate drawing area for the portion of the hunt (DM810) that lies outside of the Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge.

Suggested wording would be as follows:

The department shall enter, in a guided nonresident drawing, each application from a nonresident who will be accompanied by a guide; the department may issue a drawing permit for the general hunt only to a successful nonresident applicant who has entered into contract to be accompanied by a licensed registered guide who has current land use authorization to conduct big game services within this drawing area;

- The following provisions apply to a guided nonresident drawing under this section:

(A) An applicant for a guided nonresident drawing permit may apply for only one such permit per application period;

(B) after the successful applicants have been selected by drawing, the department shall make available by online registration any unused permits on a “first come, first served” basis, to any licensed applicant who has entered into contract with a qualified guide until the permits have been filled or the hunt date arrives, whichever comes first. The department shall be required to publish the availability date for these online permit registrations.

(C) if a successful applicant fails to accept the permit (online or in writing) by a predetermined date, or cancels the guided hunt after the permit is issued, the permit shall be determined abandoned and be made available by online registration as noted above.

ISSUE: Inability of local hunting guides, and other historical user groups of this area, to obtain permits for the upper Nowitna River area. The newly implemented permit (DM810) has increased attention to a remote area that has been largely utilized by nonresident and nonresident guided hunters for more than a decade now. Traditionally there has been minimal subsistence hunting and low resident hunting activity in this area. Nonresident hunters now have difficulty in obtaining permits due to the sharp increase of applicants, and few of these awarded permits are actually utilized each season. Of the 20 (DM810) permits issued in 2007, three permits were used, one successfully.

PROPOSAL 55 CONTINUED

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The guides and assistant guides who live near and within the affected area and also those who live at Lake Minchumina, Ruby, Tanana, Nenana, and the Kantishna River will continue to lose the economic opportunity that these permits represent through nonresident guided hunts. These guided hunts represent the only local use of these moose, since the affected guides are all local to the area and depend on this harvested resource for their annual meat supply.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The meat is traveling a shorter distance and is removed from the field more quickly when harvest during a guided hunt in this area. The meat is handled and cared for by professionals who have a legal responsibility for its care, and is then largely distributed only a short distance for processing by local residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The local residents who are employed as guides, assistants, and packers will regain the economic opportunity that these recent changes have hindered. The meat from these hunts will be once again available for local use including distribution to many rural people living in this in this part of the interior who sometimes have a hard time getting their annual needs met through their own efforts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one should suffer from these changes, since a large portion of the permits that are now being drawn by non-guided hunters is not being used. The affected area is a remote region with medium moose density populations. It appears that drawing applicants are selecting this area as a 2nd or 3rd choice with the false assumption that the area must provide exceptional hunting opportunities due to the fact that it is now a drawing area. The majority of these hunters abandon these permits once they learn of the difficulties in reaching this area and the low hunter success rates.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) An alternate list form of guided nonresident allocation. 2) Applying the nonresident guided allocation to the entirety of the DM810 permit hunt – may actually bring in new guides to the area due to increased drawing opportunity. This would nullify the original intention to aid local guide operations in the area.

PROPOSED BY: Nathan Turner (INT-08S-G-046)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51	Middle Yukon AC6	Fairbanks AC3 Mat Valley AC12

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 56 —5 AAC 85.015. **Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear.** Increase the bag limit for black bear in Unit 21 as follows.

Units 21A and 21E: **5 bear every regulatory year.**

ISSUE: Change the black bear bag limit in Units 21A and 21E from three to five bears per year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Black bears have a huge effect on predation of moose calves.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will help the moose calf survival rate.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Don Schwandt (HQ-08S-G-006)

Favor Neutral Oppose

		USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30 Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Fairbanks AC3
--	--	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 57 — 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish a drawing permit hunt for moose in Unit 21A as follows:

The proposal change would create a new moose drawing permit area in Unit 21A. This new drawing permit hunt would fall into the winter drawing permit supplement for moose with the following caveats:

Establish a drawing permit moose hunting only area for residents and nonresidents in Unit 21A for everything west of the Iditarod Historic Trail. I recommend 20 permits be issued for a legal take of “one bull moose with 50-inch antlers with 4 brow tines on at least one side by permit.” Note: This would not affect those that use the subsistence program.

ISSUE: To date there is still a steady decline in the Unit 21A moose population. Increased predator numbers, higher numbers each year of nonresident drop-off hunters and increased hunting pressure that has migrated into Unit 21A, due to the numerous closures or restrictions to moose hunting in many Units in Western Alaska over the years, has contributed to an alarming decline of moose in this area. My personal observations over the years of low numbers of adult, yearling moose and lower age structure of the male moose population has raised serious concerns about the moose population in this area. The combination of low moose density, serious declining population trends, lower age structure of adult male moose, and low numbers of yearly moose recruitment require regulating human harvest to allow for conservation of the herd, and a sustainable quality experience for all users.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will see even higher numbers of unhappy users with their poor Unit 21A outdoor experience from low moose numbers. We will see increased user group(s) pressure from the migration of hunters from other closures; because the current Alaska hunting regulations for Unit 21A make hunters think when looking that Unit 21A has a healthy moose population which is not true at all. Unit 21A moose populations will continue to drop to alarming levels.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, having this permit system will provide managers a tool for managing the moose population year to year to maintain a healthy sustainable population for all user groups. This will help balance the demand between users to ensure moose population numbers are at a sustainable level. Additionally, it will help provide a quality of experience for all.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This is a positive solution all around, it creates a smooth system to manage resource levels and provide a quality outdoor experience in Unit 21A for user groups. In the long term all user groups will benefit by having good numbers of moose to harvest and view.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those that want to leave it the way it is.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Just apply the draw to nonresident hunters. However this wouldn't help the moose population enough.

PROPOSAL 57 CONTINUED

PROPOSED BY: Don Schwandt

(HQ-08S-G-012)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

	Middle Yukon AC6	USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Fairbanks AC3
--	------------------	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 58 — 5 AC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose; and 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures. Require nonresident and nonresident alien hunters to be accompanied by a guide to hunt moose in Unit 21 as follows:

Nonresidents or nonresident aliens to hunt moose in Units 21A, 21D or 21E must be accompanied in the field by an Alaskan licensed guide or a Alaskan resident 19 years or older who is within the second-degree of kindred.

ISSUE: Many nonresidents who come to these Game Management Unit areas are first time hunters to Alaska, so they do a drop off moose hunt. They think it will be easy and cheap, not realizing the huge challenges there are in these extremely remote areas of the Alaska bush to hunt and deal with a harvested moose. For example: judging animals, packing meat in the Alaska wilderness terrain, and avoiding bear conflicts. The importance of getting meat out of the field quickly and the critical time line and cost to do this in a law abiding manner. Plus, the safety concerns, issues and procedures of being in the remote bush.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Undersized bull moose will continue to be shot and/or abandoned. The Alaska State Troopers' valuable time will continue to be stressed and be over worked. Resident and local subsistence hunters will continue to be overrun and pushed out of these popular traditional moose hunting Unit areas.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by having a skilled professional directly involved in the moose hunt it will all but eliminate citations and the impact to a stressed limited resource. Reduce user conflicts among all groups being there will be a focal point that is state regulated and licensed to address any problems that did arise.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident and subsistence moose hunters will not be overshadowed, pushed out, or overran by the large numbers of unsupervised nonresident drop off moose hunters, and nonresident hunters wanting a quality Alaskan outdoor hunting experience.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The large number of self-guided nonresident moose hunters to these areas.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Don Schwandt (HQ-08S-G-011)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51	Middle Yukon AC6	Mat Valley AC12

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 59 — 5 AAC 85.045. Seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish a bull moose season in Unit 24B as follows:

The Native lands within the Kanuti Controlled Use Area: 1 antlered bull August 25 – October 1, a federal registration permit is required for the September 26 – October 1 season.

ISSUE: Allow a concurrent state hunt with the existing federal season extensions to the fall bull moose hunt on Native Corporation lands and Native allotments that are within the Kanuti controlled use area, contiguous to the Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge and other federal lands. Rural residents are incurring very high fuel and other costs. There has been a 10% decline in human population within this census statistical area since 2000.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Native Alaskans will continue to be excluded from the opportunity to subsistence hunt of their own lands as provided by Congress in ANILCA Title VIII Sec. 801(1). The federal public lands and Native lands are to have a rural priority. The State of Alaska is the managing agency on private lands currently, the Board of Game must provide subsistence opportunity on the Native lands. The Federal Subsistence Board has recognized a need for a bull moose season extension for the described area. The owners of the adjacent Native lands should not have to incur great expense crossing, and be excluded from opportunity of using their own lands during a federal hunt. A contiguous and concurrent state hunt will be easier and more economical for the hunters and enforcement to delineate and participate in.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Hunting closer to the village on Native lands would allow for shorter transportation of moose resulting in less undue spoilage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska Native land owners who need additional moose harvest season opportunity on their private lands. The expense to participate would be reduced, as most Native lands are closer to villages.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those hunters who would not gain permission to hunt on private lands associated to the described hunt. All hunters are subject to being excluded from hunting on private lands during open seasons in every state, if the owners so wish.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? All Native lands of Unit 24B. Not as easy an area to delineate with controlled access for enforcement.

PROPOSED BY: Western Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
(HQ-08S-G-035)

PROPOSAL 59 CONTINUED

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Susan Olsen PC5 Koyukuk AC4		Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Fairbanks AC3

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 60 — 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose, and 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures. Modify the bull moose permit hunt conditions for the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area as follows:

For the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area in Unit 24A, if you draw it, you must hunt it.

ISSUE: People draw tags and don't hunt the tag they drew (bull moose). If you draw a tag, you can get a regular tag and hunt your draw tag as a last resort, or on the way back or going to hunt caribou, yet not intentionally hunting for moose (incidental bi-kill). We lost the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area due to this and wolves and bear protection.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Quotas aren't met and the tags are lost or kept from the people who know and want to hunt this area.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who want to hunt his area and this game animal

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Grady Brown Jr., Bart Colledge (INT-08S-G-032)

Favor Neutral Oppose

Susan Olsen PC5 Yukon Flats AC9	Koyukuk AC4	Fairbanks AC3
------------------------------------	-------------	---------------

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 61 — 5 AAC 85.056 Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf. Establish an archery season for wolf in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area as follows:

Unit 24A (Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area)
 Wolf, August 10-May 31 or May 1-31. Archery only, no gray area.

ISSUE: Wolves in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area. Wolf populations on the haul road are in good numbers but most bow hunters aren't in the field bear hunting until May.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose will not rebound to sufficient numbers to allow for more tags or even reopen to a regular hunt. This would also relieve pressure of the Fairbanks Management Area.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? It will give bow hunters a chance to take a wolf and wise man the increase in moose and caribou populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. (Pregnant females are trapped in April, so that's out of the window.)

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Grady Brown Jr., Bart Colledge (INT-08S-G-034)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
		Betsy Chronic PC29 Kneeland Taylor PC52 Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Fairbanks AC3 Koyukuk AC4

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 62 — 5 AAC 85.045. Seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish a moose season in Units 24C and 24D as follows:

The Native lands within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area in Units 24C and 24D:

1 moose, March 1-5, to be announced. During the March 1-5 season, a federal registration permit is required. Harvest of cows accompanied by calves is prohibited. Announcement of the antlerless moose season and cow quota will be after consultation with the Department of Fish and Game area biologist and the Chairs of the Western Interior Alaska Regional Advisory Council and the Middle Yukon and Koyukuk River Fish and Game Advisory Committees.

ISSUE: Allow a concurrent state hunt with the existing federal winter antlerless moose hunt, on Native Corporation lands and Native Allotments that are within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area, contiguous to the Koyukuk National Wildlife Refuge, and other federal lands. A small cow quota is sustainable with the predator harvest by local residents, a high density moose population, and large recruitment of a young cohort the past two years. Late winter moose hunting is a customary and traditional time to take moose. Rural residents are incurring very high fuel and other costs. There has been a 10% decline in Human population within this census statistical area since 2000.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Native Alaskans will continue to be excluded from the opportunity to subsistence hunt of their own lands as provided by Congress in ANILCA Title VIII, Sec. 801 (1). The federal public lands and Native lands are to have a rural priority. The State of Alaska is the managing agency on private lands currently, the Board of Game must provide subsistence opportunity on the Native lands. The Federal Subsistence Board has recognized a need for an antlerless late winter moose season, and cow quotas for the described area. The owners of the adjacent Native lands should not have to incur great expense crossing, and be excluded from opportunity of using their own lands during a federal hunt. A contiguous and concurrent state hunt will be easier and more economical for the hunters and enforcement to delineate and participate in.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Hunting closer to the village on Native lands, would allow for shorter transportation of moose resulting in less undue spoilage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska Native land owners who need additional moose harvest season opportunity on their private lands. The expense to participate would be reduced, as most Native lands are closer to villages.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those hunters who would not gain permission to hunt on private lands associated to the described hunt. All hunters are subject to being excluded from hunting on private lands during open seasons in every state, if owners so wish.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? All native lands of Units 24C and 24D. Not as easy an area to delineate with controlled access for enforcement.

PROPOSED BY: Western Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council

PROPOSAL 62 CONTINUED

(HQ-08S-G-034)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Koyukuk AC4		Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Fairbanks AC3

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 63 — 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the season dates for moose in Unit 24 as follows:

Units 24C and 24D: Change the hunting season from [AUG 27 – SEPT 20] to **September 1 – September 27.**

ISSUE: Because of warmer weather, an early moose season is not realistic. The moose are not moving, and the meat will spoil in warm weather.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The village subsistence hunters are having a difficult time getting their moose.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the local people would target smaller bulls and save the big ones for breeding.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The local hunters/

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Huslia Tribal Council (INT-08S-G-007)

Favor Neutral Oppose

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30 Koyukuk AC4		

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 64 — 5 AAC 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures.
Require destruction of moose antlers in Unit 24C.

Hunter shall cut through both sides of each antler, and cut them in half at kill site for all hunters in Unit 24C.

ISSUE: Antler destruction in Huslia is not working.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Kill off bull moose around Huslia.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, treats all hunters the same.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who sell antlers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Let them keep the antlers, they will kill off moose in the area.

PROPOSED BY: George C. Yaska Sr. (INT-08S-G-006)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Fairbanks AC3		Koyukuk AC4

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 65 — 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the moose registration hunt season dates in Unit 24D as follows:

Change the season dates for the registration moose hunt in Unit 24D (RM832).

September 1 – September 20, one bull

September 20- September 30, one small bull with spike or a fork

ISSUE: Because of warmer weather an early moose season is not realistic. The moose are not moving and the meat will spoil in warm weather.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The village subsistence hunters are having a difficult time getting their moose.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, hunters have a chance to at least get a bull.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trophy hunters who are looking for a big bull late in the season, and are not especially hunting for meat.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Change the season dates to September 1 – 25 for the RM 832. This was rejected because we can not get bigger bulls early in the season.

PROPOSED BY: Koyukuk River Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-014)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

USFWS - Subsistence Management w/Am. PC30 Koyukuk AC4		
---	--	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 66— 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting season and bag limits for moose. Modify the moose season dates in Unit 24D as follows:

Change the registration hunt (RM832) to the following days:

September 1 – September 30; one bull.

ISSUE: Because of warmer weather, an early moose season is not realistic. The moose are not moving, and the meat will spoil in warm weather.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The village subsistence hunters are having a difficult time getting their moose.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Somewhat, if ethical hunters don't shoot the big bulls late in the season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those hunters who like to get a medium sized bull in the late August season.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? For the RM832 registration hunt, September August 27 – September 20; one bull then September 20- September 30, spike fork. The other alternative is too fair to all hunters.

PROPOSED BY: Orville Huntington (INT-08S-G-065)

Favor Neutral Oppose

USFWS - Subsistence Management w/Am. PC30		Koyukuk AC4
---	--	-------------

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 67 —5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the bag limit and antler restriction for moose in Unit 24D as follows:

Allow the harvest of one antlerless moose by permit in Unit 24D. Taking of calves or cows accompanied by calves is prohibited.

ISSUE: Local residents of Huslia are not able to harvest bull-moose because of climate change. Nor are they allowed to harvest cow moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The village subsistence hunters are having a difficult time getting enough moose to feed their families.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, allow a drawing permit for five cows in Unit 24D.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All the hunters who need meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, except for maybe biologists.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? One antlerless moose September 21 – September 25. Too many cows would be harvested.

PROPOSED BY: Orville Huntington (INT-08S-G-066)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
		USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30 Koyukuk AC4

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 68 — 5 AAC 92.260. Taking cub bears and female bears with cubs prohibited, and 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions. Modify the bag limit and the methods for taking black bear as follows:

Allow the taking of any black bear using traditional predator management methods in Units 25D.

ISSUE: The increasing number of black and grizzly bears continues to be a problem because of their predation on moose calves. The moose population in this area is very low. Current regulations have a no closed season for three black bears but they do not allow us to use our traditional methods to manage bear predation. The current regulations for methods and bag limits are not adequate to allow people to get bears.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Black and grizzly bear numbers will increase. Moose numbers will continue to decrease. Moose is the main subsistence food for residents of Unit 25D. We would like to use known, proven, traditional methods to address this problem.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Taking any bear using our traditional methods helped manage the bear population in the past. It is fast and efficient.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who want more moose for subsistence. People who want to solve the problem of an increasing bear population in the most efficient way by using traditional methods that have been proven over many years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who do not like our traditional methods and people who do not like to see females with cubs killed. However, there are plenty of black and grizzly bears.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We have already tried other solutions and they have not worked.

PROPOSED BY: Yukon Flats Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-048)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
	Alaska Outdoor Council PC65	USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30 Kneeland Taylor PC52 Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Backcountry Hunters and Anglers - Mark Richards PC66

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 69 – 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Clarify a boundary for the 25D West Tier II moose hunt.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
----------------------	---	----------------------------

(23)

...

Unit 25(D) that portion lying west of a line extending from the Unit 25(D) boundary on Preacher Creek, then downstream along the **west banks of** Preacher Creek, Birch Creek, and Lower Mouth Birch Creek to the Yukon River, then downstream along the north bank of the Yukon River (including islands) to the confluence of the Hadweenzik River, then upstream along the west bank of the Hadweenzik River to the confluence of Forty and One-Half Mile Creek, then upstream along Forty and One-Half Mile Creek to Nelson Mountain on the 25(D) boundary.

1 bull per regulatory year by Tier II subsistence hunting permit only; up to 125 permits may be issued

Aug. 25–Feb. 28

No open season

ISSUE: This is a housekeeping proposal to clarify the boundary for the Unit 25D West Tier II hunt is along the west banks of Preacher, Birch, and Lower Mouth Birch Creeks.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Confusion will persist about the location of the boundary between the Tier II and general season hunts.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both Tier II and general season moose hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

PROPOSAL 69 CONTINUED

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G-048)

Favor Neutral Oppose

Fairbanks AC3		USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30
---------------	--	-------------------------------------

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 70 —5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Establish a drawing permit hunt Unit 25A as follows:

Create a drawing permit hunt for the general hunt in Unit 25A, with the number of permits determined by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Wildlife Conservation.

This proposal was an action item from the October 19-20, 2007 public meeting in Fairbanks of the Eastern Interior Regional Council.

ISSUE: Setting an appropriate number of sheep hunters for the general hunt in Unit 25A within the drainages of the Red Sheep Creek and Cane Creek areas of the Federal Arctic Village Sheep Management Area. Presently an unlimited number of resident hunters can hunt there. Passage of this proposal would provide for an orderly hunt and would address conservation concerns for the sheep population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The recently opened areas will attract more and more hunters resulting in conflicts with local subsistence hunters and jeopardize the health of the sheep population.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Passage of this proposal would provide for an orderly hunt that will provide for a quality hunt while protecting the resource and reducing impacts on local subsistence hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All sheep hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those that are not drawn for a permit.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
(HQ-08S-G-023)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30	Yukon Flats AC9	Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Central AC1 Fairbanks AC3

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 71 - 5 AAC 85.020(24). Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Open the brown bear season in Unit 26B one week earlier on August 25 instead of September 1.

Units and Bag Limits (24)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
Unit 26(B) that portion within the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bear every regulatory year by drawing permit only; up to 20 permits may be issued; or	<u>Aug. 25–Dec 31</u> [SEPT. 1–DEC 31]	
1 bear every regulatory year	Mar. 1–May 31	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bear every regulatory year by drawing permit only; up to 20 permits may be issued		<u>Aug. 25–May 31</u> [SEPT. 1–MAY 31]
Remainder of Unit 26(B)		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bear every regulatory year	<u>Aug. 25–May 31</u> [SEPT. 1–MAY 31]	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bear every regulatory year by drawing permit only; up to <u>20</u> [10] permits may be issued		<u>Aug. 25–May 31</u> [SEPT. 1–MAY 31]

PROPOSAL 71 CONTINUED

ISSUE: Brown bear harvest in Unit 26B has been below sustained yield for the past few years. The department believes the hunting season can be more liberal and maintain harvest within sustainable levels. Historically, harvest was near sustained yield because 2–3 guides targeted brown bears in Unit 26B. Recently however, no guides have actively pursued brown bear hunts in the area. The estimated population size is about 270 bears, based on a population estimate conducted during 1999–2003 (ADF&G, unpublished data). Applying a harvest rate of 5% indicates that 13 bears/year could be harvested on a sustained yield basis. However, during regulatory years (RY) 2002 through 2006 (RY02–RY06; RY begins 1 July and ends 30 June, e.g., RY02 = 1 July 2002 through 30 June 2003), an average of only 7.2 bears/year (range: 3–10) were harvested. During RY97–RY06, an average of 10 bears/year were harvested (range: 4–26); including one year when over-harvest occurred because the nonresident drawing permit requirement was removed and one year when several bears were killed in defense of life and property at Prudhoe Bay. During most of this 10-year period, males made up at least 60% of the bears killed.

For residents, this proposal will open the season at the end of August to provide opportunity for hunters outside the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area (DHCMA) to actively pursue bears during the general season. Although all resident hunters outside the DHCMA would have additional opportunity, it is unlikely that a multitude of hunters would take advantage of the earlier season because logistics are difficult and expensive, motorized vehicles are not allowed through the DHCMA for hunting purposes, and a \$25 grizzly bear tag is required. The number of resident hunters within the DHCMA is limited by drawing permit in the fall, so this longer season would give those permit winners additional opportunity while limiting hunter numbers to prevent over-harvest. We propose that the spring resident season remain a general season hunt inside the DHCMA because very few residents hunt bears with bow and arrow in the DHCMA during that season.

For nonresidents, this proposal will also open the season at the end of August and increase the number of permits available outside DHCMA to provide brown bear hunting opportunity for caribou and sheep hunters who are already in the field. Maintaining the drawing permit requirement allows ADF&G to limit the number of nonresident hunters to prevent over-harvest.

Increasing the number of nonresident drawing permits from 10 to 20 in the remainder of Unit 26B is a housekeeping change that would make the number of permits consistent with the number of permits available within the DHCMA. All the nonresident drawing permits within and outside the DHCMA are administered as the same hunt, which allows the winners to hunt anywhere in Unit 26B, as long as they have bow hunter certification when hunting in the DHCMA. Currently, hunters may apply for a fall or spring permit. Under discretionary permit authority, the department intends to make this one permit with 2 hunting periods (fall and spring), to provide the permit winners the option of hunting in the fall or the spring. The total number of permits awarded to nonresidents will not change, but permit winners will have more flexibility.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Some sustainable brown bear hunting opportunity will be lost.

PROPOSAL 72 — 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Modify the brown bear season dates and permits in Unit 26 as follows:

Unit 26A

Residents and nonresidents: One bear every regulatory year

August 1 – May 31

Unit 26B (the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area by bow and arrow only)

Residents: One bear every regulatory year by permit (DB990).

August 10 [September 1] – December 31. (Number of permits: **50** [20])

Residents: One bear every regulatory year.

March 1 – **June 30** [May 31]

Nonresidents: One bear every regulatory year by permit (DB987).

August 10 [September 1] – December 31

Nonresidents: One bear every regulatory year by permit (DB997).

March 1 – **June 30** [May 31]

Unit 26B (remainder)

Residents: One bear every regulatory year.

August 10 [September 1] – **June 30** [May 31]

Nonresidents: One bear every regulatory year by permit (DB987).

August 10 [September 1] – December 31

Nonresidents: One bear every regulatory year by permit (DB997).

March 1 – **June 30** [May 31]

Unit 26C

Residents and nonresidents: One bear every regulatory year.

August 10 – June 30

ISSUE: Extend brown/grizzly bear season in all of Unit 26B. Extend the spring season to close on June 30th instead of May 31st. Extend the fall season to begin on August 10th instead of September 1st. Extend all drawing permit hunts in Unit 26B to begin August 10th and/or end June 30th. Increase the number of permits awarded for DB990.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued short spring season for brown/grizzly bear and limited hunter opportunity for drawing permit awardees. Extra hunting time for drawing and spring hunters could result in a higher success rate in this area and could help the musk ox population. Current harvest rates of grizzly bears are very low and the area can easily sustain a longer season. An average of one bear per year has been taken since the inception of DB990, and only a fraction of the permit awardees even attempt to hunt. In 2006, seven of 20 DB990 permit awardees hunted. From 2002 through the end of the 2006 season, six grizzly bears were recorded killed in all of unit 26B

PROPOSAL 72 CONTINUED

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, extending the spring and fall seasons helps align the brown/grizzly bear seasons with Units 24B, 25A and 26C. Also, it is documented that grizzly bears have been killing musk ox in greater numbers. Extending the season will hopefully mean more bears will be taken. It also increases hunter opportunity, especially in the spring due to bears emerging from their dens at a later date than in other areas of the state. Grizzly bear harvest in unit 26B is extremely low and well below the sustainable yield.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters in unit 26B who wish to pursue grizzly bears as well as the local musk ox herds and visitors that enjoy seeing them. Resident and non resident drawing permit winners would have a longer season to hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to brown/grizzly bear hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Eliminate the fall resident drawing portion (DB990) in Unit 26B Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area or change the fall draw to a registration hunt. The board of game saw fit in 2001 to limit the amount of bow hunters that can hunt grizzly bears in the fall while they are in the area hunting caribou, even though the sustainable yield was not met. A registration hunt could provide extra opportunity and give the Department of Fish and Game the control to limit the harvest when the sustainable yield is met. 171 people applied for DB990 in 2006, so this would still yield a very high number of people that would obtain registration permits compared to the 20 drawing permits that are currently being issued. Raising the available drawing permits to 50 will allow more people who are serious about hunting grizzlies under DB990 have the chance to do so.

PROPOSED BY: Jerod Pollen

(INT-08S-G-052)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
		USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 73 — 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Open a general hunting seasons for moose in Unit 26C as follows:

Units and bag limits	Resident Open season	Nonresident Open season
.....		
Unit 26C <u>One moose by registration permit</u>	[NO OPEN SEASON] <u>Sept. 5- Apr. 15</u>	
<u>One bull with 50 in antlers or 4 or more brow tines on one side by registration permit</u>		<u>Sept. 5- Nov. 30</u>

ISSUE: The moose populations on the north slope continue to grow. Several areas of the eastern Brooks Range are showing signs of over-browsing from the wintering moose populations. There are little or no moose during the traditional hunting season in September due to their migratory habits so season would have to be late in the years. Many moose spend the winter in the valleys of the northern Brooks Range. The moose start to move into these areas around October 1. Liberal season could be established with very little harvest due to the remote nature of the area and difficulty of access during this time of year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Excess moose will eventually starve to death during the next hard winter and will be left to rot.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the resource is not currently being harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who like to eat moose meat and would like to hunt the most remote part of Alaska at a very tough time of year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who would like to see moose starve to death during the spring or see ANWR turned into Alaska's next National Park.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? General open season.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-08S-G-006)

PROPOSAL 73 CONTINUED

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Alaska Outdoor Council PC65		USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30 Larry Dalrymple PC59 Fairbanks AC3
---	--	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 74 — 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Modify the bag limit for trapping lynx in Units 12 and 20E as follows:

Reduce the November bag limit in Unit 12 and Unit 20E to one lynx. This will allow a trapper to retain a lynx that is accidentally caught in a set intended for another species, as was originally intended, but will discourage abuse by making the regulation easier to enforce.

ISSUE: The November lynx season in Unit 12 and Unit 20E was originally developed to allow trappers to keep up to five lynx caught in traps set for other species in November. Because lynx pelt quality is poor in November, area trappers do not begin specifically trapping for lynx until December or later. During recent years a few unethical trappers have begun to abuse the November season in Unit 12 and Unit 20E by specifically setting numerous traps along the highway corridors, intended to catch lynx, at the beginning of November and then reporting catching these lynx in December to circumvent the five lynx bag limit. Area trappers that wait until December to set for lynx are losing opportunity because many of the lynx along the road system have already been caught by these few unethical trappers. Also, because it is unlikely a trapper will catch five lynx in one set, or are unlikely to be transporting five lynx at one time, it is difficult to prove an individual trapper has caught their November limit, making the regulation difficult to enforce.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? These few unethical trappers will continue to harvest excessive numbers of lynx in November.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This change will reduce excessive harvest of lynx in November, in Unit 12 and Unit 20E, that are not yet prime and allow for these lynx to be available to ethical trappers later in the season after the lynx have become prime.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Ethical trappers who want to harvest lynx in prime condition.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unethical trappers who are abusing this regulation.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Eliminate the November season. The original intent is still valid. And by still allowing a bag limit in November a trapper still has the chance to retain a lynx that is accidentally caught.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana / Fortymile Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-039)

PROPOSAL 74 CONTINUED

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Wayne Heimer PC16 Kneeland Taylor PC52 Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Fairbanks AC3 Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8 Form Letter with 103 Signatories PC67		Alaska Trappers Association - Randy Zarnke PC45 Mat Valley AC12

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 75 — 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping; 92.085(6). Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions; and 92.990 Definitions (21). Allow black bear trapping in Units 21 and 24 as follows:

You may not take game by “using a trap or a snare to take big game, fur animals, waterfowl, cranes or snipe. However, **you may take black bear in Units 21 and 24 using snares of 3/32 cable or larger or with foot hold snare and traps with a jaw spread of 7 1/2 inches or larger. Trap sites must be clearly marked with a sign indicating the hunter’s license number.** Also you may take grouse, hare, ptarmigan or unclassified game with a snare.

Area	Open Seasons by trapping	Limit
<u>Unit 21</u>	<u>March 1 to June 10</u>	<u>3 bears</u>
<u>Unit 24</u>	<u>March 1 to June 10</u>	<u>3 bears</u>

ISSUE: A decline in the Units 21 and 24 moose population by 20 to 30 percent and the local caribou population by nearly 60 percent in the last five years due to predation by black bear and wolves.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A continued decline in moose and caribou numbers by unregulated black bear populations until even subsistence user needs cannot be met. When it is all but too late, crisis management will kick in, which benefits no one.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. In a three year study conducted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on the Koyukuk and Nowitna National Wildlife Refuges, and other studies in Alaska, show that 45 percent of moose calves are taken by black bears. We appreciate what the state has done in the McGrath area with black bears to help increase the moose herd. However the people in Unit 21s and 24 have demonstrated a willingness to be personally involved in predator management as demonstrated in the increase of wolf harvest over the last three years from an average of 50 to 60 wolves annually in Unit 21D to more than 130 wolves each of the last three years. We can reduce the number of black bears without the expenditure of state funds, all we need are the tools with which to do it.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters would like to use other methods and means to harvest black bears, the moose resource, and people who depend on moose and caribou for food.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who fear that any liberalization of regulations will cause an over harvest of black bears. This is a false assumption. Many eastern states allow the sale of black bear parts as well as does Canada. Maine in particular allows trapping and hunting of ANY bear and sale of parts. (Note: The October 2007 “Maine Sportsman” newspaper ran advertisements from businesses soliciting the bear parts.) Even though Maine is crisscrossed by roads making all the land accessible, the Maine bear population is increasing.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None thought of.

PROPOSAL 75 CONTINUED

PROPOSED BY: Colin Brown

(SC-08S-G-002)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Alaska Trappers Association - Randy Zarnke PC45	Middle Yukon AC6	USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30 Kneeland Taylor PC52 Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Backcountry Hunters and Anglers - Mark Richards PC66 Koyukuk AC4 Form Letter with 103 Signatories PC67
--	------------------	---

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 76 — 5 AAC. 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep, and 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep drawing permit hunts. Modify the Dall sheep permit system for the Tok Management Area in Units 12, 13C and 20D as follows:

Separate the Tok Management Area Sheep draw into two time periods, with each period getting fifty percent of the permits. For example fifty permits for the first time period, with up to ten percent to nonresidents (five permits) and fifty permits for the second time period with up to ten percent to nonresidents (five permits). The second season is longer since the last ten days of sheep season can have some extreme weather conditions. Suggested time periods are:

First period: August 10th through August 25th

Second period: August 26th through Sep. 20th.

ISSUE: There are too many hunters in the Tok Management Area (TMA) during the early part of the season because they want to hunt other species in September. Hunting pressure needs to be spread out more evenly through the season to maintain a high quality, uncrowded hunt, which is a management objective for the TMA.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unacceptable congestion will continue in the early part of the season, resulting in crowded hunting conditions and unacceptable concentrations of hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will alleviate the current congestion in the first part of season and spread the hunting pressure more evenly throughout the sheep season. There will be fewer hunters in the field at any one time, and it will allow for acceptable hunter concentrations and an uncrowded more gratifying hunting experience. Also, it is likely that not as many people will want to hunt during the second season due to other hunts open for other species. And this will give applicants that put in for the second season a better opportunity at drawing a TMA permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All applicants. It gives them another chance at a limited draw area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who are unsuccessful in the first season won't be able to hunt in the second.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSAL 76 CONTINUED

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-040)

Favor Neutral Oppose

Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Larry Dalrymple PC59 Delta AC2 Fairbanks AC3 Middle Nenana AC5 Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8 Mat Valley AC12	Alaska Outdoor Council PC65	Ahtna Inc. PC7
--	-----------------------------	----------------

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 77 — 5 AAC 85.055. Seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Amend the nonresident permit distribution for the Tok Management Area (Units 12, 13, and 20) as follows:

Allow a total of 20% of the nonresident tags to be awarded to 2nd degree of kindred hunters.

ISSUE: The Tok Management Area Dall sheep draw (DS102); the number of nonresident tags that are going to 2nd degree of kindred.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A large majority of the nonresident tags will go to 2nd degree of kindred hunters. The guided nonresident hunter and the services that go along with the guiding industry will suffer.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, guided hunters tend to be more selective in the rams they harvest resulting in older rams being harvested verses younger rams that are just legal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska guides, local businesses, air taxi's, Department of Fish and Game, Department of Natural Resources, and the guided nonresident hunter.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The 2nd degree of kindred hunter.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Having the 2nd degree of kindred hunter tag come out of the resident tags. Why I rejected - trying to find an equitable solution.

PROPOSED BY: Lance Kronberger (HQ-08S-G-040)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8	Alaska Outdoor Council PC65	Ahtna Inc. PC7 Larry Dalrymple PC59 Fairbanks AC3 Middle Nenana AC5 Mat Valley AC12

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 78 — 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions, and 92.260. Taking cub bears and female bears with cubs prohibited. Allow the taking of black bear from dens in Units 21 and 24 as follows:

Allow the taking of any black bear from dens, September 25 to May 1 in Units 21B, 21C, 21D, and 24.

ISSUE: Because of the current regulations, it is nearly impossible for people who are hunting bears in dens to be assured of staying legal. Current regulations prohibit the taking of sows and cubs from dens. We need to harvest a certain number of bears from dens to meet our traditional needs. The method we use is to shoot the bear in the den. It is not practical or possible to determine the sex of the bear before the bear is shot.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Traditional needs continue to not be met. If people do shoot a female bear with young cubs, then they are out of compliance with the regulations and their actions become illegal. From a totally practical point of view, when a hunter looks into the den, he sees fur. He cannot determine the sex of the animal nor whether young cubs are present.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Taking bears in dens is a proven method of removing bears from the population. It is fast, efficient, and traditional.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who harvest bears from dens and who need the meat but who want to remain legal with their harvest. People who want to keep traditional methods of harvest will also benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who object to taking females with cubs. There is a concern that taking females and cubs is a bad thing to do. But those cubs do grow up, and then they become a problem.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Middle Yukon Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-044)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Koyukuk AC4 Middle Yukon AC6 Yukon Flats AC9	Alaska Outdoor Council PC65	USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30 Form Letter with 103 Signatories PC67

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 79 — 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions, and 92.260. Taking cub bears and female bears with cubs prohibited. Allow the taking of black bear from dens in Units 21 and 24 as follows:

Allow the taking of black bear from dens from September 25 to May 1 using artificial light in Units 21B, 21C, 21D, and 24.

ISSUE: Taking bears from dens is a traditional method of our people to harvest black bears for our needs. As a safety issue, it is important that we can use flashlights to look into the den to see what the bear is doing. Whether it is sleeping, whether it is dead or wounded after being shot, or whether it is attacking.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People who take bears from the dens will not have the added safety of the use of flashlights to do so. Current regulations prohibit the use of flashlights in the taking of bears, so anyone who feels it is necessary because of safety, will be breaking the law. The safety of the hunter is at stake, and the welfare of the animal is as well. It is also important to see the bear’s activity inside the den, and, for example, whether it has been wounded so it can be shot again. The only practical way one can do that is with the use of flashlights.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, taking bears in dens is a proven efficient method of removing bears from the population. Taking bears from dens is also a traditional method of taking bears. However, not being able to use flashlights is very dangerous to someone crawling around the dens.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who want to hunt bears in dens, but who want to hunt in the safest and most efficient way possible.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? This could cause a problem with enforcement. Because using artificial light for hunting moose is illegal, we chose to make this legal after the moose season is closed.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Just taking one’s chances in a dark den.

PROPOSED BY: Middle Yukon Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-045)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Koyukuk AC4 Middle Yukon AC6 Yukon Flats AC9	Alaska Outdoor Council PC65	USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30 Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Form Letter with 103 Signatories PC67

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 80 — 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Extend the moose season dates in Koyukuk Controlled Use Areas as follows:

Change the moose season dates in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area (Units 21D and 24) as follows:

August 27 – [September 20] **September 25.**

ISSUE: Many families do not get their moose in the fall because of bad hunting conditions. They would provide five more days of opportunity.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Local hunters who cannot find moose early in the fall will have five more days to hunt.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This would give extended opportunity to a few people who did not get moose early in the fall.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who do not get a moose earlier in the fall and who still need meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Middle Yukon Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-043)

Favor Neutral Oppose

USFWS - Subsistence Management w/Am. PC30 Middle Yukon w/Am. AC6	Koyukuk AC4	
--	-------------	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 81 — 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Amend the caribou season for the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area in Units 20, 24, 25, and 26 as follows:

Two bull caribou harvest, July 1 – April 30, any caribou after October 1

ISSUE: One caribou for bow hunters July –September 31. If you can afford a boat or charter flight to take you out of the corridor you are allowed two caribou. With the cost of fuel, wear on vehicles, time off work and having to make two or more trips to get two caribou, it’s getting to expensive and wasting fuel. Quotas will not and are not being met. Meat from bulls in October is not the best eating anyway (horn hunt).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Quotas won’t be met and people can’t afford to go that far because of the cost of fuel meat gets wasted because of the taste due to rut.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Meets quotas and saves resources such as fuel.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who can’t afford to keep driving the eight hundred mile trip to put edible meat on the table for their family.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Grady Brown Jr. and Bart Colledge (INT-08S-G-029)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Central AC1 Middle Nenana AC5		Koyukuk AC4

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 82 – 5 AAC 84.270(1) Furbearer trapping 5 AAC 85.060(a)(6) Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals, and 5 AAC 92.095(a)(3) Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions. Liberalize and simplify beaver seasons, bag limits and harvest methods throughout Region III.

5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping
Trapping seasons and bag limits for furbearers are as follows:

Species and Units	Open Season	Bag Limit
(1) Beaver		
...		
<u>Units 12, 20(A), 20(C), 20(E), 20(F), and 25(C)</u>	<u>Sept. 15 – June 10</u>	<u>No limit.</u>
[UNITS 12 AND 20(E)]	[SEPT. 15 – MAY 31]	[25 PER SEASON.]
...		
<u>Units 19, 21, 24, 25(A), 25(B), and 25(D)</u>	<u>Sept. 1 – June 10</u>	<u>No limit.</u>
[UNITS 19, 21(A), 21(C), 21(E), AND 24]	[NOV. 1 – JUNE 10]	[NO LIMIT.]
Unit 20(B), that portion of the Chena River downstream from its confluence with the Little Chena River, [AND BADGER (PILED RIVER) SLOUGH DOWNSTREAM FROM PLACK ROAD]	No open season; however, the department may set seasons and bag limits, by permit only, to curb high beaver populations and reduce property damage.	

PROPOSAL 82 CONTINUED

<u>Remainder of Unit 20(B) and Unit 20(D)</u>	<u>Sept. 25 –May 31</u>	<u>No limit.</u>
[UNITS 20(A), REMAINDER OF UNIT 20(B), UNITS 20(C), 20(D), 20(F), AND 25(C)]	[SEPT. 25 – MAY 31]	[25 PER SEASON.]
[UNITS 21(B) AND 21(D)]	[SEPT. 25 – JUNE 10]	[NO LIMIT.]
...		
[UNIT 25 (EXCEPT 25(C))]	[SEPT. 1 – JUNE 1]	[50 PER SEASON.]
...		

5 AAC 85.060(a)(6). Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
(6) Beaver		
...		
Unit 21(E) No limit	<u>Sept. 1–June 10</u> [NOV. 1–JUNE 10]	<u>Sept. 1–June 10</u> [NOV. 1–JUNE 10]
...		

5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions

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

...

PROPOSAL 82 CONTINUED

(3) taking beaver by any means other than a steel trap or snare, except that a firearm may be used to take two beaver per day in Units 9 and 17, and four beaver in Unit 11, from April 15 through May 31, [IN UNIT 19 FROM APRIL 1 THROUGH JUNE 10, OR FIVE BEAVER PER DAY IN UNIT 25, EXCEPT UNIT 25(C), FROM APRIL 16 THROUGH JUNE 1 AND SEPTEMBER 1 THROUGH OCTOBER 31 IF THE MEAT IS SALVAGED FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION]; a firearm may be used to take beaver in Units 8, 12, 18, **19**, 20(A), 20(C), 20(E), 20(F), **and 21 – 25** [21(E), 22, 23, AND 25(C)] throughout the seasons and with the bag limits established in 5 AAC 84;[A FIREARM MAY BE USED TO TAKE BEAVER IN UNITS 21(B) AND 21(D) THROUGHOUT THE SEASONS AND WITH THE BAG LIMITS ESTABLISHED IN 5 AAC 84 IF THE MEAT IS SALVAGED FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION];

...

ISSUE: At the March 2006 Board of Game meeting, the department agreed to look into liberalizing and simplifying the Region III beaver seasons, bag limits, and methods of take. Given the abundance of beaver and low and declining beaver harvest in Interior Alaska, the current beaver seasons, harvest limits, and methods of take are unnecessarily restrictive and complicated. Because Region III beaver resources are lightly utilized, it is reasonable to implement region wide season dates of Sept 1–June 10, and allow the use of firearms. Several units maintained slightly more conservative season dates and methods, due to anticipated or known user conflicts and safety issues.

This proposal:

- Aligns season dates with seasons in nearby units
 - From 5 different trapping seasons (4 different starting dates and 3 different ending dates)
 - To 3 different trapping seasons (3 different starting dates and 2 different ending dates)
 - Aligns the 21E hunting season with the new trapping season dates
- Standardizes the bag limit at no bag limit instead of 25 (8 units), 50 (3 units), and no limit (13 units)
 - Eliminates the separate bag limit for beavers taken with a firearm in 3 units
- Standardizes the use of firearms as an allowed method of take
 - Adds firearms as a method of take in 6 units
 - Extends use of firearms from part of the season to the entire season in 7 units
 - Retains no firearm use only in the 2 units with high human population
- Makes the allowed uses for beavers taken with firearms the same as the allowed uses for beaver taken with traps and snares
 - Use of beavers taken with a firearm in 5 units no longer restricted to human consumption if hide is not also salvaged
 - Allowed use reverts to 5 AAC 92.220
 - Either meat or hide of beavers taken with a firearm must be salvaged for human use
 - This is currently the case for beaver taken with traps and snares

PROPOSAL 82 CONTINUED

Biologically, the Region II beaver populations are not likely to be adversely impacted by unlimited bag limits, long seasons, or firearms as a method of take because pelt prices and interest in harvesting beavers is low. Likewise, if use of beavers taken with firearms is not restricted to human consumption, it is not likely to adversely affect overall beaver populations.

Traditionally, taking beaver for food has occurred primarily in the spring. The long spring seasons and the addition of firearms as a method of take requested in this proposal will better accommodate that use of this abundant resource. Seasons that begin before pelts are prime may be viewed as an issue of allocation between trappers who want to obtain pelts later in the season when they are prime and those to whom pelt primeness is not an issue. Although pelts of beaver taken in the early fall are of lesser value on the fur market, they are still useable for homemade garments. Although we suggest changes in this proposal regarding these issues, we ask the board to decide appropriate allocation and uses of harvested beavers.

If the board liberalizes firearm use, some increased wounding loss of beavers shot but not retrieved is expected. Early and late season beaver trappers could incidentally catch otter, muskrat, and mink in traps. We expect this bycatch to be low, based on trap type and timing. However, bycatch is unknown in units where beaver seasons are currently open when otter, mink, and muskrat seasons are closed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Beaver resources will remain underutilized and seasons, bag limits, and methods and means will remain unnecessarily restrictive and complicated.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No substantial change in beaver abundance is expected due to low interest in beaver harvest in Interior Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who wish to take beaver early or late in the season, shoot beaver, and/or salvage only the meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who believe that beavers should only be harvested if the pelts are prime and the pelts are utilized. Those who do not wish beavers to be shot.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No change.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G-050)

PROPOSAL 82 CONTINUED

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Ahtna Inc. PC7 USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30 Alaska Trappers Association - Randy Zarnke PC45 Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Backcountry Hunters and Anglers - Mark Richards PC66 Central AC1 Fairbanks w/Am. AC3 Koyukuk AC4 Middle Nenana AC5 Stoney Holitna AC7 Yukon Flats w/Am. AC9 Mat Valley AC12		Kneeland Taylor PC52

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 83 — 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures, and 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions. Modify the methods for taking black bear in the Region III Units as follows:

Permit the use of scent lures while in the act of floating rivers, creeks, or lakes, in either boats or rafts in Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, and 26C:

ISSUE: Currently, you may not hunt black bears using bait or scent lures except under a bait station permit. This means a registered bait station site.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Failure to harvest predatory bears along floatable rivers and creeks.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This would improve the chances of taking predatory bears during and right after the calving season when bears are working the stream banks looking for baby ungulates.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The general hunting public and anyone hunting bears due to lower predation rates.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions were considered.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-056)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Red Devil Traditional Council PC23 Stoney River Traditional Council PC54 Lime Village Traditional Council PC55 Delta AC2 Fairbanks w/Am. AC3	Yukon Flats AC9	Ahtna Inc. PC7 Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Koyukuk AC4 Middle Nenana AC5

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 84 — 5 AAC 92.052. Required permit conditions and procedures. Establish a preference permit points system for Region III Units as follows:

In Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, and 26C: Establish a preference system as follows: One point per consecutive year of unsuccessful application for each specific drawing hunt. If a year is not applied for, the applicant would lose his/her points. Applicant's name would be submitted as many times as points applicant had accumulated for that specific drawing hunt. 50 percent of the permits would be awarded in this manner, and 50 percent as they currently are. Once a permit is drawn start over.

ISSUE: Lack of preference system for hard to draw hunts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will never be lucky and draw the permit they want.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who apply for a specific hunt every year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Many, I think this is the best one.

PROPOSED BY: Virgil L. Umphenour (INT-08S-G-063)

Favor Neutral Oppose

Dave Machacek w/Am. PC8 Middle Nenana AC5	Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Koyukuk AC4	Ahtna Inc. PC7 Koyukuk AC4
--	--	-------------------------------

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 85 — 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Modify the season dates for Dall sheep for all of Region III follows:

Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, and 26C:

Dall sheep season:

Residents: August 8 – September 25

Nonresidents: August 10-September 20

ISSUE: I would like sheep season to start two days earlier for resident hunters and remain open five days longer. The traditional season is August 10 – September 20.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Residents have difficulty competing against guided hunts. We are competing against lodges, remote spike camps, planes with private airstrips, horse pack trains, and all terrain equipment.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal gives the resident sheep hunter an adequate chance of success.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides will complain, but their season is the same duration. This helps level the playing field.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Tom Lamal

(INT-08S-G-015)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Ahtna Inc. PC7 Dave Machacek PC8 Vern Fiehler w/Am. PC10 Tom Lamal PC26 Larry Dalrymple w/Am. PC59 Marty Lambert w/Am. PC62 Fairbanks AC3 Koyukuk AC4 Middle Nenana AC5	Alaska Outdoor Council PC65	Dave Morris PC13 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Central AC1 Delta AC2 Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8
---	-----------------------------	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

The Board of Game considered this proposal during the Spring 2007 regional meeting and voted to defer it to the Spring 2008 meeting.

PROPOSAL 86 - This proposal asks the Board of Game to recommend, per its authority under Alaska Statute 16.05.255(a)(1) to the legislature for approval the establishment of a wildlife refuge as follows:

The Unit 13 state-land and waters with these boundaries:

- On the west by the Maclaren River
- On the east by the Richardson Highway
- On the south by the Denali Highway
- On the north from the northeast corner of Sec 11, T20S, R6E, eastward to the northeast corner of Sec.7,T20S,R10E, then south to the northeast corner of Sec. 30, T20S, R10E, then east to the Richardson highway

Purpose of this refuge shall be to:

- (1) Ensure the protection of critical seasonal wildlife habitat.
- (2) Ensure the conservation of caribou, moose, and other wildlife.
- (3) Ensure the continued use of these populations for hunting, trapping, and viewing.
- (4) Ensure continued management consistent with all of Unit 13.
- (5) Ensure continued protection of archeological areas and their artifacts.

To further these purposes, the following shall apply to this refuge:

- (1) Disallow Hard-rock mining.

ISSUE: The Nelchina caribou herd is the largest, most important road-accessible caribou herd in Southcentral Alaska, and many caribou from the herd utilize the eastern Denali highway region, which is within Unit 13. The area around Tangle Lakes is particularly crucial as winter habitat for these caribou. The area is also an important fall staging and rutting area for the Nelchina Caribou Herd.

Because the area is important to the herd, maintenance of its habitat is important to continuance of the largest subsistence hunt in Southcentral Alaska. Fall hunts draw thousands of hunters from across the state. Winter hunts are also important to many hunters who prefer that season or who failed to take caribou earlier. The consistency with which caribou utilize these habitats in fall and winter has made this a favored hunting ground for thousands of years. Archaeological evidence shows that hunters spotted game 10,000 years ago from the same ridges that they do today.

The eastern Denali Highway area also contains good year-round moose habitat, making it an important moose hunting and viewing area. Other important game species are grizzly bear, wolf, ptarmigan and waterfowl. The value of this area for small game hunting draws even non-resident hunters. National sporting magazines and a television show have featured ptarmigan hunting near Tangle Lakes. Trapping of fox, wolf, and wolverine provides income for local residents. The area's diverse land and water habitats support a great variety of non-game species, including Arctic warblers, a target species for visiting birdwatchers, Long-Tailed Jaegers, and Red-Throated Loons.

PROPOSAL 86 CONTINUED

Good access along the Denali Highway and the ease of sighting game across open alpine tundra contribute to this area's popularity not only with hunters, but also berry gatherers and wildlife viewers. Wildlife viewing tours provide revenue for an increasing number of small businesses. Birding tours seek out the region's unusual species. Princess Tour buses also cross the Denali Highway to give their clients views of wildlife and spectacular scenery-scenery which at present is not marred by open pit mines. The Tangle Lakes/Delta Wild and Scenic River are popular for hunting, fishing and other adventure recreation. BLM has built facilities in the corridor to specifically serve these users. The mile wide river corridor is off-limits to mining, but most of its scenic views are not protected.

The eastern Denali Highway area falls under the Tanana Basin Area Plan and the Copper Basin Area Plan, both produced by the Department of Natural Resources and the Department of Fish and Game, with considerable public input. Both documents state that the primary use for these lands is fish and wildlife habitat. Mining is an allowed use, but not a primary one.

Claims for subsurface mineral resources in most state lands in the eastern Denali Highway are held by a single Canadian company, and mineral exploration was carried out between 2004 and 2006 by a major British-owned multi-national mining company. After drilling the northern part of the claims area--the part it considered most promising--and finding insufficient mineralization, the latter company withdrew from the project. However, the claims holder continues to promote the possibility of a "world class" hard-rock nickel/copper/platinum mine, either underground or open pit, in the southern part, near the Denali-Highway and the Tangle Lakers. Thus, the threat of renewed exploration continues.

Large-scale hard-rock mining, and some mineral exploration practices, can harm wildlife habitats and wildlife. Hard-rock mines have a solid history of harming air and water quality. They displace wildlife and alter habitats with their extensive processing facilities, waste rock and tailing dumps, power lines, new roads, and increased traffic. In addition, open pit mines can destroy thousands of acres.

Hard-rock mining is not compatible with wildlife, hunting, recreation and tourism in this area. The continuing long-term value of renewable resources in the eastern Denali Highway area exceeds the short-term non-renewable value of any minerals that might be extracted.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? When exploration permits are submitted to the office of Habitat Management and Permitting within DNR, the agency does not have the authority to **make stipulations to prevent** impacts to mammals-only to fish. Thus, even in these early steps toward a possible mine, wildlife can be displaced. If drill sites are accessed in winter, any caribou and moose present can be disturbed at a time where their survival is difficult. If drill sites are accessed overland in the summer, vegetation and drainage are often disturbed. If helicopter-supported drilling activities occur in the summer, this can disrupt moose calving. It is only after mining companies invest funds, typically millions of dollars, in exploration, that they may determine that mine development is feasible, and only then are the impacts to wildlife considered. At that point, those invested funds become another rationale for allowing mine development. This exposes the Nelchina caribou herd and other wildlife to an unacceptable risk. Consequently, hunting and viewing opportunities will be at risk.

PROPOSAL 86 CONTINUED

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS

PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal addresses maintenance of high quality habitat for moose, caribou, and other animals, furbearers, and upland bird and waterfowl. It seeks to maintain the high quality of caribou, moose, and other game meat by protecting the air and water from potential mine contaminants.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The solution will benefit all those who harvest and view caribou, moose, and other wildlife in the eastern Denali Highway area’s scenic setting. It will also benefit a growing, sustainable sightseeing and recreational tourism economy. By addressing the problem now, during a hiatus in mineral exploration, this solution is also more fair to mining exploration companies than waiting until more funds have been invested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? This proposal addresses hard rock mining not the small-scale placer mining that has occurred in the area for decades; this proposal should not harm small-scale miners. It will displace hard-rock mining and mineral exploration companies, which are currently and typically are not Alaskan-owned.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? At the time that the State of Alaska was considering taking conveyance of a large block of eastern Denali Highway lands from BLM, Alaskans submitted comments pointing out the high value of wildlife that should be protected from mineral exploration. The Department of Natural Resources decided in 2003 to proceed with conveyance and allow mining. Alaskans took their concerns to the companies which held the claims and were conducting mineral exploration, but they continued their activities. Alaskans asked the office of Habitat Management and Permitting to disallow mineral exploration permits basis of impacts to mammals, but that office is allowed to make stipulations pertaining to impacts to fish only.

PROPOSED BY: Copper Country Alliance (HQ-08S-G-081)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Ahtna Inc. PC7 Cliff Eames PC9 Kathy Libby PC21 Copper Country Alliance PC24 Ruth McHenry PC25 Fran Mauer PC28 Betsy Chronic PC29 Ellen Americus PC50 Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Andrew Keller PC58 Connie Page PC61		Alaska Miners Association PC1 Dave Machacek PC8 Steven Borell PC20 Robert Angrisano PC22 Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Fairbanks AC3 Mat Valley AC12 Division of Natural Resources PC31

FINAL ACTION: Carries _____ Fails _____ Tabled _____ No Action _____ See Prop. # _____
 ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 87 — 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled Use Areas (7)(B). Modify the hunting restrictions in the Holitna-Hoholitna Controlled Use Area as follows:

Omit the 40hp boat motor restriction on the Holitna River due to no moose hunt.

ISSUE: A book keeping problem concerning moose in Unit 19. The regulation has a 40hp boat motor restriction on the Holitna River and no moose hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unnecessary regulation.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? It's a frivolous regulation all would benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Open moose season on a drawing permit bases, rejected due to low moose season.

PROPOSED BY: Patrick Jones (HQ-08S-G-015)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Red Devil Traditional Council PC23 Stoney River Traditional Council PC54 Lime Village Traditional Council PC55		Stoney Holitna AC7

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 88 — 5 AAC 92.540. **Controlled Use Areas(7)**. Modify the boundaries of the Upper Kuskokwim Controlled Use Area as follows:

Reduce the size of the Upper Kuskokwim Controlled Use Area to include only an approximate five-mile corridor along the Kuskokwim from the Black River to the Swift Fork, along the Takotna River to Takotna and along the South Fork to Nikolai.

ISSUE: Creation and expansion of the Upper Kuskokwim Controlled Use Area closed a large area to all moose hunting because much of the closed area is only accessible by aircraft.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Large areas of Unit 19D East will remain closed to moose hunting unnecessarily.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Provides for additional moose hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters in Unit 19D who own or would like to use aircraft to hunt moose away from the Kuskokwim. Other hunters who would like to hunt moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Almost no one because the five-mile corridor would protect virtually all local hunters from competition.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Shrinking the Controlled Use Area to its original size. It would still be too large.

PROPOSED BY: Patrick Valkenburg (INT-08S-G-026)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
		Stoney Holitna AC7

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 89 — 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas (3)(F)(ii). Short the closure dates for the Wood River Controlled Use area as follows:

Change the closed date to read August 1 – **August 31** [September 30]. The Wood River Controlled Use Area will remain closed to all motorized vehicles, except airplanes for the taking of Dall sheep.

ISSUE: Shorten closed period. The Wood River Controlled Use Area is closed to the use of motorized vehicles, except aircraft, for big game including the transportation of any big game hunters, their hunting gear, and or parts of big game, August 1 – September 30.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be a continued low harvest of moose in the area. Currently most of the hunting pressure is focused along the Rex Trail, during the regular hunting season. Few animals are harvested from this vast area, only around the few runways. The few guides that work this area only remove trophy animals. This drastically restricts the harvest of moose, grizzly bears, and wolves during the regular season. There will be continued resentment from the general public that view this area as the private hunting preserve of the few guides that work there. There is no biological reason for it being a Controlled Use Area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This would give access to this area during the regular hunting season for moose, grizzly bears, and the incidental wolf.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The general public.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The few guides that work this area during the month of September. They would still have the month of August for sheep hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Leaving it as it is, and not managing the area for maximum sustainable yield.

PROPOSAL 89 CONTINUED

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee

(INT-08S-G-057)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
		John Morak PC2 John Guichici PC3 David Pott PC4 Ahtna Inc. PC7 Dave Machacek PC8 Deborah Waugaman PC48 Larry Dalrymple PC59 Bill Renel PC60 Marty Lambert PC62 Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Backcountry Hunters and Anglers - Mark Richards PC66 Fairbanks AC3 Middle Nenana AC5

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 90 – 5 AAC 92.540(3)(F). Controlled Use Areas. Amend the regulation for the Wood River Controlled Use area as follows:

Delete the Wood River Controlled Use Area.

ISSUE: In 2000, there was a proposal put and accepted by the Board of Game by a non U.S. citizen that moved the boundary of the Wood River Controlled Use Area to the east side of the Wood River preventing motorized vehicle access to the trails on the eastern side of the Wood River. This proposal stopped many Alaskans from being able to harvest this area. I would like to see the boundary changed back to the west bank of the Wood River or totally eliminate the Wood River Controlled Use Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Many Alaskans will be able to access this harvest source and fill their freezers. Additionally, the Department of Fish and Game is having trouble meeting the harvest quotes for cows in this area and this will help meet these harvest quotes.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it allows for more equal access to all Alaskans.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Al Alaskan hunters. People who hunt for food, not trophies.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The non-U.S. citizen who put in the original proposal

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There are no other solutions that I can think of.

PROPOSED BY: Robert Caywood (HQ-08S-G-042)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
		John Morak PC2 John Guichici PC3 David Pott PC4 Ahtna Inc. PC7 Tom Lamal PC26 Deborah Waugaman PC48 Larry Dalrymple PC59 Bill Renel PC60 Marty Lambert PC62 Backcountry Hunters and Anglers - Mark Richards PC66 Middle Nenana AC5 Middle Yukon AC6

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 91 — 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Create a controlled use area in the Kantishna River area in Unit 20C as follows:

Due to the concern for the critical habitat, fair chase of big game and salmon spawning grounds the Kantishna River and it's tributaries are closed to all air boat traffic.

ISSUE: The operating of air boats on the Kantishna River and the Toklat River.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The land bordering the Kantishna and Toklat River is critical habitat susceptible to damage by vehicle use. Unfair chase of game animals and subjects the salmon spawning grounds to boat traffic.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Habitat protected. Protects big game from unfair chase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Country and wildlife.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Airboat operators.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Mike Turner (INT-08S-G-013)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Ahtna Inc. PC7 Mike Turner PC15 Mike Brase PC57		Fairbanks AC3 Mat Valley AC12

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 92 — 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Reestablish the Nenana Controlled Use Area in Unit 20 as follows:

Reinstate the Nenana Controlled Use Area that was repealed in 2004, and adopt regulation to mitigate the adverse impact of airboat usage during moose season, specific wording listed below.

The Nenana Controlled Use Area:

(i) The area consists of those portions of Units 20(A) and 20(C) bounded by a line beginning at the confluence of the Wood and Tanana Rivers, then southerly along the west bank of the Wood River to the Rex Trail, then west along the Rex Trail to the Parks Highway, then west along the Bear Paw Trail to the Kantishna River, then northerly along the east bank of the Kantishna River to the Tanana River, then easterly along the south bank of the Tanana River to the point of beginning;

(ii) The area is closed to the use of airboats for moose hunting, including the transportation of moose hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of moose, from September 1 through September 25.

ISSUE: Reinstate the Nenana Controlled Use Area and introduce regulation to limit airboat access from September 1 to September 25.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Opportunities for traditional “fair chase”, such as hunting on foot, from a canoe, or in areas on or near the river will continue to be diminished if this problem is not solved.

Airboat usage during moose season in the former Nenana Controlled Use Area, specifically the Nenana and Teklanika river drainages, is directly impacting the concept of “fair chase”. The extreme noise produced by an airboat interferes with traditional moose hunting techniques of calling, spot and stalk hunting, and still-hunting. This proposal will address the ongoing conflict between airboat operators and these other hunter groups. Destruction or alteration of wildlife habitat in areas where heavy airboat usage occurs is also an issue.

Airboat noise drives animals far away from the river, and makes harvesting moose in an area with generally low population densities difficult. This is historically an area with lower moose population levels, and is primarily targeted by “meat hunters”, rather than trophy hunters or those looking for a hunting experience in an area with high game populations. In addition, airboats have been observed using new seismic lines created for gas exploration in 2004 for terrestrial travel, and are exacerbating the issue by adversely affecting the effort of hunters using traditional techniques further off the river, as well as adversely impacting wildlife habitat.

It is not the intention of this proposal to eliminate access, but rather regulate a specific method of transportation during a limited timeframe. No other method of transportation would be affected. This is a reasonable approach that has proven useful and successful in several other areas of Alaska where specific methods of transportation have adversely impacted the hunting experience and/or wildlife habitat.

PROPOSAL 92 CONTINUED

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Adopting this regulation will improve harvest opportunity and reduce human induced alteration of natural wildlife movement and behavior. It also would reduce potential for impact to and destruction of wildlife habitat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters that use traditional methods of hunting, such as hunting on foot, from canoes, from tree stands, using calling, spot/stalk hunting, and still-hunting techniques.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Airboat operators who wish to use airboats for moose hunting related activities in the limited area defined as the Nenana Controlled Use Area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Limit use of airboats for moose hunting in all of Unit 20, but realized the reasonable desire and higher customary use of airboats in other regions and subunits of Unit 20. In addition, there are large areas in the immediate region that would remain accessible to airboat operators that consist of terrain and habitat that are more suitable for airboat use that offer comparable, if not higher, population densities of moose available for harvest.

PROPOSED BY: Minto-Nenana Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-009)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Ahtna Inc. PC7 Mike Brase PC57	Middle Nenana AC5	Fairbanks AC3 Mat Valley AC12

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 93 — 5AAC 92.540(3)(I). Controlled Use Areas. Clarify travel restrictions within the Ladue River Controlled Use Area.

(3) Units 13 and 20:

...

(I) the Ladue River Controlled Use Area:

...

(ii) the area is closed to the use of any motorized land vehicle for hunting, including the transportation of hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of game, from August 24 through September 30; however, this provision does not prohibit motorized access, or transportation of game, on the Nine Mile and Liberty Creek trails, the Alaska–Canada border or [,] the Boundary Cutoff of the Taylor Highway [, OR OTHER TRAILS DESIGNATED BY THE DEPARTMENT];

ISSUE: By authorizing the department to designate any number of trails for motorized access, this regulation places the department in the position of allocating the resource within the Ladue River Controlled Use Area (LRCUA) between user groups. The Upper Tanana Advisory Committee indicated that the public wishes to allow motorized travel within the LRCUA only on Nine Mile and Liberty Creek trails, the Alaska–Canada border, and the Boundary Cutoff of the Taylor Highway. The current regulation also necessitates that the department mark and monitor designated trails, which is time consuming and costly. This proposal clarifies travel restrictions within the LRCUA and will minimize expenditure of funds for trail marking and monitoring by designating these few well-known and easily marked access routes.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will continue to be placed in the position of having to allocate resources among user groups and expend excessive time and money to mark and monitor designated trails.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Limited department funds will be available for higher priority management activities, including moose, caribou, and wolf surveys.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who are unsure of where they can use motorized vehicles.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who wish to access the LRCUA with motorized vehicles where motorized travel restrictions exist.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Eliminate the LRCUA.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G-047)

PROPOSAL 93 CONTINUED

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Backcountry Hunters and Anglers - Mark Richards PC66 Fairbanks AC3 Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8		Mat Valley AC12

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 94 — 5 AAC 92.540(8)(A). Controlled Use Areas. Amend the access restrictions for the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area in Units 21 and 24 as follows:

Eliminate the following language for the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area:

[THE AREA IS CLOSED TO THE USE OF AIRCRAFT FOR HUNTING MOOSE, INCLUDING THE TRANSPORTATION OF MOOSE HUNTERS, THEIR HUNTING GEAR, AND/OR MOOSE PARTS; HOWEVER THIS DOES NOT APPLY TO THE TRANSPORTATION OF MOOSE HUNTERS, THEIR HUNTING GEAR, AND/OR PARTS OF MOOSE FROM A PUBLICLY OWNED AIRPORT IN THE CONTROLLED USE AREA.]

ISSUE: The prohibition of aircraft access to the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? 1.) Nearly three million acres of public lands that are inaccessible by any means other than aircraft will remain essentially closed to hunting without any biological reason. The thin ribbon of water (Koyukuk River) that courses through the nearly four million acre Koyukuk National Wildlife Refuge affords moose hunting only to boat borne hunters and only to an average of less than one mile back from the river. Meanwhile, the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area covers an area so vast that small ponds and lakes thirty miles back from the river, that are inaccessible to aircraft, are left unutilized on otherwise huntable, public lands.

2.) With the ever closing of more federal park lands, native held lands etc., crowding has become and will continue to become a problem. This is an opportunity to easily open more public land and spread out the pressure.

3.) The clause of equal access to natural resources for all residents in the Alaska Constitution will continue to be violated. Since the controlled use area is an area of drawing permit and registration permit only a set number of hunters will have access to the area. It should therefore not matter that a hunter transports himself by boat or aircraft.

4.) The controlled use area restriction to aircraft was conceived twenty-six years ago to limit the number of hunters in the area. In the intervening years the very fact so many hunters have engulfed the area that a drawing permit system became necessary shows what an abject failure the aircraft restriction is. Without allowing some of those permitted hunters to get off of the river and into the back country the problems associated with crowding on the river will continue.

5) If no aircraft access continues, all hunters will remain bunched together on the river corridor, competition and hostilities between local and non local users will continue and hunting pressure on the moose herd in a small area will continue rather than be spread out over a larger area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Many of the drawing permit hunters are non local. Many would prefer to fly into the area well back from the main river thus reducing conflict and crowding with other hunters and also providing a more quality hunting experience. Also, since this is a drawing permit area, only a set number of hunters are allowed in so the harvest would not increase and it would be spread over a larger area.

PROPOSAL 94 CONTINUED

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All people who want to see the hunting pressure and people conflicts reduced on the Koyukuk River while at the same time providing a more quality outdoor experience. Also benefiting are all the people who would like to see an approximate three million more acres of public land opened to moose hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? 1.) All those who believe an Alaska resident who owns an aluminum boat with a 150 horse power engine and a propeller should have open access to this huge area while an Alaska resident who owns an aluminum airplane with a 150 horse power engine and a propeller should not. We need to get past the idea that an airplane owner is rich and therefore doesn't deserve to hunt this controlled use area. Fly in hunting and certainly scouting the area from the air is an option that is affordable to anyone, especially those who can afford to hunt via gas guzzling motor boat. 2.) All those who wrongly assume that the inaccessible area acts as a reserve area in which moose are raised to come to the river. Biological studies show that moose grow up and die in a five to seven square mile area. Even if it was true that the area acted as a reserve, shouldn't aircraft owners then also be allowed to land on the river? Why would boat hunters have a "reserve" of three million acres off limits to other Alaskan citizens simply because of their mode of travel?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1.) Changing the controlled use area to a five miles wide corridor along the Koyukuk River (2 ½ miles either side) that would be inaccessible to aircraft. This solution still violates the equal access clause to the Alaska Constitution. 2.) Changing the regulation for the controlled use area to allow only the use of aircraft for moose hunting and banning boats for moose hunting completely. This solution also violates the equal access clause of the Alaska Constitution and is as silly as the present ban on aircraft. 3.) Suing the State of Alaska. This was rejected as I thought that a proposal that corrected a violation to the Alaska Constitution, that was good for the local people, non-local hunters, environmentalists and the moose would be taken as common sense and slide right through the approval process. I am submitting this for the forth time as I feel common sense maybe more "common" not than it was two years ago.

PROPOSED BY: Colin Brown (SC-08S-G-001)

Favor Neutral Oppose

Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Larry Dalrymple PC59 Alaska Outdoor Council PC65		Fairbanks AC3 Koyukuk AC4
---	--	------------------------------

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 95 — 5 AAC 92.530(7) **Management areas.** Amend the regulations for the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area and provide a permit hunt as follows:

A permit by lottery system for 10 day September only, use of licensed motor vehicles on existing mining roads and trails in Unit 24A, or a registration permit for the same limited dates.

ISSUE: Reasonable access to areas outside the Dalton Highway Corridor Management in Unit 24A.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Only a very small group of mine owners and wealthy boat and airplane hunters will have a vast private hunting area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It would help give limited access to hunters that cannot afford riverboats, airplanes, or who do not own mines.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The working class hunters of modest means.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Doug Hamilton (HQ-08S-G-024)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
		Koyukuk AC4

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 96—5 AAC 92.530(7) Management areas. Amend the access restrictions for the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area as follows:

Licensed highway vehicles may be used in Unit 24A, only on existing mining access roads and trails from August 31 through September 10.

ISSUE: Lack of reasonable access to hundreds of square miles of federal lands. Unit 24A has no public airstrips, few lakes, and very shallow waterways.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The area will remain set aside for the wealthy hunters and mine owners.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It keeps the reason we were told the regulations changed in tack. To protect the caribou north of Unit 24A from competition hunting effecting villagers. Unit 24A has no villagers and few caribou in September.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who hunted Unit 24A for years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Doug Hamilton (HQ-08S-G-025)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Mat Valley AC12		Koyukuk AC4
--	--	-------------

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

The Board of Game considered this proposal during the Spring2007 regional meeting and voted to defer it to the Spring 2008 meeting.

PROPOSAL 97 - 5 AAC 92.125. Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans.

Amend the regulation as follows:

Implement a predator management plan for Unit 9 to help increase the caribou populations so that caribou can be harvested.

ISSUE: The need for a predator management plan for Unit 9B, 9C, and 9E.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Caribou population in 9C and 9E will continue to be below harvestable levels. Moose population will continue to decline.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Randy Alvarez (HQ-08S-G-079)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Fairbanks AC3	Alaska Outdoor Council PC65	USFWS PC47 Defenders of Wildlife PC56
---	-----------------------------	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

The Board of Game considered this proposal during the Spring 2007 regional meeting and voted to defer it to the Spring 2008 meeting.

PROPOSAL 98 - 5 AAC 92.125. Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans. Amend the regulation as follows:

Establish a wolf control program in Unit 17B and 17C, areas important to the Mulchatna caribou herd.

ISSUE: Continued decline of the Mulchatna caribou herd and predation by wolves.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued predation, especially on newborn calves, will contribute to the decline of this herd.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Reducing the number of Mulchatna caribou killed by wolves will slow the decline of this herd and help in its recovery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who use Mulchatna caribou.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who do not like wolf control.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Same.

PROPOSED BY: Hans Nicholson (HQ-08S-G-080)

Favor Neutral Oppose

Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51		
--	--	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 99 —5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping; 92.085(6). Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions; 92.125. Predation control areas implementation plans; and 92.990 Definitions (21). Allow black and brown bear trapping by permit in Unit 19 as follows:

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game would be able to issue up to ten permits to allow trapping of black and grizzly bears in the McGrath Experimental Micro Management Area (EMMA) from April 1 to June 30 with bag limit of 15 bears. Only foot snares would be legal, snares to be checked every two days.

ISSUE: Allow trapping of black and grizzly bears under permit in the McGrath EMMA, so the public can continue the McGrath experimental moose management program

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bears will rebound, moose harvests will decline, people in McGrath will return to the Board of Game in future years asking for more widespread wolf control.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If bear numbers can be kept low in the small area around McGrath, the moose population could support all or most of the demand by local residents for moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People of the state who hunt would save money if the department does not have to conduct predator control. Residents of McGrath would not have to travel so far to get moose. Non local residents would have more opportunity to hunt in remote areas of Unit 19D East if demand for moose by local residents can be met in the local area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who don't want bears trapped or killed.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Bear baiting with an incentive; it would not be effective enough to reduce bear numbers. Neck snares-not selective enough.

PROPOSED BY: Patrick Valkenburg (HQ-08S-G-027)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Red Devil Traditional Council PC23 Alaska Trappers Association - Randy Zarnke PC45 Fairbanks AC3 Stoney Holitna AC7 Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8	Alaska Outdoor Council PC65	Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Defenders of Wildlife PC56
--	-----------------------------	---

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 100 — 5 AAC 92.260. Taking cub bears and female bears with cubs prohibited, and 92.125. Predation control areas implementation plans Modify the methods for taking bears in Unit 19 intensive management areas as follows:

1. The harvest of any bear from a den is legal in intensive management areas.
Unit 19, residents, no closed season

2. The harvest of any bear legal in intensive management areas.

ISSUE: Black bears kill a high number of moose calves in the spring and summer. There are a large number of black bears in Unit 19, and a great shortage of moose. Other regulations that have been adopted allowing the taking of more bears have not been as effective as anticipated in reducing the number of black bears. One main issue that has contributed to this is the high cost of fuel for boat travel.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bear predation on moose calves will remain high without more effective tools to address it. Moose populations will take longer to recover. Wolf control efforts will need to remain in place longer.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This proposal will reduce bear numbers, and so will decrease predation of moose calves by black bears. The recovery and quality of moose stocks in the area will be the result

1.) The points listed below will all contribute to the taking of more bears by local residents during the winter, particularly in rural areas of the state.

- In the winter, when people are traveling by snow machine there is an opportunity to access a whole area, rather than being limited to river corridors.
- People are trapping in the winter, and bear harvest will be done at the same time.
- This will also be done at a much lower fuel cost, since snow machines are more fuel efficient than outboard motors.
- The meat and hide of bears is superior during the winter, than during summer and fall. People will be harvesting bears for meat as a partial substitute for the moose that have traditionally been relied on.

2.) In the McGrath area when bears were moved, no sows with cubs were moved, only single bears. Because of this, an expensive program that could have made a more lasting difference was short-lived. This is borne out by the increasing calf mortality rate in that area, due to bear predation. In only two or three years, those cubs that could have been taken out, are now adults.

Also, according to some biologists, the killing of mostly boars during spring, summer, and fall increases bear populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The moose population, and those interested in moose population recovery.

PROPOSAL 100 CONTINUED

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? These actions could cause concern with those who object to the taking of sows with cubs as an ethical issue. This sort of action –the taking of any age or sex of a given prey specie- is routinely done in other countries to balance predator/prey populations, and it is effective. These actions are taken for that reason only, and have nothing to do with sport hunting or fair chase.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Bear snaring, aerial bear control were discussed.

PROPOSED BY: Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-035)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Red Devil Traditional Council PC23 Stoney River Traditional Council PC54 Lime Village Traditional Council PC55 Stoney Holitna AC7	Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Koyukuk AC4	Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Backcountry Hunters and Anglers - Mark Richards PC66

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 101 — 5 AAC 92.125. Predation control areas implementation plans. Extend the Unit 19A predator control plan as follows:

The predator management program for Unit 19A will be reauthorized for six years. This program will start July 1, 2009 and expire June 30, 2015. The reason for this number of years is that the program will then expire on a year when Unit 19 will be on the Board of Game meeting cycle.

ISSUE: The Predator Management Program that is operating in Unit 19A began July 1, 2004, and ends June 30, 2009. This plan, along with the moose hunting closure, is allowing the moose herds in Unit 19A to regenerate. More time is needed to make this recovery a success.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The wolf population in Unit 19A will increase and the small increase that has occurred in the moose population will be wiped out in a short period of time.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The herd numbers are increasing right now, due to the present predator management program. With the continuing program, there will be more time for moose stocks to increase to a healthy level, capable of a sustainable yield.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups of moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Making the program a permanent one.

PROPOSED BY: Central Kuskowim Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-018)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Rob Jones PC19 Red Devil Traditional Council PC23 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Stoney River Traditional Council PC54 Lime Village Traditional Council PC55 Fairbanks AC3 Stoney Holitna AC7		Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Central AC1 Form Letter with 103 Signatories PC67

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 102 —5 AAC 92.125. Predation control areas implementation plans. Terminate the wolf control program for Unit 19A as follows:

Due to ineffectiveness in providing higher harvest of moose, the board terminates the aerial predator control program in Unit 19A.

ISSUE: Expensive and ineffective aerial predator control program in Unit 19A. See proposal for Unit 19D for overall information that is relevant. Similar issues also apply to the Unit 19A predator control program.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continuing wolf control would expend more funds that might be better used for programs that have tangible benefits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal addresses improving and/or maintaining the quality of Alaska's natural and healthy ecosystems by recognizing the important role predators like wolves and bears play in maintaining healthy populations of ungulates. Science has proven repeatedly that long-term damage to ecosystems occurs when they are grossly manipulated for the benefit of a single species.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska's healthy ecosystems, in addition to all people who appreciate and respect Alaska's wildlife.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solution seems appropriate, as the number of moose reported taken by hunters has not increased after all this effort and expense.

PROPOSAL 102 CONTINUED

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Center for the Environment, Alaska Wildlife Alliance, and
 Defenders of Wildlife (HQ-08S-G-032)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Betsy Chronic PC29 Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Form Letter with 103 Signatories PC67		Rob Jones PC19 Red Devil Traditional Council PC23 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Stoney River Traditional Council PC54 Lime Village Traditional Council PC55 Larry Dalrymple PC59 Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Delta AC2 Fairbanks AC3 Middle Nenana AC5 Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 103 — 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions, and 92.125. Predator control areas implementation plans. Amend the regulations to allow wolf denning as follows:

In Unit 19, make it legal to disturb and destroy wolf dens in the pursuit of customary and traditional predator management methods. (The wolf season and daily bag limit in Unit 19 are sufficient at this time.)

ISSUE: The predator populations in Unit 19 must continue to be held in check to allow moose populations to increase and stay at a level of sustainable yield that is sufficient to meet the needs of the large number of humans living in Units 18 and 19. The predator management programs that exist are constantly under assault by those against them through the courts, U.S. Congress, and by ballot initiative. The predator management program in Unit 19A is due to expire June 30, 2009. The present state predator management programs are effective, but their future is tenuous. The state must have alternative, additional legal methods for the Department of Fish and Game and/or Alaskans to control predator numbers.

In the expectation that the Board of Game adopts proposal 41 at the Statewide board meeting, the Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee (CKAC) proposes that the board apply the new regulation to Unit 19. If proposal 41 has not been adopted, the CKAC urges the board to adopt this proposal for Unit 19.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If Unit 19 loses its predator management programs, the ungulate populations will continue to decrease. There will be few other legal, effective methods left, to hold predator numbers down.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It has been proven that limiting predator numbers contributes to maintaining larger ungulate populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All those who depend on ungulates as a main source of food, and sport user groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who are fundamentally against active predator control, or the use of wildlife by humans for food.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSAL 103 CONTINUED

PROPOSED BY: Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee

(INT-08S-G-019)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Red Devil Traditional Council PC23 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Stoney River Traditional Council PC54 Lime Village Traditional Council PC55 Stoney Holitna AC7 Form Letter with 103 Signatories PC67	Koyukuk AC4	Betsy Chronic PC29 Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Middle Nenana AC5
--	-------------	---

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 104 — 5 AAC 92.125(f). Predation control areas implementation plans. Extend the Unit 19D East predation control area plan as follows:

Extend the wolf control program in Unit 19D for another five years. If the population goals are reached before the end of this period it can be ended. The wolves will not be threatened by this action because they will quickly learn to take advantage of the denser cover. The number of permittees who want to hunt here will also be low but some harvest of wolves is better than no harvest. It will also slow the recovery of wolf packs in the Experimental Micro Management Area (EMMA) to better insure that moose population goals are reached.

ISSUE: The wolf control program was expanded last year in part of Unit 19D east to lower the population of wolves in the area surrounding the area. The harvest was low in that only about 17 wolves were taken. This was due in part to the heavier forest cover and the lack of good tracking snow during much of the season. It was enough however to insure that wolf packs did not reoccupy the area. This program is set to expire at the end of next winter (spring 2009).

The area in Unit 19D East outside the EMMA has been subject to increased hunting pressure due to the EMMA being closed to hunting. The area up the North Fork of the Kuskokwim is the primary hunting grounds for the community of Nikolai which is the most subsistence dependent community in Unit 19D. They have had to pay the price of increased hunting pressure due to increased pressure from residents of the area who had to travel to hunt. Pressure needs to be kept on the wolf packs in this area to allow the moose population to recover. It is also one of the areas hardest to hunt for wolves.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will remain low in this area. Wolf packs from this area will quickly reoccupy the area and slow the recovery program there. The goal of achieving a moose population that can sustain a harvest of 130 to 150 for Unit 19D will be difficult to reach.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will help insure the recovery of healthy game populations in Unit 19D.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters who qualify for the registration hunt and others who will be able to hunt once the moose population recovers. The predators will also benefit in the long run if we can continue to increase their prey base.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSAL 104 CONTINUED

PROPOSED BY: McGrath Advisory Committee

(INT-08S-G-047)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Rob Jones PC19 Red Devil Traditional Council PC23 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Stoney River Traditional Council PC54 Lime Village Traditional Council PC55 Fairbanks AC3 Stoney Holitna AC7		Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Form Letter with 103 Signatories PC67

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 105 — 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping; 92.085(6). Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions; 92.125. Predation control areas implementation plans; and 92.990(21) Definitions. Allow black and brown bear trapping by permit in Unit 19 as follows:

To implement a special permit program that would allow snares to be used by permit holders selected by the Department of Fish and Game to take bears in the Experimental Micro Management Area (EMMA). This should apply to both black and grizzly bears. It should also allow the harvest of sows and cubs. The permit could define how this would be implemented to avoid snaring of moose or other game animals.

ISSUE: Current attempts to increase harvest with liberal bag limit and special permits to expand the take plus the allowance of baiting has not increased the harvest. Sitting on bait is too time consuming for most hunters when there is not a big demand for bear skins or meat

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Recovery of moose population will slow or level off and could begin falling if predation increases. Especially if the wolf control program ends. Moose population needs to continue to increase to the point where it can sustain a human harvest of 125-150, which was the goal of the control program.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will improve the quantity of resource harvested which is the desired goal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who depends on healthy game populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who do not want to see any animals harvested.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: McGrath Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-036)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Red Devil Traditional Council PC23 Alaska Trappers Association - Randy Zarnke PC45 Stoney River Traditional Council PC54 Lime Village Traditional Council PC55 Fairbanks AC3 Stoney Holitna AC7 Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8		Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Kneeland Taylor PC52 Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Central AC1

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 106 —5 AAC 92.125. Predation control areas implementation plans. Terminate the wolf control program for Unit 19D East.

Our proposed solution is to immediately terminate the Unit 19D (East) wolf control program. This would mean revoking the implementation plan entirely, or removing wolf control provisions from it while leaving other provisions intact.

ISSUE: The wolf control program in Unit 19D (East) is now in its 5th year. The initial justification for the program (that subsistence demand for moose was unmet) was flawed. Wolf control since 2003 has not produced more moose for hunters. The scientific value of the experiment has been lost. Valid monitoring and evaluation protocols are absent and costs of removing wolves are excessive. These facts indicate that the Board of Game should immediately terminate this wolf control program.

Justification: In March 1995, the Board of Game (board) approved a wolf control program for the McGrath area (Unit 19D (East)) designed to reduce wolf numbers in that area by 80% in order to increase moose numbers to benefit hunters. This was in response to reports that the moose population had declined from several thousand in the 1970's to much lower numbers and the wolf population had increased greatly. However, the control program was not implemented at that time.

In 1999, the board again passed a wolf control program after local residents reported that moose numbers continued to decline. Again, the program was not implemented.

In 2000, the governor appointed a planning team to review the information and issue recommendations to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (department). The team determined that a harvest of about 150 moose per year was required to meet subsistence needs of local residents and a moose population of about 3500 was necessary to sustain the annual harvest. The planning team was told by the department that only about 850 moose remained in the area and a crisis existed. The team recommended that bears and wolves be reduced and hunting seasons in a portion of the area be closed in order to re-build the moose population. The department accepted the recommendations and the board adopted them in spring 2001.

In November 2001, the department conducted a moose census in the area that estimated a moose population of about 3,600. This indicated that previous censuses that estimated much lower numbers were in error. Plans to reduce predators were suspended because the estimate of 3,600 moose exceeded the estimate of about 3,500 needed to satisfy harvest demand.

In March 2003, a new board appointed by the Governor revisited the issue and approved a control plan featuring aerial shooting of wolves in a portion of the area and a bear translocation effort. The board subsequently raised the intensive management moose population objective from 3,000 – 3,500 to 6,000 – 8,000. The department staff reports to the board indicated that U.S. Census Bureau data showed the human population in the area declined from 868 in 1990 to 564 in 2000 thereby lowering the subsistence demand for moose. The fall 2002 moose harvest estimate was 100 based only on legally taken moose voluntarily reported by successful hunters.

PROPOSAL 106 CONTINUED

A 2003 lawsuit challenging the McGrath predator control program revealed problems related to accurately estimating moose harvests (and thus determining whether or not intensive management objectives were met – one of the triggers for a control program). One problem was the magnitude of the unreported legal harvest. The planning team found that prior to 2001, for every 50 moose reported another 40-50 were probably taken legally but not reported. A second problem is the illegal (obviously unreported) harvest. The department data from McGrath based on radioed animals indicated that 35 of 98 moose were killed illegally by hunters and 12 were taken illegally. This indicates a ratio of about one illegally taken moose for every three legally taken. Thus, this information indicates that unreported legally taken moose may be as high as 100% of the reported harvest and illegally taken moose add an additional 30%

This analysis indicates that the fall 2002 actual moose harvest likely exceeded 200 animals, much higher than previously estimated based only on the reported harvest. This, combined with the human population decline in the area, indicated that the board's finding that subsistence demand for moose in 2003 was not being met was likely in error. The finding that subsistence demand was unmet and intensive management harvest objectives were not achieved was the primary justification the board used to adopt a predator control program in 2003.

Predator control at McGrath began in fall 2003 and extends to the present time. Bears were translocated in the springs of 2004 and 2005 during moose calving season. Wolves in Unit 19D were killed each winter: 39 in 2003-04, 32 in 2004-05, 15 in 2005-06, 31 in 2006-07 (over four seasons, a total of 45 killed by aerial gunning, and 72 by combined hunting, trapping or snaring). Following the bear translocations, moose calf survival from birth to November doubled. In the bear removal area, calf:cow ratios were 51-63 calves per 100 cows – much higher than previously. This occurred primarily in a 520 square mile area termed the Experimental Micro-Management Area (EMMA). This was only a small portion of the 8,500 square miles in GMU 19D (East). Wolves were shot in an area of about 3,200 miles (expanded to 6,245 square miles in 2006). The moose hunting season was closed in the EMMA in order to rebuild the moose population quickly.

In November 2004, another moose census was attempted but poor snow conditions terminated it before it was completed. A department memo summarizing the census data warned that extrapolating the 2004 data from the limited area censused to the entire area was not warranted. However, this was done with the resulting claim that moose numbers increased from 2001 to 2004. The invalid 2004 estimate (4,374) was compared to the intensive management population objective (6,000 – 8,000) to claim that the objective was unmet and therefore predator (wolf) control should continue.

No moose population censuses have been done since 2004 and the current number of moose in the entirety of Unit 19D (East) is unknown. Despite increased early calf survival following bear translocation, many of calves "saved" from bears starved in the very severe winter of 2004-2005. The department estimated that moose increased 30% in the EMMA (only 6% of the entire unit) mainly as a result of moving bears and closing the hunting season. Only 45 wolves were reported taken by aerial shooters in Unit 19D (East) between 2003 and 2007, including only

PROPOSAL 106 CONTINUED

seven last winter from a population estimated at 94% of the area outside the EMMA as a result of wolf control. With the small number of wolves taken recently by aerial hunters, there is no indication that continuing wolf control will benefit hunters in the future.

Unfortunately, the main factor(s) responsible for the increases in calf:cow ratios and overall moose densities in the EMMA cannot be identified. At the May 2006 board meeting, board members and department staff agreed that the scientific value of the McGrath predator control program was lost due to the way the program was conducted. Bear translocation, wolf reduction, and closure of the moose hunting season were all initiated at about the same time. As a result, it is not possible to determine which of these variables (or indeed, which other variables) are most important in producing observed changes in the moose population. The National Research Council Report (1997) strongly recommended that predator control programs be done so that results are clear. Unfortunately, the Committee's advice was not followed for the McGrath program.

Of the five currently active predator control programs in Alaska, the Unit 19D(East) program has the most complete data and has received the most effort by the department to gather field data. Unfortunately, the study plan prepared in 2001 by department and peer reviewed scientists inside and outside Alaska was shelved in 2003 when the new board approved the control program. Thus, the scientific protocols to adequately monitor and evaluate the results over time are not being implemented. This, in part, resulted in department and board agreement that the scientific value of the program was lost. It also argues against continuing wolf control. If we cannot properly determine success or failure, why continue the highly controversial practice of aerial shooting?

The 19D(East) program is also the only one for which the department has provided cost figures. Total expenditures two years ago were estimated at \$1.7 million. Surely, these have now risen. If 45 wolves were taken from 2003 to 2007, the state's cost per dead wolf was nearly \$38,000, not including the costs incurred by the aerial shooters or the public relations costs to the state due to the negative image of aerial hunting. Of course, we are well aware that much of the total cost was spent on activities not related to shooting wolves but the department has not provided cost figures specifically for that activity.

What benefits have resulted from the cost of wolf removal? As stated above, there is no evidence that significantly more moose are available to hunters outside the EMMA as a result of reducing wolves, and there is no indication that continuing wolf control will produce more moose.

We maintain that the initial justification for wolf control at McGrath in 2003 overestimated subsistence demand for moose and underestimated subsistence harvests. Clearly, the moose population estimates prior to 2001 severely underestimated moose numbers actually present and provoked a "crisis" that never existed. Thus, the justification for wolf control was flawed at the outset.

PROPOSAL 106 CONTINUED

We maintain that the wolf control conducted since 2003 has not “worked.” It has failed to produce more moose for hunters. The modest gains in moose numbers in the EMMA were likely due to moving bears during moose calving season and closing the moose season. In the 94% of Unit 19D(East) outside the EMMA there is no evidence that moose have increased as a result of wolf control and no additional moose are being taken by hunters. The reported moose harvest in 2006-07 throughout all Unit 19D was 82. This is less than the 115 reported harvest in 2002-2003 before the wolf control began.

We agree with the department and the board that the scientific value of the “experiment” at McGrath has been lost and we are unable to learn anything more there that may guide future programs. Indeed, we will likely be unable to assess whether or not wolf control worked and what factors likely limited the moose population.

We believe that it is most unfortunate that the peer reviewed study plan for McGrath was shelved before it was implemented in 2003. Now, in the absence of scientifically valid protocols to monitor and evaluate the program, one of the National Research Council’s main recommendations has been breached – that the program should be conducted so the outcomes are clear. A recent letter of concern by 172 scientists sent to the current Governor echoed this concern. In the absence of monitoring and evaluation protocols that compromise scientific validity, and with failure to accomplish management goals (more moose for hunters), the McGrath program appears to be a total failure.

We find that the cost of wolf control at McGrath are excessive, especially since control has not produced more moose for hunters. Continuing wolf control would expend more funds that might be better used for programs that have tangible benefits.

These facts provide strong justification to terminate wolf control at McGrath immediately and we strongly urge the BOG to do so.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wolves will continue to be shot needlessly since there is no evidence that wolf control has produced more moose for hunters to date and there is no evidence that removing additional wolves will result in more moose.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal addresses improving and/or maintaining the quality of Alaska’s natural and healthy ecosystems by recognizing the important role predators like wolves and bears play in maintaining healthy populations of ungulates. Science has proven repeatedly that long-term damage to ecosystems occurs when they are grossly manipulated for the benefit of a single species.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska’s healthy ecosystems, in addition to all people who appreciate and respect Alaska’s wildlife.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

PROPOSAL 106 CONTINUED

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solution seems appropriate, as the number of moose reported taken by hunters has not increased after all this effort and expense.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Center for the Environment, Alaska Wildlife Alliance,
and Defenders of Wildlife (HQ-08S-G-031)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Kneeland Taylor PC52 Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Form Letter with 103 Signatories PC67		Rob Jones PC19 Red Devil Traditional Council PC23 Betsy Chronic PC29 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Stoney River Traditional Council PC54 Lime Village Traditional Council PC55 Larry Dalrymple PC59 Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Delta AC2 Fairbanks AC3 Middle Nenana AC5 Stoney Holitna AC7 Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 107 — 5 AAC. 92.125. Predation control areas implementation plans. Modify the predation control plan for Unit 20E to provide the following:

Under a bear control permit, allow the following: 1.) taking of all sex-age classes of both brown and black bears; 2.) the use of bear snares for taking bears; 3.) taking of bears same-day-airborne; 4.) sale of tanned and untanned hides and skulls from bears taken in the control program. Establish a working group to develop recommendations on methods, means and protocol for carrying out the bear control program. This working group should include members of local advisory committees, public sportsman's organizations including the Alaska Outdoor Council, and the Department of Fish and Game research and management staff.

ISSUE: Current conditions of the bear predation control program in the Upper Yukon/Tanana area have not resulted in elevated levels of bear removal and reduction of the bear-caused ungulate mortality.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Current restrictions on allowable methods to take bears will make bear population reduction impossible. High rates of bear predation will continue to limit moose and caribou populations in this important hunting area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Effective reduction of bear predation will allow moose and caribou populations to increase providing significantly higher harvests in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Thousands of moose and caribou hunters will benefit. Thousands of tourists will have a greater chance of viewing moose and caribou. Businesses catering to hunters and tourists will benefit economically.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People philosophically opposed to hunting and intensive management. A small number of hunters who may want to hunt specifically for bears in this area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSAL 108 — 5 AAC 92.125. Predation control areas implementation plans. Modify the predator control plan in Unit 20A as follows:

Reactivate the existing wolf management project to increase the survival of moose calves to 45 to 50 calves per 100 cows in November, thereby maintaining the annual harvest as the moose population is reduced to the objective.

ISSUE: The 20A moose population is being reduced to achieve the intensive management objective of 10,000 – 12,000 moose. The current population is 14,000 – 15,000. To maintain the intensive management objective of 1,000 – 1,500 while the population is being reduced will require that natural predation be reduced also. The 20A moose harvest remains very important to Interior and South Central Alaskan hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will continue to decline below the intensive management objective of 10,000 – 12,000 if wolves and other predators are not managed. Current harvest levels which are at or near the harvest objective levels cannot be maintained as the moose population is lowered. Moose harvest levels will be reduced in a futile attempt to maintain the moose population the minimum intensive management level. If predators are not reduced in concert with the moose population, drastic measures will be necessary to stop the moose population from dropping to the 1972 – 1976 levels.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal action would maintain the quantity and quality of the harvest as the population is reduced to improve the health and production of the moose heard in the future. Previously planned habitat improvement will allow the population and harvest intensive management objectives to maintained or even increased in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters, guides, outfitters, transporters and the general economy which benefits from recent increased harvest and future harvests.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Wolf trappers may suffer from the initial reduction. In the unlikely even that bears are a major contributing mortality factor, bear hunter guides, etc. will suffer. Previous investigations in Units 19 & 20 indicated that wolves are the major cause of moose predation, not bears.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1. Reduce harvest by hunters, rejected because it is against the intensive management laws. 2. Reinstate a bounty program, rejected because the Board and the Department lack jurisdiction. 3. Develop a privately funded incentive/bounty program, rejected at present because there is no known funding source or organization. 4. Liberalize hunting and trapping regulations to increase wolf harvests, rejected because extending seasons, bag limits, and methods and means to periods when wolves are not primes has not been effective.

PROPOSAL 108 CONTINUED

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee

(INT-08S-G-059)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Fairbanks AC3		John Morak PC2 Betsy Chronic PC29 Kneeland Taylor PC52 Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Backcountry Hunters and Anglers - Mark Richards PC66 Middle Nenana AC5
---------------	--	---

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 110 — 5 AAC 92.125. Predation control areas implementation plans. Amend the regulation to provide the following:

If the Delta caribou herd is not addressed in the existing Unit 20A predator management authorization, the board should request and approve a predator management project to achieve the population and harvest objectives. If the Delta caribou are addressed in the existing authorization, a management plan amendment should be approved and predator reduction action begun.

ISSUE: The Delta caribou herd is currently 50 percent or more below the intensive management population objective of 5,000 to 7,000. The harvest is, therefore, way below the harvest objectives of 300 to 700.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to compete for a token harvest of around 50 caribou from this readily accessible herd. The Department of Fish and Game and the Board of Game will continue to disregard the intensive management law and ignore an important economic and food resource.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The herd can be returned to former productive population levels. It would then provide a valuable hunting experience and food. There would also be increased economic opportunities for guides, outfitters, trappers, and other hunting service providers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Increasing the herd is not a difficult problem. The herd increased from about 1,500 in 1976 to over 6,000 when the wolf population was reduced. Hunters, guides, outfitters, natural predators, trappers and others would benefit by increasing the herd to 7,000. A harvest of 700 would leave three to four times that amount for the natural predators.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anyone who would object to increased human use of a resource that has been determined important for human consumption or increase human use of the range occupied by the herd. Some folks object to the increase number of predators that would benefit from a larger caribou herd.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Transplanting caribou into the herd range or transplanting predators out of the herd's range. This was rejected as it is too costly.

PROPOSAL 110 CONTINUED

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee

(INT-08S-G-054)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Fairbanks AC3		John Morak PC2 Kneeland Taylor PC52 Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Backcountry Hunters and Anglers - Mark Richards PC66 Middle Nenana AC5
---	--	---

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 111 — 5 AAC 92.125(B) Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans.
 Modify the boundary for the Unit 20E predation control area as follows:

In 20E, expand the predator control area to include Ladue River drainage to Unit 20E boundary.

ISSUE: Expand to the subunit boundary to the south.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The boundary is not in the crest between two drainages. A major trail is here. It doesn't make sense have one side of trail in the unit while other side is not.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Takes away a boundary and allows hunters to harvest bear along ridge which 40 herd travel.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who hunt in Unit 20E.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Include entire in Unit 20E.

PROPOSED BY: William Shuster (HQ-08S-G-021)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Fairbanks AC3 Upper Tanana 40 mile w/Am. AC8 Mat Valley AC12		Kneeland Taylor PC52 Defenders of Wildlife PC56

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 112 — 5 AAC 92.125. Predation control areas implementation plans. Amend the regulation to provide the following:

Adopt a wolf predation control plan for Unit 21E which can be implemented right away instead of waiting two more years for the Board of Game to meet after the intensive management plan has been drafted and adopted.

ISSUE: The Yukon Innoko Moose Management Plan was endorsed by the Board of Game in March 2006. Members of the Yukon Innoko Moose Management Working Group, which included several members of the Grayling, Anvik, Shageluk, Holy Cross Advisory Committee (GASH) and non-local hunters, unanimously recommended a wolf predation control program in Unit 21E to prevent further decline in the moose population and maintain harvest opportunities. There has already been a two year delay in implementing this recommendation. In the letter endorsing the plan, the board requested the department to develop an intensive management plan to be considered by the board at the next available opportunity. The department is preparing an intensive management plan to submit to the board at the upcoming meeting. GASH feels it is crucial that the board endorse the intensive management plan and adopt this proposed regulation to authorize a wolf predation control now before the moose population declines to a very low level that would be very difficult to recover from.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? So far there is no wolf predation control plan in place, and the moose populations will plummet even farther if we wait for the intensive management plan to be adopted by the Board of Game and then have to wait until the March 2010 meeting to adopt a regulation for a wolf predation control program.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The wolf population can be reduced now instead of waiting two or three more years. Reducing wolf predation will help to increase the moose population and maintain hunting opportunities for local and non-local hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters in Unit 21E who want to see the moose populations begin to grow and continue to be able to harvest moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Persons from outside our area that do not like wolf control may not like the idea. We do not want to see wolves eliminated from the area and wolf numbers will come back up when there are more moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Wait until the entire intensive management plan has been adopted. We rejected this option because time is of the essence, and waiting 2 or 3 more years will cause moose populations to become even more reduced because of increased predation.

PROPOSAL 112 CONTINUED

PROPOSED BY: Grayling-Anvik-Shageluk-HolyCross (GASH) AC (INT-08S-G-041)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Red Devil Traditional Council PC23 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Stoney River Traditional Council PC54 Lime Village Traditional Council PC55 Fairbanks AC3 Stoney Holitna AC7 Upper Tanana 40 mile w/Am. AC8		Kneeland Taylor PC52 Defenders of Wildlife PC56 Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Central AC1

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 113 — 5 AAC 92.125. Predation control areas implementation plans.
Terminate the aerial predator control program for Units 20E and 25C:

Due to ineffectiveness in providing higher harvest of moose, the board terminates the aerial predator control program in Units 20 and 25C.

ISSUE: Expensive and ineffective aerial predator control program in Units 20E and 25C. See proposal for Unit 19D for overall information that is relevant. Similar issues also apply to the Units 20E and 25C predator control program.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continuing wolf control would expend more funds that might be better used for programs that have tangible benefits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal addresses improving and/or maintaining the quality of Alaska's natural and healthy ecosystems by recognizing the important role predators like wolves and bears play in maintaining healthy populations of ungulates. Science has proven repeatedly that long-term damage to ecosystems occurs when they are grossly manipulated for the benefit of a single species.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska's healthy ecosystems, in addition to all people who appreciate and respect Alaska's wildlife.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solution seems appropriate, as the number of moose reported taken by hunters has not increased after all this effort and expense.

PROPOSAL 113 CONTINUED

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Center for the Environment, Alaska Wildlife Alliance,
and Defenders of Wildlife (HQ-08S-G-033)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Betsy Chronic PC29 Kneeland Taylor PC52 Defenders of Wildlife PC56		Red Devil Traditional Council PC23 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC51 Stoney River Traditional Council PC54 Lime Village Traditional Council PC55 Larry Dalrymple PC59 Alaska Outdoor Council PC65 Delta AC2 Fairbanks AC3 Middle Nenana AC5 Stoney Holitna AC7 Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 114 --5 AAC 085.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorize the existing antlerless moose season in Berners Bay.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident	
	Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(1)		
...		
Unit 1(C), Berners Bay drain- ages	Sept. 15–Oct.15 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15–Oct.15
1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 permits may be issued		
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be re-authorized annually by the board. The Berners Bay strategic moose management plan calls for a post-hunt count of 90 moose, based on the estimated moose carrying capacity of this area. The Department of Fish and Game has been very successful at maintaining this population level through the harvest of both bull and cow moose. Restricting the harvest to bull moose could disrupt this balance.

The number of moose counted during the fall aerial surveys determines the number of drawing permits issued. Aerial counts during 1990–2006 have ranged from a high of 107 moose in 1999 to a low of 59 in 2002, with a count of 76 moose in fall 2006. The mean annual count during this period has been 77 moose. Although we have not yet conducted a fall 2007 survey, we expect moose numbers to be somewhat lower than in 2006 due to the severe winter of 2006/07 when 17% of collared cow moose (n=31) died in Berners Bay.

During 1998–2006, the number of drawing permits issued by the department for this herd ranged from 10 bull permits and 10 antlerless permits to 7 bull permits and 0 antlerless permits. The average annual harvest of bull moose during this period was seven, while cow harvests in years we issued antlerless permits was 4. Although we have the latitude of issuing up to 30 permits annually, we will likely restrict the harvest to 5-10 bulls and 0-7 antlerless moose for the near future.

PROPOSAL 114 CONTINUED

Because of the high natural mortality that occurred during the winter of 2006/07 we did not issue any antlerless permits for the fall 2007 hunt, and will likely continue this trend for fall 2008. At this point we believe a conservative approach is warranted. However, we will reassess our harvest strategy for the 2008 hunting season after conducting fall/winter aerial survey counts. In spite of this, we would prefer to keep this hunt active and available as a tool should we need to implement an antlerless hunt in the future.

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G-051)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Mat Valley AC12	USFWS - Subsistence Management PC30	

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 115 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorize the existing antlerless moose season in the Gustavus area.

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

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be re-authorized annually by the board. The Gustavus moose population (Unit 1C) increased rapidly from just a few animals during the 1980’s to a count of 185 animals in 1998, to a subsequent count of 404 animals in 2003. By 2002 department estimated the winter range moose density at Gustavus exceeded 5 moose per km², with only a small portion of that area being productive winter range as identified by abundant stands of willow. Because of concerns with these high moose numbers, department biologists began conducting spring browse utilization surveys in 1999, and documented 85–95% of the current annual growth of willow twigs available to moose had been consumed. This trend has continued to present, and department biologists are convinced this high moose population is not sustainable.

PROPOSAL 115 CONTINUED

Based on the browse utilization data and overall moose densities at Gustavus, an antlerless hunt was first authorized for the Gustavus area by the board in fall 2000. Since that time, hunters have harvested 10, 30, 54, 67, and 11 cow moose in 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006 respectively. The fall 2007 antlerless hunt was cancelled after nearly 20% of radio-collared cow moose (n=33) died from natural causes presumably linked to the severe winter of 2006/2007. Along with the cow mortality, the calf and yearling survival also seemed to be compromised, thereby eliminating the need to remove additional animals with a fall 2007 antlerless harvest.

Department biologists have been able to collect rump fat measurements as an index of body condition as well as collect pregnancy and twinning rate data from the reproductive tracts from the majority of the harvested animals. The rump fat index has been very low in comparison to similar measurements taken during early winter from moose in other populations throughout Alaska. In addition, the percent of females that were pregnant and the percent carrying twins was also below that found in many other populations, and below thresholds expected for a healthy moose population. In addition to these data collected from harvested cow moose, capture operations conducted during spring and fall from 2003 through 2007 accounted for approximately 20-30 cow moose per capture session being measured for rump fat and assessed for pregnancy. The rump fat indices for both pre and post winter were very low in comparison to similar measurements taken from moose in other populations throughout the state.

With the level of natural mortality that was observed on moose at Gustavus this past year, biologists will likely forgo an antlerless hunt in fall 2008. The closing of the fall 2007 hunt has shown that biologists will use the antlerless hunt with caution and utilize this harvest strategy only in the case where they believe it is necessary. Therefore in spite of the 2007 closure of the antlerless hunt, and its' unlikely use in 2008, biologists would like to keep this tool available to implement if needed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This moose population could persist at a density too high for the habitat to support, thereby continuing the over utilization of winter browse as seen in the past 7 years. Ultimately biologists are concerned that the long range carrying capacity of this range could be compromised due to this over utilization of preferred winter browse species.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSAL 115 CONTINUED

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08S-G-052)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Mat Valley AC12		
-----------------	--	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 116 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorize the existing antlerless moose season at Nunatak Bench.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
----------------------	---	----------------------------

(3)

<p>Unit 5(A), that portion south of Wrangell-Saint Elias National Park, north and east of Russell and Nunatak Fjords, and east of the east side of East Nunatak Glacier to the Canadian Border (Nunatak Bench)</p>	Nov. 15 - Feb. 15	Nov. 15 - Feb. 15
---	-------------------	-------------------

1 moose by registration
permit only; up to 5
moose may be taken

...

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

The Nunatak Bench strategic moose management plan calls for a post-hunt population of a maximum of 50 moose. During a February 2001 survey 52 moose were counted in this area followed by 25 in December 2003. However, since that time the moose population at Nunatak Bench has declined dramatically, with counts of 14 and 11 moose in 2005 and 2006 respectively. The decline in moose numbers is almost certainly related to the 68' rise in water level that flooded this area in 2003 when the advancing Hubbard Glacier created a dam. A similar situation

occurred in 1989 which caused a similar decline in moose numbers. The cause of the moose
PROPOSAL 116 CONTINUED

declines post flooding appears to be due to the decimation of preferred willow browse by the high water, causing emigration of moose from the area.

During the 1997-2004 hunting seasons an average of 12 permits were issued while 4 persons actually hunted each season. An average of 8 days of hunting were expended each year to kill 0-4 moose, with an average annual harvest of about 2 moose. Six cows and 9 bulls made up the total harvest during this period. No moose have been harvested since 2004, and the department has closed the season each of the last three years by emergency order prior to any moose being harvested.

Although the moose numbers at this time do not warrant a harvest, the department would like to keep this antlerless authorization active should the moose numbers again reach a harvestable level. The department will continue to monitor this moose population and again allow a harvest when the survey counts reach or exceed 25 moose.

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

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Retaining the antlerless season will provide more moose hunting opportunity.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G-053)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Mat Valley AC12		

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 117 - 5 AAC 085.045.(4) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorizes the antlerless moose season in Unit 6(A).

Seasons and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(4)		
Unit 6 (A), all drainages into the Gulf of Alaska from Cape Suckling to Palm Point		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull by registration permit only; up to 30 bulls may be taken; or	Sept. 1-Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 drawing permits may be issued	Sept. 1-Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 5 drawing permits may be issued		Sept. 1- Nov. 30
Remainder of Unit 6(A)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or	Sept. 1- Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; up to 20 antlerless moose may be taken	Nov. 15-Dec. 31 (General hunt only)	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or		Sept. 1- Nov. 30

PROPOSAL 117 CONTINUED

1 antlerless moose by
registration permit; up to 20
antlerless moose may be taken

Nov. 15-Dec. 31

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. We recommend continuation of the antlerless season to promote population stability. The desirable post-hunt population size in Unit 6(A) west of Cape Suckling is 300 to 350 moose. A census completed during February 2006 yielded a population estimate of 275 moose with 15% calves. The reported antlerless harvest was 4 during 2005 and the hunt was not open during 2006 or 2007.

The desirable post-hunt population size in Unit 6(A) east of Cape Suckling is 300 to 350 moose. A census completed during February 2002 yielded a population estimate of 285 moose with 15% calves. No antlerless hunts were held because of previous poor calf survival and population level below the management objective. However, if recruitment does improve, antlerless hunts may be needed to hold the moose population at objective levels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If antlerless hunts are eliminated in Unit 6(A), hunting opportunity will be needlessly lost.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Individuals who desire to hunt antlerless moose in Unit 6(A).

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who are opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G-054)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Copper River / PWS AC10 Mat Valley AC12		

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 118 – 5 AAC 085.045(4). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorizes the antlerless moose season in Unit 6(B).

Units and Bag Limit	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(4)		
...		
Unit 6(B)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 antlered moose by registration permit only; up to 30 antlered moose may be taken; or	Aug. 27- Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 drawing permits may be issued for antlerless moose;	Aug. 27- Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. Desirable post-hunt population size is 300-350. A survey completed during February 2005 indicated a population of 200 moose with 13% calves. Antlerless hunts have not been held during recent years because of continued poor calf survival and population level below the management objective. However, if the population increases to the desired level, antlerless hunts may be needed to hold the population at objective levels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the moose population in Unit 6(B) increases and a season is possible, antlerless hunts will provide additional hunting opportunity.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Individuals desiring to hunt antlerless moose in Unit 6(B).

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who are opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSAL 118 CONTINUED

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08S-G-055)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Copper River / PWS AC10		
Mat Valley AC12		

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 119 - 5 AAC 085.045(4). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorizes the antlerless moose season in Unit 6(C).

Seasons and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(4)		
...		
Unit 6(C) 1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 40 permits for bulls and up to 20 permits for antlerless moose may be issued	Sept. 1-Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season.
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. The population objective is 400 moose. A census completed during February 2007 yielded an estimate of 560 moose, 20% of which were calves. Because the available antlerless harvest quota in Unit 6(C) is currently harvested under a federal subsistence season administered by the U. S. Forest Service, we have not held the antlerless hunt since the 1999-2000 season. We recommend re-authorizing the state antlerless hunt in the event that the federal subsistence hunt is cancelled. If recruitment improves, continuation of the antlerless hunts will be necessary to hold the population at objective levels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity will be lost, and the population may exceed the objective, which is based on the availability of adequate habitat during severe winters.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters desiring to take a moose in Unit 6(C).

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSAL 119 CONTINUED

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08S-G-056)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Copper River / PWS AC10		
Mat Valley AC12		

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 120 - 5 AAC 085.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorizes the drawing permit hunts for antlerless moose in Unit 14(A).

<i>Units and Bag Limits</i>	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
Unit 14(A)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
...		
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 500 antlerless moose permits may be issued	Aug. 20-Sept. 25 (General hunt only) Nov. 1 – Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	No open season
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be re-authorized annually by the board. During November 2003, the subpopulation of moose in Unit 14(A) was surveyed and estimated at 6,564 which was slightly greater than the post-hunt objective of 6,000 – 6,500 moose. During this survey we observed 20 bulls and 29 calves:100 cows. Snow depth accumulations in the subunit during the last 4 winters overall were average and survival of calves and adults was good. The moose population in the unit is believed to be relatively unchanged since the last survey and within the population objective.

During 1999 and 2000, we issued no permits because the subpopulation estimate remained below objective levels. In 2001 we resumed the antlerless hunts because the population had recovered and exceeded objectives. The 14A population is now at the upper end of management objectives. Our strategy for harvesting cows from 8 different permit hunt areas within the subunit was to concentrate antlerless moose permits in those areas where moose densities were highest. Minor adjustments to permit numbers and drawing areas were made in 2007 to address areas with numerous nuisance moose calls. Also, the addition of a youth antlerless moose hunt in the Point MacKenzie area began in 2007 (DM412). The permits for this hunt were allocated from the existing antlerless permit hunt area (DM402).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Portions of the Unit 14(A) moose subpopulation could grow beyond the ability of the habitat to sustain that population level. Increased cases of starvation, conflicts with humans and vehicle collisions will occur.

PROPOSAL 120 CONTINUED.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; excessively high moose density can lead to nutritionally stressed animals in the harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All who wish a healthy, productive moose population in the Matanuska-Susitna valleys, and those who wish to use antlerless moose for human consumption.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who disagree with the harvest of antlerless moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G-057)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Mat Valley AC12		

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 121 - 5 AAC 085.045(5). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Units 7 and 14(C).

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(5)		
<p>...</p> <p>Unit 7, the Placer River drainages, and that portion of the Placer Creek (Bear Valley) drainage outside the Portage Glacier Closed Area, and that portion of Unit 14(C) within the Twentymile River drainage</p>	<p>Aug. 20-Oct. 10 (General hunt only)</p>	
<p>RESIDENT HUNTER: 1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits for bulls will be issued in combination with nonresident hunts, and up to 70 permits for antlerless moose will be issued</p>		
<p>NONRESIDENT HUNTER: 1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits for bulls will be issued in combination with resident hunts</p>		<p>Aug. 20-Oct. 10</p>
<p>...</p>		

PROPOSAL 121 CONTINUED

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. A count in late November 2004 found 94 moose (27 bulls, 44 cows, 23 calves), half the previous year's count, which indicated heavy winter mortality or emigration. The moose population in this hunt area is strongly influenced by winters with unpredictably deep snow accumulations. A population peak of 333 moose in 1990 exceeded the carrying capacity of the winter range, and an aerial survey completed 2 years later found that many of the moose had died or emigrated. The population also declined 25% to 30% during the severe winter of 1994-95. Harvest quotas were reduced and fewer permits were issued in the late 1990s and early 2000s to allow the population to recover. Similarly, no antlerless permits were issued in 2005, 2006 and 2007.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population will increase quickly over several mild winters and suffer major losses during a severe winter. Habitat may be over browsed, reducing carrying capacity in subsequent years, and road and train kills will increase.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who obtain a drawing permit, wildlife viewers and motorists driving in the Portage area. Visitor use is high and viewing is an important activity in this area. Local moose hunters who are willing to harvest a moose in December.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who are opposed to antlerless moose hunting or moose hunting in general.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G-058)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Central Peninsula AC11		
Mat Valley AC12		

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 122 - 5 AAC 085.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorize the antlerless moose season in the Fort Richardson Management Area in Unit 14(C).

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
...		
Unit 14(C), Fort Richardson Management Area	Day after Labor Day -Mar. 31 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Mar. 31
1 moose per regulatory year by drawing permit, and by muzzle loading black powder rifle or bow and arrow only; up to 160 permits may be issued.		
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. An early December 2006 census on Fort Richardson, Elmendorf Air Force Base, and upper Ship Creek yielded a population estimate of 435 moose with a bull:cow ratio of 45 bulls per 100 cows and a calf:cow ratio of 30 calves per 100 cows. At that time the population was slightly below the population objective of 500 moose; however, this population has a history of rapid increase during mild winters and may have rebounded to a level closer to the population objective by fall 2007. Ten antlerless permits were issued for the fall archery and muzzle-loader hunts and 55 either-sex permits for the late hunt, with a total of 125 permits issued for all Fort Richardson hunts. Harvests for 2005, 2006, and 2007 (preliminary) were 26 bulls and 17 cows, 24 bulls and 18 cows, and 10 bulls and 3 cows, respectively; however, the 2007 late-season hunt (55 either-sex permits) had not occurred as of the drafting of this proposal.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population is likely to exceed the carrying capacity of the habitat if antlerless hunts are not authorized.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Muzzleloaders and bow hunters who draw permits. Persons living near Fort Richardson who incur damage to their gardens and shrubs and motorists on the Glenn Highway and in east Anchorage.

PROPOSAL 122 CONTINUED

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who oppose antlerless moose hunting, and archery or muzzleloader hunting or hunting in general.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Long-term, large-scale habitat enhancement is desirable but difficult because of costs and conflicts with military operations.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and U. S. Army, Fort Richardson
(HQ-08S-G-059)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Mat Valley AC12		

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 123 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorize the antlerless moose season in the Anchorage Management Area in Unit 14(C).

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
...		
Unit 14(C), that portion known as the Anchorage Management Area	Day after Labor Day -Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season
1 moose by drawing permit only, and by bow and arrow, shotgun, or muzzle loading black-powder rifle only; up to 50 permits may be issued; a person may not take an antlered bull unless it has a spike-fork antler; this hunt will be held at the department's discretion		

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be re-authorized annually. During summer, an estimated 200-300 moose inhabit the Anchorage metropolitan area. This number increases to 700-1,000 moose during the winter. Many of these moose come from the upper Campbell Creek valley, which lies within Chugach State Park. One hundred sixty-one moose (41 bulls, 90 cows, 30 calves) were counted in fall 2001 and 117 moose (21 bulls, 79 cows, 17 calves) were counted in fall 2003. Most of these moose move into the metropolitan area during December or January, where high densities of moose cause severe over browsing in some areas, and lead to increased incidences of collisions with motor vehicles and adverse conflicts with humans.

The Board of Game re-authorized this hunt in 2005, and it was held for the first time since 1983. Four antlerless permits were issued for the upper Campbell Creek drainage in 2005, 2006, and 2007. In consultation with Chugach State Park staff and the park advisory committee, an additional 4 antlerless permits were issued in McHugh Creek drainage in 2007. Hunters took 4 cows in 2005, 3 cows in 2006, and 5 cows (preliminary) in 2007.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will continue to over browse winter habitat and moose mortality from collisions with vehicles and starvation during severe winters will continue.

PROPOSAL 123 CONTINUED

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who acquire permits for antlerless moose hunts. People who believe there are too many moose in the Anchorage Bowl.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to hunting antlerless moose, hunting moose in parks, or hunting in general.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Issuing more permits for the upper Campbell Creek hunt area. However, this area is heavily used by other recreationists and moose gut piles in the last three years have quickly attracted brown bears. These bears are also killing moose in the same area during the hunting season; nevertheless, it would be wise to base a decision to issue more moose permits (a.k.a. gut piles) on more experience in this portion of Chugach State Park.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G-060)

Favor Neutral Oppose

Mat Valley AC12		Kneeland Taylor PC52
-----------------	--	----------------------

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 124 - 5 AAC 085.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorize the antlerless moose season in the Birchwood Management Area and the remainder of Unit 14(C).

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
...		
Unit 14(C), that portion known as the Birchwood Management Area	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30
1 moose by drawing permit, by bow and arrow only; up to 25 permits may be issued		
...		
Remainder of Unit 14(C)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits may be issued	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season
...		

PROPOSAL 124 CONTINUED

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. Composition counts are not flown in the Birchwood Management Area. However, we believe that a small resident population of 10–15 moose as well as an equal number of animals from Fort Richardson frequent the area. Ten bull and 5 antlerless permits were issued in 2005, 2006, and 2007. Archers took no moose in 2005 and 2006 and 1 bull in 2007 (i.e., total hunter success for the last 3 years was 3% for bulls and 0% for antlerless moose). Very little public land exists in this management area and most of it is city parkland closed to discharge of weapons. Large parcels of land owned by Eklutna Native Corporation could not be hunted by permittees because no access permits were issued, and this land is quickly turning into subdivisions. Despite the warning in the permit supplement that cautions hunters about the private property and low success rates, hunters are increasingly frustrated when they obtain one of these permits and cannot find a place to hunt. The one large block of public land remaining in this hunt area is Beach Lake Park, where discharge of firearms and bows is not allowed by city park ordinance.

Composition counts are seldom flown in the remainder of Unit 14(C) due to lack of funding. One hundred thirty-nine cows were counted during the fall 2001 trend counts in Knik/Hunter and Peters Creek count areas. The moose populations in these areas appeared to be at or above carrying capacity; however, to manage the moose population conservatively, lacking recent trend data, the number of antlerless permits was reduced from 30 to 20 in 2000 and 10 in 2007. Hunters in Knik/Hunter took 1 cow in 2005, 3 cows in 2006, and 2 cows and 1 antlerless bull in 2007. Hunters in Peters Creek took 2 cows in 2005, 1 cow and 1 antlerless bull in 2006, and no moose in 2007.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The opportunity to harvest antlerless moose will be lost, and urban moose-human conflicts will likely increase.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Persons who acquire permits for antlerless moose hunts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to antlerless moose harvest or hunting in general.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G-061)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Mat Valley AC12		

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 125 - 5 AAC 085.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorize the antlerless moose hunt on Elmendorf Air Force Base in Unit 14(C).

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
...		
Unit 14(C), Elmendorf Air Force Base	Day after Labor Day -Mar. 31 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Mar. 31
1 moose by drawing permit, and by bow and arrow only; up to 25 permits may be issued.		
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. Moose on Elmendorf Air Force Base are part of a resident wintering population that also occupies Fort Richardson. An early December 2006 census on Ft. Richardson, Elmendorf Air Force Base and upper Ship Creek yielded a population estimate of 452 moose. During September, up to 100–150 of these moose frequent lands managed by Elmendorf. A majority of these animals move to Fort Richardson during late fall and winter, many into areas where hunting is not allowed. Because the density of hunters on Fort Richardson has reached maximum manageable levels, the Elmendorf hunt provides additional hunter opportunity and helps achieve desired harvest levels. Thirteen bull, 7 antlerless and 5 either-sex permits were issued in 2005–2007. During the 2005, 2006, and 2007 (preliminary) seasons, hunters took 9 bulls and 7 cows, 7 bulls and 5 cows, and 4 bulls and 6 cows, respectively.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Habitat may be over-browsed, reducing carrying capacity in subsequent years, and road and train kills will increase. The overall Fort Richardson-Elmendorf Air Force Base moose population is thought to have been above carrying capacity during the severe 1994-1995 winter. Browse was over-utilized across extensive areas during the severe winters of 1989-1990, 1991-1992, and 1994-1995. If cows are not harvested, the population will increase and suffer major losses during a severe winter.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BY IMPROVED? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive.

PROPOSAL 125 CONTINUED

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bow hunters who draw permits. Persons living on or near Elmendorf Air Force Base who incur damage to their gardens and shrubs, and motorists on Elmendorf and in north Anchorage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to antlerless moose hunting, bow and arrow hunting, or hunting in general.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Long-term, large-scale habitat enhancement is desirable, but difficult because of costs and conflicts with military operations.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and Elmendorf Air Force Base
(HQ-08S-G-062)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Mat Valley AC12		

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 126 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish a registration moose hunt and re-authorize the antlerless portion of the any-moose drawing permit in the upper Ship Creek drainage in Unit 14(C).

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
...		
Unit 14(C), that portion of the Ship Creek drainage upstream of the Fort Richardson		
Management Area		
1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 50 permits may be issued; or	Day after Labor Day --Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day --Sept. 30
1 bull by registration permit only	Oct. 1—Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	Oct. 1—Nov. 30
...		

ISSUE: Moose use the upper Ship Creek drainage throughout the year. However, the highest density appears to be in fall and early winter when rutting and post-rut concentrations occur. In most years, accumulated snow packs force most of the moose out of the upper Ship Creek drainage in December. The moose move to lower-elevation wintering areas on Fort Richardson, Elmendorf AFB, and other portions of the Anchorage Bowl. An early December 2006 census on Fort Richardson, Elmendorf Air Force Base and upper Ship Creek yielded a population estimate of 452 moose with a bull:cow ratio of 45 bulls per 100 cows and a calf:cow ratio of 30 calves per 100 cows. Forty either-sex permits were issued for upper Ship Creek drainage in 2005 and 50 either-sex permits were issued in 2006 and 2007. Hunters took 7 bulls and 3 cows in 2005, 12 bulls and 3 cows in 2006, and 9 bulls and 3 cows in 2007.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive. An either-sex drawing moose hunt should allow greater harvests in an area with limited access.

PROPOSAL 126 CONTINUED

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose will continue to be under-harvested, with concomitant problems in nearby urban areas and occasional large die-offs during severe winters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None. A late-season registration hunt for any bull was held in October and November 2007 to harvest additional moose from upper Ship Creek drainage.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G-063)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Mat Valley AC12		Kneeland Taylor PC52

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____
ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 127 - 5 AAC 085.045.(13). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorize the antlerless moose season in the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area of Unit 15(A).

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(13)		
Unit 15(A), the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area		
1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 permits for spike-fork antlered moose may be issued; or	Sept. 15-Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15- Sept. 30
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 50 permits may be issued; the taking of calves, and females accompanied by calves is prohibited	Sept. 15-Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. A joint management objective developed for the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area (SLWMA) by the department and U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service calls for a fall population of approximately 2 moose per square mile or approximately 130 moose counted during the November survey. The SLWMA was last counted during December 2005 and yielded a count of 79 moose, the lowest count in over 20 years. The ratios observed were 12 bulls/100 cows and 9 calves/100 cows. Because the SLWMA is managed primarily for wildlife viewing, a second management objective requires that we maintain a minimum bull:cow ratio of 40 bulls/100 cows. The last permit hunt was held in 1999 when 40 permits were issued for antlerless and 20 for spike-fork antlered moose. The department recommends maintaining the hunt, but not issuing permits for the fall 2008 season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The SLWMA is a wintering area for moose. In the past, during moderate to severe winters, this area supported up to 300 moose, more than twice the desired resident population size. If resident moose are allowed to increase beyond the management objective, excessive use of the habitat will occur, affecting both resident and migratory moose that depend on this area. Viewing opportunities will be adversely affected as well.

PROPOSAL 127 CONTINUED

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Since this is a proposal to re-authorize an existing hunt, no resource or product improvements are expected.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wildlife viewers and hunters receiving permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals opposed to hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Increase the moose carrying capacity of the area. Additional habitat enhancement is expensive and no projects are currently planned.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
(HQ-08S-G-064)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Central Peninsula AC11		
Mat Valley AC12		

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 128 - 5 AAC 085.045.(13) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Unit 15(C).

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(13)		
...		
Unit 15(C), that portion south of the south fork of the Anchor River and northwest of Kachemak Bay		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or	Aug. 20-Sept. 20 (General Hunt only)	Aug. 20-Sept. 20
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; the taking of calves, and females accompanied by calves, is prohibited; up to 50 permits may be issued	Aug. 20-Sept. 20	Aug. 20-Sept. 20

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. The Homer benchland in Unit 15(C) often holds high moose densities in winters when deep snow pushes the moose down into human populated areas. These deep snow winters result in a high number of moose dying due to malnutrition and increased negative interactions with humans as moose become more aggressive in their search for food around human residences.

In the fall of 2005, 441 moose were counted in the permit area and 26% were calves. Fifty permits were issued in each of the last 6 years resulting in an average harvest of 23 cows per year. We recommend re-authorization of the antlerless hunt and anticipate issuing 50 permits for the fall 2008 hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Deep snow winters will result in a high number of moose deaths due to malnutrition and continued conflicts between aggressive moose and humans.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? A limited antlerless moose hunt may improve overall browse quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wildlife viewers and hunters receiving permits.

PROPOSAL 128 CONTINUED

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals opposed to hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G-065)

Favor Neutral Oppose

Central Peninsula AC11		
Mat Valley AC12		

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 129 - 5 AAC 085.045(14). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorize the antlerless moose hunt on Kalgin Island in Unit 16(B).

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(14)		
...		
Unit 16(B), Kalgin Island		
1 moose per regulatory year, by registration permit only	Aug. 20 - Sept. 20	Aug. 20 - Sept. 20
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be re-authorized annually. The population objective for this predator-free, 23-mi² island is 20-40 moose, a density of 1-1.75 moose/mi². Following a November 2007 survey, we counted 118 moose which is approximately 4.74 moose/mi².

Because of concerns of over-population and deteriorating habitat conditions, a drawing permit hunt for cows was initiated in 1995. In an attempt to reduce the population quickly, the board established a registration hunt for any moose for the fall 1999 season. The population of moose on Kalgin Island is high at this time and remains well above the objective of 20-40.

The "any moose" registration hunt is recommended to provide additional mortality on this predator-free island population. A registration hunt also allows the department to continue gathering biological information from specimens provided by successful hunters. The difficult hunting conditions and limited access will minimize the danger of over-harvest. Allowing the continued harvest of calves provides an additional management tool needed to reduce population productivity.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Without a liberal harvest including cows and calves, the population will continue to exceed the island's carrying capacity, resulting in habitat damage and ultimately decline in moose numbers through starvation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If the island population size is kept at or near objective levels, moose will have adequate available forage and therefore, show less sign of being nutritionally stressed.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who make the effort to get to Kalgin Island will have the opportunity to take any moose.

PROPOSAL 129 CONTINUED

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Seasonal residents of Kalgin Island have been concerned about hunters trespassing on their land and cabins. The current season dates concentrate hunter activity when most seasonal residents are present.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A general season for any moose will also work to lower moose densities, but would diminish the ability to collect biological information.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G-066)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Central Peninsula AC11		
Mat Valley AC12		

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 130 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunting season in Unit 20A.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
(18) Unit 20A, the Ferry Trail Management Area, Wood River Controlled Use Area, and the Yanert Controlled Use Area		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or	Sept. 1 – Sept. 25 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; or	Aug. 25 – Feb. 28 <u>(General hunt only)</u>	
1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 500 permits may be issued; or	Sept. 1 – Sept. 25 <u>(General hunt only)</u>	
1 bull by drawing permit only; by muzzle-loading firearms only; up to 75 permits may be issued	Nov. 1 – Nov. 30 <u>(General hunt only)</u>	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or		Sept. 1 – Sept. 25
1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only; by muzzle- loading firearms only; up to 75 permits may be issued		Nov. 1 – Nov. 30

PROPOSAL 130 CONTINUED

Remainder of Unit 20A

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1 – Sept. 25
[[GENERAL HUNT ONLY]]

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; or

Aug. 25 – Feb. 28
[[GENERAL HUNT ONLY]]

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 500 permits may be issued

Sept. 1 – Sept. 25

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1 – Sept. 25

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. The primary justification for the Unit 20A antlerless hunts is to reduce the population to the desired population objective of 10,000–12,000 moose or until we observe a density-dependent response in terms of improved productivity. In addition, this hunt provides additional harvest opportunity which helps to meet human consumption interests and intensive management harvest objectives. The number of moose in Unit 20A was estimated at 17,000–18,000 in 2003. Research indicates this moose population is experiencing density-dependent effects, including low productivity, relatively light calf weights, and high browse removal rates of winter forage. As a result, in 2004 the Board of Game adopted a unit-wide registration hunt for antlerless moose during September 1–December 10 (closed by Emergency Order when the desired number of antlerless moose were taken), and in 2006 expanded that hunt to August 25–February 28. The reported harvest of antlerless moose averaged 615 (range 551–692) during regulatory years 2004 through 2006 (RY04–RY06; RY begins 1 July and ends 30 June, e.g., RY04 = 1 July 2004 through 30 June 2005). Based on the high level of harvest and participation (average of 4760 permits issued annually during RY04–RY06), this hunt has been successful in reversing moose population growth, increasing hunter participation, and meeting the IM harvest objective.

Extending the antlerless hunt from September 1–December 10 to August 25–February 28 provided additional hunting opportunity and helped reduce hunter densities and crowding. Opening the antlerless season one week earlier allowed hunters to hunt antlerless moose under less crowded conditions. Extending the season through February also increased hunting opportunity, but only in the more remote areas. The main biological issue with antlerless seasons

extending beyond early December is the potential take of bulls that have dropped their antlers.
PROPOSAL 130 CONTINUED

We estimated that approximately 40 antlerless bulls were taken during the winter hunt in RY06, with the majority taken in Zones 4 and 5. With an estimated 1200–1300 bulls in those 2 zones, additional harvest at that level had minimal effect (1–2 bulls:100 cows) on bull:cow ratios in those zones. The estimated bull:cow ratio in 2006 was ≥ 37 bulls:100 cows.

Adjusting the term “general hunt only” for these Unit 20A hunts is a housekeeping correction. All hunts in nonsubsistence areas, such as most of Unit 20A, should include this language to designate hunts as nonsubsistence hunts. Hunts which include the area of Unit 20A outside the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence Area should not include this designation. This designation was not adjusted when these hunt areas were recently adjusted.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Unit 20A moose population may increase, which may result in further deterioration of the habitat and exacerbate a population decline in years with severe winter conditions. The opportunity to hunt a harvestable surplus of cow and calf moose will be lost, subsistence hunters in the portion of Unit 20A outside the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence Area (part of the western Tanana Flats) may not have a reasonable opportunity for to pursue moose subsistence uses, and intensive management harvest objectives for Unit 20A may not be met.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, hunting opportunity and harvest will increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Meat hunters will benefit from the opportunity to harvest cow and calf moose in the western Tanana Flats. In the remaining antlerless hunt areas, hunters will benefit by having the opportunity to harvest cow moose for meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G-067)

Favor	Neutral	Oppose
Ahtna Inc. PC7 Delta AC2 Fairbanks w/Am. AC3 Middle Nenana w/Am. AC5 Mat Valley AC12	John Morak PC2 Larry Dalrymple PC59	John Guichici PC3 Allen Avinger PC6 Phyllis Haggland PC17 Tom Lamal PC26 Marty Lambert PC62

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 131 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunting season in Unit 20B.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(18) ...		
Unit 20(B), that portion within Creamer’s Refuge		
1 bull with spike-fork or greater antlers by bow and arrow only; or	Sept. 1 – Sept. 30 (General hunt only) Nov. 21 – Nov. 27 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1 – Sept. 30 Nov. 21 – Nov. 27
1 antlerless moose by bow and arrow only, by drawing permit only; up to 150 permits may be issued in the Fairbanks Management Area; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area; or	Sept. 1 – Nov. 27 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1 – Nov. 27
1 antlerless moose by muzzle- loader by drawing permit only; up to 10 permits may be issued; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area	Nov. 21 – Nov. 27 <u>(General hunt only)</u>	Nov. 21 – Nov. 27
Unit 20(B), remainder of the Fairbanks Management Area		

PROPOSAL 131 CONTINUED

1 bull with spike-fork or greater antlers by bow and arrow only; or	Sept. 1 – Sept. 30 (General hunt only) Nov. 21 – Nov. 27 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1 – Sept. 30 Nov. 21 – Nov. 27
1 antlerless moose by bow and arrow only, by drawing permit only; up to 150 permits may be issued; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area	Sept. 1 – Nov. 27 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1 – Nov. 27
Unit 20(B), that portion within the Minto Flats Management Area		
1 moose by registration permit only; or	Sept. 1 – Sept. 25 (Subsistence hunt only) Jan. 10 – Feb. 28 (Subsistence hunt only)	No open season.
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side	Sept. 11 – Sept. 25	No open season.
Unit 20(B), the drainage of the Middle Fork of the Chena River and that portion of the Salcha River drainage upstream from and including Goose Creek		
1 bull; or	Sept. 1 – Sept. 20	Sept. 1 – Sept. 20
1 bull, by bow and arrow only	Sept. 21 – Sept. 30	Sept. 21 – Sept. 30
Remainder of Unit 20(B)		
1 bull; or	Sept. 1 – Sept. 15	Sept. 5 – Sept. 15

PROPOSAL 131 CONTINUED

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 300 permits may be issued

Sept. 1 – Sept. 30
(General hunt only)

No open season.

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually.

Fairbanks Management Area (FMA) – The purpose of this antlerless hunt is to provide opportunity to harvest a surplus of antlerless moose in the FMA and potentially reduce moose–vehicle collisions and nuisance moose problems.

Population estimates in the FMA and adjacent areas, as well as anecdotal information, indicate high but stable moose numbers. The number of moose/vehicle collisions in the FMA is also high and continues to be a chronic problem that poses significant safety concerns to motorists. In addition, moose nuisance complaints continue to place significant demands on department staff. To increase hunting opportunity and harvest and reduce moose/vehicle collisions, the department increased the number of drawing permits for antlerless moose by archery hunting only (DM788) from 25 in 1999 to 150 in 2004. However, antlerless harvest has not increased commensurate with increases in the number of permits issued. Therefore to further increase harvest to meet management goals the board expanded the season beginning in fall 2006 from September 1–30 and November 21–27 to September 1–November 27. Harvest is regulated by the number of permits issued rather than season length. At this juncture, we do not have sufficient data to evaluate the effect of higher antlerless moose harvests on moose/vehicle collisions or moose nuisance problems. Adding the term “general hunt only” to the muzzleloader hunt for antlerless moose is a housekeeping correction. All hunts in nonsubsistence areas, such as the FMA, should include this language to designate the hunt as a nonsubsistence hunt. This designation was inadvertently left off when the hunt was created.

Minto Flats Management Area (MFMA) – The primary purpose of this antlerless hunt is to provide a reasonable opportunity for subsistence uses. In 2004, the board replaced the Tier II subsistence hunt TM785 (100 permits with a bag limit of “one moose” during September 1–20 and January 10–February 28) with 2 registration hunts (bag limit of “one moose” during September 1–25 and January 10–February 28). In addition, a 15-day general hunt (September 11–25) for bulls only with antler restrictions (spike-fork or 50” or 4 or more brow tines) provides additional hunting opportunity and to help meet intensive management harvest objectives for Unit 20B.

Population estimation surveys indicate the moose density within the MFMA is high (>3.0 moose/ mi^2). The reported harvest of antlerless moose taken during subsistence hunt TM785 averaged 24 during regulatory years (RY) 1996–2003 (a regulatory year begins 1 July and ends 30 June; e.g., RY96 = 1 July 1996 through 30 June 1997). The reported harvest for hunts RM775 and RM785 averaged 43 antlerless moose (range 32–59) during RY04–RY06. That harvest represents approximately 1 to 2 percent of the MFMA moose population and is sustainable.

PROPOSAL 131 CONTINUED

Remainder of Unit 20B – The drawing permit hunt for antlerless moose was recommended to the board in 2006 to take advantage of relatively high and increasing moose numbers in the central portion of Unit 20B. Population estimates (12,313 in 2001; 15,485 in 2003; 16,572 in 2004; and 15,986 in 2006) and calf:cow ratios (37–43:100 in 2003, 2004 and 2006) suggest numbers are increasing. Moreover, moose densities are relatively high (1.0–1.8 moose/mi²) in the central portion of Unit 20B surrounding the Fairbanks area. Additional harvests of antlerless moose will curb growth of this population that has surpassed the upper limit of the Intensive Management population objective of 12,000–15,000 moose.

In addition, mortality from vehicle and train collisions has been high. An average of about 100 moose have been killed annually by motor vehicles in the FMA (1997–1998 through 2004–2005), an area of just over 300 mi² with an estimated 400–500 moose. By focusing harvest in the more heavily roaded central portion of Unit 20B, road kill may be reduced.

Finally, extensive burns in north central Unit 20B will provide excellent habitat in the foreseeable future. Limiting moose densities during the immediate future, until shrubs have regenerated, would benefit the moose population in the long term.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The opportunity to hunt a surplus of cow moose will be lost. In central Unit 20B and the FMA in particular, moose/vehicle collisions and nuisance moose problems will likely remain high or increase. Furthermore, the cow segment of the population would likely continue to increase resulting in a higher density moose population putting additional stress on available browse.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, hunting opportunity and harvest will increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence hunters benefit from the opportunity to harvest any moose in the MFMA hunt. In the central portion of Unit 20B including the FMA, hunters benefit by having the opportunity to harvest cow moose, and urban residents may benefit from reduced moose/vehicle collisions and moose/human conflicts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSAL 131 CONTINUED

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08S-G-068)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Delta AC2 Fairbanks w/Am. AC3 Mat Valley AC12		John Guichici PC3 Allen Avinger PC6
---	--	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 132 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(20). **Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.**
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 22(C) and the remainder of Unit 22(D), as follows:

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

PROPOSAL 132 CONTINUED

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Aug. 10 - Sept. 14
Oct. 1 - Jan. 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1 - Sept. 14

...

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

In October 1999, the Board of Game authorized a registration hunt for antlerless moose in Unit 22(C) and the department manages this hunt with a quota of up to 20 permits annually. The intent of the hunt is stabilization of the Unit 22(C) moose population, which is believed to be at or near carrying capacity of its winter range.

The Unit 22(C) moose population grew steadily throughout the 1990s and the current population is estimated at 620 moose, which exceeds the departments' management goal of 450–525 moose. Calf crop and yearling recruitment is high and generally exceeds 20% annually. However, the bull:cow ratio is low, varying between 10–20 bulls:100 cows. The low bull:cow ratio makes additional bull harvest ill-advised. It appears that the antlerless hunt has helped stabilize moose numbers in Unit 22(C) and we recommend reauthorizing the antlerless moose hunt to achieve the moose population objectives for this unit.

In most other parts of Unit 22, low recruitment rates are believed to be causing moose population declines. However, in the Remainder of Unit 22 (D) we recommend continued authorization of antlerless moose hunting where moose populations are stable and hunting pressure is low. This portion of Unit 22(D) is relatively remote with difficult access and these factors contribute to limited hunting pressure in the area. The estimated number of moose has been stable since 1997 and composition surveys typically show higher calf:cow and calf:adult ratios than other parts of Unit 22, except Unit 22(C). A 2006 geo-spatial population estimation process completed in Unit 22(D) Remainder estimated the population at 599 moose with a calf:adult ratio of 35 calves:100 adults. The reported cow harvest in this area has been low, averaging 1 cow moose per year since 1997. Village harvest survey data (collected only in 2000-2001) shows 5 cow moose were harvested from Unit 22(D) Remainder, which is a more realistic estimate of annual cow harvest

PROPOSAL 132 CONTINUED

compared to harvest ticket reports. Low harvest rates of antlerless moose support our recommendation to reauthorize antlerless moose seasons in the Remainder of Unit 22(D).

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

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G-069)

Favor Neutral Oppose

Mat Valley AC12		
-----------------	--	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

PROPOSAL 133 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(21). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 23, as follows:

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

PROPOSAL 133 CONTINUED

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

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

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

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Moose density is currently low in large portions of Unit 23. As a result, in November 2003 the Board of Game restricted moose hunting for resident and nonresident hunters. These restrictions substantially shortened the resident antlerless moose season and limited the harvest of antlerless moose to hunters who register for registration permit hunt RM880. In November 2005 and 2007, the BOG considered public proposals and made no changes to the moose hunting seasons in Unit 23. Historically, the reported harvest of cow moose has been low throughout Unit 23 despite liberal antlerless seasons. We do not think maintaining an antlerless season during November and December, when moose harvests tend to be low, will endanger Unit 23 moose populations.

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

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G-070)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Mat Valley AC12		
-----------------	--	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 134 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(24). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 26(A), as follows:

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

...

PROPOSAL 134 CONTINUED

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

Within the 'upstream' portion of the Colville River drainage, a winter hunt was established by the Board in November 2005 and opened in the 2005-2006 regulatory year to provide more hunting opportunity in an area where the moose population is increasing in Unit 26(A). Since most bull moose shed their antlers before the established season opening of February 15, the bag limit for this hunt is one moose, except a calf or cow accompanied by a calf may not be taken. In this antlerless hunt area, the moose population is currently increasing and a low number of cows were harvested during the 2007 winter hunt. A similar harvest is anticipated for the current regulatory year (2008 hunt in progress Feb 15-Apr 15). Low harvests of antlerless moose (<10 per year) in the Colville River drainage should not limit the growth of the population and we recommend reauthorization of the antlerless moose season in this area.

The portion of Unit 26(A) west of 156 00' W longitude and north of the Colville drainage has a sparse distribution of moose. Each year a small percentage of moose (primarily bulls and cows without calves) disperse away from the major river drainages and across the coastal plain. These moose provide the only opportunities for harvest in the northwestern portion of Unit 26(A). Overall, the moose population in the unit is increasing and the small number of cow moose that disperse and could be harvested under this reauthorization proposal will have very little impact on the growth of the population. To date, after several years of hunting, few antlerless moose have been harvested in this portion of the unit which supports our assessment that an antlerless season would have little impact on the moose population. We recommend reauthorization of the antlerless moose season in this portion of Unit 26(A).

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

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSAL 134 CONTINUED

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08S-G-071)

Mat Valley AC12		
-----------------	--	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 135 – 5 AAC 85.045(a)(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunting season in Unit 20D, create an antlerless registration hunt in the same area.

5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. (a) ...

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
(18)		
...		
Unit 20(D), that portion lying west of the west bank of the Johnson River and south of the north bank of the Tanana River, except the Delta Junction Management Area and the Bison Range Youth Hunt Management Area		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 15 <u>(General Hunt Only)</u>	
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 1,000 permits may be issued in combination with that portion in the Delta Junction Management Area; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf, <u>or;</u>	Oct. 1 – Nov. 15 <u>(General Hunt Only)</u>	

PROPOSAL 135 CONTINUED

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

Oct. 1 – Nov. 15 (General Hunt Only)

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

Sept. 5–Sept. 15

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

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

Sept. 1 – Sept. 30
(General Hunt Only)

Sept. 1 – Sept. 30

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

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

Sept. 1 – Sept. 15
(General Hunt Only)

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 1,000 permits may be issued in combination with that portion lying west of the

Oct. 1 – Nov. 15
(General Hunt Only)

PROPOSAL 135 CONTINUED

west bank of the Johnson River and south of the north bank of the Tanana River; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf **or;**

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

Oct. 1 – Nov. 15 (General Hunt Only)

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

Sept. 5–Sept. 15

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. Reauthorization of a limited drawing permit for cow moose without calves is proposed in order to begin stabilizing population growth in this area, and increase harvest toward the intensive management harvest objective. The density of moose in Unit 20D south of the Tanana River and west of the Johnson River is high, about 5.6 moose/mi² in 2006. The Unit 20D moose population has reached its intensive management population objective of 8,000 to 10,000, with most population growth and highest densities occurring in this southwestern portion of Unit 20D. The moose population in this area is increasingly demonstrating the effects of increased competition for food; e.g. twinning rates are at moderately low levels of 21%. Also, browse surveys indicate that moose are consuming moderately high quantities (25%) of available browse over the winter. Unit 20D antlerless moose hunts should be conducted as drawing permit hunts in road accessible areas. However, it would be advantageous to have the option of establishing registration permits hunts in the more remote, roadless areas where moose browsing pressure is greatest, and to direct hunting pressure there through the incentive of a registration permit.

Adding the term “general hunt only” to the resident season hunts is a housekeeping correction. All hunts in nonsubsistence areas, such as this portion of Unit 20D, should include this language to designate them as nonsubsistence hunts. This designation was inadvertently left out of the codified language.

PROPOSAL 135 CONTINUED

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population in southwest Unit 20D will continue to increase in size and may over browse its habitat, and the Unit 20D intensive management harvest objective will not be met.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Passage and implementation of this proposal will improve the ability of moose habitat in southwest Unit 20D to support the current moose population. It will also allow hunters to increase moose harvest toward meeting the Unit 20D intensive management harvest objective without further reducing the bull-to-cow ratio.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The moose population will benefit by having a moose density compatible with their habitat. Moose hunters will benefit by increasing harvest of moose from this area to meet the harvest objective.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those people that are opposed to intensive management harvest strategies.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No antlerless permits or more antlerless permits.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G-044)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Delta AC2 Fairbanks AC3 Mat Valley AC12		Allen Avinger PC6 Ahtna Inc. PC7
---	--	-------------------------------------

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 136 - 5 AAC. 92.015 Brown bear tag fee exemption. Reauthorize brown bear tag fee exemptions in Region II.

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

- (1) Unit 11;
- (2) Units 13 and 16(A), that portion outside of Denali State Park;
- (3) Unit 16(B);

....

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

- (1) Unit 9(B);
- (2) Unit 9(E), that portion including all drainages that drain into the Pacific Ocean between Cape Kumliun and the border of Unit 9(D) and Unit 9(E);
- (3) Unit 17;

....

ISSUE: Brown bear tag fee exemptions must be reauthorized annually. In March of 2003 the Board of Game liberalized brown bear hunting regulations, including the tag fee exemption, to increase the harvest of brown bears. In addition, brown bear tags are not required for subsistence brown bear hunting in parts of Unit 9 and Unit 17. Continuation of the exemption is necessary to encourage hunters to take brown bears in these units.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the board does not reauthorize the tag fee exemption, the fee will be reinstated and hunters will not be able to legally harvest a bear unless they had purchased the tag. This action may likely reduce the incidental harvest of bears by other hunters (i.e. sheep and moose hunters) and direct potential brown bear hunters to other units.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The goal by both the board and the department is to increase the harvest of brown bears in order to decrease predation on moose calves. A tag fee exemption will help to achieve this goal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who incidentally encounter bears in these units that may be interested in harvesting one.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSAL 136 CONTINUED

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G-072)

Favor Neutral Oppose

Ahtna Inc. PC7 Central AC1 Fairbanks AC3 Mat Valley AC12		
---	--	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 137 – 5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize the current resident tag fee exemptions for general season brown bear in Units 19A, 19D, 20D, 20E (that portion outside of Yukon–Charley Rivers National Preserve), 21B, 21D, 21E, 25C, and 25D; and reauthorize the current subsistence registration permit tag fee exemptions for brown bear in Units 19A and 19B (downstream of and including the Aniak River drainage), 21D, and 24.

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

- ...
- (4) Unit 19(A) and Unit 19(D);
- (5) Unit 20(D);
- (6) Unit 20(E), that portion outside of Yukon–Charley Rivers National Preserve;
- (7) Unit 21(B), Unit 21(D), and Unit 21(E);
- ...
- (10) Unit 25(C) and Unit 25(D).

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

- ...
- (5) Units 19(A) and 19(B), that portion downstream of and including the Aniak River drainage;
- (6) Unit 21(D);
- ...
- (9) Unit 24;
- ...

ISSUE: The board must reauthorize brown bear tag fee exemptions annually or the fee automatically becomes reinstated. We recommend continuing resident tag fee exemptions in Region III for the general season in Units 19A, 19D, 20D, 20E (outside of Yukon–Charley Rivers National Preserve), 21B, 21D, 21E, 25C and 25D and subsistence season hunts in Units 19A and 19B (downstream of and including the Aniak River drainage), 21D, and 24.

General Season Hunts. Annual reauthorizations are recommended for:

Unit 19A. The brown bear tag and fee requirement for Unit 19A was eliminated by the Board of Game beginning in regulatory year 2006–2007 (RY06, which begins 1 July 2006 and ends 30 June 2007). This exemption was meant to increase brown bear harvest to benefit moose calf survival consistent with the Central Kuskokwim Moose Management Plan. The difficulty in obtaining brown bear tags from area license vendors was also considered when this requirement was waived. Prior to the tag fee exemption, reported harvest of brown bears averaged 8 bears/year for RY96–RY05. Ten brown bears were taken in 19A during RY06. The tag fee exemption appears to have increased brown bear harvest, however it is still below levels required to significantly reduce the effect of brown bear predation on moose calf survival.

PROPOSAL 137 CONTINUED

Unit 19D. The brown bear tag and fee requirement for Unit 19D was eliminated by the Board of Game beginning in RY98 to increase the harvest of brown bear to benefit moose calf survival. Calf mortality studies in Unit 19D indicate brown bears are a significant predator on moose calves. Prior to the tag fee exemption, reported harvest of brown bears averaged 2 bears/year for RY91–RY97. Since the exemption was implemented, reported harvest increased to an average of 4.8 bears/year for RY98–RY06. The estimated population in Unit 19D is 165 bears (13 bears/1000 mi²), based on extrapolation of estimates obtained in other areas. The tag fee exemption appears to have increased brown bear harvest, however it is still below levels required to significantly reduce the effect of brown bear predation on moose calf survival.

Unit 20D. The tag fee exemption was implemented in 1995 in the southern portion of Unit 20D primarily to increase the harvest of brown bears to reduce predation on moose and caribou calves. The tag fee exemption was expanded to all of Unit 20D in 2003. Current Unit 20D brown bear hunting regulations include an August 10–June 30 hunting season with a bag limit of 1 bear/year.

The current Unit 20D brown bear harvest objective adopted by the board in March 1995 is 5–15 bears/year. Harvest increased as a result of the tag fee exemptions in 1995 and 2003. Mean annual human-caused brown bear mortality from both hunting and nonhunting has averaged 12 bears/year. Much of the increase was in the southwest portion of 20D, where mortality of brown bears killed in defense of life and property and kill of nuisance bears under hunting regulations in the vicinity of Delta Junction is significant.

Unit 20E. The current tag fee exemption in Unit 20E, excluding Yukon–Charley Rivers National Preserve, was implemented in RY02 to help reduce brown bear predation on moose calves. The brown bear population in all of Unit 20E (including Yukon–Charley Rivers National Preserve) was estimated at 320–394 in 2006. Harvest averaged 15 bears/year during RY92–RY01, prior to the tag fee exemption, and averaged 15 bears/year during RY02–RY06. Harvest is below a level that would significantly reduce the effect of brown bear predation on moose calf survival.

Unit 21B. The tag fee in Unit 21B was exempted in RY04, reinstated in RY05, then exempted again in RY06. This exemption was intended to increase harvest because the bear population is believed to be high and can support additional take. Before the exemption, the ten-year mean reported harvest was 0.4 bears (RY94–RY03). The RY04 harvest was 1 male bear. The harvest was zero in RY05 and one bear in RY06. In combination with Units 21C and 21D, a conservative harvest of 25 bears is sustainable. Demand for brown bears is low. Hunting success is also low due to dense forested habitat in most of the area.

Unit 21D. The tag fee in Unit 21D has been exempted since RY04. This exemption is desired to allow an increase in harvest because the bear population can likely support additional take. Before the exemption, the 5-year mean reported harvest was 5.6 bears (RY99–RY03) and the sex ratio of the harvest was 79 percent males. The harvest during RY04–RY06 was 2, 8, and 2,

PROPOSAL 137 CONTINUED

respectively. A conservative harvest of 23 bears is sustainable. Demand for brown bears is low. Hunting success is also low due to dense forested habitat in most of the area.

Unit 21E. The brown bear tag and fee requirement for Unit 21E was eliminated by the Board of Game beginning in RY06 to increase the harvest of brown bear to benefit moose calf survival consistent with the Yukon–Innoko Moose Management Plan. The difficulty in obtaining brown bear tags from area license vendors was also considered when this requirement was waived. During the 5 regulatory years prior to elimination of the tag requirement, an average of 5.2 bears were taken, with an average resident and nonresident take of 1.8 and 3.4, respectively. During RY06, 4 bears were reported harvested, 3 by residents and 1 by a nonresident. The tag fee exemption has not encouraged an increase in harvest, but does make it easier for local hunters to comply with hunting regulations. This harvest is well below levels necessary to reduce bear predation on moose calves.

Unit 25C. The Unit 25C brown bear tag and fee requirement was eliminated by the board beginning in RY06 to increase the harvest of brown bear to benefit calf survival of the Fortymile caribou herd. During the 5-year period prior to the tag fee exemption, the mean annual harvest was 4 bears, with 68% males. During the first year the tag fee was waived (RY06), 8 brown bears were taken, with 63% males. The Department manages Unit 25C for a 3-year mean annual human caused mortality of ≤ 6 bears (≥ 2 years of age) and $\geq 55\%$ males. At current densities, the estimated allowable harvest for Unit 25C is 6 bears, with a minimum of 55% males.

Unit 25D. The Unit 25D brown bear tag and fee requirement was eliminated by the board in RY98. The board identified the moose population in Unit 25D as important for providing high levels of human consumption. The tag fee exemption was intended to increase harvest reporting and to increase harvest of brown bears to benefit moose calf and adult survival. Prior to the exemption, relatively few local residents purchased a tag because they generally do not hunt specifically for brown bears. However, some brown bears are taken incidental to encounters in or near communities or fishing and hunting camps. Calf mortality studies in interior Alaska, including Unit 25D, indicate brown bears are often an important predator on moose calves. Prior to the tag fee exemption, annual reported harvest was 0–5 bears. During RY98–RY06, annual reported harvest was 0–10 bears. The tag fee exemption appears to have increased reporting and may have increased the harvest. Unreported harvest is probably higher than reported, but total harvest is likely below a level that would significantly reduce the effect of brown bear predation on moose calf survival.

PROPOSAL 137 CONTINUED

Subsistence Hunts. Annual reauthorizations are needed for:

UNITS 19A AND 19B, THAT PORTION DOWNSTREAM OF AND INCLUDING THE ANIAK RIVER DRAINAGE. THIS TAG FEE EXEMPTION IS PART OF A REGISTRATION PERMIT HUNT CREATED AFTER THE WESTERN ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA WAS ELIMINATED IN RY04. THE HUNT IS INTENDED TO ALLOW SUBSISTENCE USE OF BROWN BEARS FOR FOOD AND TO ALLOW RESIDENTS TO CONTINUE TO FOLLOW TRADITIONAL BELIEFS REGARDING

PROPER TREATMENT OF BEAR SKULLS THAT ARE INCONSISTENT WITH NORMAL SEALING REQUIREMENTS. NO PERMITS WERE ISSUED FOR THIS HUNT. REAUTHORIZING THIS TAG FEE EXEMPTION DOES NOT HAVE NEGATIVE IMPACTS ON THE GRIZZLY BEAR POPULATION.

UNITS 21D AND 24. IN UNITS 21D AND 24, A TOTAL OF 8 RB601 PERMITS WERE ISSUED IN RY05–RY06. NO BEARS WERE REPORTED HARVESTED EITHER YEAR. HARVEST RATES ARE LOW, ARE WELL WITHIN SUSTAINED YIELD LIMITS, AND EXEMPTING THE RESIDENT TAG FEE HAS NOT CAUSED AN INCREASE IN SUBSISTENCE TAKE.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Additional brown bear harvest for the benefit of moose and caribou calf survival will not occur and subsistence users will find it more difficult to harvest bears for food.

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who feel brown bears should not be harvested to benefit moose and caribou calf survival or to provide food for subsistence hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSAL 137 CONTINUED

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08S-G-073)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Ahtna Inc. PC7 Red Devil Traditional Council PC23 Stoney River Traditional Council PC54 Lime Village Traditional Council PC55 Delta AC2 Fairbanks AC3 Koyukuk AC4 Middle Yukon AC6 Stoney Holitna AC7 Upper Tanana 40 mile AC8 Mat Valley AC12		
---	--	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

PROPOSAL 138 – 5 AAC 92.015(a) (8) & (9) and 92.015 (b) (4), (7), (8) & (10) Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize the current resident tag fee exemptions for brown bear in Units 18, 22, 23 and 26A.

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

- ...
- (8) Unit 22;
- (9) Unit 23;
- ...

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

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

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

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

General season brown bear harvest rates are within sustained yield limits and exempting the resident tag fee has not caused dramatic or unexpected increases in overall harvest. In Unit 22, during the tag-free period resident harvest has increased slightly to a 3-year average annual harvest of 89 bears, although during this period other regulatory changes were implemented and contributed to increased harvest. In Unit 23, general harvests have increased slowly since 1961 although there has been substantial annual variability in harvest levels. The increasing trend in overall harvest is probably most influenced by the increasing human population in Alaska rather than the result of regulatory changes. Annual variability in harvests is probably most affected by weather. Harvest data for Unit 23 show no trend in the sex ratio, age or size of bears harvested under all types of hunts.

PROPOSAL 138 CONTINUED

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

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

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

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSAL 138 CONTINUED

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08S-G-074)

Favor

Neutral

Oppose

Red Devil Traditional Council PC23 Stoney River Traditional Council PC54 Lime Village Traditional Council PC55 Fairbanks AC3 Stoney Holitna AC7 Mat Valley AC12		
---	--	--

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

The Board of Game deferred this proposal from the 2008 Statewide meeting to the Interior region meeting, amended to provide the following: Conibear traps size 220 or greater allowed within 100 feet of either side of a designated trail in the park. If set within 100 feet of a designated trail, the conibear trap must be 5 feet above the ground/snow. Snares within 100 feet of a trail of the park is prohibited.

PROPOSAL A - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions. Amend this regulation as follows:

In Chugach State Park, the use of the following traps are prohibited:

- a) Steel foothold (leghold) traps with jaw spreads exceeding 5 ¼ inches as measured across the outside diameter or maximum width of the set jaws at the widest point.
- b) Steel neck snares with cables exceeding 1/16 inch in diameter.
- c) Conibear-type lethal traps with striker bar spreads or widths exceeding 7 inches, as measured across the minimum outside width of the set bars at their narrowest openings.
- d) All other trapping devices not named above (for example, foot snares, deadfalls, spring-activated neck snares) are prohibited.

ISSUE: Limits are needed on the types and sizes of traps allowed in Chugach State Park (Unit 14C).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If trap sizes and types are not limited, an excessive number of wolverines, wolves, domestic dogs, and other large animals (including non-target species) will be caught in traps.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The use of smaller traps will help ensure that wolverines are harvested in limited numbers, if at all, in this area close to Anchorage where wildlife viewing opportunities are important and are protected by statute.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The general public, including dog owners, year-round wildlife viewing enthusiasts, individuals concerned with loss of high-value viewable species.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trappers desiring to harvest medium to large-sized wolverines in the park.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Andrew Josephson (HQ-08W-G-052)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____