

Arctic & Western Regions

Proposal Index

Bethel Area – Unit 18

1. Increase the number of available drawing permits to ‘up to 100 permits’ for the spring hunt for bull muskox on Nunivak Island in Unit 18.
2. Issue all Nunivak Island muskox permits in Mekoryuk only.
3. Issue cow musk ox registration permits only on Nunivak Island.
4. Issue cow muskox registration permits only on Nunivak Island.
5. Change the Amounts Reasonably Necessary for Subsistence Uses for moose in Unit 18.
6. Eliminate the requirement to pick up moose registration permits weeks or months prior to the season in remote villages in Region V (Units 18 and 23); make all registration permits available in season from designated vendors. *(This proposal will also be considered under the Unit 23 management area.)*
7. Lengthen the Unit 18 resident moose season in the Lower Yukon Area (*e.g.*, downstream of Mountain Village) and change the bag limit to include any moose in the fall and two moose per regulatory year.
8. Lengthen the resident moose winter season in the Remainder of Unit 18 and change the bag limit to include any moose in the winter hunt.
9. Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 18.
10. Allow the use of electronic calls for taking moose in Unit 18
11. Allow the use of salt licks for taking moose in Unit 18.
12. Allow moose to be harvested from a boat under power in Unit 18
13. Develop a Unit specific Amount Necessary for Subsistence finding for each Unit in the Arctic Region. *(This proposal will also be considered under the other management areas.)*
14. Close nonresident trapping seasons for certain species in the Arctic Region Units. *(This proposal will also be considered under the other management areas.)*
15. Increase the bag limit for wolves in Unit 18.
16. Increase the bag limit for wolverine in Unit 18.
17. Extend the season and increase bag limit for lynx in Unit 18.
18. Clarify when a violation has occurred concerning incidental take by trappers.
19. Close nonresident fur animal hunting seasons for certain species in the Arctic Region Units. *(This proposal will also be considered under the other management areas.)*
20. Increase the bag limit and lengthen the season for ptarmigan in Unit 18.
21. Modify the boundaries for Units 18, 19 and 21.

Nome Area – Unit 22

22. Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 22C and the remainder of Unit 22D.
23. Review the discretionary authority for requiring the nullification of trophy value of animals taken under a subsistence permit; specifically Seward Peninsula muskox.
24. Align brown bear seasons in Unit 22C with remainder of Unit.
25. Align brown bears seasons in Unit 22.
26. Open a year round season for brown bear in Unit 22.
27. Lengthen the ptarmigan season in Unit 22.

Kotzebue Area – Unit 23

28. Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 23.
29. Allocate 50% of the Unit 23 moose permits for DM875 to guides.
30. Establish a harvest objective for brown bear in the Noatak National Preserve.

Barrow Area – Unit 26A

31. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 26A.
32. Add Unit 26A to the list of areas where a resident brown bear tag is not required for hunts.
33. Open the wolverine hunting season earlier in Unit 26.

Regional

34. Reauthorize the current resident tag fee exemptions for brown bear in Units 18, 22, 23 and 26A.

Other Units

35. Approve an intensive management plan for moose in Unit 15A.
36. Approve an intensive management plan for moose in Unit 15C.
37. Amend the current predation management plan for the Southern Alaska Peninsula caribou herd in Unit 9.

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
Arctic & Western Regions
November 11-14, 2011
Inupiat Heritage Center
Barrow, Alaska

~TENTATIVE AGENDA~

NOTE: This Tentative Agenda is subject to change throughout the course of the meeting. This Tentative Agenda is provided to give a general idea of the board's anticipated schedule. The board will attempt to hold to this schedule; however, the board is not constrained by this Tentative Agenda. Persons wishing to testify must sign-up by the deadline. Public testimony will continue until those present at the meeting are heard; the board will continue working through its agenda immediately upon conclusion of public testimony. The following time blocks are only an estimate.

Friday, November 11, 8:30 AM

OPENING BUSINESS

Call to Order

Introductions of Board Members and Staff

Board Member Ethics Disclosures

Purpose of Meeting (overview)

STAFF AND OTHER REPORTS

PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY (upon conclusion of staff reports)

THE DEADLINE FOR SIGN-UP TO TESTIFY will be announced at the meeting. Public testimony will continue until persons who have signed up before the deadline and who are present when called by the Chairman to testify, are heard.

Saturday, November 12, 8:30 AM

PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY Continued

BOARD DELIBERATIONS (Upon conclusion of public testimony)

Sunday, November 13 – Tuesday, November 14 8:30 AM

BOARD DELIBERATIONS Continued

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, including petitions, findings and policies, letters, and other business (Upon conclusion of deliberations)

ADJOURN

Special Notes

- A. This agenda is TENTATIVE and subject to change during the meeting. A list of staff reports and a roadmap will be available at the meeting. Scheduled updates will be available on the Board of Game website.
- B. Meeting materials are available through the website at: www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov or by contacting the ADF&G Boards Support Office in Juneau at 465-4110.
- C. A live audio stream for the meeting is intended to be available at: www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov
- D. The State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game complies with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). Individuals with disabilities who may need auxiliary aids, services, and/or special modifications to participate in this hearing and public meeting should contact 465-4110 no later than October 28, 2011 to make any necessary arrangements.

Bethel Area – Unit 18

PROPOSAL 1 - 5 AAC 85.050 (a) (1) Hunting seasons and bag limits for musk oxen.

Increase the number of available drawing permits to ‘up to 100 permits’ for the spring hunt for bull muskox on Nunivak Island in Unit 18.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(1)		
Unit 18, Nunivak Island		
1 bull by drawing permit only, with up to 10 permits to be issued for the fall season and up to 100 [50] permits to be issued for the spring season; or 1 cow by registration permit only, with up to 60 permits for cows to be issued on a first-come, first-served basis	Sept. 1-Sept. 30 (General hunt only) Feb. 1-Mar. 15 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1-Sept. 30 Feb. 1-Mar. 15

...

ISSUE: The Nunivak Island musk oxen population in Unit 18 currently has high bull:cow ratios, and low hunter participation. By increasing the available bull drawing permits, the department will be able to issue more bull drawing permits to achieve a more balanced bull:cow ratio in the herd. Currently the ratio is approximately 130 bulls:100 cows and the target ratio is 100 bulls:100 cows. At the current maximum of 50 bull drawing permits, low participation and success by hunters has made it difficult to reduce the bull component of the population.

By increasing the number of bull drawing permits the department would be better able to manage for a harvest of 50 bulls per year compared to the current harvest of 35 bulls per year. The population of 550 animals can sustain additional hunter harvest due to the predator free conditions on Nunivak Island. Adding more drawing permits to the spring hunt responds to an increased interest by the public to hunt in the spring season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bull harvest will be insufficient to reduce the imbalance in bull: cow ratios. The department will need to use additional staff time to manage alternate lists to achieve harvest objectives.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Winter harvest allows for good meat care.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents and nonresidents interested in spring drawing hunts for bull musk ox.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The alternative of reducing cow harvest to balance the sex ratio was considered but dismissed because the reduction in total harvest would lead to an increasing population that would be above management objectives and cause overpopulation on Nunivak Island.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

Log Number: ADFG0428110

PROPOSAL 2 - 5 AAC 85.050. Hunting seasons and bag limits for musk oxen. Issue all Nunivak Island muskox permits in Mekoryuk only.

The number of permits to be issued at Mekoryuk will include five permits issued from Bethel; all permits to be issued at Mekoryuk Alaska.

ISSUE: We would like to have the five cow permits issued in Bethel to be issued in Mekoryuk, Alaska.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Need to keep proposing this issue until we get the extra five permits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The musk-ox meat will feed our people and bring income.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Yes. We need the meat here more than others outside of Nunivak. The people of Nunivak Island.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The people outside of Nunivak.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: PROPOSED BY: The Cupiq Native Village of Mekoryuk

LOG NUMBER: EG051011482

PROPOSAL 3 - 5 AAC 85.050. Hunting seasons and bag limits for musk oxen. Issue cow muskox registration permits only on Nunivak Island.

One cow by permit (number of permits to be announced) available in person in Mekoryuk beginning Jan. 29, 8:00 a.m. [AND IN PERSON IN BETHEL ADF&G OFFICE BEGINNING JAN 26, 8:00 A.M.]

ISSUE: All Nunivak Island cow musk ox registration tags/permits need to be issued on Nunivak Island; hunt number RX061.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Very little impact to state residents (including nonresidents) who wish to get a permit.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? There will be no impact. There will be no changes in the number of musk ox being harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? No one person benefits directly for the change. All residents (including nonresidents) will have the same opportunity to register for a permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one suffers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: No other solutions considered.

PROPOSED BY: Samuel Davis and Solomon Williams

LOG NUMBER: EG09241074

PROPOSAL 4 - 5 AAC 85.050. Hunting seasons and bag limits for musk oxen. Issue cow muskox registration permits only on Nunivak Island.

One cow by permit (5 permits) available in person in Mekoryuk [BETHEL ADF&G OFFICE] beginning August 27, 8 a.m..

ISSUE: All Nunivak Island cow musk ox registration tags/permits need to be issued on Nunivak Island. Hunt number RX060.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Very little impact to state residents (including non-residents) who wish to get a permit.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? There will be no impact. There will be no changes in the number of musk ox being harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? No one person benefits directly for the change. All residents (including non-residents) will have the same opportunity to register for a permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one suffers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: No other solutions considered.

PROPOSED BY: Samuel Davis and Solomon Williams

LOG NUMBER: EG09241075

PROPOSAL 5 - 5 AAC 99.025. Customary and traditional uses of game populations. Change the Amounts Reasonably Necessary for Subsistence Uses for moose in Unit 18.

Amounts Reasonably Necessary for Subsistence Uses for moose in Unit 18 would be changed to 500-1000 moose.

ISSUE: Current Amounts Necessary for Subsistence (ANS) for moose in Unit 18 remain unacceptably low.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Subsistence use of moose in the area will continue to not be given the recognition it deserves and is called for under regulatory or statutory intent and purpose.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Area subsistence users would be more assured that their needs and use is adequately recognized, and would be subject to protective measures if the area moose populations and related harvestable surplus was to decrease substantially in the future

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Potential future users who would be restricted through Tier 1 or Tier II subsistence only hunts if area moose populations and harvestable surplus was to decrease substantially in the future.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: PROPOSED BY: Lower Kuskokwim Advisory Committee and the Orutsararmiut Native Council

LOG NUMBER: EG050211427

Note: Unit 19 will be considered at the Interior Region meeting in March; see Proposal 153.

PROPOSAL 6 - 5 AAC 85.045 Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Eliminate the requirement to pick up moose registration permits weeks or months prior to the season in remote villages in Region V. Make all registration permits available in season from designated vendors.

Unit	Registration #	Tag pickup dates and locations	Season Dates
18	RM615	[AUG 1-25] <u>August 1- September 10</u> In Bethel and villages in the hunt area	September 1-10
18	RM620	[AUG 1-25] <u>August 1- September 30</u> In Goodnews Bay and Platinum	September 1-30
19	RM650	[JULY 14 – AUG 20 <u>July 14 – September 25</u> In McGrath, Nikolai, and Tokotna	September 1-25
23	RM880	[JUNE 1-15] July 1- December 31 in Unit 23 villages	August 1- October 31 and November 1 - December 31

ISSUE: Some registration moose permits are only available in the village nearest the hunt two weeks to five months before the hunt opens. This causes much extra cost (around \$1,000 extra from Anchorage) to participate in this hunt for all residents other than those residing in the local village. This is a rural priority designed to keep non-local hunters out. Moose are trust property (although introduced to Kodiak) and owned by all Alaskans equally. Most of these hunts will not be greatly utilized by nonlocal hunters but all Alaska residents should have an equal chance to obtain permits. Registration tags in most Units surrounding these areas are available throughout the season in local villages. Some of these areas have enough moose to offer five month seasons for any moose to those that can get the permits.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Only a small number of people will have a realistic opportunity to hunt moose in these sought after locations without spending extra money and time to go to the village weeks before hunting.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident moose hunters that live outside the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Local hunters may see slightly more pressure from non local Alaskans.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: Get rid of the registration hunt and make it all drawing, not needed. Make permits available in all major cities.

PROPOSED BY: Aaron Bloomquist

LOG NUMBER: EG051911497A

PROPOSAL 7 - 5 AAC 85.045 (a)(16) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Lengthen the Unit 18 resident moose season in the Lower Yukon Area (*e.g.*, downstream of Mountain Village) and change the bag limit to include any moose in the fall and two moose per regulatory year.

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

(16)

Unit 18, Lower Yukon Area, that portion north and west of the Kashunuk River including the north bank from the mouth of the river upstream to the old village of Chakaktolik, west of a line from Chakaktolik, and excluding all Yukon River drainages upriver from Mountain Village

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

2 moose; only one may be an antlered bull

Aug. 1-Last day of Feb.

[1 ANTLERED BULL; OR
1 MOOSE]

[AUG. 10-SEPT. 30]
[DEC. 20-FEB. 28]

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 antlered bull

Sept 1-Sept 30

...

ISSUE: The moose population in the Lower Yukon Area of Unit 18 has experienced rapid growth since the mid 1990s. Before this time, moose were present at very low densities and they have since expanded their range into the area. In 2008, the population was estimated at 3,320 (± 21 percent) moose with a calf to adult ratio of 55 calves per 100 adults. This is about 2.8 moose per square mile. The previous estimate in 2005 was 1,340 (± 21 percent) moose, with a calf to adult ratio 68 calves per 100 adults. More recent twinning surveys and moose composition surveys indicate that this population is still rapidly growing, with 69 calves per 100 cows observed in November 2010 and twinning rates of 40 percent documented in May 2010. The current population of moose in this part of the unit is at the highest level ever.

As the moose population in this area has increased, the hunting seasons have been lengthened and the bag limits have been liberalized. Harvest of moose in this area has increased as well. In the years 2000 to 2004, total harvest ranged from 27 to 74 moose. In the most recent five years, harvests have ranged from 111 to 222, with over 200 moose harvested every year in the past three years. Winter hunts have accounted for 15 to 21 percent of the total harvest for the past four years. About 50 percent of the winter harvests have been cows. Current harvest levels have not appreciably slowed the growth of this population, and without a large increase in harvest, specifically cows, the population can quickly reach a level that is unsustainable.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will continue to increase to the point that winter habitat will be depleted, and in a bad winter the population would be prone to significant mortality.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The ability to take a cow during times when bulls are in rut will increase the quality of harvested meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents of the local area that harvest moose at a fairly high rate.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Changing the bag limit to “1 moose” while retaining the current seasons. Since most of the harvest in the fall, the department believes that allowing hunters to harvest a cow in the fall will result in more cows being harvested than if the winter season were more liberal.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

Log Number: ADFG042811Q

PROPOSAL 8 - 5 AAC 85.045 (a) (16) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Lengthen the resident moose winter season in the Remainder of Unit 18 and change the bag limit to include any moose in the winter hunt.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(16)		
...		

Remainder of Unit 18

1 antlered bull [PER
REGULATORY YEAR]; or

Aug. 10-Sept. 30
[DEC. 20-JAN 10]

Sept 1-Sept 30

1 moose

Dec. 20-Jan. 31

No open season

ISSUE: The moose population in the remainder of Unit 18 has experienced steady growth for several decades. The most recent estimate in a portion of the area, the Paimiut Count Area, was in 2006 and estimated 3,620 moose with a calf to adult ratio of 29 calves per 100 adults. The previous estimate in 2002 was 2,340 with a calf to adult ratio of 49 calves per 100 adults. The most recent estimate for the Andrefsky Survey Area was in 2002 and yielded an estimate of 419 moose with a calf to adult ratio of 24 calves per 100 adults. More recent twinning surveys and moose composition surveys indicate that this population is growing, with 61 calves per 100 cows observed in the Andrefsky Count Area in November 2010; twinning rates have ranged from 30% to 50% in the past three springs.

In response to increasing populations, the hunting season has been lengthened and bag limits have been liberalized. In the past two winters, based on emergency petitions to the Board of Game and the Federal Subsistence Board, the winter season was extended with an ‘any moose’ bag limit. During these modified winter hunts harvest has ranged from 60 to 71 moose, 40 of those in each year being cows. During the previous five years, winter harvest has ranged from 13 to 50 moose. Winter hunts have accounted for 31 percent of the total harvest in this area in the past two years.

This proposal provides additional opportunity for resident hunters in response to a growing and productive moose population. Extending the season and changing the bag limit will also help meet public requests for more moose hunting in the Remainder of Unit 18.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Winter harvests will be lower and restricted to antlered bulls. The public will probably continue to request additional winter hunting opportunity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Cow moose harvested in the winter may be in better body condition than post-rut bulls, yielding better meat quality to hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents desiring to harvest moose in the winter.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered simply changing the bag limit to any moose for the winter season or adding ten days to the winter season. Since requests in the past two years have also cited poor travel conditions in the early part of the hunt, we decided longer season dates were warranted.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

Log Number: ADFG042811H

PROPOSAL 9 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(16). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 18, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(16)		
...		
Unit 18, Lower Yukon Area, that portion north and west of the Kashunuk River including the north bank from the mouth of the river upstream to the old village of Chakaktolik, west of a line from Chakaktolik to Mountain Village, and excluding all Yukon River drainages upriver from Mountain Village		
1 antlered bull; or	Sept. 1-Sept. 30	No open season.
1 moose	Dec. 20-Feb. 28	

...

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. One area in Unit 18 requires reauthorization: Lower Yukon River hunt area.

In 2005, the Board authorized an antlerless moose hunt that included both calves and antlered bulls. In the 2007 and 2009 meetings, the board liberalized both the bag limit to include any moose and lengthened the season to the current dates. At submission deadline in April 2011, the department is proposing a more liberal season and bag limit for residents in this portion of Unit 18 for consideration at the November 2011 Board meeting in Barrow. If action is taken on the November proposal, the reauthorization request (this proposal) is not needed. If there are no

changes to resident regulations, this proposal is needed and the department recommends continuation of antlerless moose bag limit.

The Lower Yukon area is the most densely populated moose habitat in Unit 18. From 2002 to 2008, the population has doubled every three years and is now estimated at 3,320 moose in an area of about 1,100 square miles. The most recent data (May 2010) indicates that twinning rates are still high at about 50%. Anecdotal evidence suggests that calf survival rates remain high.

Harvest data for 2010-2011 has not been finalized prior to the proposal submission deadline. We expect harvest to be similar to 2009-2010 when 224 moose were harvested and when 46 moose were harvested in the winter season of December 20 to February 28 season, including 24 (52%) cows. Continuing antlerless moose harvest opportunity will benefit hunters and also help slow the growth rate of the population. Both effects are beneficial aspects of reauthorizing the antlerless moose hunt in Unit 18.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity for antlerless moose in portions of Unit 18 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

Log Number: ADFG04281100

PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 92.085(14). Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.

Allow the use of electronic calls for taking moose in Unit 18.

Electronic calls maybe used for all game animals except moose, however, electronic calls may be used for moose in Unit 18.

ISSUE: Wildlife managers are drastically relaxing moose season and bag in the Lower Yukon and Remainder, relaxing means and methods by allowing electronic calls when gas is \$6 a gallon makes sense.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaskans who harvest moose in parts of Unit 18 are experiencing big leaps in season and bag limits for moose. How about making it easier for us to hunt too with relaxed means and methods.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the wildlife managers say the moose are threatening

their browse and need to be harvested. As a result they have opened to a two moose limit, a cow season, and increased the season. Help us help you by making it easier for us to harvest moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both wildlife and hunters. The moose benefit when their population is culled and the hunters benefit with relaxed means and methods when gasoline to hunt is an all time high.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: Hunt with the current methods. When the floodgates for season are opened, why not relax the methods and means too.

PROPOSED BY: George Smith

LOG NUMBER: EG050511449

PROPOSAL 11 - 5 AAC 92.080(7). Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Allow the use of salt licks for taking moose in Unit 18.

(E) Artificial salt licks may be used in Unit 18 (Lower Yukon).

ISSUE: Wildlife managers are drastically relaxing moose season and bag in the Lower Yukon, relaxing means and methods by allowing artificial salt licks when gas is \$6 a gallon makes sense.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaskans who harvest moose in parts of Unit 18 are experiencing big leaps in season and bag limits for moose. Make it easier for Alaskans to hunt as well with relaxed means and methods by allowing artificial salt licks. This will not be a huge advantage but every bit will help in being able to harvest moose.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the wildlife managers say the moose are threatening their browse and need to be harvested. As a result they have opened to a two moose limit, a cow season, and increased the season. Making it easier for us to harvest moose will help the population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both wildlife and hunters. The moose benefit when their population is culled and the hunters benefit with relaxed means and methods when gasoline to hunt is at an all time high.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: Hunt with the current methods. When the flood gates for season are opened, why not relax the methods and means too.

PROPOSED BY: George Smith

LOG NUMBER: EG050511450

PROPOSAL 12 - 5 AAC 92.080(A)(4). Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions.

Allow moose to be harvested from a boat under power in Unit 18.

Moose may be harvested by a boat under power in Unit 18 (Lower Yukon).

ISSUE: Wildlife managers are drastically relaxing moose season and bag limit in the Lower Yukon, relaxing means and methods by allowing taking a moose with a boat under power makes sense especially when the federal regulations already allow this in the Lower Yukon with no negative consequences.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaskans who harvest moose in parts of Unit 18 are experiencing big leaps in season and bag limits for moose. How about making it easier for us to hunt too with relaxed methods and means by being able to take a moose with a boat under power. The method is typically boats under low power putting up and down the rivers early in the morning or in the evening, NOT boats at full speed running and gunning moose.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the wildlife managers say the moose are threatening their browse and need to be harvested. As a result they have opened to a two moose limit, a cow season, and increased the season. Making it easier for us to harvest moose will help the population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both wildlife and hunters. The moose benefit when their population is culled and the hunters benefit with relaxed means and methods when gasoline to hunt is at an all time high. This is not a run and gun proposal, the boat under power allows hunters to be able to take a moose without waiting the crucial few extra seconds for the boat to come to a complete stop. This will also make it easier for hunters by streamlining state and federal regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: Hunt with the current methods. It is confusing to hunters with two contradicting regulations.

PROPOSED BY: George Smith

LOG NUMBER: EG050511453

PROPOSAL 13 - 5 AAC 99.025. Customary and traditional uses of game populations.

Develop a Unit specific Amount Necessary for Subsistence finding for each Unit in the Arctic Region.

...

(11) Wolves

Units 18, 22, 23 & 26A

Develop a Unit specific amount needed for subsistence (ANS) finding for each Unit in the arctic region. Sustained yield analysis must include all harvest by all methods and means, including trap or snare, and consider the total harvest rate by all methods and means regarding the sustained yield of wolves in each Unit. Independent ANS findings for take by hunting or trapping license must be defined since the ANS finding and sustained yield analysis for harvest as a furbearer (trapping license) is independent of the finding for take as a big game animal (hunting license).

Define an ANS based on ADF&G, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management, and National Park Service village surveys, sealing records, anecdotal information, and any other sources of historical harvest data of all residents of Alaska.

ISSUE: Lack of subsistence hunting ANS findings in the Arctic & Western Regions. The Board of Game (board) is required by law (AS 16.05.258) to define an amount needed for subsistence prior to establishing a harvest season for species with a positive customary and traditional use (C&T) finding.

The board has made a positive C&T use determination for wolves in these Units under authority of AS 16.05.258 (a). Under that authority, when the board makes a positive C&T finding the Board is required to do the following - AS 16.05.258 (b) states:

"The appropriate board shall determine whether a portion of a fish stock or game population identified under (a) of this section can be harvested consistent with sustained yield. If a portion of a stock or population can be harvested consistent with sustained yield, the board shall determine the amount of the harvestable portion that is reasonably necessary for subsistence uses.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The board will continue to illegally authorize harvest seasons for wolves in these Unit's. In the absence of an amount needed for subsistence finding, no harvest season can be legally authorized for any harvest of wolves. The Alaska legislature specifically intended residents to have first priority for the harvest of wildlife in Alaska in all regions of the state with a subsistence priority finding.

The amount needed for subsistence findings must consider historical harvest rates of all resident Alaskans. The Alaska constitution guarantees fair and equal access to Alaska's wildlife resources for all Alaskans.

Alaska Constitution, Article 8, Section 3 "Common Use": "Wherever occurring in their natural state, fish, wildlife, and waters are reserved to the people for common use".

Traditional harvest of wolves in these Units therefore must include the traditional use levels of all Alaskans that have harvested wolves in these Units if the amount needed for subsistence is to reflect the needs of all Alaskans, the intent of AS 16.05.258, the findings of the Alaska Superior Court, and the Alaska Constitution.

"A requirement that one must reside in a rural area in order to participate in subsistence hunting and fishing, violates the Alaska Constitution, art. VIII, sec. 3, 15 & 17 - *McDowell vs. State*, 785 P. 2D 1 (Alaska 1989).

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, protecting the sustained yield for the subsistence take of wolves by residents of Alaska is the highest priority for the management of Alaska's resources, for upholding Alaska's constitution, and the legislative intent for establishing the Board of Game to make recommendations to the ADF&G regarding the management of Alaska's wildlife resources.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents that support the management of wolves based on the sustained yield principle that prioritizes harvest for residents first, especially subsistence harvest. Alaskan's have a long history of relying on wolf pelts to support their subsistence lifestyle. Wolf pelts are one of the most lucrative pelts for Alaskan subsistence hunters and trappers and no alternative exists for this important subsistence resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those that would prefer to deplete wolf populations below the amount Alaskan's need for subsistence.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: The Alaskan Constitution requires it. No other options exists.

PROPOSED BY: Science Now Project!

LOG NUMBER: EG050311443

PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 84.270 Furbearer trapping. Close nonresident trapping seasons for certain species within the Arctic Region Units.

For species defined in 5 AAC 99.025(13)(a) – (m) amend 5 AAC 84.270 as follows:

Units 18, 22, 23, & 26A

Nonresidents: No open season

ISSUE: Nonresident harvest opportunity under a trapping license for furbearers and fur animals with a positive customary and traditional use finding and a 100 percent harvestable surplus amount needed for subsistence (ANS) finding statewide [5AAC 99.025 (13) (a) – (m)].

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Board of Game will continue to illegally authorize nonresident trapping harvest opportunity for furbearers and fur animals with a positive C&T and an ANS finding of 100 percent of the harvestable surplus.

The amount needed for subsistence findings must consider historical harvest rates of all resident Alaskans. The Alaska Constitution guarantees fair and equal access to Alaska's wildlife resources for all Alaskans.

Alaska Constitution, Article 8, Section 3 "Common Use": "Wherever occurring in their natural state, fish, wildlife, and waters are reserved to the people for common use".

Traditional harvest of wolves in these Units therefore must include the traditional use levels of all Alaskans that have harvested wolves in these Units if the amount needed for subsistence is to reflect the needs of all Alaskans, the intent of AS 16.05.258, the findings of the Alaska Superior Court, and the Alaska Constitution.

"A requirement that one must reside in a rural area in order to participate in subsistence hunting and fishing, violates the Alaska Constitution, art. VIII, sec. 3, 15 & 17 - McDowell vs. State, 785 P. 2D 1 (Alaska 1989).

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, protecting the sustained yield for the subsistence take of furbearers and fur animals by residents of Alaska is the highest priority for the management of Alaska's resources, for upholding Alaska's constitution, and the legislative intent for establishing the Board of Game to make recommendations to the ADF&G regarding the management of Alaska's wildlife resources.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents that support the management of fur bearers and fur animals based on the sustained yield principle that prioritizes harvest for residents. Alaskan's have a long history of relying on furbearer and fur animal pelts to support their subsistence lifestyle.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those that would prefer to allocate furbearer and fur animal harvest opportunity under a trapping license to nonresidents when the Board of Game has determined 100 percent of the harvestable surplus is the amount residents need to meet their subsistence needs.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: The Alaska Constitution requires it. No other option exists.

PROPOSED BY: Science Now Project!

LOG NUMBER: EG052611506

PROPOSAL 15 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf. Increase the bag limit for wolves in Unit 18.

Change hunting bag limit for wolves in Unit 18 from 5 to 10.

ISSUE: Current hunting bag limit for wolves in Unit 18.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters are unnecessarily restricted from harvesting more than five animals per season should the opportunity occur.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? A slightly higher harvest may occur in a given year, but given

the productive and prolific nature of this species would create or present no overall consequences to their population in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those hunters with the ability and opportunity to harvest more than five wolves per year would be allowed to do so.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: PROPOSED BY: Lower Kuskokwim Advisory Committee and Orutsararmiut Native Council

LOG NUMBER: EG050211429

PROPOSAL 16 - 5 AAC 85.057. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolverine. Increase the bag limit for wolverine in Unit 18.

Change hunting bag limit for wolverine in Unit 18 from 1 to 2.

ISSUE: Current hunting bag limit for wolverine in Unit 18.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters are unnecessarily restricted from harvesting more than one animal per season should the opportunity occur.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Little to none. An additional animal or two may occur in a given year, but would create or present no overall consequences to their population in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those hunters with the ability and opportunity to harvest more than one wolverine per year would be allowed to do so.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: PROPOSED BY: Lower Kuskokwim Advisory Committee and Orutsararmiut Native Council

LOG NUMBER: EG050211430

PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 85.060. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals. Extend the season and increase the bag limit for lynx in Unit 18

Unit 18: Five lynx, August 10 - April 30.

ISSUE: Lynx doubles as a fur animal and a food species in Western Alaska. Extending the season and bag limit to accommodate Alaskans who eat lynx makes it more equitable compared to the trapping regulation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The idea that lynx is just a furbearer where trappers can harvest an unlimited quantity in a season is inequitable to hunters to eat lynx in finite quantities (two currently and five proposed).

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, it just allows hunters to eat up to five lynx a year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans in Unit 18 who hunt lynx as a food species. This is a win-win proposal, trappers can still get their "unlimited" bag limit, and hunters who eat lynx will get a marginally longer season and larger bag limit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, the trappers enjoy an unlimited bag and the lynx population follows the hare cycle.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: Encourage hunters who eat lynx to stay within the trapping season. It's not equitable to hunters.

PROPOSED BY: George Smith

LOG NUMBER: EG050511452

PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.

Clarify when a violation has occurred concerning incidental take by trappers for Unit 18.

Continuing to take, or attempting to take, furbearers at a site where a moose, caribou, or deer has been taken incidentally is a violation. Any moose, caribou or deer that dies as a result of being caught in a trap or snare, whether found dead or euthanized, becomes the property of the regional management agency. The trapper should salvage edible meat and surrender it to the appropriate agency. **A person who salvages and surrenders the edible meat in accordance with this regulation will not be subject to citation.** If such an incidental take occurs, the trapper must move all active traps and snares at least 300 feet from the site for the remainder of the regulatory year **(July 1 through June 30), and after the ending of the July 1 – June 30 regulatory year, may reset again in the same place or area during subsequent trapping seasons.**

ISSUE: Clarifying language is needed so that trappers will not be cited for an incidental catch of non-target species the following year if it occurs in the same area as the previous year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The current language is unclear to some individuals (both enforcement officers and trappers) regarding the difference between the regulatory year and the calendar year, and unnecessary citations (subsequently dismissed after court time and legal fee expenditures) have been issued as a result. Also, trappers should be made clear that trappers will not be subjected to further hardship in their good faith efforts to comply with the law.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Not applicable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers would gain more buy-in and faith in fairness of the management system. Enforcement should not feel compelled to issue questionable or unnecessary citations from misapplication or misinterpretation in this current “grey area”.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: PROPOSED BY: Lower Kuskokwim Advisory Committee and Orutsararmiut Native Council

LOG NUMBER: EG050211428

PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 85.060 Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals. Close nonresident fur animal hunting seasons for certain species in Arctic Region Units.

For species defined in 5 AAC 99.025 (13)(a) – (m) amend 5 AAC 85.060 Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals as follows:

Units 18, 22, 23, & 26A

Nonresidents: No open season

ISSUE: Nonresident hunting opportunity under a hunting license for fur animals with a positive and customary traditional use finding and a 100 percent harvestable surplus amount needed for subsistence (ANS) finding statewide [(5AAC 99.025 (13) (a) – (m)].

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Board of Game will continue to illegally authorize nonresident hunting harvest opportunity for fur animals with a positive C & T and an ANS finding of 100 percent of the harvestable surplus.

The amount needed for subsistence findings must consider historical harvest rates of all resident Alaskans. The Alaskan constitution guarantees fair and equal access to Alaska’s wildlife resources for all Alaskans.

Alaska Constitution, Article 8, Section 3 “Common Use”

“Wherever occurring in their natural state, fish, wildlife, and waters are reserved to the people for common use.”

Traditional harvest of furbearers in these Unit’s therefore must include the traditional use levels of all Alaskans that have harvested wolves in these Unit’s if the amount needed for subsistence is to reflect the needs of all Alaskans, the intent of AS 16.05.258, the findings of the Alaska Superior court, and the Alaska Constitution.

“A requirement that one must reside in a rural area in order to participate in subsistence hunting and fishing, violates the Alaska Constitution, art. VIII, secs. 3, 15, & 17 – McDowell v. State, 785 P. 2d1 (Alaska 1989)”

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, protecting the sustained yield for the subsistence take of fur animals by residents of Alaska is the highest priority for the management of Alaska's resources, for upholding Alaska's constitution, and the legislative intent for establishing the Board of Game to make recommendations to the ADF&G regarding the management of Alaska's wildlife resources.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents that support the management of fur animals based on the sustained yield principle that prioritizes harvest for residents. Alaskan's have long history of relying on fur animal pelts to support their subsistence lifestyle.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those that would prefer to allocate fur animal harvest opportunity under a hunting license to nonresidents when the Board of Game has determined 100 percent of the harvestable surplus is the amount residents need to meet their subsistence needs.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: The Alaska Constitution requires it. No other option exists.

PROPOSED BY: Science Now Project!

LOG NUMBER: EG052611507

PROPOSAL 20 - 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Increase the bag limit and lengthen the season for ptarmigan in Unit 18.

Unit 18: Fifty per day, one hundred in possession, August 10 - June 15.

ISSUE: Ptarmigan arrive in large numbers in the coastal section of Western Alaska from the more interior sections after the season closes on April 30th, mechanically locking out hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaskans who eat ptarmigan in Western Alaska will continue to be locked out or hunt illegally.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, it just allows hunters to legally harvest ptarmigan.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans who hunt ptarmigan as a food species in Unit 18. This is allowed in Unit 23 and 26 and no reason biologically it should not be allowed in Unit 18.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: Encourage hunters not to harvest ptarmigan after April 30. This proposal is a better solution.

PROPOSED BY: George Smith

LOG NUMBER: EG050511451

Note: This proposal was deferred by the Board of Game from the Spring, 2011 meeting. It was previously listed as Proposal 205.

PROPOSAL 21 - 5 AAC 92.450. Description of Game Management Units. Modify the boundaries for Units 18, 19 and 21 as follows:

Create new boundary language for Unit 18 to read: That area draining into the Yukon River downstream from the ‘down river’ boundary of ; and that area draining into the Kuskokwim River downstream from the ‘down river’ boundary of Dick Nash’s fish camp, on the South bank of the river and the ‘down river’ boundary of Sam Savage’s fish camp on the North side of the river (both located five miles downriver of Lower Kalskag); and that area draining into Crooked Creek (also know as Johnson River) downstream from the northern terminus of the Mud Creek to Crooked Creek (also know as Johnson River) tramway (also known as Mud Creek to Johnson River Portage).

Create new boundary language for Unit 19 to read: That area draining into the Kuskokwim River upstream from the ‘down river boundary of Dick Nash’s fish camp, on the South bank of the river and the ‘down river’ boundary of Sam Savage’s fish camp, on the North bank of the river; and that area draining into Crooked Creek (also known as Johnson River) upstream from the northern terminus of the Mud Creek to Crooked Creek (also known as Johnson River) tramway (also know as Mud Creek to Johnson River Portage).

Create new boundary language for Unit 21 to read: That area draining into the Yukon River upstream from the “down river” boundary of .

(Note: All of the above-mentioned land marks are well known to all hunters in Units 18, 19, and 21. They are also very easy to locate on “up-to-date” maps. It would also make it easier for the “map makers” to draw in the affected drainages.)

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

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Many hunters would still not know where the real boundary is. There is no definite language explaining where the “straight line” begins or ends. Does the line start as the “down river,” the “center of” or the “up river” boundary of or Lower Kalskag?

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The boundaries would be clear, definite and visible. There would be no more confusion about where the boundaries begin and end. Hunters would know exactly what Unit they are in. All these Units have different seasons and bag limits. This would clarify when, where and what may be hunted and harvested. (No more confusion means no more “citations.”)

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters traveling upriver on the Kuskokwim and Yukon Rivers to Units 19 and 21. Hunters from Lower Kalskag and Kalskag would benefit the most, because they would be gaining additional hunting areas in Units 18, 19 and 21, which is their customary and traditional hunting area.

This would clarify the issue of the land north of Lower Kalskag and Kalskag and south of the High Portage Ridge. High Portage Ridge divides the Yukon and Kuskokwim drainages. All drainages north of the ridge flowing into the Yukon River would be in Unit 21, and all drainages south of the ridge flowing into the Kuskokwim River would be in Unit 19, not in Unit 21 as shown in the current regulation map.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one would suffer if this solution is adopted.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Starting the boundary at the mouth of Paimiut Slough, up the slough to the upper end of Twelve Mile Slough, following the slough to the mouth of Anvik Creek, following the creek to its head, crossing over to the head of Hooking Creek that drains into “Big Lake”, north of Kalskag, following it down to Big Lake, following the north shore of Big Lake to the head of Crooked Creek (also known as Johnson River), following it to the north terminus of the Mud Slough to Johnson River Portage, then south on the Portage to Mud Creek, down to its confluence with First Slough, following its north bank to its mouth, then to the “down river” boundary of Sam Savage’s fish camp on the north shore of the Kuskokwim River, then across the river to Dick Nash’s fish camp on the south bank of the river. This may vividly clarify the issue, but it was rejected because it is too wordy and cumbersome.

PROPOSED BY: Central Kuskokwim Fish and Game Advisory Committee

LOG NUMBER: HQ-10W-G-016

Nome Area – Unit 22

PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(20). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 22C and the remainder of Unit 22D, 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	
<i>1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; or</i>	<i>Sept. 15-Sept. 30</i>	
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)		
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	Aug. 10 - Sept. 14 Oct. 1 - Jan. 31	

accompanied by a calf; only antlered
moose may be taken from
Jan. 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 30 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 approximately 660 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. The Unit 22(C) moose population experienced 2% annual growth from 2001- 2010, and there was no statistically significant population increase between moose censuses completed in 2007 and 2010. It appears 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 2000. 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 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

LOG NUMBER: ADFG042811TT

At the March, 2011 Board of Game meeting in Wasilla, the board deferred action on trophy nullification of Seward Peninsula muskox, as proposed in a portion of Proposal 223. Based on information presented by ADF&G, changes to muskox trophy nullification discussed by the board include the options of no horn-cutting in subsistence hunts combined with changes to the subsistence hunt bag limit to exclude mature bull muskox. In this scenario mature bull muskox could only be hunted with drawing permits. By deferring Proposal 223, the public will have an opportunity to comment on these options for trophy nullification as it relates to subsistence muskox hunts on the Seward Peninsula.

PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures.
Review the discretionary authority requiring the nullification of trophy value of animals taken under a subsistence permit.

5 AAC 92.052

...

(5) ... the trophy value of an animal taken under a subsistence permit may be nullified by the department;

...

ISSUE: The Board of Game has requested a statewide review of all hunts requiring antler destruction. Antler destruction is currently used in for some muskoxen hunts in Unit 22 and 23 and some moose hunts in Units 12, 21, and 24. This proposal has been submitted to allow public comment on the use of this practice in managing hunts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to be required to destroy the trophy value of horns and antlers of animals taken while subsistence hunting when deemed necessary by the Board and the department.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who believe it is wrong to destroy trophy value of any animal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: The Board of Game

LOG NUMBER: ADFG113010S

PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Align brown bear seasons in Unit 22C with remainder of Unit.

Unit 22C:

Residents: August 1 - May 31, one bear every regulatory year.

Nonresidents: August 1- May 31, one bear every regulatory year by drawing permit.

ISSUE: Unmatched bear season dates and bag limits with rest of Unit 22. Under-harvested bear population. Bear predation on local ungulates in spring. Bear predation on local reindeer. Bear human conflicts. Higher enforcement costs due to differing bear season dates and bag limit with rest of Unit 22.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued lack of opportunity for late fall and early spring harvests of otherwise legal grizzly bears in Unit 22C. Continued excess of harvestable bears. Continued bear predation of ungulates with little opportunity for hunters to affect that predation. Continued loss of private reindeer. Continued defense of life and property bear kills by reindeer herders that could be legal sport harvests. Continued problem of bear/human conflicts. Possible reductions in moose and musk ox quotas due to predation. Possible intensive management for moose in Unit 22C. Continued higher enforcement costs as officers must plan and staff for a different patrol program for just Unit 22C.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Possibility to improve ungulate harvest opportunities thru effective bear harvests, lowering predation. Increases public safety enforcement opportunities/contacts and lowers costs by bringing bear season in Unit 22C in line with rest of Unit 22. This proposal improves the quality of bear hides by allowing later fall and earlier spring harvests. Spring bear DLP kills on bears predating on reindeer fawns will be legal sport harvests. The public will benefit thru decreased human/bear conflicts. Wildlife viewers/photographers will have increased viewing opportunities of all wildlife due to lower predation. Hunters will benefit thru increased ungulate harvest opportunities due to lower bear predation. Hunters will benefit thru increasing opportunities to take bears in Unit 22C. The reindeer industry will benefit thru legal sport kills of predating bears. The State will benefit thru lower enforcement costs and thru unit wide bear management under one season and bag limit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The public will benefit thru decreased human/bear conflicts. Wildlife viewers/photographers will have increased viewing opportunities of all wildlife due to lower predation. Hunters will benefit thru increased ungulate harvest opportunities due to lower bear predation. Hunters will benefit thru increasing opportunities to take bears in Unit 22C. The Reindeer industry will benefit thru legal sport kills of predating bears. The state will benefit thru lower enforcement costs and thru unit wide bear management under one season and bag limit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? We see no opportunity for anyone to suffer under this proposal.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: No other solutions strike the balance needed to assist the Department to manage all of the Game species while at the same time offering increased benefits for all resources users and enforcements efforts.

PROPOSED BY: The Reindeer Herders Association; Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory Council; Northern Norton Sound Advisory Committee, Nome Sportsmen Association

LOG NUMBER: EG042511319

PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Align brown bears seasons in Unit 22.

The preferred solution would allow bear hunters to harvest bears with the least complex bear hunting regulations and affords the opportunity to do so. A unified bear season from August 1 to May 31 like the adjoining units is the most preferable solution to the problem of the relatively short bear hunting opportunity in Unit 22C. The bear hunting public widely demands a longer bear season in Unit 22C. The Board of Game has been approached numerous times to change the bear season in Unit 22C. I do not believe many more bears would be harvested as a result of this regulation.

ISSUE: The problem is a disjointed general hunt grizzly bear season in Unit 22C from the other Unit 22 subunits. Additionally, bear hunters desire to have more opportunity to hunt bears from Unit 22C.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Subsistence and general season bear hunters will miss out on opportunities to hunt abundant bear populations in Unit 22C.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal if enacted will provide for a more meaningful bear hunting opportunity in Unit 22C.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bear hunters will benefit from this proposal if it is enacted.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Bear watching public

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: Longer bear season; rejected because the preferable season should be the same as other units.

PROPOSED BY: Austin Ahmasuk

LOG NUMBER: EG050611456

PROPOSAL 26- 5 AAC 85.020 Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Open a year round season for brown bear in Unit 22.

No closed season for brown and grizzly bears in Unit 22.

ISSUE: Current regulations were adopted for a "sport hunt" and not for a "subsistence harvest" resulting in an increasing number of bears breaking into subsistence cabins, raiding/spoiling subsistence caches, and interrupting subsistence harvesting activities. Unit 22 residents have observed an increase in brown/grizzly bears in Unit 22 and current regulations do not provide for traditional subsistence harvest methods and seasons to address the growing population of brown/grizzly bears in Unit 22.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Subsistence harvesters will continue to:
1) spend time and resources to repair damage done by bears to their cabins, gear and equipment;
2) not be able to replace subsistence harvested foods taken/spoiled by bears; and 3) have their subsistence harvesting activities interrupted by bears.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this proposal will improve the quality and quantity of other subsistence harvested food and by-products otherwise destroyed or contaminated by brown/grizzly bears.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence harvesting families.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: Break the law. Don't want to break the law.

PROPOSED BY: Sandra Tahbone

LOG NUMBER: EG042911374

PROPOSAL 27 - 5 AAC 85.065 (a)(3). Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game.
Lengthen the ptarmigan season in Unit 22.

Units and Bag Limits

Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)

Nonresident Open Season

....
(3)

Ptarmigan (rock, willow, and white-tailed)

Unit 22
20 per day, 40 in possession

Aug. 10 [SEPT. 1] - Apr. 30;

Aug. 10 [SEPT. 1] - Apr. 30

ISSUE: Throughout Interior, Southcentral, Western, and Arctic Alaska, autumn ptarmigan hunting seasons open on August 10. The exception is Unit 22, where ptarmigan hunting season opens September 1. I would like the regulations changed so the ptarmigan season in Unit 22 is opened on August 10. Ptarmigan are abundant in Unit 22, and lightly exploited relative to other ptarmigan populations that are accessible from the highway system in Southcentral and Interior Alaska. Ptarmigan that are accessible from the Nome road system are certainly more heavily exploited than ptarmigan several miles from the road system. But hunting pressure on birds close to the road is still a fraction of what can be observed near road systems accessible to the population centers of the state. There are no conservation concerns that justify a later opening date for ptarmigan in Unit 22 than the rest of the state.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Three weeks of hunting opportunity in mid- to late- August will continue to be lost. This is a time of year when people are very active in the outdoors. Hunters should be allowed to take ptarmigan intentionally, or incidental to other field activities. Also, ptarmigan hunting is an activity that is enjoyed by more mature school age children, and running around in the hills trying to catch birds is more healthy activity than some alternatives that youth might participate in. I personally would enjoy the opportunity to get out and walk in the hills and work my hunting dogs during mild August weather, in addition to taking birds home to eat.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This is a matter of personal taste. I prefer young-of-the-year birds taken prior to late September, while the birds are still on succulent feed before they switch over to willow buds. While I take a few birds all winter, I definitely prefer the earlier birds for table-fare. I know people who have just the opposite opinion. I doubt that the number of birds taken in August will have any measurable effect on the opportunity to take birds later in the year, for those who prefer later birds.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anybody who wants to hunt for ptarmigan in Unit 22 in mid- to late- August, and those who want to take ptarmigan incidental to other field activities at this time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I am not aware of any person that would suffer if this proposal is adopted.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: I considered proposing a reduced bag limit along with the earlier season opening date, as a compromise to any perceived conservation issues. However, a reduced bag limit is not justified by any real conservation concern that I am aware of. If the ptarmigan numbers decline precipitously, closing the season three to four weeks earlier in the spring would benefit potential summer production, as it would save the birds that survived the winter for breeding. However, bird numbers are very high so this type of management action is not warranted at this time. Also, the Department has Emergency Order (EO) closure authority, should a substantial conservation concern arise.

For what it's worth, when willow ptarmigan numbers were considered "low" in autumn 2008 in Unit 22, ptarmigan were far more abundant near the Nome road system than in Units 13, 20, and 25 where "low" bird densities were also observed.

PROPOSED BY: Dan Reed

LOG NUMBER: EG050611455

Kotzebue Area – Unit 23

PROPOSAL 28 - 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	July 1 - Dec. 31	Sept. 1 - Sept. 20
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	Sept. 1 - Sept. 20	
1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side		
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		
Remainder of Unit 23	Aug. 1 - Dec. 31	
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

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 (BOG) 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, 2007 and 2009 the BOG considered public proposals and made no changes to the moose hunting seasons in Unit 23. At submission deadline in April 2011, the department has no changes proposed for Unit 23 moose for consideration at the November 2011 Board meeting in Barrow. If there are no changes to resident regulations, this proposal is needed and the department recommends continuation of antlerless moose bag limit. 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

LOG NUMBER: ADFG042811UU

PROPOSAL 29 – 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Allocate 50% of the Unit 23 moose permits for DM875 to guides.

Require 50 percent guide-client agreements for DM875 permits in Unit 23.

ISSUE: Unit 23-05 moose permits, DM875 is oversubscribed and underutilized.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? DM875 permits will continue to be wasted. Hunters with the resources to utilize the permits will continue to be denied access.

The Unit 23 drawing process was established in 2005 along with a resident registration hunt as tools to reduce user conflicts. Area 23-05 was capped at a historical nonresident user level of 24 permits. Since inception the cap of 24 permits has not been met in any year and in the past two years participation has fallen to 50 percent, just 12 of 24 permits utilized in 2009 and 2010. All the while, applications for the permits remain at high levels (average of 62 applications per year over past 5 years).

Two primary reasons have been identified as to why these permits are going unused:

- 1) Nonresidents do not do their homework prior to the draw application and waste the permit when they find out the realities, difficult logistics and high costs, to hunt the area.
- 2) Booking agents shotgun the permit process with clients and attempt to sell the hunts post draw, or toss out the permit in favor of an alternate permit awarded their client in another state.

Guided clients are usually booked a year or more in advance. The hunting area is marketed to the client, at expense to the outfitter and the hunters know well in advance what to expect for cost and logistics. Significant deposits are taken to secure the hunt. Guide contracted hunters are in essence prequalified to be awarded permits. Guide contracted clients will use the permits.

Each year more of these prequalified hunters are rejected by the current drawing system than are awarded permits (average 40 percent draw success over past 5 years). Harvest data reveals that it is primarily contracted hunters that are currently utilizing the permits.

For these reasons many of the permits are being wasted. High costs and difficult logistics, make it equally difficult for a guide/outfitter to do business in this remote region. Ability to conduct a viable business and deliver a quality level of service is hampered by the unpredictability of the drawing system. Requiring 50 percent of the drawing permits to be guide/client contracted would bring some stability to the system and assure that no less than 50 percent of the permits would be utilized each year.

Year	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
# of Applicants	56	76	71	57	39	69
Permits Available	24	24	24	24	24	24

Percent Drawn	42%	31%	33%	42%	61%	35%
# of permits hunted	21	17	14	18	12	12
Percent of permits hunted	87%	70%	58%	75%	50%	50%

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The ability to provide quality service in such a remote region is highly dependent on being able to predict and maintain a reasonable level of participation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nonresidents with the desire and required resources to hunt the area. The Selawik NWR which makes up the majority of the unit. Guide/outfitters trying to conduct a viable business in the area. All associated communities and businesses that benefit from visitors to the state. ADF&G tag sales.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: Create an alternate list for DM875 permits. Create alternate lists statewide for all oversubscribed underutilized drawing permit hunts. Allocate 50 percent of the permits to the single Selawik NWR guide. The Selawik Refuge makes up the majority of Unit 23-05. To this proposal add an application limit for all guides registered in the unit in accordance with their Refuge or BLM permitted moose allocation. Require tag purchase at time of application. Refund non-winners.

PROPOSED BY: Joe Schuster

LOG NUMBER: EG042911398

PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Establish a harvest objective for brown bear in the Noatak National Preserve.

The National Park Conservation Association anticipates that additional regulatory amendments or management objectives may be provided for this proposal during the open comment period based on further review of current and subsequently released ADF&G and National Park Service brown bear harvest and survey data.

Current proposal:

Establish a harvest objective for the Noatak National Preserve within Unit 23 as follows:

Establish a 3-year mean, annual total human-caused mortality limit of < than 8 percent for adult bears (i.e. > 2 years old).

Based on the most recent population estimate, the total allowable human-caused mortality would be < than 23 adult bears harvested in the Noatak National Preserve per year.

ISSUE: Localized unsustainable harvest rates for brown bears in Unit 23.

ADF&G management reports indicate brown bear harvest rates are concentrated in the Noatak and Kobuk drainages, both of which have significant portions within the Noatak National Preserve. Approximately 80 percent of the total harvest of brown bears in Unit 23 has occurred in these two drainages alone from 2001 to 2006.

ADF&G management power point presentations from the 2009 fall Board of Game meeting indicate that median skull size of all brown bears harvested in 2008 had declined to the lowest level since 1989. In addition, the same staff presentation indicated the median age of male brown bears harvested in 2008 had decreased to the lowest age since at least 1989.

Unfortunately, the 2009 brown bear harvest report is still unpublished at the time of this proposal submission deadline (April 2011). The lack of timely dissemination of harvest data by the Alaska Department of Fish & Game significantly handicaps the National Park Conservation organization's ability to suggest prudent amendments to harvest regulations due to biological concerns. In addition, significant liberalizations to the number of permits issued for nonresident brown bear harvest opportunity have occurred since the last brown bear management report was published (in 2007).

Subsistence and DLP brown bear harvest continues to be significantly under reported as noted in the 2007 ADF&G brown bear management report as well.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Potential negative impacts to the natural population level or age class composition of brown bears in the Noatak National Preserve.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, managing brown bears at a sustainable harvest rates promotes the long term stability and availability of brown bears for harvest by local subsistence hunters and sport hunters.

In addition, managing brown bears at a sustainable harvest rate of ≤ 8 percent of the estimated adult population conforms to recognized scientific brown bear management policies designed to protect the natural population levels and age class composition of brown bears in the Noatak National Preserve.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All segments of the public benefit from maintaining a harvest strategy that promotes the long term stability and natural population level of brown bears in the Noatak National Preserve.

Subsistence hunters will benefit by ensuring the long term availability of a harvestable surplus of brown bears and the prudent distribution of harvest opportunity for non-local and nonresident hunters to protect, and prioritize, for federally qualified subsistence users the harvest opportunity

in the Noatak National Preserve. In addition, maintaining a natural mature age class in the population may decrease negative brown bear / human interactions and the resulting need for DLP harvest.

Sport hunters will benefit from having a harvestable surplus of mature age class cohort in the brown bear population that is managed at sustainable harvest rates, ensuring the long term availability of that segment of the bear population and the potential for a trophy status brown bear.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those that would prefer an unnaturally low brown bear population.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: Managing harvest at natural and sustainable level is mandatory on National Park Service managed lands. In addition, negative impacts to federally qualified subsistence hunting opportunity by excessive competition from hunters that are not considered subsistence hunters is not allowed in the Noatak National Preserve. No other options exist to these management mandates.

PROPOSED BY: Jim Stratton, National Parks Conservation Association

LOG NUMBER: EG050311441

Barrow Area – Unit 26A

PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(24). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 26A, 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 upstream 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.

...

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 decreasing. However, a low number of cows have been harvested in the winter season: 2 cows in 2006, 3 cows in 2007, 1 cow in 2008, and 1 in 2009. A similar low harvest is anticipated for the current regulatory year. Low harvests of antlerless moose (<5 per year) in the Colville River drainage should not prevent the population from recovering 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). The Unit 26A moose population is currently declining, but the small number of dispersing cow moose that could be harvested under this reauthorization proposal will have very little impact on the size of the population. To date, after several years of hunting, few antlerless moose have been harvested in this portion of the unit. One cow was harvested in 2006, none in 2007, 1 in 2008, and none in 2009 or 2010 during this hunt. 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.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

LOG NUMBER: ADFG042811VV

PROPOSAL 32 – 5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Add Unit 26A to the list of areas where a resident brown bear tag is not required for hunts.

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

...
(11) Unit 26(A);

(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:

...

(10) [UNIT 26(A)]

ISSUE: Unit 26A has a healthy brown bear population based on observations during moose and caribou surveys, observations by hunters, and reports of an increasing number of bears breaking into cabins and camps in the unit. The annual harvest has ranged from 8 - 20 bears between 2000 and 2010, while the sustainable harvest level for this population is estimated at 45-56 bears. It is unlikely that the proposed change would greatly increase bear harvest. In addition, adjoining Units 23 and 26(B), as well as Unit 26(C), do not require resident tag fees. This will align tag fee requirements in northern Alaska for resident hunters.

The subsistence permit hunt in Unit 26(A) has the tag fee exempted but meat must be salvaged and hides cannot be transported to a tannery without the skin of the head and the front claws being removed and retained by the department. This proposal does not change the subsistence hunt requirements. Instead, it relaxes the general season tag requirement and does not restrict transport of hides out of the unit to a tannery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? General season bear hunting by residents will require a \$25 tag to be purchased before hunting. Some hunters may be deterred from brown bear hunting in Unit 26(A) because of the tag requirement.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Hides may be more fully utilized by local hunters who harvest a bear at camp under general season regulations and have it tanned.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters that would like to harvest a bear in Unit 26(A) but are reluctant because of the tag fee. Also, local residents would be able to take bears that get into their cabin or meat rack under general season regulations with no subsistence permit requirement.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who enjoy seeing bears may have fewer bears to observe if the bear harvest increases.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

LOG NUMBER: ADFG042811P

PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 85.057. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolverine Open the wolverine hunting season earlier in Unit 26.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Units 1 – 5 1 wolverine	Sept. 1 - Feb. 15 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1 - Feb.15
Units 6 - 10, 12, 15, 16(B), and 17 - [26 1 wolverine]	Sept. 1 - Mar. 31 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1 - Mar. 31
Units 11, 13, 14, and 16(A) 1 wolverine	Sept. 1 - Jan. 31 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1 - Jan. 31
<u>Unit 26</u> <u>1 wolverine</u>	<u>August 1-March 31</u>	<u>August 1-March 31</u> <u>1 wolverine</u>

ISSUE: The vast majority of hunting in Unit 26 is done in August. Winter arrives quickly to the North Slope of the Brooks Range in September. Access becomes very difficult, if not impossible in September. Many hunters are missing a fantastic opportunity to harvest a unique species while on hunts for Sheep, Caribou and Bears. Unit 26 is a vast area with huge areas where wolverines can escape all hunting pressure. Winter hunting pressure is very light if not non-existent. Some trappers take wolverines in Unit 26 but winter conditions, extremely remote areas, and lack of light also make trapping difficult.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nothing, status quo. Alaska hunters will continue to be restricted from hunting wolverine in this area during traditional hunting times for other species.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those that would like to experience a truly remote, wilderness moose hunt in ANWR.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None

PROPOSED BY: Aaron Bloomquist

LOG NUMBER: EG051911499

Regional

PROPOSAL 34 – 5 AAC 92.015. (a)(8); (9); (b)(4), (7), (8) and (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 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 10 years, and Unit 23, where the tag fee has been exempted for 6 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 a 10-year average annual harvest of approximately 48 brown bears. 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.

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, about 6 bears are taken during a 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 by residents will probably 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.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

LOG NUMBER: ADFG042811YY

Other Units

PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 92.125. Intensive Management Plan. Approve an intensive management plan for moose in Unit 15A

ISSUE: In January 2010, the Board of Game (board) approved a habitat based intensive management plan for moose in Unit 15A. Due to slight errors in several of the statistics provided in the proposal and also due to an administrative oversight, the plan did not go into codified regulation. At the March 2011 meeting, the board did not take action on the revised intensive management plan proposed by the department, but rather asked the department to draft a different plan that also considered aerial wolf control for consideration at the November, 2011 meeting. Because the time constraints between the March 2011 meeting and the proposal deadline for the statewide meeting did not allow for completion of a revised plan, the department provides this proposal as a placeholder. Department staff will present a feasibility assessment and a revised intensive management plan at the November 2011 regional meeting in Barrow.

The full plan will be posted on the department web site: [prior to the November, 2011 meeting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The board is mandated to address intensive management, as well as conditions that would preclude it, outlined in AS 16.05.255 (f)(1).

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? A successful intensive management plan will improve the moose population, which would in turn increase the harvestable surplus benefitting hunters that rely on this population. A feasibility assessment will be presented that will describe the effectiveness of an intensive management program towards meeting intensive management objectives.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who rely on moose from Unit 15A for food.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals who do not approve of intensive management of wildlife populations.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The department is working with major land owners in GMU 15A to accomplish habitat enhancement projects.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

LOG NUMBER: ADFG042811K

PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC 92.125 Intensive management implementation plan. Approve an intensive management plan for moose in Unit 15C.

ISSUE: At the March 2011 meeting, the Board of Game requested the department to draft an intensive management plan for moose in Unit 15C that would include aerial wolf control for consideration at the November, 2011 meeting. Because the time constraints between the March 2011 meeting and the April 29 proposal deadline the department did not have sufficient time to complete a plan. Therefore, the department is submitting this as a placeholder proposal. Department staff will present a feasibility assessment and an intensive management plan at the November regional meeting in Barrow.

The full plan will be posted on the department web site: www.BoardOfGame.ADFG.Alaska.Gov prior to the November, 2011 meeting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The board is mandated to address intensive management, as well as conditions that would preclude it, as outlined in AS 16.05.255 (f)(1).

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? A successful intensive management plan will improve the moose population, which would in turn increase the harvestable surplus, benefitting hunters that rely on this population. A feasibility assessment will be presented that will evaluate the potential effectiveness of an intensive management program.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who rely on Unit 15A moose for food.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals who do not approve of intensive management of wildlife populations.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The department is working with major land owners in GMU 15C to accomplish habitat enhancement projects.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

LOG NUMBER: ADFG042811L

Note: The Board of Game approved an agenda change request to consider this proposal at the November, 2011, meeting.

Proposal 37 - 5 AAC 92.125. Intensive management plans. Amend the current predation management plan for the Southern Alaska Peninsula caribou herd.

(k) **Southern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area.** Notwithstanding any other provisions in this title, and based on the following information contained in this section, the commissioner or the commissioner's designee may conduct a wolf population reduction or wolf population regulation program on the Alaska Peninsula in Unit 9(D):

(1) the Southern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area is established to increase the Southern Alaska Peninsula Caribou Herd (SAPCH) on the mainland portion of Unit 9(D) to aid in achieving intensive management objectives; the control area includes all drainages of the Alaska Peninsula west of a line from the southernmost head of Port Moller Bay to the head of American Bay, encompassing approximately 3,819 square miles; [THIS WOLF CONTROL PROGRAM DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY FEDERAL LANDS UNLESS APPROVED BY FEDERAL LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCIES;]

(2) the discussion of wildlife populations and human use information is as follows:

(A) SAPCH population and human use information is as follows:

(i) the SAPCH was estimated to contain over 10,000 caribou in 1983; following a population decline to 1,500 caribou in the 90s, the SAPCH increased to 4,200 caribou by 2002 **before declining again to 600 caribou by 2007**; [SINCE 2002, THE SAPCH POPULATION HAS DECLINED TO FEWER THAN 800 CARIBOU;] **since 2007 the SAPCH has increased following the removal of wolves from the control area in the Southern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area during the 2008-2010 calving seasons**; a post-calving count of the SAPCH in **2009** [2007] estimated the herd size at **800** [600] caribou;

(ii) nutritional limitations are not currently implicated as a factor affecting the current status of the SAPCH;

(iii) 79 percent of cows that were 24 months of age or older exhibited signs of pregnancy in 2007 based on a random sample of 235 adults observed during an aerial survey; a similar pregnancy rate was observed in caribou marked with radio collars **in 2007**; **pregnancy rates remained high based on similar surveys in 2008-2010; pregnancy rates were 86 percent in 2008, 90 percent in 2009, and 91 percent in 2010**;

(iv) calf survival to one month of age was estimated to be less than one percent in 2007 based on 23 radio collared cows that exhibited signs of pregnancy; no calves were observed in the SAPCH during the post-calving count despite repeated efforts to find calves in caribou groups and locating 85 percent of the estimated total population; **calf survival to one month of age increased significantly following the removal of wolves from the control area in the Southern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area during the 2008-2010 calving seasons; calf survival to one month of age was 57 percent in 2008, 71 percent in 2009, and 65 percent in 2010**;

(v) research into calf mortality in the SAPCH conducted in 1999 documented a survival rate during the first two months of life to be 34 percent and survival during the first year of life to be 31 percent; cause of death during the first two weeks of life was primarily attributed to wolves and brown bears; **calf mortality studies conducted in 2008-2010 during a period of wolf removal from the control area of the Southern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area indicate that predation by wolves and brown bears remain the primary cause of death for calves in the SAPCH**

(vi) October calf-to-cow ratios declined annually since 2002, averaging 6.4 calves per 100 cows during the period of 2002 - 2007 (range 0.5 - 16); calf-**to-cow** ratios were one calf per 100 cows in 2006 and 0.5 calves per 100 cows in 2007; **since 2007 calf-to-cow ratios have increased following the removal of wolves from the control area in the Southern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area during the 2008-2010 calving seasons; calf-to-cow ratios were 39 calves per 100 cows in 2008, 43 calves per 100 cows in 2009, and 47 calves per 100 cows in 2010**;

(vii) bull-to-cow ratios declined to 15 bulls per 100 cows by 2007; the bull-to-cow ratio was [IS] expected to continue to decline based on the lack of calf recruitment in 2006 and 2007; **the bull-to-cow ratio reached a low of 10 bulls per 100 cows in 2008; since 2008 the bull-to-cow ratio has increased due to the increased calf recruitment that resulted from the removal of wolves from the control area of the Southern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area during the 2008-2010 calving seasons; the bull-to-cow ratios were 21 bulls per 100 cows in 2009 and 28 bulls per 100 cows in 2010;**

(viii) the harvestable surplus was [IS] estimated to be 0 caribou from [IN] 2007 to 2010 based on chronic poor calf recruitment **that occurred from 2003 to 2007** and reduced bull-to-cow ratios;

(ix) the intensive management population objective established by the board for the SAPCH is **1,500 – 4,000** [4,000 - 5,000] caribou; the intensive management harvest objective is **150 - 200** [200 – 500] caribou annually;

(x) reported human harvest peaked at 388 caribou in 1984; estimates of unreported harvest suggest that harvest may have exceeded 1,000 caribou annually during the 1980s; human harvest remained low during the brief recovery following an extended period of closures from 1993 - 1998; reported human harvest between 1998 and 2007 were not an important factor in the recent decline; **caribou hunting was closed from 2007 – 2010 to promote population recovery;**

(B) the predator population and human use information is as follows:

(i) wolves are a major predator of caribou on the Alaska Peninsula;

(ii) while no current aerial population survey data are available for the wolf population in the Southern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area, recent anecdotal evidence obtained from pilots and local residents indicates that wolves remain [ARE] abundant **in the Southern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area** [AND LIKELY INCREASING];

(iii) in 2008, the wolf population in the Southern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area was estimated at 60 - 80 wolves in 9 - 13 packs based on habitat type and prey base;

(iv) research into the causes of caribou calf mortality **on the Alaska Peninsula** indicates that wolves are responsible for 45 percent of the calf deaths during the first two weeks of a life; **based on the reduced calf mortality that occurred as a result of the removal of wolves from the control area of the Southern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area during the 2008-2010 calving seasons, it can be inferred that wolf predation accounted for 94 percent of caribou calf deaths in the SAPCH prior to wolf removals;**

(v) an average of three wolves (range of 0 - 6 wolves) were [HAVE BEEN] harvested annually in Unit 9(D) [SINCE] **between 2000 [- 2007] and 2006; during the period of wolf removal from 2007-2009, an average of 7 wolves were harvested annually by the public in Unit 9(D); predation management activities in the control of the Southern Alaska Peninsula Management Area resulted in the removal of an additional 28 wolves in June 2008, 8 wolves in June 2009, and 2 wolves in June 2010; the combined take of wolves averaged 19 to 25 percent of the pre-wolf-removal population estimate and is considered a sustainable rate of human-caused wolf mortality for a wolf population;**

(vi) the boundaries of the Southern Alaska Peninsula [WOLF] **Predation** Management Area correspond to the current and historic range of the SAPCH;

(vii) brown bears are important predators of caribou on the Alaska Peninsula; while brown bears have been known to kill adult caribou opportunistically, brown bears are effective predators of calves during the first 10 days of life;

(viii) brown bears are abundant throughout the Alaska Peninsula; spring brown bear density was estimated at 170 bears per 1,000 square kilometers in the Southern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area in May 2002;

(ix) research into the causes of caribou calf mortality indicates that brown bears are typically responsible for 30 percent of the calf deaths on the Alaska Peninsula during the first two weeks of life;

(3) predator and prey population levels and objectives and the basis for those objectives are as follows:

(A) the intensive management population objective established by the board for the SAPCH is [4,000 - 5,000] 1,500 – 4,000 caribou; the intensive management harvest objective is 150 - 200 [200 – 500] caribou annually; intensive management objectives were established by the board based on historic information regarding population numbers, habitat limitations, human use, and sustainable harvests; the estimated SAPCH population in July 2007 was 600 caribou; no human harvest was authorized during the 2007 – 2010 regulatory years;

(B) before May 20, 2008, wolf population objectives for Unit 9 were to maintain a wolf population that can sustain a three-year-annual harvest of 50 wolves;

(C) brown bear population objectives in Unit 9 are to maintain a high density bear population with a sex and age structure that can sustain a harvest composed of 60 percent males, with 50 males eight years of age or older during combined fall and spring seasons;

(4) justification, objectives, and thresholds for the predator management implementation plan are as follows:

(A) justification for the Southern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area is based on the board decision to designate the SAPCH as being important for providing high levels of human consumptive use; the board established the objectives for population size and annual sustained harvest of caribou in Unit 9(D) consistent with multiple use and principles of sound conservation and management of habitat and all wildlife species in the area;

(B) the objective of the Southern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Plan is to halt the population decline of the SAPCH and to achieve a population sex and age structure that will sustain the population; because 40 percent of the land area in Unit 9(D) is federal land and federal regulations restrict typical control methods, the program will not affect all wolves in Unit 9(D); the goal of this program is to remove all wolves from a focus area that will be defined annually by the department based on the distribution of caribou calving;

(C) the commissioner may initiate the reduction of wolf numbers in a predation management area on the Alaska Peninsula according to the following thresholds:

(i) the caribou population is below intensive management objectives established by the board and harvest objectives are not being met;

(ii) adult nutrition is not considered the primary factor limiting caribou population growth; and

(iii) calf recruitment is the most important factor limiting population growth and calf survival during the first four weeks of life is less than 50 percent;

(D) the commissioner may continue to reduce wolf numbers in predation management areas on the Alaska Peninsula until the following thresholds are met without the benefit of wolf control:

(i) the bull-to-cow ratio can be sustained within management objectives and the fall calf-to-cow ratios can be sustained above 20 [30] calves per 100 cows;

(ii) the population can grow at a sustained rate of 5 percent annually or the population objective is met; or

(iii) harvest objectives are met;

(E) the wolf population objective for the Southern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area is to annually remove all wolves from caribou calving areas within Unit 9(D); because wolves will not be removed from all lands within the [MANAGEMENT AREA] **Southern Alaska Peninsula Management Area** and because logistic limitations limit public access to the [MANAGEMENT AREA] **Southern Alaska Peninsula Management Area** and minimize public take of wolves, the majority of wolves in Unit 9(D) will not be affected by the management activities authorized in this plan **and the wolf population in the Southern Alaska Peninsula Management Area will be conserved;**

(F) the department will utilize radio-telemetry, wolf surveys, or a combination of those methods to ensure that a viable wolf population persists outside of active treatment areas on the Alaska Peninsula;

(G) reduction of predators by humans is necessary to stop the caribou population decline and promote recovery;

(H) reduction of wolf numbers in control areas defined by the seasonal distribution of caribou is expected to stop the caribou population decline;

(I) reduction of bear numbers remains unlikely due to the high density of brown bears in Unit 9(D), logistical limitations, and competing management priorities;

(5) the authorized methods and means used to take wolves are as follows:

(A) hunting and trapping of wolves by the public in treatment areas during the term of the management program may occur as provided in the hunting and trapping regulations set out elsewhere in this title, including the use of motorized vehicles as provided in 5 AAC 92.080; **the board finds that the opportunity to harvest the amount necessary for subsistence will continue to be provided by allowing ongoing hunting and trapping of wolves**

(B) the commissioner may issue public aerial shooting permits, public land and shoot permits, allow agents of the state to conduct aerial shooting, or allow department employees to conduct aerial shooting as a method of wolf removal under AS 16.05.783, including the use of any type of aircraft;

(C) the commissioner may authorize the use of state employees or state-owned or charter equipment, including helicopters, as a method of wolf removal under AS 16.05.783;

(6) the anticipated time frame and schedule for update and reevaluation are as follows:

(A) **through June 30, 2017** [FOR UP TO FOUR YEARS BEGINNING MAY 20, 2008], the commissioner may reduce the wolf populations in the Southern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area;

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

(7) other specifications that the board considers necessary:

(A) the commissioner shall suspend wolf control activities

(i) when prey population management objectives are obtained;

(ii) when predation management objectives are met; or

(ii) upon expiration of the period during which the commissioner is authorized to reduce predator numbers in the predator control plan area;

(B) the commissioner shall annually close wolf hunting and trapping seasons as appropriate to ensure that the minimum wolf population objectives are met.

ISSUE: Authorization for the Southern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Plan is scheduled to expire on May 20, 2012. While this program has been successful in many regards, the department requests that the plan be reauthorized so it can be utilized in the future to accomplish the objectives specified in the plan. If adopted, the proposal would reauthorize the plan for an additional 5-year period (expiring May 20, 2017).

The Southern Alaska Peninsula (SAP) caribou herd is recovering from a population low that resulted from a period of poor calf recruitment between 2002 and 2007. The recent increases are a direct result of active management efforts to reduce wolf predation on caribou calves during the time interval when calves are most vulnerable to predation. While the program has been very successful at increasing calf survival and recruitment, caribou harvest opportunity has not been restored in Subunit 9D.

In response to the severe population decline that occurred from 2002 to 2007, the department initiated a targeted wolf removal program to increase calf recruitment in the SAP. This was the first time the department used helicopters to remove the minimum number of wolves necessary from a caribou calving ground to increase calf survival. These efforts resulted in an immediate increase in calf survival and recruitment during the first year that the plan was implemented. After 3 years of implantation there was a significant increase in the SAP's population size and bull ratio and an improvement in the age structure of the population. Based on this early success, the plan was recessed after the first 3 years of implementation to allow biologists to monitor the herd's progress in the absence of the predation reduction program, but the main objectives of the program, to restore harvest opportunity and return the herd to the intensive management objectives, have not been achieved.

Despite the progress toward objectives, the department anticipates that there may be a need to reactivate the program in future years if calf survival declines while the program is recessed. To allow for a timely implementation of the program and to continue progress toward management objectives, the department requests that the board reauthorize the program for an additional five-year period.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If this intensive management plan is not reauthorized, management actions to reduce wolf predation on caribou will not occur if calf survival decreases as wolf packs reestablish themselves on the caribou calving grounds. If wolf predation becomes severe, population growth of the SAPCH will be inhibited, the reinstatement of harvest opportunity will be delayed, and progress toward program objectives will be hindered.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Implementation of this intensive management plan is necessary to rebuild the SAPCH and restore harvest opportunity. Harvest opportunity will be restored when the herd has recovered sufficiently to allow hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Future hunters

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

LOG NUMBER: ADFG042811T
