

MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska Department of Law

TO: Kristy Tibbles Executive Director
Alaska Board of Game

DATE: December 29, 2011

FILE NO.: JU2011200573

TEL. NO.:

FROM: Kevin Saxby *rkms*
Sr. Assistant Attorney General
Natural Resources
Anchorage

FAX:

SUBJECT: Board of Game: January 13-17,
2012 Anchorage Meeting:
Statewide Regulations; Cycle B

GENERAL COMMENTS

In general, ethics disclosures: Before staff reports begin on any new agenda item, or, if preferred, at the very beginning of the meeting, Ethics Act disclosures and determinations must be made under AS 39.52.

In general, record-making: It is very important that Board members carefully explain and clearly summarize on the record the reasons for their actions and the grounds upon which the actions are based. The Alaska Supreme Court has stressed the importance of a clear record to facilitate the courts in determining that the Board's actions are within its authority and are reasonable. A clear record also assists the public in understanding the Board's rationale. If board members summarize the reasons for their actions before they vote, it will help establish the necessary record.

In considering each proposal, and the specific requirements that apply in some cases, such as with the subsistence law, it is important that the Board thoroughly discuss and summarize on the record the basis and reasons for its actions. Consistency with past approaches is another important point for discussion. If a particular action does not appear to be consistent, Board members should discuss their reasons for a different approach.

The Alaska Administrative Procedures Act requires that State agencies, including the Board of Game, "[w]hen considering the factual, substantive, and other relevant matter, ...pay special attention to the cost to private persons of the proposed regulatory action." AS 44.62.210(a). This requirement to pay special attention to costs means, at a minimum, that the Board should address any information presented about costs, or explicitly state that no such information was presented, during deliberation of any proposal likely to be adopted. In our view, this requirement does not go so far as to

mandate that the Board conduct an independent investigation of potential costs, nor does it require that cost factor into the Board's decision more than, for example, conservation concerns might. However, it does require the Board to address and "pay special attention to" costs relevant to each regulation adopted.

In general, written findings: If any issue is already in court, or is controversial enough that you believe it might result in litigation, or if it is complex enough that findings may be useful to the public, the department, or the Board in the future, it is important that the Board draft and adopt written findings explaining its decisions. From time to time, the Department of Law will recommend that written findings be adopted, in order to better defend the Board's action. Such recommendations should be carefully considered, as a refusal to adopt findings, in these circumstances, could mean that the Board gets subjected to judicial oversight and second-guessing which might have been avoided. The Alaska Supreme Court has stressed the importance of an adequate decisional document, or written finding, to a determination that the Board has acted within its authority and rationally in adopting regulations, and has deferred to such findings in the past.

In general, subsistence: For each proposal the Board should consider whether it involves or affects identified subsistence uses of the game population or sub-population in question. If action on a proposal would affect a subsistence use, the Board must be sure that the regulations provide a reasonable opportunity for the subsistence uses, unless sustained yield would be jeopardized. If the Board has not previously done so, it should first determine whether the game population is subject to customary and traditional uses for subsistence and what amount of the harvestable portion, if any, is reasonably necessary for those uses. The current law requires that the Board have considered at least four issues in implementing the preference:

- (1) Identify game populations or portions of populations customarily and traditionally taken or used for subsistence; *see* 8 criteria at 5 AAC 99.010(b);
- (2) determine whether a portion of the game population may be harvested consistent with sustained yield;
- (3) determine the amount of the harvestable portion reasonably necessary for subsistence uses; and
- (4) adopt regulations to provide a reasonable opportunity for subsistence uses.

Reasonable opportunity is defined to mean "an opportunity, as determined by the appropriate board, that allows a subsistence user to participate in a subsistence hunt or fishery that provides a normally diligent participant with a reasonable expectation of

success of taking of fish or game.” AS 16.05.258(f). It is not to be construed as a guarantee of success.

The amount of the harvestable portion of the game population that is reasonably necessary for subsistence uses will depend largely on the amount of the game population used for subsistence historically and the number of subsistence users expected to participate. This may require the Board to determine which users have been taking game for subsistence purposes, and which ones have not. Once the Board has determined the amount reasonably necessary for subsistence uses, the Board should by regulation provide an opportunity that allows the predicted number of normally diligent participants a reasonable expectation of success in taking the subject game. In doing so, the Board must distinguish among the various uses, unless the harvestable surplus is so numerous as to be able to provide for all uses. The Board may base its determination of reasonable opportunity on information regarding past subsistence harvest levels of the game population in the specific area and the bag limits, seasons, access provisions, and means and methods necessary to achieve those harvests, or on comparable information from similar areas.

If the harvestable portion of the game population is not sufficient to provide for subsistence uses and any other consumptive uses, the Board is required to eliminate non-subsistence uses in order to continue to provide a reasonable opportunity for subsistence uses. If the harvestable portion of the game population is still not sufficient to provide a reasonable opportunity for all subsistence uses, the Board is required to eliminate non-subsistence consumptive uses and distinguish among the subsistence users based on the following Tier II criteria:

- (1) The customary and direct dependence on the game population by the subsistence user for human consumption as a mainstay of livelihood; and
- (2) the ability of the subsistence user to obtain food if subsistence use is restricted or eliminated. AS 16.05.258.

In general, intensive management: Under AS 16.05.255 (e), (f) and (g), the Board should assure itself that the steps outlined below have been followed when acting on proposals dealing with ungulate populations.

First - Determine whether the **ungulate** population is **important for high levels of human consumptive use**.

- If so, then subsequent intensive management analysis may be required.
- If not, then no further intensive management analysis is required.

Second - Is the ungulate population **depleted** or will the Board be **significantly reducing the taking** of the population?

The Board must determine whether depletion or reduction of productivity, or Board action, is likely to cause a significant reduction in harvest.

- If either is true, then subsequent intensive management analysis is required.
- If not, then further intensive management analysis is not required.

Third - Is intensive management appropriate?

(a) If the population is depleted, has the Board found that consumptive use of the population is a preferred use? Note that the Legislature has already found that “providing for high levels of harvest for human consumption in accordance with the sustained yield principle is the highest and best use of identified big game prey populations in most areas of the State ...” In the rare cases where consumptive use is not a preferred use, then the Board need not adopt intensive management regulations.

(b) If consumptive uses are preferred, and the population is depleted or reduced in productivity so that the result may be a significant reduction in harvest, the Board must consider whether enhancement of abundance or productivity is feasibly achievable using recognized and prudent active management techniques. At this point, the Board will need information from the Department about available recognized management techniques, including feasibility. If enhancement is feasibly achievable, then the Board must adopt intensive management regulations.

(c) If the Board will be significantly reducing the taking of the population, then it must adopt, or schedule for adoption at its next meeting, regulations that provide for intensive management *unless*:

1. Intensive management would be:
 - A. Ineffective based on scientific information;
 - B. Inappropriate due to land ownership patterns; or
 - C. Against the best interests of subsistence users;

or

2. The Board declares that a biological emergency exists and takes immediate action to protect and maintain the population and also schedules for adoption those regulations necessary to restore the population.

Comments on Individual Proposals

Proposals 38, 39 and 40: In amending the falconry regulations, the Board should determine whether limiting nonresident take and uses remains consistent with constitutional standards. The Board may limit or close nonresident uses when doing so serves a legitimate governmental purposes and the limitation or closure relates in some rational manner to a particular problem caused by the nonresident use. Conversely, there may be no legal reason or need to limit nonresident uses if the nonresident harvest is so miniscule as to have no effect on game populations.

Proposal 49: Some have questioned the constitutionality of previous versions of this proposal. It is the Dept. of Law's view that, as currently drafted, this proposal complies with all applicable constitutional principles.

Proposals 60, 61 and 77: The Board may adopt proposals along the lines of what is proposed, but better regulatory language will need to be developed.

Proposals 66, 67, 68 72, 73, 74, 75, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, and 89: All of these proposals suggest discrimination in favor of residents over nonresidents, in some fashion. The Board may limit nonresident uses more than resident uses when doing so serves a legitimate governmental purposes and the limitation relates in some rational manner to a particular problem caused by the nonresident use.

Proposal 71: Intensive management is not, currently, primarily applied to an area. Rather, it is applied to individual game populations. The Board would need to adjust several other regulations if it decides to switch to a primarily area-based approach. Also, this proposal raises the same constitutional issues addressed above for proposal 66.

Proposal 76: The Board may adopt regulations along the lines proposed here, but should ensure that any such regulations track AS 16.05.255(i) in doing so.

Proposal 105: It is already the law that if an animal is mortally wounded, it has been "killed" or "taken" and so, at least if the hunter knows it has been mortally wounded, it must be counted against the bag limit, salvaged, reported, etc. The Board could clarify this further, if it so desired.

Proposal 113: Any federal officer in Alaska that is considered to be a "police officer" or "an officer whose duty it is to enforce and preserve the public peace" is already defined by AS 01.10.101 and, more specifically, by AS 16.05.150 to be a "peace officer of the state" and is authorized to enforce Alaska's fish and game laws. The Board cannot change that grant of authority.

Proposal 128: The Board has no authority to establish fees.

Proposal 130: If this proposal is adopted, the title of 5 AAC 92.125 should be changed to “Predation Control and Intensive Management Plans,” as musk oxen have not been identified for intensive management.