

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

**REVIEWER LETTER**

*Dear Reviewer,*

**August 2012**

The Alaska Board of Game will consider the attached book of regulatory proposals at its meetings scheduled for **January through March 2013**. The proposals generally concern changes to the State's hunting and trapping regulations. Members of the public, organizations, advisory committees, and department staff submitted these proposals. The proposals are published essentially as they were received.

The proposals are presented as brief statements summarizing the intended regulatory changes. In cases where confusion might arise or where the regulation is complex, proposed changes are also indicated in legal format. In this format, bolded and underlined words are **additions** to the regulation text, and capitalized words or letters in square brackets [XXXX] are deletions from the regulation text.

You are encouraged to read all proposals presented in this book. Some regulations have statewide application and some regulations affect other regions of the state so please read all the proposals presented in this book.

In this book, proposals are grouped by the meeting to which they pertain (see *Proposal Index* for each meeting). Within each meeting the proposals are then organized by area. The proposals are listed in tentative order for which is they are intended to be considered during the meetings. The final order of proposals to be deliberated by the board, also known as the "roadmap" will be made available approximately two weeks prior to each meeting. However, the roadmap may be changed up to and during the meeting.

Before taking action on these proposed changes to the regulations, **the board would like your written comments and/or oral testimony on any effects the proposed changes would have on your activities.**

After reviewing the proposals, please send written comments to:

**ATTN: Board of Game Comments  
Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
Boards Support Section  
P.O. Box 115526  
Juneau, AK 99811-5526  
Fax: 907-465-6094**

Public comment, in combination with Advisory Committee comments and ADF&G staff presentations, provide the Board of Game with useful biological and socioeconomic data to form decisions. Written comments become public documents. The following are recommendations for providing written comments:

**Timely Submission:** Submit written comments by fax or mail at least two weeks prior to the meeting for which the topic will be considered (*See Tentative Meeting Schedule on Page vi*). Written comments received after the two-week period will still be accepted but will not be inserted in board member workbooks until the beginning of each meeting. If you provide written comments during a

board meeting, submit 20 copies to Board Support Section staff, who will distribute your written comments to board members. If including graphs or charts, please indicate the source.

**Length:** Prior to the two week deadline, the board will accept written comment of up to 100 single sided pages in length from any one individual or group related to proposals at any one meeting. After the two week deadline and during the meetings, written comment will be limited to 10 single sided pages in length.

**List the Proposal Number:** Written comments should indicate the proposal number(s) to which the comments apply. Written comments should specifically state “support” or “opposition” to the proposal(s). If the comments support a modification in the proposal, please indicate “support as amended” and provide your preferred amendment in writing. This will help ensure written comments are correctly noted for the board members. You do not need to list the Alaska Administrative Code (AAC) number.

**Do Not Use Separate Pages When Commenting on Separate Proposals:** If making comments on more than one proposal, please do not use separate pieces of paper. Simply begin the next set of written comments by listing the next proposal number.

**Provide an Explanation:** Please briefly explain why you are in support or opposition of the proposal. Board actions are based on a complete review of the facts involved in each proposal, not a mere calculation of comments for or against a proposal. Advisory committees and other groups also need to explain the rationale behind recommendations. Minority viewpoints from an advisory committee should be noted in advisory committee minutes along with the majority recommendation. The board benefits greatly from understanding the pro and cons of each issue. A brief description consisting of a couple of sentences is sufficient.

**Write Clearly:** Comments will be photocopied so please use 8 1/2" x 11" paper and leave reasonable margins on all sides to allow room for insertion into the board workbooks. Whether typed or handwritten, use dark ink and write legibly.

**Advisory Committees:** In addition to the above, please make sure the Advisory Committee meeting minutes reflect why the committee voted as it did. If the vote was split, include the minority opinion. A brief description consisting of a couple of sentences is sufficient. Detail the number in attendance (e.g., 12 of 15 members) and indicate represented interests such as subsistence, guides, trappers, hunters, wildlife viewers, etc.

Tentative agendas for each meeting are included in each regional section. Meeting information, documents, and a link to the audio is available through the Boards of Game website at: [www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov](http://www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov). Board actions will also be posted on the website shortly after the meeting.

Persons with a disability needing special accommodations in order to comment on the proposed regulations should contact the Boards Support Section at (907) 465-4110 at least two weeks prior to the scheduled meeting to make any necessary arrangements.

Kristy Tibbles, Executive Director  
Alaska Board of Game  
(907) 465-4110

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME  
2012/2013 PROPOSAL BOOK**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>INTRODUCTION SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE NUMBER</u>
Reviewer Letter.....	i-ii
Table of Contents.....	iii-iv
Guidelines for Public Testimony .....	v
Tentative Meeting Schedule .....	vi
Board of Game Long-Term Meeting Cycle.....	vii-viii
Board of Game Membership Roster .....	ix
Boards Support Section Staff.....	x

<u>PROPOSAL SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE NUMBER</u>
-------------------------	--------------------

**SOUTHEAST REGION (REGION I)**

Proposal Index .....	1
Meeting Agenda.....	4
Juneau Area – Units 1C, 1D & 5 .....	5
Ketchikan Area – Unit 2 .....	15
Petersburg Area – Units 1B & 3 .....	17
Regional and Multiple Units.....	23
Sitka Area – Unit 4 .....	36
Arctic & Western Regions - Reauthorization Proposals.....	47

**CENTRAL/SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION IV)**

Proposal Index .....	57
Meeting Agenda.....	62
Dillingham Area– Unit 17 .....	63
King Salmon Area – Units 9 and 10 .....	74
Glennallen Area – Units 11 and 13.....	94
Palmer Area – Units 14A, 14B, and 16 .....	134

Regional and Multiple Units.....	164
Interior Region – Reauthorization Proposals.....	181
Statewide.....	197

**SOUTHCENTRAL REGION (REGION II)**

Proposal Index .....	199
Meeting Agenda.....	203
Cordova Area– Unit 6.....	204
Anchorage Area – Unit 14C .....	209
Kodiak Area – Unit 8.....	220
Kenai Peninsula Area – Units 7 & 15.....	222
Regional and Multiple Units.....	243

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME**  
GUIDELINES FOR  
PUBLIC TESTIMONY &  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY

Persons planning to testify before Board of Game hearings must fill out a blue PUBLIC TESTIMONY SIGN-UP CARD and turn it in to the board's staff. Persons providing written material for the board members must provide at least **20 copies** to the staff; and **submit with your blue testimony card**. Do not wait until it is your turn to testify to submit written material, as it may not be distributed to the board in time for your testimony. **Provide a name and date on the first page of written material and identify the source of graphs or tables, if included in materials.**

When the chairman calls your name, please go to the microphone; state your name and whom you represent. At the front table, a green light will come on when you begin speaking. A yellow light will come on when you have one minute remaining. A red light will indicate that your time is up. When you are finished speaking, please stay seated and wait for any questions board members may have regarding your comments.

**If you wish to give testimony for more than one group** (i.e., yourself plus an organization, or advisory committee), you only need to turn in one sign-up card, listing each group you will be representing. When you begin your testimony, state for the record the group you are representing. Keep your comments separate for each group. For example: give comments for the first group you are representing, then after stating clearly that you are now testifying for the second group, give comments for that group.

Please be aware that when you testify you may not ask questions of board members or of department staff. This is your chance to make comments on proposals before the board. If board members and/or department staff need clarification, they will ask you questions. **A person using derogatory or threatening language to the board will not be allowed to continue speaking.**

Generally, the board allows five minutes for oral testimony, whether you testify for yourself or on behalf of an organization. The board chairman will announce the length of time for testimony at the beginning of the meeting.

Advisory Committee representatives are usually allowed 15 minutes to testify, and should restrict testimony to relating what occurred at the advisory committee meeting(s). Testimony should be a brief summary of the minutes of the meeting, and copies of the minutes should be available for the board members. An Advisory Committee representative's personal opinions should not be addressed during Advisory Committee testimony.

PLEASE NOTE: The time limit on testimony does NOT include questions the board members may have for you.

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME  
TENTATIVE MEETING DATES & LOCATIONS  
2012/2013 MEETING CYCLE  
SOUTHEAST, CENTRAL/SOUTHWEST, AND SOUTHCENTRAL REGIONS**

<b>MEETING DATES</b>	<b>TOPICS</b>	<b>LOCATION</b>
<b>January 11 – 15, 2013 (5 days)</b> <i>Comment Deadline – December 28, 2012</i> <i>ACR Deadline – November 12, 2012</i>	<b>Southeast Region</b>	<b>Sitka</b>
<b>February 8 - 15, 2013 (8 days)</b> <i>Comment Deadline – January 25, 2013</i> <i>ACR Deadline – December 10, 2012</i>	<b>Central/Southwest Region</b>	<b>Wasilla</b>
<b>March 15-19, 2013 (5 days)</b> <i>Comment Deadline – March 1, 2013</i> <i>ACR Deadline – January 14, 2013</i>	<b>Southcentral Region</b>	<b>Kenai/Soldotna</b>

**Agenda Change Request Deadline: 60 days prior to each meeting.**

**The proposal deadline for the 2013/2014 meeting cycle will be May 1, 2013 at 5:00 pm. The Call for Proposals will be open to regulations for the Arctic, Western, and Interior Regions. It will also be open for the Statewide Regulations, Cycle A Schedule.**

\*\*\*\*\*

Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
Boards Support Section  
P.O. Box 115526  
Juneau, AK 99811-5526  
Phone: (907) 465-4110  
Fax: (907) 465-6094  
[www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov](http://www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov)

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME**  
**MEETING CYCLE**

The board meeting cycle generally occurs from October through March. The board considers changes to regulations on a region-based schedule. Each region will be discussed on a two-year cycle. When the regional area is before the board, the following regulations are open for consideration within that region:

- Trapping Seasons and Bag Limits -- All species
- General and Subsistence Hunting Seasons and Bag Limits -- All species (Except antlerless moose hunts as noted below)
- Wolf Control Implementation Plans
- Bag Limit for Brown Bears
- Areas Closed To Hunting
- Closures and Restrictions in State Game Refuges
- Management Areas; Controlled Use Areas, and Areas Closed To Trapping

Regulations specific to an area (e.g., Permits for Access to Round Island) will be taken up when the board is scheduled to consider regulations in that Region. Proposals for changes to regulations pertaining to reauthorization of all antlerless moose hunts, 5 AAC 85.045, and all brown bear tag fee exemptions, 5 AAC 92.015, will be taken up annually.

The Board of Game does not consider proposals to statewide regulations in every meeting cycle. Instead, the Board of Game reviews statewide regulations on a four-year cycle, distributed between winter meetings, every other year. The list of statewide regulations and the associated “Cycle A” and “Cycle B” meeting schedule is set forth on the next page of this publication.

The proposal deadline is May 1 every year. **If May 1 falls on a weekend, the proposal deadline is the Friday preceding that weekend.**

<u>REGION:</u>	<u>MEETING CYCLE:</u>		
<b>Southeast Region (Region I)</b> Game Management Units: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2012/2013	2014/2015	2016/2017
<b>Southcentral Region (Region II)</b> Game Management Units: 6, 7, 8, 14C, 15	2012/2013	2014/2015	2016/2017
<b>Central / Southwest Region (Region IV)</b> Game Management Units: 9, 10, 11, 13, 14A, 14B, 15, 16, 17	2012/2013	2014/2015	2016/2017
<b>Arctic and Western Regions (Region V)</b> Game Management Units: 18, 22, 23, 26A	2013/2014	2015/2016	2017/2018
<b>Interior Region (Region III)</b> Game Management Units: 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, 26C	2013/2014	2015/2016	2017/2018

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME**  
STATEWIDE REGULATIONS SCHEDULE

**CYCLE “A” 2014, 2018, 2022**

**5 AAC Chapter 92 Statewide Provisions:**

- .001 Application of this Chapter
- .002 Liability for Violations
- .003 Hunter Education and Orientation Requirements
- .004 Policy for Off-Road Vehicle Use for Hunting and Transporting Game
- .005 Policy for Changing Board Agenda
- .010 Harvest Tickets and Reports
- .011 Taking of Game by Proxy
- .012 Licenses and Tags
- .013 Migratory Bird Hunting Guide Services
- .018 Waterfowl Conservation Tag
- .019 Taking of Big Game for Certain Religious Ceremonies
- .020 Application of Permit Regulations and Permit Reports
- .025 Permit for Exporting a Raw Skin
- .028 Aviculture Permits
- .029 Permit for Possessing Live Game
- .030 Possession of Wolf Hybrid Prohibited
- .031 Permit for Selling Skins, Skulls, and Trophies
- .033 Permit for Science, Education, Propagative, or Public Safety Purposes
- .034 Permit to Take Game for Cultural Purposes
- .039 Permit for Taking Wolves Using Aircraft
- .042 Permit to Take Foxes for Protection of Migratory Birds
- .047 Permit for Using Radio Telemetry Equipment
- .104 Authorization for Methods and Means Disability Exemptions
- .106 Intensive Management of Identified Big Game Prey Populations
- .110 Control of Predation by Wolves
- .115 Control of Predation by Bears
- .116 Special Provisions in Predation Control Areas
- .141 Transport, Harboring, or Release of Live Muridae Rodents Prohibited
- .165 Sealing of Bear Skins and Skulls
- .170 Sealing of Marten, Lynx, Beaver, Otter, Wolf, and Wolverine
- .171 Sealing of Dall sheep horns
- .200 Purchase and Sale of Game
- .210 Game as Animal Food or Bait
- .220 Salvage of Game Meat, Furs, and Hides
- .230 Feeding of Game
- .250 Transfer of Musk oxen for Science and Education Purposes
- .450 Description of Game Management Units
- .990 Definitions

**CYCLE “B” 2016, 2020, 2024**

**5 AAC Chapter 92 Statewide Provisions:**

- .009 Obstruction or Hindrance of Lawful Hunting or Trapping
- .035 Permit for Temporary Commercial Use of Live Game
- .036 Permit for taking a Child Hunting
- .037 Permit for Falconry
- .040 Permit for Taking of Furbearers with Game Meat
- .041 Permit to Take Beavers to Control Damage to Property
- .043 Permit for Capturing Wild Furbearers for Fur Farming
- .044 Permit for Hunting Black Bear with the Use of Bait or Scent Lures
- .049 Permits, Permit Procedures, and Permit Conditions
- .050 Required Permit Hunt Conditions and Procedures
- .051 Discretionary Trapping Permit Conditions & Procedures
- .052 Discretionary Permit Hunt Conditions and Procedures
- .057 Special Provisions for Dall Sheep Drawing Permit Hunts
- .062 Priority for Subsistence Hunting; Tier II Permits
- .068 Permit Conditions for Hunting Black Bear with Dogs
- .069 Special Provisions for Moose Drawing Permit Hunts
- .070 Tier II Subsistence Hunting Permit Point System
- .075 Lawful Methods of Taking Game
- .080 Unlawful Methods of Taking Game; Exceptions
- .085 Unlawful Methods of Taking Game; Exceptions
- .090 Unlawful Methods of Taking Fur Animals
- .095 Unlawful Methods of Taking Furbearers; Exceptions
- .100 Unlawful Methods of Hunting Waterfowl, Snipe, Crane
- .130 Restriction to Bag Limit
- .135 Transfer of Possession
- .140 Unlawful Possession or Transportation of Game
- .150 Evidence of Sex and Identity
- .160 Marked or Tagged Game
- .200 Purchase and Sale of Game
- .260 Taking Cub Bears & Female Bears with Cubs Prohibited
- .400 Emergency Taking of Game
- .410 Taking of Game in Defense of Life or Property
- .420 Taking Nuisance Wildlife

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME  
MEMBER LIST**

NAME AND ADDRESS	TERM EXPIRES
Ted Spraker, Acting Chairman 49230 Victoria Ave. Soldotna, AK 99669	6/30/2014
Stosh (Stanley) Hoffman P.O. Box 2374 Bethel, AK 99559	6/30/2014
Teresa Sager Albaugh HC 72 Box 835 Tok, AK 99780	6/30/2015
Nathan Turner P.O. Box 646 Nenana, AK 99760	6/30/2013
Nick Yurko 9412 Long Run Drive Juneau, AK 99801	6/30/2014
Pete Probasco P.O. Box 861 Palmer, AK 99645	6/30/2013
Bob (Robert) Mumford 13391 Baywind Drive Anchorage, AK 99516	6/30/2015

\*\*\*\*\*

Alaska Board of Game members may also be reached through:

**ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME**

Boards Support Section

P.O. Box 115526

Juneau, AK 99811-5526

(907) 465-4110 PHONE

(907) 465-6094 FAX

Boards Support Section website: <http://boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov>

Kristy Tibbles, Executive Director, Alaska Board of Game

e-mail: [kristy.tibbles@alaska.gov](mailto:kristy.tibbles@alaska.gov)

## **BOARDS SUPPORT SECTION STAFF LIST**

Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
Mailing address: PO Box 115526, Juneau, AK 99811-5526  
Physical location: 1255 West 8th Street  
Phone: (907) 465-4110; Fax: (907) 465-6094

### **HEADQUARTERS**

#### Board of Fisheries

**Monica Wellard**, Exec. Director II, 465-6095  
**Shannon Stone**, Pub. Specialist II, 465-6097

#### Board of Game

**Kristy Tibbles**, Exec. Director I, 465-6098  
**Frances Leach**, Pub. Specialist II, 465-4046

**Shaundy Petraborg**, Administrative Officer I, 465-6096  
**Fathom Whiteley**, Administrative Assistant I, 465-4110  
**Dani Cherian**, College Intern III, 465-6084

### **REGIONAL OFFICES**

#### Southeast Region (north of Frederick Sound)

**Frances Leach**  
PO Box 115526  
Juneau, AK 99811-5526  
Phone: 465-4046  
Fax: 465-6094

#### Western Region

**Alissa Joseph**  
P.O. Box 1467  
Bethel, AK 99559  
Phone: 543-2433  
Fax: 543-2021

#### Southeast Region (south of Frederick Sound)

**Shannon Stone**  
PO Box 115526  
Juneau, AK 99811-5526  
Phone: 465-6097  
Fax: 465-6094

#### Arctic Region

**Carmen Daggett**  
PO Box 689  
Kotzebue, AK 99752  
Phone: 442-1717  
Fax: 442-2420

#### Southcentral Region

**Sherry Wright**  
333 Raspberry Road  
Anchorage, AK 99518-1599  
Phone: 267-2354  
Fax: 267-2489

#### Interior Region

**Nissa Pilcher**  
1300 College Road  
Fairbanks, AK 99701-1599  
Phone: 459-7263  
Fax: 459-7258

#### Southwest Region

**Susan Jenkins-Brito**  
PO Box 1030  
Dillingham, AK 99576  
Phone: 842-5142  
Fax: 842-5514

# Southeast Region

---

## *Proposal Index*

### **Juneau Area – Units 1C, 1D & 5**

- 1 Increase the bag limit for deer in Unit 1C, mainland.
- 2 Open a youth only deer hunt in Unit 5A.
- 3 Extend the brown bear season and increase the bag limit for Berners Bay, Unit 1C.
- 4 Extend the brown bear season and increase the bag limit for Berners Bay, Unit 1C
- 5 Allow the resident harvest of one brown bear every two years in Unit 5A.
- 6 Shorten the black bear baiting season in Unit 1D.
- 7 Allow the incidental take of fisher in Unit 1C.
- 8 Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in Berners Bay.
- 9 Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in the Gustavus area.
- 10 Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season at Nunatak Bench.

### **Ketchikan Area – Unit 2**

- 11 Change the black bear hunting regulations for Prince of Wales Island, Unit 2.

### **Petersburg Area – Units 1B & 3**

- 12 Modify the definition of a legal moose antler for Units 1B and 3.
- 13 Modify elk drawing hunt area in Unit 3 to exclude Zarembo Island, and close season on Zarembo and associated islands.
- 14 Decrease season length and bag limit for deer in Unit 3, Lindenberg Peninsula.
- 15 Prohibit the use of motorized vehicles by marten trappers on the Tonka Road System in Unit 3, the Lindenberg Peninsula.

## **Regional and Multiple Units**

- 16 Modify the bag limit for goat in Units 1 and 4.
- 17 Close the taking of grouse hens in the spring for all Southeast Region Units.
- 18 Prohibit snaring bears in the Southeast Region.
- 19 Prohibit snaring bears in the Southeast Region.
- 20 Prohibit the taking of wolves March through November in the Southeast Region.
- 21 Align the trapping season dates for the Southeast Region.
- 22 Lengthen coyote trapping seasons in Units 1-5.
- 23 Open resident hunting seasons seven to ten days before nonresident seasons for Southeast Region Units.
- 24 Open resident hunting seasons seven days before nonresident seasons for Southeast Region Units.
- 25 Open resident hunting seasons ten days before nonresident seasons; allocate 90% harvest to residents, remove guide requirements and increase fees for Southeast Region Units.
- 26 Allocate 90% drawing permits to residents and eliminate nonresident participation in hunts with ten or less permits for Southeast Region Units.
- 27 Limit drawing permits to 10% for nonresidents for Southeast Region Units.
- 28 For Southeast Region Units, allocate a certain percentage of permits to nonresidents and eliminate nonresident participation for those hunts with a small number of permits.

## **Sitka Area- Unit 4**

- 29 Allow hunters to harvest one antlerless deer on Pleasant Island, Unit 4.
- 30 Establish a three-day doe season for Chichagof Island, Unit 4.
- 31 Limit the harvest of nannies and prohibit the taking of nannies with kids in Unit 4.
- 32 Alternate spring and fall bear seasons for nonresidents in Unit 4.
- 33 Shorten the season for brown bear in Unit 4.

- 34 Restrict the bag limit for brown bear in Unit 4.
- 35 Modify the brown bear harvest allocation for residents in Unit 4.
- 36 Exclude wounding loss from the annual brown bear harvest for Unit 4.
- 37 Extend the otter trapping season in Unit 4.
- 38 Lengthen the trapping season for marten and mink in Unit 4.
- 39 Lengthen the furbearer trapping season on Chichagof Island, Unit 4.

**Arctic & Western Regions – Units 18, 22, 23 and 26A**

- 40 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 18.
- 41 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 22C and the remainder of Unit 22D.
- 42 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 23.
- 43 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 26A.
- 44 Reauthorize the current resident tag fee exemptions for brown bear in Units 18, 22, 23 and 26A.

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME**  
**Southeast Region Meeting**  
**(Game Management Units 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5)**  
**January 11 - 15, 2013**  
**Harrigan Centennial Hall**  
**Sitka, 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, January 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, January 12, 8:30 AM**

**PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY Continued**

**BOARD DELIBERATIONS (Upon conclusion of public testimony)**

**Sunday, January 13 – Tuesday, January 15, 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 at: [www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=gameboard.meetinginfo](http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=gameboard.meetinginfo) 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](http://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 December 28, 2012 to make any necessary arrangements.

# Juneau Area – Units 1C, 1D & 5

---

**PROPOSAL 1 - 5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.** Modify the bag limit for hunting deer on Juneau mainland as follows:

The regulations would read: Douglas, Lincoln, Shelter and Sullivan Islands and the Juneau road system.

**ISSUE:** The mainland in Juneau is open for hunting bucks only. There are more miles of road to hunt from in Juneau than there is on Douglas Island where a person can take a total of four deer of either sex.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Nothing.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone who hunts deer.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Gary Miller EG042212541  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 2 - 5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer, and 5 AAC 92.530. Management areas.** Open a youth only deer hunt in Unit 5A as follows:

In Unit 5A, open a youth only, (18years of age or younger) hunt which would begin October 15th, two weeks ahead of the general hunt, which would begin as posted on November 1. Proxy hunts would not be permitted during the two week period for youth hunters.

**ISSUE:** The current general deer season opens November 1st for all ages and all areas. This makes for a somewhat congested hunt for everybody involved. We would like to have a two week head start hunt for youths only (18 years of age and under) to allow for a better chance for of our youths to experience a successful first hunt.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The status quo will be everybody, all ages, hunts at the same time lowering the odds for the young hunters.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Youths would have a better chance at a successful hunt, thereby instilling in them confidence to continue in the tradition of hunting, and family members will be able to experience the hunt with them.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** We considered having special youth only areas, but decided it would make things more confusing than just having an earlier season.

**PROPOSED BY:** Yakutat Advisory Committee EG050112611  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 3 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.** Extend the brown bear season and increase the bag limit for Berners Bay, Unit 1C as follows:

Brown/Grizzly Bear: Berners Bay and all drainages draining into Berners Bay: One bear every regulatory year by registration permit: March 15 - June 20.

**ISSUE:** Brown bear season in the Berners Bay area. The current regulations have a season of March 15 - May 31. Many years the snow and ice persists well into June, the bears are not accessible to hunt.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** A continued increase in brown bear numbers, (estimated at approximately two per square mile), and a moose population that, while not limited by available browse or habitat, remains too low to support hunting opportunities, The bear population could easily withstand a two to three-fold increase in harvest, and of course the Department of Fish and Game, in the event of any concerns, can invoke an Emergency Order Closure.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. The products produced would be moose. In time, a hunt that reflects the carrying capacity of this area could once again be provided.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Moose, moose hunters, brown bear hunters, and wildlife viewers would all benefit from a slight increase in brown bear harvest. It is presumed that an increased bear harvest would lead to a more robust moose population.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** It is unlikely that anyone would suffer.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Extending the spring season to run concurrently with black bear, open through June 30. This would be a viable option.

**PROPOSED BY:** Barry Brokken EG041612530  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 4 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.** Extend the brown bear season and increase the bag limit for Berners Bay, Unit 1C as follows:

In Berners Bay, portion of Unit 1C, season: March 15 to June 10, one bear ever year.

**ISSUE:** Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear in Unit 1C of Berners Bay: change bag limit to one bear every year; change season dates to end June 10 instead of May 31; up the percent for brown bear from four percent to fifteen percent.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There has not been a hunt in Berners Bay since 2006. The calves will not make it to the fall with over 75 brown bears and 150 black bears and wolves.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Increase brown bear hunting opportunity and possibly improve moose calf survival.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bear hunters and possibly moose hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Repeal the \$25.00 resident tag fee.

**PROPOSED BY:** Horst Schramm

EG050312624

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 5 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.** Allow the resident harvest of one brown bear every two years in Unit 5 as follows:

One brown bear may be harvested every two years by an Alaskan resident in Unit 5. Nonresident will remain the same, one brown bear every four years in Unit 5.

**ISSUE:** We would like to change the current regulation of one brown bear per four years for an Alaskan resident, to one brown bear per two years for an Alaskan resident in Unit 5.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will continue to be an unnecessarily long waiting period for Alaskan residents between brown bear hunts in 5A and 5B, (the Yakutat area). Some will look at like we are already harvesting about as many bears as we should be, and would be less inclined to have more bears taken. Our point is, it's an open registration hunt, there already exists the possibility that you could have twice the number of bear hunters come out on any given year, there's just not that much interest for brown bears. The reality of it is, this change likely won't amount to more than one or two extra resident bears per year, and absolutely no more risk of too many bears being taken than already exists now with the current open registration hunt. Our bear population seems to be extremely healthy.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Resident brown bear hunters who want to harvest a bear more often than every four years.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** We considered including nonresident hunters, but decided against it based on the potential of possibly harvesting too many bears, and not seeing the need as nonresidents mostly are content with a bear every four years based on our guide input.

**PROPOSED BY:** Yakutat Advisory Committee EG050112607  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 6 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures.** Shorten the black bear baiting season in Unit 1D as follows:

Open black bear baiting from June 1 (just after spring brown bear season closes) through June 31.

**ISSUE:** Brown bears being attracted to black bear baiting sites during spring brown bear season.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Brown bears will be shot at black bear bait sites.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** It eliminates the controversy and conflict between the two species.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The public's perception of taking brown bears at baiting sites.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Black bear baiting season will be shortened to four weeks from 12 weeks.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** A black bear hunter has eight weeks to get a spring bear; if unsuccessful he has four weeks to try baiting.

**PROPOSED BY:** Dave Werner EG053012712  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 7 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping.** Allow the incidental take of fisher in Unit 1C as follows:

Allow for the incidental take and retention of fisher in Unit 1C.

**ISSUE:** Trapping fisher.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The occasional fisher caught by a trapper incidental to marten trapping will continue to have to be surrendered to the Department of Fish and Game. This solves nothing. While this area is not considered fisher habitat, every once in a great while, one is harvested. While less than half a dozen are known to have been taken in the last 20 years, it is unknown if others were simply not reported. Allowing a season for trapping fisher, (with perhaps a limit of one), would allow the trapper to retain his catch, and with sealing or reporting requirements, could provide the Department of Fish and Game with any data that might be desired.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Under current regulation, any fisher caught must be surrendered. This provides no value to the trapper, and any value to the department could still be accommodated through sealing, hair and tissue sampling, etc. While it would likely prove futile to purposely attempt to target fisher in this area, any one captured incidentally should have value of some kind, be it monetary, or sentimental, to the harvester.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** A trapper who is fortunate enough to take a fisher, and the department, as sealing compliance would be expected at 100%.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Unknown.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo. This does not address the issue.

**PROPOSED BY:** Barry Brokken EG041512527  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 8 - 5 AAC 085.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in Berners Bay as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season  (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(1)		
...		
Unit 1(C), Berners Bay drain-	Sept. 15–Oct.15	Sept. 15–Oct.15

ages

(General hunt only)

1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 permits may be issued

...

**ISSUE:** Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the Board of Game. The Berners Bay strategic moose management plan calls for a post-hunt count of 90 moose, based on the estimated moose carrying capacity of this area. ADF&G has been very successful at maintaining this population level through the harvest of both bull and cow moose.

During 1998–2006, the number of drawing permits issued by the department for this herd ranged from 10 bull permits and 10 antlerless permits to 7 bull permits and 0 antlerless permits. The average annual harvest of bull moose during this period was seven, while cow harvests in years we issued antlerless permits was four. Although we have the latitude of issuing up to 30 permits annually, we haven't issued more than 20 permits annually during any of the past 10 years; and no permits were issued during the period 2007-2011.

The number of moose counted during the fall aerial surveys determines the number of drawing permits issued. Aerial counts during 1990–2006 ranged from a high of 108 moose in 1999 to a low of 59 in 2002. The fall 2006 count of 76 moose was just one lower than the mean annual count of 77 during 1990–2006. However, severe winter weather in 2006, 2007 and 2008 resulted in this population decreasing. The number of moose counted in replicate aerial surveys between 2007 and 2009 ranged between 33-62 moose. Surveys conducted in 2010 and 2011 detected 73 moose, including 10 calves each year. Based on the 2011 survey and sightability data from collared moose, the Berners Bay moose population is estimated to be near 108 animals indicating the population is slowly increasing.

As a result of the severe winters and the impacts they have had on this moose herd, we did not issue any permits in 2011 and due to the timing for drawing permit applications, there will not be a hunt in fall 2012. We will continue to monitor this population through annual composition and calving surveys, and use these numbers to decide whether or not we will issue any permits. In addition we will be collecting information on moose survival, mortality, and recruitment. If we begin to detect an increasing trend in moose numbers, and determine that this population is recovering, we can then decide whether a few permits can be issued. Very likely this would be only bull permits for the foreseeable future. In spite of this, we would prefer to keep the antlerless hunt available so we have this tool in the future if needed.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The population could increase and exceed the carrying capacity of the habitat as it has done in the past. The Berners Bay moose harvest will be restricted to bulls thereby limiting opportunity for hunters.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters will have more opportunity to hunt moose. The moose population will benefit from either-sex harvests that will balance the herd.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED:** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050412659  
 \*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 9 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in the Gustavus area as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
	<b>(Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	
(1)		
...		
Unit 1(C), that portion west of Excursion Inlet and north of Icy Passage		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side by registration permit only; or	Sept. 15–Oct. 15 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15–Oct. 15
1 antlerless moose	Nov. 10–Dec. 10	Nov. 10–Dec. 10
by drawing permit only; up to 100 permits may be issued	(General hunt only)	

**ISSUE:** Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the Board of Game (board). The Gustavus moose population (Unit 1C) increased rapidly from just a few animals during the 1980's to a count of 185 animals in 1998, to a subsequent count of 404 animals in 2003. By 2002 ADF&G estimated the winter range moose density at Gustavus exceeded 5 moose per km<sup>2</sup>, with

only a small portion of that area being productive winter range as identified by abundant stands of willow. Because of concerns with these high moose numbers, ADF&G biologists began conducting spring browse utilization surveys in 1999, and documented 85–95% of the current annual growth of willow twigs available to moose had been consumed.

Based on the browse utilization data and overall moose densities at Gustavus, an antlerless hunt was first authorized for the Gustavus area by the board in fall 2000. Between 2002 and 2008, hunters harvested 11 to 67 antlerless moose annually depending on the number of permits made available. A hunt was not held in fall 2007 due to high winter-related moose mortalities.

A goal of the Gustavus antlerless moose hunts is to control the number of moose on the available winter range to ensure the available habitat is adequate to support the animals utilizing it. Based on aerial survey data and the use of collared moose to determine sightability estimates it appears this strategy is working. During the period 2000-2009 aerial survey counts ranged from 207-404 moose; surveys in 2010 and 2011 counted 165 and 136 moose, respectively. In 2008, Gustavus calf survival decreased significantly to >10%. Surveys in 2010 and 2011 indicate calf numbers are increasing and the survival estimate for 2010 was near 20%, and better than 30% through summer 2011; the annual adult female survival estimate is 90% for the period 2004-2010. Improving calf numbers and stable adult female survival suggests the Gustavus moose population has the potential to increase. Sightability data from collared adult moose suggests the Gustavus moose population has stabilized at 250-300 animals.

Research was conducted on this moose population during 2003-2009 revealed cow moose in relatively poor body condition (as measured by rump fat thickness), and low reproductive indices (as measured by pregnancy and twinning rates) when compared to other coastal moose population in Yakutat and Berners Bay. Through the implementation of the antlerless hunts, the density of moose was lowered at Gustavus, resulting in improved body condition and reproductive indices and a more resilient moose population. The population is now at a level the department believes is sustainable with the available habitat.

Although an antlerless hunt was not held in 2011, biologists believe it is important to keep this tool available to implement should the moose population increase to a point where there is detrimental impacts to available habitat.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** This moose population could persist at a density too high for the habitat to support, thereby continuing the overutilization of winter browse. Ultimately biologists are concerned that the long range carrying capacity of this range could be compromised due to this over utilization of preferred winter browse species.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All persons interested in having a healthy moose population, and one that does not compromise the health of the habitat they depend on. Also, an antlerless hunt can provide additional opportunity for those people interested in harvesting a moose.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED:** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050412660

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season at Nunatak Bench as follows:.

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(3)		
Unit 5(A), that portion  south of Wrangell-Saint Elias National Park, north and east of Russell and Nunatak Fiords, and east of the east side of East Nunatak Glacier to the Canadian Border (Nunatak Bench)	Nov. 15 - Feb. 15	Nov. 15 - Feb. 15
1 moose by registration permit only; up to 5 moose may be taken		

...

**ISSUE:** Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the Board of Game. The Nunatak Bench (Unit 5A) hunt area is separated from adjacent moose habitat by fiords and glaciers, allowing for little immigration or emigration by moose. Therefore we manage this population separately from the remainder of Unit 5A, with a much longer and later running hunting season that spans the period of November 15 - February 15. Because of the isolated nature of Nunatak Bench and the limited amount of moose habitat, we have traditionally allowed maximum hunter opportunity through an either sex hunt, thereby aiding in our goal of limiting herd growth to stay within the carrying capacity of this area. The either sex hunt strategy accommodates the timing of this hunt given that much of the hunt period occurs post antler drop making sex differentiation difficult.

The Nunatak Bench strategic moose management plan calls for a post-hunt population of a maximum of 50 moose. A high of 52 moose were counted on the Nunatak Bench in 2001, after

which a decline in moose numbers was observed. During the period 2005-2011 (no survey in 2010) the number of moose counted has ranged from 11 to 14, with only 1 to 2 calves observed on each flight. The decline in moose numbers may be related to the 68 foot rise in water level that flooded this area in 2003 when the advancing Hubbard Glacier created a dam. A similar situation occurred in 1986 that caused a similar decline in moose numbers. The cause of the moose declines post flooding appears to be due to the decimation of preferred willow browse by the high water, causing emigration of moose from the area.

During 1997-2004 hunting seasons an average of 12 permits were issued, with only four people actually hunted each season. An average of eight days of hunting was expended each year to kill 0-4 moose, with an average annual harvest of about two moose. Six cows and nine bulls made up the total harvest during this period. No moose have been harvested since 2004 and the department has not issued any permits for this area since then.

Although the moose numbers at this time do not support a harvest, the department would like to keep this antlerless authorization active should the moose numbers again reach a harvestable level (25 moose). To date moose have not recolonized the area as quickly as they did in the past, and it is unknown if moose numbers will increase sufficiently to provide hunting opportunity. The department will continue to monitor this moose population and again allow a harvest when the survey counts reach or exceed 25 moose.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The harvest of moose at Nunatak Bench will be limited to bulls without any biological reason to do so. In addition, since much of the season occurs post antler-drop restricting the harvest to bulls would make it difficult for hunters to select a legal animal. Moose habitat is not abundant in this area and if herd growth is not restricted by a limited cow harvest, carrying capacity of winter range may be exceeded.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Adopting this proposal will provide more moose hunting opportunity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters will continue to have more opportunity to hunt moose. The moose population will benefit from either-sex hunts that will help balance the herd in this area of limited moose range.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED:** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050412661

\*\*\*\*\*

# Ketchikan Area – Unit 2

---

*Note: The Board of Game does not have the authority to change fees.*

**PROPOSAL 11 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear.** Change the black bear hunting regulations on Prince of Wales Island, Unit 2 as follows:

- 1.) Season: Black bear hunting season shall be the month of May, i.e. starting May 1 and ending 6:00 p.m., May 31.
- 2.) Bag Limit: All black bear hunters will be limited to one bear per year. Bait stations shall be limited to two per hunter.
- 3.) Fee: All bear hunters using a bait station shall pay a baiting fee of \$100.
- 4.) Registration: Bait stations can be registered by mail using GPS coordinates.
- 5.) Senior Hunters: Hunters over age 65 shall be able to bait within 1/8 of a mile from a road.
- 6.) Tag Fee: Black bear sealing tags fees shall be increased by \$50.
- 7.) Permit Draw: Eliminate having to draw for a permit.

**ISSUE:** The intent of the proposal is to change black bear hunting regulations on Prince of Wales (POW) Island to preserve hunting opportunities for future generations and improve trophy quality by changing black bear hunting regulations. This proposal is especially for Prince of Wales but could be considered for other areas. This proposal has been reviewed by several nonresident hunters who have hunted on POW for more than ten years. Our hope and objective is to preserve hunting opportunities for future generations and to improve trophy quality.

The present requirement of having to go to an office to register a bait station is arbitrary and unreasonable. With today's technical capabilities, GPS coordinates can precisely locate a bait station. If anyone cannot provide GPS coordinates, then they can go to the local Department of Fish and Game office and put a dot on the appropriate map. Requiring hunters to go to the office requires an extra day of precious vacation time and require extra expenses, plus using gas to get to an office adds pollution to the environment. In this era, most hunters have limited time to spend on red tape. Visits to an office severely reduces available hunting time and does not provide any information. The requirement to draw is not realistic. In today's world where jobs are in flux, many people do not know what their schedules will be for the following year and planning is difficult for draws so far in advance. If hunting season is reduced, the need for a draw will be eliminated. It also seems to be a big imposition for hunters to buy a 2013 tag in 2012 when one does not know if he will be lucky in the draw.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?**

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Black bear hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Richard Ziminzki

EG050312637

\*\*\*\*\*

# Petersburg Area – Units 1B & 3

---

**PROPOSAL 12 - 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions.** Modify the definition of a legal moose antler for Units 1B and 3 as follows:

Points that grow out of the base of the antler, commonly referred to as burr points shall not be counted when determining antler legality in the RM038 moose hunt.

**ISSUE:** In Units 1B and 3, there is currently inconsistency in how the Departments of Fish and Game and Public Safety deal with moose antler burr or rosette points. Sometimes these points are ignored if they tend to make an antler illegal and sometimes they are counted if they will make an antler legal. These antler burr points, which come out of the base of the antler and are either in the moose hair or very close to the hair are very difficult to impossible to see when hunting and judging moose and they should not count when determining the legality of the moose. Many of these points are very short, less than two inches, but they do meet the definition of a point.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will continue to be inconsistency in how antlers are judged in the RM038 moose hunt.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters, managers and enforcement personnel will all benefit by having a consistent way to determine the legality of moose antlers in RM038. Hunters will benefit by not being surprised by a point, which would make a moose illegal that they were not able to see because of its location.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Some hunters may suffer if they need one of these points to count to make a moose legal, however these points are difficult if not impossible to see when judging a live moose and probably were not seen before the moose was killed.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** I considered the status quo but I think it would be good for everyone if these points are dealt with in a consistent manner.

**PROPOSED BY:** Brennon Eagle EG043012583  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 13 - 5 AAC 85.035. Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk.** Modify elk drawing hunt area in Unit 3 to exclude Zarembo Island, and close season on Zarembo and associated islands as follows:

**5 AAC 85.035. Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk.**

**Resident**

**Units and Bag Limits**

**Open Season**  
(Subsistence and  
General Hunts)

Nonresident  
**Open Season**

(1)

Unit 3, that portion bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of **Stikine** [SUMNER] Strait and Clarence Strait, running Southeast following the midline of Clarence Strait, [DOWN THE MIDLINE OF SNOW PASSAGE, THEN EAST OF THE KASHEVAROF ISLANDS BACK TO THE MIDLINE OF CLARENCE STRAIT ] down to its intersection with Ernest Sound, then northeast following the midline of Ernest Sound, excluding Niblack Islands, to its intersection with Zimovia Strait, then northwest following the western shoreline of Zimovia Strait to its intersection with Chichagof Passage, then west along the midline of Chichagof Passage to its intersection with Stikine Strait, then **west and south** [NORTHERLY] along the midline of Stikine Strait, [WEST OF VANK ISLAND, TO ITS INTERSECTION WITH SUMNER STRAIT, THEN NORTHWEST ALONG THE MIDLINE OF SUMNER STRAIT] back to the point of beginning

1 bull by drawing

Sept. 1 - Sept. 30

Sept. 1 - Sept. 30

permit only, and by bow and arrow only; up to 50 permits will be issued; or

(General hunt only)

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 250 permits will be issued; or

Oct. 1 - Oct. 31  
(General hunt only)

Oct. 1 - Oct. 31

1 bull by registration permit only

Nov. 15 - Nov. 30  
(General hunt only)

Nov. 15 - Nov. 30

**Unit 3, Zarembo, Bushy, Shrubby and the Kashevarof islands**

**No open season.**

**No open season.**

Units 1, 2, and the remainder of Unit 3

1 elk

Aug. 1 - Dec. 31

Aug. 1 - Dec. 31

**ISSUE:** Since the inception of the elk hunt in Unit 3, both Etolin and Zarembo Island have been included within the draw hunt boundaries, and considered capable of sustaining elk harvest. In the mid 2000s however, the Department of Fish and Game became concerned with the lack of elk being seen by hunters on Zarembo Island. Precise population estimates for elk on Etolin and Zarembo islands are not available and are difficult to obtain due to difficulty in sightability due to rough terrain, dense vegetation, and elusive behavior by elk. Prior to the initiation of Unit 3 elk research in 2008, the department estimated the Zarembo Island elk population at roughly 75-100 elk in two distinct herds. This was based on anecdotal information from hunters as well as department survey flights. However, elk radiocollaring efforts initiated in 2008 led department biologists to suspect that the Zarembo Island elk population was likely lower than previously estimated. Few elk were seen during capture sessions, and little sign was seen along the beaches where elk usually reside during winter. Although only a single cow elk was collared on this island, the GPS locations and sightings during radio tracking efforts convinced department biologists that Zarembo Island supports just a single elk herd numbering approximately 35 animals. As a result, the elk hunting season on Zarembo Island was closed by emergency order in 2008 and has remained closed since.

Given that the Zarembo Island elk hunt has remained closed by emergency order since 2008, and is unlikely to reopen in the near future, we recommend that Zarembo Island be closed to elk hunting, and that the boundaries of the Unit 3 elk drawing permit be redrawn to exclude Zarembo Island until such time that the elk population on the island increases to a level capable of providing a harvestable surplus.

Concern exists that elk are being illegally harvested on Zarembo Island during the Region I general season elk hunt and falsely reported as having been taken on nearby Bushy and Shrubby islands, which are outside the drawing permit hunt area but open to elk hunting under the general season.

Therefore, to reduce the likelihood of elk being bootlegged from Zarembo Island during the general season elk hunt, we recommend that Zarembo, Bushy, Shrubby and the Kashevarof islands in GMU 3 be closed to the taking of elk (no open season).

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** It will be necessary to prolong the closure of the Zarembo Island elk hunt using discretionary authority. Bootlegging of Zarembo Island elk will likely continue to the detriment of the Zarembo Island elk population.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The quality of the resource harvested or products produced will be unaffected by this proposal.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Consumptive and non-consumptive users of the Zarembo Island elk resource who would like to see the Zarembo elk population increase to a level capable of providing a harvestable surplus.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who seek to use the Region I general season elk hunt as a means of exploiting the Zarembo Island elk population.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Close the general season elk hunt throughout Units 1-3. This was rejected because it conflicts with the department’s Elk Management Plan which seeks to restrict the distribution of non-native elk to only the Etolin and Zarembo island complex.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050412643  
 \*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.** Decrease season length and bag limit for deer in Unit 3, Lindenberg Peninsula as follows:

**5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.**

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
...		
<b><u>Unit 3, that portion of Kupreanof Island on the Lindenberg Peninsula east of the Portage Bay –</u></b>	<b><u>Oct. 15 – Oct. 31</u></b>	<b><u>No open season.</u></b>

## Duncan Canal Portage

### 1 buck

Remainder of Unit 3

Aug. 1 - Nov. 30    Aug. 1 - Nov. 30

2 bucks

...

**ISSUE:** The combined effects of habitat loss, three consecutive deep snow winters (2006/2007, 2007/2008 and 2008/2009) and predation by wolves and black bears has reduced deer populations to low levels on the Lindenberg Peninsula, Kupreanof Island. Presently the United States Forest Service (USFS) is finalizing plans to harvest 2,085 acres of productive old growth forest on the Lindenberg Peninsula. This harvest will be supported by up to 1.7 miles of new USFS road and an additional 7.6 miles of temporary road. The reduction of important forest habitat along with the increased access from proposed roads adds additional management concerns to this area that already has low deer numbers. We believe management action is necessary to prevent overexploitation of deer in this area.

From 1993 to 2002 the Lindenberg Peninsula was managed under a very restrictive 2-week deer season (Oct 15-31) with a 1-buck bag limit. In the wake of increased deer density, the deer season and bag limit on Lindenberg Peninsula were increased in 2003 to match the remainder of GMU 3 (4-month season (Aug 1 to Nov 30) with a 2-buck limit).

The Department of Fish and Game recommends that the deer season and bag limit on the Lindenberg Peninsula be returned to pre-2003 levels to mitigate (through conservative management) the effects of low deer numbers, additional winter habitat loss and increased access the proposed forest management activities will have on this area.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The deer population on the Lindenberg Peninsula may be harvested at unsustainable levels due to already low deer numbers that will be exacerbated by additional loss of winter habitat and increased access for hunters.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The quality of the resource harvested or products produced will be unaffected by this proposal.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those who are concerned with possible overexploitation of deer in this area due to the effects of proposed forest management practices.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Residents of Petersburg who do not have the means to travel greater distances to areas where deer are more abundant, and where seasons are longer and bag limits are higher.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo. This was rejected because low deer numbers, continued reductions in carrying capacity on the Lindenberg Peninsula, and increased access for hunters require immediate conservation measures.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050412645  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 15 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping and 5 AAC 92.540, Controlled Use areas.** Prohibit the use of motorized vehicles by marten trappers on the Tonka Road System in Unit 3, the Lindenberg Peninsula as follows:

The Department of Fish and Game recommends that a Controlled Use Area (CUA) prohibiting the use of motorized land vehicles for marten trapping be implemented for the Tonka Road System on the southern Lindenberg Peninsula. The Tonka road system is isolated from other road systems and has only one point of vehicle access, so this regulation would be easily interpreted by trappers and enforceable by the Department of Public Safety. Marten trapping along the southern Lindenberg Peninsula shoreline would be allowed to continue and would be unaffected by this proposal.

**ISSUE:** The US forest Service (FS) is finalizing plans (Tonka Timber Sale) to harvest up to 2,085 acres of productive old growth forest from the southern Lindenberg Peninsula in Game Management Unit 3. This will require construction of up to 1.7 miles of new FS road and an additional 7.6 miles of temporary road. Some of these areas are important marten habitats. In addition, increased road construction associated with forest management activities will increase trapper access and make the area’s marten population increasingly vulnerable to harvest.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Due to reduced carrying capacity and increased access, martens could be harvested at unsustainable levels on southern Lindenberg Peninsula.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fur trappers who would like continued, if somewhat reduced, access to the marten resource on the southern Lindenberg Peninsula.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** A limited number of marten trappers who currently use motorized vehicles to access marten trap lines along the Tonka Road system.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Close the marten trapping season within that portion of Lindenberg Peninsula located south of Petersburg Creek drainage. This was rejected as unnecessarily restricting shoreline access to the marten resource

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050412644  
\*\*\*\*\*

# Regional and Multiple Units

---

**PROPOSAL 16 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat.** Modify the bag limit for goat in Units 1 and 4 as follows:

If a nanny mountain goat is taken, the hunter is prohibited from hunting any goats in Units 1 and/or 4 for five regulatory years.

**ISSUE:** Reduce and discourage the harvest of female (nanny) goats in Units 1 and 4.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Possible Emergency Order or Board of Game season restrictions.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Reduced nanny harvest, therefore increased population recruitment.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Both hunters and viewers will benefit from stable and/or increasing goat populations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** A hunter that fails to take a closer look and harvests a nanny.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** A nanny is a legal goat and some hunters seem compelled to fill their tag at any cost.

**PROPOSED BY:** Zach Decker EG050312626

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game.** Close the taking of grouse hens in the spring for all Southeast Region Units as follows:

Units 1-5: Five per day except hens may not be taken after March 1.

**ISSUE:** Shooting hen grouse in the spring.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Nothing.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** There would be more grouse for hunting if the hens are protected in the spring.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** This will benefit everyone who hunts grouse because there would be a larger population. Those who currently hunt hens would be harmed.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Gary Miller

EG042212542

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping, and 5 AAC 92.125. Intensive management plans.** Prohibit snaring bears in the Southeast Region as follows:

Snaring of bears is illegal in Southeast Alaska Region (Game Management Units 1, 2, 3, 4, 5).

**ISSUE:** The 2010 decision to list bears as furbearers and the recent escalation of bear control policies concern many Alaskans of all user groups and walks of life, as demonstrated by tremendous ongoing public outcry. Authorizing a bear trapping season in Southeast Alaska is completely inappropriate and detrimental to the welfare of Southeast Alaskans. Bear trapping presents an unacceptable safety risk to the public. Bear snaring is inhumane. Bear snaring is an ineffective use of the resource and is scientifically/biologically/ecologically unsound. Bear snaring is bad for the economy of Southeast Alaska. Bear snaring presents law enforcement difficulties.

**SAFETY ISSUES:** Allowing bear snaring stations in the vicinity of residences, roads, and trails is irresponsible and unsafe. The public cannot know where bear snaring is occurring. The Department of Fish Game currently does not provide a map or locations where bear snaring bait stations are located; this puts the public at risk of inadvertently encountering a free-roaming adult, cub, or sibling of a bear caught in a snare. The only time of year conducive to snaring bears corresponds directly with other activities such as fishing, hiking, dog walking, camping, and berry picking. As bear snaring areas expand, the danger increases that someone will be hurt - either a trapper, his/her child (since children of at least 10 years old are allowed to accompany the adult who is trapping), or an innocent passerby. Because snaring is indiscriminate, young bears with mothers can be trapped, mothers of cubs can be trapped, and siblings can be trapped. The resulting danger presented, for example, by a free roaming sow whose cub is caught in a snare, is both tremendous and unacceptable. Additionally, bears can become food-conditioned (which is illegal in most circumstances), thus posing additional threats to people, including law enforcement officials and pets.

**HUMANE ISSUES:** Unless someone who can kill a snared bear immediately upon its capture is constantly attending a bear snaring site - which is not required, it is unlikely that a bear would not suffer as a result of being snared. Indeed, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) had to kill a brown bear due to injuries received from struggling to free itself in just a few hours of being caught in a snare in Unit 16. Despite the rhetoric of ADF&G, the fair chase ethic by which most Alaskans abide is affronted by the practice of bear snaring. Bears have been - and remain - an iconic species to Alaskans and visitors alike; bears deserve better treatment than this.

**SCIENTIFIC/BIOLOGICAL/ECOLOGICAL ISSUES:** Bear snares are indiscriminate, allowing the capture of all bears, including sows with cubs, cubs, and siblings. This method of take is not only socially and ethically unacceptable, but is also inconsistent with prudent scientific wildlife management practices. Because bears have a relatively low reproductive rate, the taking of sows with cubs and the taking of cubs have both been discouraged over the years. In fact, the productivity of brown bears is the lowest of any terrestrial mammal in North America. Bears play a vital role in Southeast Alaska's ecosystems by distributing nutrients brought from the sea by the five species of Pacific salmon that die after spawning; vegetation and other wildlife species in Southeast Alaska rely on the role that bears play. If too many bears are taken, it is difficult to bring the populations back up; as a result, entire ecosystems can suffer. ADF&G cannot insure that bears will not be overharvested by the use of snaring. At the 2010 Board of Game meeting in Ketchikan, there was much discussion and concern from ADF&G regarding the decrease in the black bear population in the southern Southeast panhandle, including Prince of Wales. The allowance of bear snaring in the southern Southeast panhandle on that account alone is unwarranted and inappropriate. There was also concern regarding the decrease of the black bear population in some northern Southeast panhandle game management units, including southern portions of Unit 1C. Additionally, there is still little evidence that intensive management even works over the long term.

**ECONOMIC ISSUES:** The negative impact on the bear populations that bear snaring would have is totally unacceptable and inappropriate in Southeast Alaska. This is a region which relies more and more on the strong and growing wildlife tourism industry, particularly given that the timber industry is no longer viable here. Wildlife viewing is an important and growing part of this region's and our state's economy and brings valuable economic development and benefits to many communities and businesses in Southeast Alaska. This has been clearly illustrated by the numerous proposals included in the 2011/2012 proposal book, particularly from the Ketchikan and Prince of Wales areas, requesting that this resource be conserved for the growing and thriving wildlife tourism businesses.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT ISSUES:** Alaska has fewer than 100 Wildlife Troopers to cover a state that is roughly 1/5 the size of the continental US, and with far more remote areas in it. Bear snaring would add a huge and unnecessary burden to our Wildlife Troopers, using resources, including time and money, that are already overburdened.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** It is likely that bears will become a diminished resource as a result of bear snaring. More people and pets will be faced with a public safety issue. The tourism industry will suffer, and thus the economy in Southeast Alaska will suffer. Southeast Alaska's ecosystems could suffer. Bears could become food-conditioned, thereby creating an additional hazard for people and pets. Enforcement of bear snaring regulations is problematic. The classification of bears as furbearers is a wasteful and inappropriate use of this resource. Alaska's already tarnished reputation for wildlife management will suffer even more, causing unrest in our state and damaging our tourism industry even more. Alaska's wildlife management policies will lose credibility with citizens, visitors, and potential visitors alike.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Bear snaring is an indiscriminate method of take. A trapper can still harvest a bear under a trapping license by using a firearm and bait station to attract a free roaming bear. Under this method, a trapper can be selective in harvesting a bear, thereby avoiding taking species not targeted, cubs, and females with cubs. Bear snaring is a wanton waste of our resources; prohibiting it benefits us all.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All Alaskans - including all user groups, and visitors who value wildlife and prudent science-based management of our wildlife resources will benefit. Ethical hunters who abide by the rules of fair chase will benefit. All Alaskans and visitors who want the opportunity to view bears and other wildlife will benefit. All Alaskans and visitors who want the opportunity to visit and/or live in intact ecosystems will benefit. The strong and growing Southeast Alaskan wildlife tourism industry will benefit, and thus the economy of Southeast Alaska will benefit. The reputation of Alaska and Alaskans will benefit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will suffer. Trappers will still be able to trap.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Declassify black bears as furbearers.

**PROPOSED BY:** Greg Brown

EG043012602

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping, and 5 AAC 92.125. Intensive management plans.** Prohibit snaring bears in the Southeast Region as follows:

Snaring of bears, black and grizzly, would be prohibited in the Southeast Region. The only exceptions would be for state wildlife personnel under specific emergency situations where a bear or bears have become a public nuisance or danger. Even then, it should be used only as a means of relocating the bears.

**ISSUE:** Snaring of bears, both black and grizzly, is being instituted in various areas of the state either on a public-activity basis or an experimental basis. With the classification of black bears as a furbearer subject to trapping, there is an incentive to take them in large numbers regardless of gender or the presence of dependent offspring. The result for an species with an extremely low reproductive rate is that both the present and the next generation are subject to removal from the population without any real regard to management. Bears caught in snares will be killed and any management changes to that situation would only take place after the damage is done.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** For one thing, wildlife management in Alaska as viewed by both residents and nonresidents will decline further in credibility and public acceptance. There is no real justification for this method or increased take, a position held by many Alaskans. Yet, it is being proposed by a handful of interested parties who have no reason other than yet another way to kill bears. Bear baiting, which is repugnant to many, both hunters and non-hunters, gives enough opportunity that snaring is not justified. To, enforcement by the wildlife division of the Alaska State Troopers is apt to be spotty at best. Presently, we have less than 100 wildlife troopers for the entire state. They are already stretched very thinly in terms of

manpower and resources just trying to maintain the hunting/trapping regulations already in effect. To expect them to additionally take on the burden of having to inspect a flood of snaring sites is likely to overwhelm their capabilities and lead to poorly-maintained sites without any real enforcement.

Additionally, there are the dangers to hikers and other non-consumers using the land who may come upon a situation where one bear is caught while its siblings or mother remain free in the area, creating the very real possibility of severe injuries or fatalities. The humaneness often touted as a feature of these snares is debatable. For an animal that has never been restrained to suddenly be unable to move more than a few feet in any direction is very likely to produce a considerable and stressful reaction. As the present proposals allow three days between checking snares, this means any bear caught will be going that entire period without water or food or the ability to protect itself against any other predator. That's assuming the snares are checked according to schedule. Therein again rises the problem of enforcement. Should a sow with cubs be caught, the cubs will be stressed severely by their mother's response. Equally, if a cub is caught, there will be an extremely stressed bear sow roaming the area.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** With liberal bear hunting seasons and bag limits, the widespread use of bait-stations, the onslaught against bears in Alaska has been increasing. This is a species with a low reproductive rate yet it has high value as a tourism draw with bears being one of the big three species most often cited as viewing opportunities. Rather than indiscriminate killing of bears, they should be managed with a view towards their vital role in a healthy environment. It is much easier not to create problems at the onset as opposed to trying to repair damage after it has been done.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Viewers of wildlife, both resident and nonresident, will benefit from the opportunities these animals present. In 2008, the entire revenue from hunting/trapping fees and licenses totaled \$124 million while the revenue from tourism was over \$538 million. Additionally, the ethical hunter that believes in fair chase will benefit by not having to deal with snare sites and the attendant problems and dangers thereof. The indiscriminate killing of bears would negatively impact healthy, sustainable bear populations, a situation affecting both hunters and non-hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Remove bears from the furbearer classification. I do not reject this; I heartily endorse it. With snaring in place, the opportunity for a black market in bear gall bladders is greatly enhanced as is the waste of bears. There is not a huge demand for bear pelts and not all bears taken by this method will have suitable pelts. The probability of wastage is high.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Wildlife Alliance

EG042912576

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 20 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping; 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf; and 5 AAC 92.125. Intensive management plans.** Prohibit the taking of wolves March through November in the Southeast Region as follows.

Wolf take is prohibited in all Southeast Region Units prior to November 1 and after March 1. That is, wolf take is prohibited between March 1 and November 1.

**ISSUE:** Currently, state law allows taking of wolves in some Units prior to November 1, while pups remain dependent on their parents. As well, state law in some Units allows taking of wolves after March 1, after mating has usually occurred and while females may be pregnant. The Board of Game should end this practice, as take prior to November 1 and after March 1 can result in substantially higher numbers of wolves lost to the population - pups - than are accounted for in harvest statistics. This unaccounted for loss of pups and breeding adults - which is likely very significant - causes a loss of additional recruitment to the population. As well, wolf hides are not in prime marketable condition prior to November in most areas, and thus taking wolves prior to November constitutes a waste of the resource.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If wolves continue to be taken prior to November 1, while pups remain dependent on parents; or after March 1, when many adult females are pregnant, wolf populations will continue to lose reproductive capacity and recruitment, causing an overall loss of population and erosion of family structure. This is a waste of a valuable resource.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. As stated above, hides of wolves taken prior to November 1 are of lower market value, and this is a clear waste of the resource. As well, the loss of dependent pups prior to November 1, or unborn pups from females taken after March 1, constitutes a clear and unnecessary loss of recruitment to wolf populations in all Units.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Wolf populations, wolf family structure and integrity, viewers of wolves, and science. As well, trappers and hunters will benefit as the proposal will result in an increase in wolf populations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Few, if any. The proposal will enhance wolf populations, which would then be more available for harvest by hunters/trappers from November - March.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Rick Steiner EG043012605  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 21 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping.** Align the trapping season dates in the Southeast Region as follows:

Essentially, beaver, coyote, red fox, lynx, marten, mink, weasel, muskrat, river otter, squirrel, marmot, wolf, and wolverine would have an opening day of trapping season of November 10.

**ISSUE:** Align the trapping season opening dates. Currently there are three different dates allowing the trapping of various furbearers in this area. This creates dilemmas for enforcement as well.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued challenges for law enforcement, the surrender of furbearers taken incidentally, resulting in little or no value.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Animals harvested incidentally out of season currently must be surrendered, giving them little or no value. With a simultaneous opening, the harvester can process the take responsibly, and receive the maximum value of the furbearer at the time harvested.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trappers who currently have to surrender an incidental take of an otherwise valuable furbearer.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Having all seasons begin November 1, the current opening for wolves. This was rejected allowing an additional ten days for fur to reach prime.

**PROPOSED BY:** Barry Brokken EG041512528  
 \*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping.** Lengthen coyote trapping seasons in Units 1-5 as follows.

Species and Units	Open Season	Bag Limit
<b>(2) Coyote</b>		
Units 1 – <u>5</u> [4]	<b><u>Nov. 1 - April 30</u></b> [DEC. 1 - FEB. 15]	No limit.
[UNIT 5]	[NOV. 10 - FEB. 15]	[NO LIMIT.]

**ISSUE:** Anecdotally, the coyote population appears to be increasing in Unit 1C. Over the past 5-10 years, coyote sightings have increased steadily to where reports of these animals are now common, and during the past few years sightings of coyotes have escalated. The Department of Fish and Game does not have an accurate assessment of their distribution, population size, or the number taken by trappers and hunters because sealing of coyote hides is not required. However, based on anecdotal information we do not have any concerns regarding coyote populations in these units. The current coyote trapping season closes on February 15 while the wolf trapping season extends to April 30. Wolf trappers have incidentally captured at least five coyotes in the past few years after

the close of the coyote season, and had to surrender them to the department. We expect this trend to continue given the surprising abundance of coyotes in recent years.

This proposal would extend the coyote-trapping season to match that for wolves in Unit 1C. However, we believe it is most practical to be consistent with the coyote-trapping season across the region, and therefore propose this change for all of Region I. Additionally, if this proposal is adopted, sealing should be required to allow the department to track harvest numbers and to gain insight into coyote distribution in the region.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Trappers will have to surrender coyote hides taken incidentally to wolf trapping.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** No. Coyote fur will be prime by the suggested start date of November 1. The ability to take coyotes concurrent with wolves will provide trappers with additional fur for personal use and/or the sale of fur.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trappers who would like to retain coyotes that were taken incidentally to wolf trapping.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Individuals who would like to see trapping curtailed rather than expanding opportunity.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Only extend the coyote trapping season end date. This solution is only partly useful if the intent is to allow trappers to retain coyotes taken incidental to wolf trapping; the wolf trapping season opens November 1 and the current coyote season opens December 1.

Extend both the coyote trapping and hunting season. This solution was rejected in favor of lengthening the coyote trapping season because current hunting regulations provides substantial opportunity (September 1-April 30) to hunt coyotes.

**PROPOSED BY:** The Department of Fish and Game EG050412646

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Hunting seasons and bag limits.** Open resident hunting seasons seven to ten days before nonresident seasons for Southeast Region Units as follows:

Resident hunting seasons begin seven to ten days before nonresident seasons in the Southeast Region Units.

**ISSUE:** Inequitable hunting opportunities for Alaskan residents. Most hunting states provide an early and/or extended hunting season for resident hunters. Alaska does not. We need to keep our residents fed and active in the management of our game, not depend nor allow the high dollar hunters from outside who support a very small portion of our economy through the use of guide

services. The local hunters are the folks who live here year around and keep the dollars local. We need to focus our game management on Alaskans.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Alaskan hunters will become disenchantred and revolt.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** No, just the quality of the hunt

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaskans.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** There really isn't any other solution, except to ban nonresident hunters completely, and that is probably not going to fly

**PROPOSED BY:** Shaune O'Neil EG042712557

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Hunting seasons and bag limits.** Open resident hunting seasons seven days before nonresident seasons for Southeast Region Units as follows:

Whatever opening date is determined for any species the new regulation would indicate the opening for nonresidents would be seven days later.

**ISSUE:** Big game hunting seasons in Region 1, open seven days before nonresidents for all species of big game.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** This will allow residents to have access to game populations without interference from nonresident hunters who may be utilizing professional guide services or hunting on their own. Opening day numbers will be thinned out, hunter transporters will be able to cater to more people, or at least spread the movement of people over more days and primarily allow residents a less chaotic hunt.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal would improve the quality of the hunting experience for the Alaskan resident. Our State Constitution indicates the wildlife resources belong to the people of Alaska. It should only be considered as fair for the people to have access to our wildlife resource without interference from nonresidents. Other states have the same limitations on nonresident hunters. The regulations should be no different in Alaska.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone will benefit from this proposal. Residents will have an opportunity to access game populations in a less crowded field. Nonresidents would share the same type of experience. With the opening day rush thinned out the remainder of all hunting seasons would be much smoother.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** I can't see any group suffering from this proposal. Hunting pressure would be thinned, commercial services would be spread out and Alaska would be in line with many of the other hunting states.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No other solutions considered.

**PROPOSED BY:** Terry Marquette EG042812561  
\*\*\*\*\*

*Note: The Board of Game does not have authority to remove the guide requirement for hunting certain big game animals nor to increase permit and tag fees.*

**PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits.** Open resident hunting seasons ten days before nonresident seasons, allocate 90% harvest to residents, remove guide requirements, and increase fees for Southeast Region Units as follows.

Start ALL resident hunting seasons for ALL species ten days prior to nonresident hunters. Remove the guiding requirement for sheep, goats, and brown bears. Raise ALL nonresident harvest tags and permit fees significantly! Allocate 90% of harvests to residents and 10% to nonresidents.

**ISSUE:** I would like the Board of Game to address the problem of favoring guides and their nonresident clients over the needs of Alaskan residents. Specifically, I would like the Board of Game to address the declining hunting opportunities residents are facing and the competition we face from the guiding industry in filling our freezers.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Residents will continue to see their hunting opportunities diminish. The Board of Game and the guiding industry will continue to claim that nonresident hunters provide monies for the management of our game and bring in much needed dollars to the State when in fact they don't. Residents live here, spend their money YEAR round, buy services and goods YEAR round and support a multitude of businesses in their pursuit of game. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game spends about \$42 million dollars per year in support of the commercial fishing industry, yet only receives about \$16 million in revenue from the commercial fishing industry. Clearly, if the Department of Fish and Game--and the Board of Game --were concerned about much needed dollars, we can find savings in other avenues.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** You bet. We live here and these are OUR resources. Not the feds, not nonresidents, and surely not the guides. The Board of Game needs to start to manage our wildlife for Alaskan residents and we have seen for too long now, declining populations of our game and most especially, declining hunting opportunities for us and our children. The future does not look bright if we continue--if the Board of Game continues to manage our wildlife species the way you have. We have an excellent Department of Fish and Game--some of the best and brightest biologists in the world--yet your actions, and in many cases, lack of action--has made them ineffective as managers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaskan residents--and that's all that really matters. That and our game resources. This should be the metric for each and every decision you make. Does it help the Alaskan resident--current and future? Your last meeting on the Interior failed in this regard on several fronts.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Guides and the guiding industry and that is fine with the vast majority of ALASKANS.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Continue on the same management path as you have--and that is unacceptable. It is time to put Alaskans First. It is time to think of Future Alaskans--specifically, our children. These are our game resources--we expect you to manage them for our benefit and for our children's benefit. The Board of Game--current and past-- has failed to do this, and I reject this as being acceptable.

**PROPOSED BY:** Jake Sprankle EG042912572  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits.** Allocate 90% drawing permits to residents and eliminate nonresident participation in hunts with ten or less permits for Southeast Region Units as follows:

For Southeast Region Units, a minimum of 90% of drawing permits will go to Alaskan residents for all species. If a certain Unit has less than 10 permits available nonresidents are not eligible to participate in that drawing.

**ISSUE:** Drawing permit preference for Alaska Residents – All species.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued conflict between resident hunters and commercial operators, degraded experience in the field for Alaska resident hunters. Alaska needs to put a cap of 10% on nonresident participation in drawing permits. This will put us in line with the other western states that have preferences for their residents which is usually 90% for drawing permits.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** An Alaskan preference for drawing permits will improve the quality of the hunt for resident hunters and give more opportunities to our youth. This will take away a lot of the conflict with sheep, goats, and brown bear where nonresidents are forced to hire a guide.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All Alaskans.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The commercial operators (guides) will complain on sheep, goats, and brown bears but the other western states don't force nonresidents to use a guide for any specie. The guides don't support preference points for residents or a high allocation of permits going to resident hunters. The commercial operators are using a resource we all own and

residents would like the Board of Game to adopt proposals that reduce conflict in the field between guides and resident hunters.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The Board of Game has been very kind to the guiding industry at the expense of the resident hunter. Nonresident tag fees bring a lot of money to the state and this helps support the Department of Fish and Game. How do other western states survive giving their residents high allocations of game? Other western states require nonresidents to apply for drawing permits (elk, deer, antelope, bear, sheep, goat, moose, cougar, etc.) Six to eight months in advance of the season, they have a preference point system, and high tag fees with no guide requirements. They make money to support their programs and give their residents very (usually 90%) high allocations of game. Nonresidents can come to Alaska the day before hunting season and buy a nonresident tag over the counter the day before the season at a fraction of the price other states charge. Why doesn't Alaska manage game for residents and our Fish & Game Department like other states? If the Board of Game doesn't start showing some preference to residents, Alaskans need to contact the governor and their representatives asking them to confirm board members who put residents as priority #1 or vote for politicians that support a preference for Alaska residents.

**PROPOSED BY:** Tom Lamal and Darcy Etcheverry EG043012580  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 27 – 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits.** Limit drawing permits to 10% for nonresidents for Southeast Region Units as follows:

Nonresidents will only be granted 10% of the hunting permits offered for any big game hunting permit drawing.

**ISSUE:** In the Southeast Region (Region I), nonresidents will be limited to receiving no more than 10% of the permits issued for any hunt drawing.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The wildlife resources of Alaska belong to the Alaska residents first and foremost. It is only fair that the bulk of hunting draw permits go to Alaskan residents first and a smaller portion be extended to nonresidents. Extending 10% of any hunting draw coincides with the percentage extended by other states for hunting permit draws. Without this nonresident limitation Alaskans who desire to use this resource, pay the application fee (which is non-refundable) and consequently get bumped by a nonresident are being denied access to their own resource.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal secures the Alaska resident as having first priority status for acquiring big game hunting permits through the drawing process.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The Alaska resident will benefit from this proposal.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will suffer.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No others considered.

**PROPOSED BY:** Terry Marquette

EG042812562

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 28 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits.** For Southeast Region Units, allocate a certain percentage of permits to nonresidents, and eliminate nonresident participation for those hunts with a small number of permits as follows:

I'd like to see a maximum number, say 15%, placed on nonresidents, allowed for all permitted hunts of all species. In those units with small numbers of permits, only residents should be allowed.

**ISSUE:** Nonresident hunters are allowed the same chance of drawing permits as Alaskan residents. This allows nonresident hunters to gain permits ahead of Alaskan residents.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Nonresidents will continue to get permits ahead of residents. Alaskan residents are discouraged by this process which gives nonresidents an undue advantage.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** I see improving Alaskan residents' hunting experiences as ADF&G's first priority. Hunting privileges for nonresidents is secondary, regardless of the financial aspects of permits and tags sold to hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All hunters who are Alaskan residents.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** I am sure that guides and commercial operators will oppose this as this will diminish their nonresident hunt numbers. Let us fully understand the primary consideration of the proposed change, which is to improve and preserve the Alaskan resident's privilege to hunt Alaska's game animals.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** I commend the Board of Game for their efforts to help us all participate in the good stewardship of Alaska's great resources. I am however, offended that the guiding industry in Alaska is given unfair consideration at the expense of the resident hunter. It is time for changes in Alaska's hunting regulations that will preserve our resident privileges and make our permit regulations consistent with other states.

**PROPOSED BY:** Steven Bunkowski

EG043012595

\*\*\*\*\*

# Sitka Area – Unit 4

---

**PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.** Allow hunters to harvest one antlerless deer on Pleasant Island, Unit 4 as follows:

We propose that hunters be allowed to harvest one antlerless deer per season on Pleasant Island, Unit 4.

**ISSUE:** Deer are being harvested in unsustainable numbers on Pleasant Island.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The quantity and quality of the deer herd will continue to decline to a point where recovery will be very difficult and take many years. Additional pressure on the Pleasant Island deer population due to a reduction in moose available for harvest in the Gustavus area will also contribute to further decline as effort shifts from moose to deer.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The quality of the resource will improve by allowing more deer to reach and sustain reproductive age, giving more opportunity to reproduce. This would improve the quantity and quality of the herd, improving the quality of the hunting experience and still allow hunting opportunities for all hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All hunters will benefit from a larger breeding population of deer.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The beach “hunters” who kill every animal they see and determine size and sex afterwards are not going to like this change. It will require them to get out of their boats and actually stalk animals in the woods. If that is “suffering” then they’ll suffer.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** We considered shortening the season, but that would concentrate the hunting pressure over a shorter period of time, lowering the quality of the hunting experience and not really address the issue of overharvesting pre-reproductive animals and reproductive females.

**PROPOSED BY:** Icy Straits Advisory Committee EG053112720  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.** Establish a three day doe season on Chichagof Island, in Unit 4 as follows:

Within the boundaries of the Northeast Chichagof Special Use Area, and available only to those hunters that reside within the boundaries of the NE Chichagof Special Use Area (must possess both a physical and postal address), a 3-day doe season, limit one doe per hunter, to commence the Friday immediately following the November Thanksgiving holiday.

**ISSUE:** To create, within the boundaries of the NE Chichagof Special Use Area, and available only to those hunters that reside within the boundaries of the NE Chichagof Special Use Area (must possess both a physical and postal address), a 3-day doe season, limit one doe per hunter, to commence the Friday immediately following the November Thanksgiving Holiday. This proposal is intended to be in effect only if there is a closure of the regular doe season in the NE Chichagof Special Use Area.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Largely because the venison of the late-season Blacktail buck deer is considered very poor table fare, and in spite of an emergency closure of the harvest of Blacktail doe, the practice continues. An authorized season will perhaps help to curtail this unauthorized harvest.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The venison of the late-season Blacktail doe is of much better quality than that of the late-season rutting Blacktail buck deer. This proposal might also help to address the problem of wanton waste regarding the harvest of late-season Blacktail deer.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The entire family of the successful hunter will benefit, as venison of the late-season Blacktail doe is of much better quality than that of the late-season rutting Blacktail buck deer. Also, as a result of this proposal, the less physically able hunters and the elderly hunters will have an increased chance of late-season success, as most buck deer in the more easily accessible areas have long since succumbed to early-season hunting pressure and are either in the deep woods or in the deep freeze.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** From a human perspective, we can see no negative impact as a result of this proposal. However, we do believe that hunters need to be made more aware of the role of emergency closures in protecting the sustainability of game animal populations.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** A longer special doe season was considered. It is, however, our belief that a shorter season might better address management concerns and provide a more controlled harvest.

**PROPOSED BY:** Icy Straits Advisory Committee EG050312636  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat.** Limit the harvest of nannies and prohibit the taking of nannies with kids in Unit 4 as follows:

Limit a hunter's ability to harvest a female mountain goat (nanny) in consecutive seasons after harvesting one. One goat by registration permit only, however, if a nanny is taken the hunter is prohibited from taking a goat in Unit 4 for five regulatory years; the taking of nannies with kids is prohibited.

**ISSUE:** Despite repeated departmental educational efforts to aid the hunter (mountain goat ID handbooks, quizzes, public forums) in determining the difference between billies and nannies, a

high nanny harvest continues. This proposal would allow us to directly affect those hunters unwilling to help reduce high nanny harvests that currently affect our declining goat population. This also is an effective mechanism to dissuade a hunter who mistakenly harvests a nanny to leave it on the mountain rather than risk a citation in a no-nanny harvest strategy.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** A small group of residents will likely continue to harvest a high percentage of nannies which can have significant impacts on declining goat populations for all hunters.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Reduction in the nanny harvest will aid the reproductive potential of the population providing greater hunter opportunities.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Both consumptive and non-consumptive users will benefit from increased goat populations (harvest and viewing).

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Hunters unwilling to take the time and effort to identify the sex of the goat.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** More closure areas, reduced overall hunting opportunity, goat ID quizzes.

**PROPOSED BY:** Max Russell EG050312639  
 \*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.** Alternate spring and fall bear seasons for nonresidents in Unit 4 as follows:

Modify the existing brown bear registration hunt for nonresidents in Unit 4 by allowing a hunting season on an every other year basis, with fall seasons being open in (odd years only) and spring seasons being open in (even years only).

**5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.**

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(3)		
<b>Unit 4, Chichagof Island</b> south and west of a line that follows the crest of the island from Rock Point	<b>Sept. 15 - Dec. 31</b> Mar. 15 - May 31	<b>Sept. 15 - Dec. 31</b> <u>(Odd years only)</u> Mar. 15 - May 31 <u>(Even years only)</u>

(58° N. lat., 136° 21' W. long.) to Rodgers Point (57° 35' N. lat., 135° 33' W. long.), including Yakobi and other adjacent islands; Baranof Island south and west of a line that follows the crest of the island from Nismeni Point (57° 34' N. lat., 135° 25' W. long.) to the entrance of Gut Bay (56° 44' N. lat., 134° 38' W. long.), including the drainages into Gut Bay and including Kruzof and other adjacent islands

1 bear every 4 regulatory years by registration permit only

Unit 4, that portion within the Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area

Sept. 15 - Dec. 31  
Mar. 15 - May 20

Sept. 15 - Dec. 31  
**(Odd years only)**  
Mar. 15 - May 20  
**(Even years only)**

1 bear every 4 regulatory years by registration permit only

Remainder of Unit 4

Sept. 15 - Dec. 31  
Mar. 15 - May 20

Sept. 15 - Dec. 31  
**(Odd years only)**  
Mar. 15 - May 20  
**(Even years only)**

1 bear every 4 regulatory years by registration permit only

**ISSUE:** The Unit 4 management of brown bears is guided by the Unit 4 Brown Bear Management Strategy (BBMS), adopted in 2000. The strategy was designed by a broad group of citizens and agency representatives; sponsored by the Board of Game and the Department of Fish and Game - Division of Wildlife Conservation. From 1998-2000, the group, known as the Brown Bear Management Team (BBMT) discussed a wide variety of issues concerning brown bears in Unit 4 to arrive at a consensus for the strategy. The BBMS has framed brown bear management in Unit 4 for over a decade. Brown bear populations in the Unit are currently

believed to be stable, but upward trends of human-caused mortality are a cause for concern/caution. Hunting harvest, primarily from non-resident hunters (more than 60%), is the largest, sustained, component of the mortality. Three-year average mortality guidelines (including high percentages of female bear harvest) established as part of the strategy, have been exceeded on two occasions and led to Emergency Order closures on Admiralty, Baranof, and Chichagof islands during the fall 2011 season.

Within the BBMS, recommended solutions toward addressing human-caused mortality that exceeds the recommended guidelines were focused on:

- Mandatory adjustment of number of guided hunters
- Season adjustments
- Institution of drawing permits

Little progress has been made in the past dozen years to adjust the primary cause of the majority of human-caused mortality, either in hunt numbers or in the number of guides as recommended by the BBMS. It would seem appropriate to initiate action to implement a season adjustment, specifically to restrict the harvest of brown bears by nonresident hunters in Unit 4 to every other regulatory year. In the meantime, a careful analysis should be conducted to examine why components of the BBMS have been ignored. The resident bear season would not be affected by this proposal.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The established hunt mortality guidelines will continue to be exceeded, resulting in emergency orders and disrupted hunts, and a loss of hunting opportunity.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The brown bear hunt for residents and nonresidents would be improved by implementing this regulatory change that would minimize the possibility of Emergency Order closures that disrupt hunts and take away harvest opportunity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All bear hunters and nonconsumptive users-stakeholders in the BBMS who agreed to a balance between consumptive-nonconsumptive uses of brown bears for the overall benefit of a sustainable, healthy bear population.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Nonresident hunters and commercial guides who prefer to hunt every year.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1.) Request that the USFS to make adjustments to the number of recommended guides (20) and number of allowable hunts by Guide Use Area by any combination of guides, thereby limiting the number of nonresident guided hunters. 2.) Establish a nonresident drawing permit hunt with limited permits. 3.) Change the fall brown bear season opening date from September 15 to October 15.

**PROPOSED BY:** Anthony Perkins EG050912719  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 85.020 Seasons and bag limits for brown bear.** Shorten the season for brown bear in Unit 4 as follows:

Open season (RB0770 **September 8-31** [SEPTEMBER 15-DECEMBER 31]).  
Open season (RB088 and RB089)- no change.

**ISSUE:** Reduce harvest of female brown bear in Unit 4. Most females are taken in the fall. Males leave creeks before females in the fall. Earlier fall opening and closing would result in fewer females taken.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Possible Emergency Order or Board of Game season restriction.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Fewer female brown bears harvested.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All brown bear hunters and viewers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Late fall and winter bear hunters.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** One week earlier opening will provide higher ratio of male bears. Very limited, if any, brown bear hunting occurs between October and December.

**PROPOSED BY:** Jimmie Rosenbruch EG050312625  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 34 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.** Restrict the bag limit for brown bear in Unit 4 as follows:

Hunters would lose hunting opportunity for eight regulatory years if female with under 20-inch skull is taken. Guides would lose one hunt allocation in one of the next two regulatory years after two females are taken under 20-inch skulls in one regulatory year.

**ISSUE:** Harvest of female brown bear with skull size under 20-inches combined length and width, including lower jaw.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Possible Emergency Order or Board of Game season restriction.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Reduced female brown bear harvest.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Brown bear hunters and viewers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Hunters who take female bears with under 20-inch skull size. Guides may lose hunt quota.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Female bears with under 20-inch skull is 'legal'. Some hunters insist to take a 'legal' bear despite a guide telling them “Do not shoot.”

**PROPOSED BY:** Jimmie Rosenbruch

EG050312627

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.** Modify the brown bear harvest allocation for residents in Unit 4 as follows:

Any increase in the brown bear, 4% harvest guideline for Unit 4 would go to resident hunters only.

**ISSUE:** Brown bear harvest guidelines as recommended by the Unit 4 Brown Bear Management Strategy is set at a 4% annual harvest basis. As such, it represents the most conservative harvest guideline in Alaska regarding hunting of brown bears. Kodiak, Alaska Peninsula and several other Units have brown bear conservation programs that have higher annual harvest guidelines which have proven to be sustainable.

We recognize that brown bears within Southeast Alaska may have special conservation needs that differ from these other regions and because of this, we would like for the Board of Game to understand that we feel that if you make any decisions regarding increasing the allocation above the existing four percent level, that the additional allocation would go to resident hunters only. There are plenty of guides and nonresident hunters in the field already and additional allocation for nonresident hunters would create additional conflict in the field concerns.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Possible emergency closures of brown bear hunting opportunity for all hunters who wish to hunt in this region. Also, additional conflicts in the field between guide service providers as well as resident hunters would increase if additional nonresident opportunity is created.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Increase in resident hunter effort is growing within this region. It would provide additional resident hunter opportunity if the Board of Game and the Department of Fish and Game find that conservation based opportunity exists.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Resident hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Nonresident hunters and any professional hunting guides who would like to see a higher level of allocation without knowing if a conservation basis does exist.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo but felt that the Board of Game may be inclined to increase opportunity and wanted them to understand our recommendations for resident hunters only.

**PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.** Exclude wounding loss from the annual brown bear harvest for Unit 4 as follows:

In keeping with the Unit 4 Brown Bear Management Strategy, wounding loss will not be calculated within the annual harvest.

**ISSUE:** All wounded brown bears are currently being counted as dead female bears within annual harvest summaries.

Wounding loss of brown bears in Unit 4 was well recognized at the time the Brown Bear Management Strategy (BBMS) was developed but was recognized as an indeterminate factor and one which probably has no measureable effect on bear populations. Quoting from BBMS, “ADG&G has no credible information on the magnitude of wounding loss and so does not typically include it as a factor in management equations or population modeling.”

The newly implemented practice of counting every wounded bear as a dead bear as well as a female bear is a deviation from the plan and one which unfairly raises the total human caused mortality figure. In many cases, when a hunter wounds and does not retrieve a bear it escapes and survives, and was not a female bear. It is unreasonable to consider every wounded bear as a dead bear and then also consider it a female bear.

We recommend that the wounding loss factor go away entirely in keeping with the BBMS and the historical harvest summary be adjusted to reflect this.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The annual Human Caused Harvest Summary will continue to be unfairly calculated and hunting opportunities will continue to be lost for all brown bear hunters in Unit 4.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. As it is being calculated currently, wounding loss is unfairly contributing to the overall harvest level and is thus contributing to the Emergency Closures that have occurred. If calculated as prescribed within the BBMS, the Emergency Closures would not have happened and more hunting opportunities would have been and will be provided in the future.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All hunters who want to participate within conservation based hunting opportunity for brown bears in Unit 4 will have a better opportunity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** We considered suggesting a ratio for consideration regarding what wounding actually results in mortality and what the mortality may be regarding female versus male bears. However, we found that the recommendations within the BBMS

regarding wounding loss were more appropriate and that those recommendations had been well vetted through development with the many user groups that were involved in its development.

**PROPOSED BY:** The Alaska Professional Hunters Association Inc. EG050412642  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping.** Extend the otter trapping season in Unit 4 as follows:

Unit 4 otter season would extend November 10 - April 30.

**ISSUE:** Currently, trapping seasons don't align, incidental species that are caught, must be turned over to the Department of Fish and Game. For example, a spring beaver trapper must turn in all otters caught while beaver trapping, after February 15. While beaver season runs to May 15. Since beaver ponds are good otter habitat, a certain amount of incidental harvest will occur. Trappers want to have the ability to legally retain and sell these otters. Otters throughout Southeast Alaska are found in high densities, but current seasons are so short, as to impede possible harvest, during the times fur is prime.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** A renewable resource will continue to be under-utilized, and incidental catches will have no value to trappers.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, otters that are currently turned over to Department of Fish and Game, would be sellable, thus gaining more income for trappers. Otters are a consistently underutilized resource, due to season restrictions. Extending the season would allow both incidental otters to be sold, and otter to be targeted over a longer time frame, for higher harvest numbers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All otter and/or beaver trappers in Unit 4.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Leaving the current seasons, as is. I rejected this, because as stated above, I believe otter are an underutilized species, due to season restrictions. I know of no biological reason otter season shouldn't be extended, as otters are at extremely high population levels, and densities, throughout Unit 4.

**PROPOSED BY:** Uriah Strong EG042512553  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 38 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping.** Lengthen the trapping season for marten and mink in Unit 4 as follows.

Marten and mink season open November 10 - March 15.

**ISSUE:** Short marten and mink season in Unit 4. Currently the Northeast portion of Chichagof Island is only open the month of December. The rest of the Unit is only December 1- February 15.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Marten and mink will continue to be an under-utilized species in Unit 4.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, trappers will be able to produce more fur, due to a longer season. Current seasons are unacceptably short, and limit a trappers ability to make a living.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trappers in Unit 4.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Maintaining current seasons. I rejected this, as I find December 1 - December 31 is far too short of a season for any realistic trapping effort. Marten and mink are in very high abundance throughout Unit 4, so I see no biological reason that the season should not be extended. Thus allowing trappers to put in more effort, and produce more fur during a longer season.

**PROPOSED BY:** Uriah Strong EG042512554  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 39 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping.** Lengthen the furbearer trapping season on Chichagof Island, Unit 4 as follows:

The regulation would move the start date of trapping season on state and federal lands on Chichagof Island to November 1. This would allow for an extra month of targeted efforts on marten in areas of the island not accessible later in the winter due to heavy snowfall closing the road system to all but snow machine travel.

**ISSUE:** We would like the board to extend the small furbearer trapping season on Chichagof Island by one month, beginning the season on November 1, rather than December 1. This extension would allow for the targeting of marten for a longer period of time and hopefully result in reduction of their numbers to a level that would allow the local bird populations to recover. The introduction of marten on Chichagof Island over 50 years ago has contributed to a serious decline in the grouse and ptarmigan populations on the island to the point that they are few and far between. This proposal would also afford local residents the opportunity to harvest fur for use in regalia and traditional dress where fur quality is not of primary concern but ease of access is.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The decline in bird populations will continue the result being a potential eradication of these game birds and other bird species from the island where they have been a traditional food source for island residents.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The proposal will improve the quality of the bird population and give individuals without access to snowmobiles the opportunity to harvest some of these furbearers. The potential for reduced fur quality at the earlier time in the season is not of major concern as the primary goal of this proposal is to reduce the pressure on the game bird species.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** People who customarily eat game birds will have access to greater populations. Individuals who cannot access the forest by boat or snowmobile will have a window to trap before snow closes the roads.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Individual trappers who already have established lines may find themselves facing competition from increased effort. A potential reduction in fur quality in the earlier part of the season may reduce prices at market for the fur. To some extent, the mink population may be affected but as they are primarily marine animals, this proposal would not change the numbers being harvested significantly.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Extending the season on state land to match the federal season doesn't afford the improved access as the roads are already closed.

**PROPOSED BY:** Icy Straits Advisory Committee EG050312635  
\*\*\*\*\*

# Arctic & Western Regions – Units 18, 22, 23, & 26A

---

**PROPOSAL 40 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(16). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.**  
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 18 as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(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		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 2 moose; only one may be an antlered bull; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Aug. 1-Sept. 30	
2 antlerless moose	Oct. 1 – Last Day of Feb.	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 antlered bull		Sept 1-Sept 30
Remainder of Unit 18		
1 antlered bull; or	Aug. 10 - Sept. 30	Sept. 1 - Sept. 30

1 moose

Dec. 20 – Last Day of Feb.

No open season

...

**ISSUE:** To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Two areas in Unit 18 require reauthorizations: Lower Yukon River hunt area and Remainder of Unit 18.

In November 2011, the Board of Game authorized antlerless moose hunts in the respective hunt areas through 'any moose' and antlerless moose bag limits. This follows a trend of increased opportunity at board meetings in 2007 and 2009, where regulations were adopted to liberalize bag limits and length of season. At proposal submission deadline in April 2012, the antlerless seasons in 2012-2013 are forthcoming and harvest information is not available. Based on the recent trend of substantial moose population growth and population parameters in the requested areas, 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 (Nov 2010) indicates calf:cow ratios of 69:100, twinning rates at 50%, and estimated minimum density of 2.8 moose/mi<sup>2</sup>. Anecdotal evidence suggests that calf survival rates remain high.

Lower Yukon harvest data for 2011-2012 has not been finalized prior to the proposal submission deadline. Due to increased opportunity, we expect harvests to be slightly higher than 2010-2011 when 255 moose were harvested, including 60 moose in the winter season of December 20 to February 28 (season extended by emergency order). The winter harvest included 25 antlerless moose (cows). Continuing antlerless moose harvest opportunity will benefit hunters and also help slow the growth rate of the population.

The Remainder of Unit 18 has under-utilized moose habitat and a growing moose population. Based on counts in 2006 and 2010, the population is estimated at above 4,000 moose. The most recent data (Nov 2010) indicates calf:cow ratios of 61:100 and twinning rates at 50%. Anecdotal evidence suggests that calf survival rates remain high.

Remainder of Unit 18 harvest data for 2011-2012 has not been finalized prior to the proposal submission deadline. Due to increased opportunity, we expect harvests to be slightly higher than 2010-2011 when 291 moose were harvested, including 115 moose in the winter season of December 20 to February 28 (season extended by emergency order). The winter harvest included 65 antlerless moose (cows). Continuing antlerless moose harvest opportunity will benefit hunters and also help slow the growth rate of the population.

**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 EG050712675  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 41 - 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:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(20) ... Unit 22(C)		
<b>RESIDENT HUNTERS:</b> 1 bull by registration permit only, or	Sept. 1-Sept. 14	
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; or	Sept. 15-Sept. 30	
1 antlered bull by registration permit only; during the period Jan. 1 – Jan. 31, a season may be announced by emergency order	Jan. 1 – Jan. 31 (to be announced)	
<b>NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:</b> 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)		
<b>RESIDENT HUNTERS:</b> 1 moose; however, antlerless	Aug. 10 - Sept. 14	

moose may be taken only from  
Dec. 1—Dec. 31; a person may  
not take a calf or a cow  
accompanied by a calf; only antlered  
moose may be taken from  
Jan. 1—Jan. 31

Oct. 1 - Jan. 31

**NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:**

1 bull with 50-inch antlers  
or antlers with 4 or more brow  
tines on one side, by registration  
permit only.

Sept. 1 - Sept. 14

...

**ISSUE:** To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Two areas in Unit 22 require reauthorization: Unit 22C, and the Remainder of Unit 22D.

In October 1999, the Board of Game authorized a registration hunt for antlerless moose in Unit 22C 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 22C moose population, which is believed to be at or near carrying capacity of its winter range.

The Unit 22C moose population has grown 2% annually during the period 2000-2010 and the current population is estimated at approximately 660 moose, which exceeds the departments' management goal of 450-525 moose. Calf:adult ratios vary annually from 16-34ca:100ad with an average of 24ca:100ad since 1990. 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 antlerless hunt has helped stabilize moose numbers in Unit 22C 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 22D we recommend continued authorization of antlerless moose hunting where moose populations are stable and hunting pressure is low. This portion of Unit 22D is relatively remote with difficult access and these factors contribute to limited hunting pressure in the area. The moose population has grown 1% annually during the period 1997-2011 and the estimated number of moose has increased from 578 in 1997 to 700 in 2011. This area typically shows higher calf:cow and calf:adult ratios than other parts of Unit 22, annually ranging from 14-35ca:100ad with an average of 23ca:100ad since 1988. The reported cow harvest in this area has been low, averaging one cow moose per year since 2000. Village harvest survey data (collected only in 2000-2001) shows five cow moose were harvested from Unit 22D 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 22D.

**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 EG050712677

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 42 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(21). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.**

Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 23 as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(21)		
Unit 23, that portion north of and including the Singoalik River drainage		
<b>RESIDENT HUNTERS:</b>	July 1 - Dec. 31	
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	
<b>NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:</b>		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		

Remainder of Unit 23

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

Aug. 1 - Dec. 31

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 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. The seasons and bag limits have not changed since they were adopted in regulatory year 2004-2005 and the reported harvest of cow moose has been low throughout Unit 23 despite generous 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.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(24). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.**

Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 26A as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
<u>(24)</u>		
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 26A are considered by this proposal: 1) the Colville River drainage upstream from and including the Anaktuvuk River drainage; and 2) the portion of Unit 26A 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 was, at that time, 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. Currently, this remote and inaccessible antlerless hunt area has a moose population that is decreasing primarily due to nutrition and predation rather than hunting pressure. In the past winter seasons, low numbers of cows have been harvested: two cows in 2006, three cows in 2007, one cow in 2008, one in 2009, and no cows in 2010 and 2011. A similar low harvest is anticipated for the current regulatory year. The low rate of antlerless moose harvest (0-3 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 26A 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 26A. 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, one in 2008, and none in 2009 -2011 during this hunt. We recommend reauthorization of the antlerless moose season in this portion of Unit 26A.

**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 EG050712679  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 92.015(a)(4), (8), (9) & (13), and 92.015 (b) (4), (7), (8) & (10)**

**Brown bear tag fee exemptions.** Reauthorize the current resident tag fee exemptions for brown bear in Units 18, 22, 23, and 26A as follows:

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

- ...
- (4) Units... 26;
- ...
- (8) Unit 22;
- (9) Unit 23;
- ...
- (13) Unit 18;
- ...

(b) In addition to the units as specified in (a) of this section, if a hunter obtains a subsistence registration permit before hunting, that hunter is not required to obtain a resident tag to take a brown bear in the following units:

- ...
- (4) Unit 18;
- ...
- (7) Unit 22;
- (8) Unit 23;
- ...
- (10) Unit 26(A).

**ISSUE:** The Board of Game must reauthorize brown bear tag fee exemptions annually or the fee automatically becomes reinstated. We recommend continuing resident tag fee exemptions for the general season and subsistence season hunts in Region V (Units 18, 22, 23, and 26A).

**General Season Hunts:** Reauthorizations are needed for: Unit 18, where the tag fee has been exempted for 1 year; Unit 22, where the tag fee has been exempted for 11 years; Unit 23, where the tag fee has been exempted for 6 years; and Unit 26A, where the tag fee has been exempted for 1 year. 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 Units 18 and 26A, tag exemptions have been newly authorized for 2012-2013 and summaries of harvest are not possible at time of proposal submission. In these GMUs, reported harvest has been with sustained yield for the preceding 10-year period. In Unit 22, during the tag-free period resident harvest has a 10-year average annual harvest of approximately 50 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 Units, 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 26A, 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

EG050712682

\*\*\*\*\*

# Central/Southwest Region

---

## *Proposal Index*

### **Dillingham Area - Unit 17**

- 45 Change the hunting regulations for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd in Units 9, 17, 18 and 19.
- 46 Modify the caribou hunting season dates in Unit 17.
- 47 Open a nonresident caribou season in Unit 17B with certain conditions.
- 48 Establish a nonresident registration hunt in Togiak National Wildlife Refuge in Unit 17A.
- 49 Decrease the bag limit for brown bear in Unit 17B.
- 50 Allow the sale of brown bear in Unit 17.
- 51 Change hunting regulations for black bear in Unit 17 to a bag limit of three bears per year and no closed season.

### **King Salmon Area – Units 9 and 10**

- 52 Restrict nonresident hunting opportunity in Unit 9.
- 53 Establish caribou hunting seasons and bag limits for the Southern Alaska Peninsula Herd in Unit 9D.
- 54 Modify the brown bear hunting regulations for Unit 9.
- 55 Eliminate the village registration permit hunts in Unit 9, allow the taking of nuisance bears, and/or open bear season.
- 56 Increase the brown bear bag limit in Units 9 and 10 for the RB525 hunt.
- 57 Modify the brown bear hunt area for the village registration permits (RB525) in Units 9 and 10.
- 58 Establish a Katmai Preserve, specific registration hunt for brown bear in Unit 9.

- 59 Allocate brown bear permits in Unit 10 and establish limits for number of applications allowed per guide.
- 60 Exclude National Park Service lands from certain wolf hunting and trapping regulations.
- 61 Modify the intensive management plan for the North Alaska Peninsula Caribou herd.

**Glennallen Area – Units 11 and 13**

- 62 Reauthorize the drawing permit hunts for antlerless moose in Unit 13.
- 63 Modify the cow moose drawing hunt for Unit 13.
- 64 Open a youth hunt for moose in Unit 13A.
- 65 Modify the Copper Basin Community Subsistence Harvest Hunt in Units 11, 12 and 13.
- 66 Repeal the community subsistence harvest hunt and other changes.
- 67 Repeal the community subsistence harvest hunt and conditions and establish a weighted subsistence drawing hunt.
- 68 Increase the number of people per group who can apply for the Copper Basin community subsistence harvest hunt.
- 69 Increase the any bull quota for the Copper Basin community subsistence harvest hunt.
- 70 Establish general harvest moose hunts for nonresidents in Unit 13.
- 71 Establish a nonresident moose hunt in Unit 13B; close the other Unit 13 subunits to nonresident hunting.
- 72 Repeal the exclusive hunting restriction for Tier I caribou in Unit 13.
- 73 Repeal the exclusive hunting restriction for Tier I caribou in Unit 13.
- 74 Allow the taking of brown bear over registered black bear bait stations in Unit 13D.
- 75 Open Unit 13 to brown bear baiting.
- 76 Open Unit 13D to brown bear baiting.
- 77 Open Unit 13 to brown bear baiting.

- 78 Open Unit 13D to brown and black bear baiting.
- 79 Exclude National Park Service lands from brown bear tag fee exemptions.
- 80 Modify the moose population and harvest objectives for Unit 13B.
- 81 Modify the moose population and harvest objectives for Unit 13.
- 82 Modify the wolf population objective under intensive management for Unit 13.
- 83 Modify the intensive management plan for Unit 13.
- 84 Establish a predator control program in Units 11 and 12.
- 85 Establish a predator control plan in Unit 11.
- 86 Close an area near Denali National Park in Unit 13 to taking wolves.
- 87 Allow use of off-road vehicles for elderly and/or disabled to hunt caribou in Unit 13.
- 88 Modify the hunting season open date and bag limit for Ptarmigan in Unit 13.
- 89 Establish and muzzleloader and archery hunt for Dall sheep in Unit 13A.
- 90 Modify the resident sheep hunt and bag limit for Unit 13.
- 91 Change the Dall sheep bag limit to full curl, convert the draw hunts to general hunts for Units 13 and 14A, and limit nonresident allocation.
- 92 Modify bag limit to full curl in Units 14A and 13D.

**Palmer Area – Units 14A, 14B, and 16**

- 93 Reauthorize the drawing permit hunts for antlerless moose in Unit 14A.
- 94 Modify the season and/or bag limit for moose hunting in Unit 14A.
- 95 Require moose hunters in Unit 14A to submit jaw bone and antlers to ADF&G.
- 96 Establish a winter antlerless moose hot-spot hunt in 14B and reauthorize the winter antlerless moose hunt in Unit 14A.
- 97 Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt on Kalgin Island in Unit 16B.
- 98 Modify the moose hunting season dates in Unit 16A.
- 99 Align the resident and nonresident moose season dates in Unit 16B.

- 100 Close the nonresident season in the Unit16 intensive management area.
- 101 Prohibit hunting with off road vehicles in Unit 16B until after 3:00 am following the day riding.
- 102 Establish a drawing permit hunt for caribou in Unit 14A and a winter season that can be offered if harvest opportunity exists.
- 103 Review and modify the Unit 16 intensive management program and the progress that has been made towards meeting the program's objectives.
- 104 Prohibit the snaring of bears in the Central/Southwest Region.
- 105 Prohibit the snaring of bears in the Central/Southwest Region.
- 106 Open Unit 16 to brown bear baiting for residents and nonresidents in the spring and fall.
- 107 Retain the current no closed season for brown bear in the remainder of Unit 16B.
- 108 Suspend/relax the intensive management of wolves in Unit 16.

### **Regional and Multiple Units**

- 109 Open resident hunting seasons ten days before nonresident seasons, allocate 90 percent of drawing permits to residents; remove guide requirements, and increase tag and permit fees for Central/Southwest Region Units.
- 110 Open resident sheep seasons seven days before nonresident seasons for the Central/Southwest Region Units.
- 111 Open resident sheep seasons seven days before nonresident seasons for Central/Southwest Region Units.
- 112 Open resident sheep seasons five days before nonresident seasons for Central/Southwest Region Units.
- 113 Open resident sheep hunting seasons five days before nonresident seasons for the Central/Southwest Region.
- 114 Open resident hunting seasons seven days before nonresident seasons for Central/Southwest Region Units.
- 115 Limit sheep drawing permits to ten percent for nonresidents for Central/Southwest Regions.
- 116 Limit drawing permits to ten percent for nonresidents for Central/Southwest Region Units.

- 117 Allocate 90% of drawing permits to residents for Central/Southwest Region hunts and exclude nonresidents in hunts with less than ten permits
- 118 Develop a permit allocation formula for second degree of kindred hunters in Units 10, 13, and 14.
- 119 Open coyote hunting year round in the Central/Southwest Region Units.
- 120 Close the taking of coyotes on National Park Service lands during summer months and reduce the bag limit in the Central/Southwest Region.
- 121 Prohibit the taking of wolves March through November in the Central/Southwest Region.
- 122 Reauthorize the brown bear tag fees for the Central/Southwest Region.

### **Interior Region**

- 123 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Units 19D, 20A, 20B and 20D.
- 124 Reauthorize resident grizzly bear tag fee exemptions throughout Interior and Eastern Arctic Alaska.
- 125 Create a youth hunt for Fortymile caribou.

### **Statewide**

- 126 Prohibit some pack animals from being used for big game hunting.

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME**  
**Central/Southwest Region Meeting**  
**(Game Management Units 9, 10, 11, 13, 14A, 14B, 16 & 17)**  
**February 8 – 15, 2013**  
**Best Western Lake Lucille Inn**  
**Wasilla, 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, February 8, 8:30 AM**

**OPENING BUSINESS**

Call to Order

Introductions of Board Members and Staff

Board Member Ethics Disclosures

Purpose of Meeting (overview)

**AGENCY 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, February 9, 8:30 AM**

**PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY Continued**

**BOARD DELIBERATIONS (Upon conclusion of public testimony)**

**Sunday, February 10 – Friday, February 15, 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 at: [www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=gameboard.meetinginfo](http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=gameboard.meetinginfo) 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](http://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 January 25, 2013 to make any necessary arrangements.

# Dillingham Area – Unit 17

---

**PROPOSAL 45 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou.** Change hunting regulations for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd (MCH) in Units 9A, 9B, that portion of 9C within the Alagnak River drainage, 17, 18, 19A and 19B. Under this proposal, hunting for Mulchatna caribou would change from the general hunt to a registration hunt. Seasons and bag limits would be aligned within the range of the Mulchatna Herd.

**5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. (a) ...**

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
...		
(3)		
Unit 9(A) and that portion of Unit 9 (C) within the Alagnak River drainage		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 2 caribou <b>by registration permit</b> ; however no more than 1 bull may be taken and no more than 1 caribou may be taken from Aug. 1-Jan. 31	Aug. 1 – Mar. 15	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		No open season.
Unit 9(B)		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 2 caribou <b>by registration permit</b> ; however no more than 1 bull may be taken and no more than 1 caribou may be taken from Aug. 1-Jan. 31	Aug. 1 – Mar. 15	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		No open season.
Unit 9(C), that portion north of the Naknek river and south of the Alagnak River drainage		

...

If the department determines that Mulchatna Herd caribou have largely replaced Northern Peninsula Herd caribou, **2** [3] caribou may be taken by registration permit only during a winter season between Jan. 20 and Mar. **15** [31] to be announced by emergency order

(Winter season to be announced)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

...

(12)

Unit 17(A), all drainages east of Right Hand Point

RESIDENT HUNTERS:  
**2** [1] caribou **by registration permit** may be taken during a season to be announced by emergency order

(Season to be announced)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

Remainder of Unit 17(A)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:  
**2** caribou **by registration permit**; however no more than 1 bull may be taken and no more than 1 caribou may be taken from Aug. 1-Jan. 31

Aug. 1 – Mar. 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

Unit 17(B), that portion in the Unit 17(B) Nonresident Closed Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:  
**2** caribou **by registration permit**; however no more than 1 bull may be taken and no more than 1

Aug. 1 – Mar. 15

caribou may be taken from Aug.  
1-Jan. 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

Remainder of Unit 17(B), and  
that portion of Unit 17(C)  
east of the Wood River  
and Wood River Lakes

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

2 caribou **by registration permit**;  
however no more than 1 bull  
may be taken and no more than 1  
caribou may be taken from Aug.  
1-Jan. 31

Aug. 1 – Mar. 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

Remainder of Unit 17 (C)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

(Season to be announced)

**2** [1] caribou **by registration permit**  
may be taken during a season to be  
announced by emergency order

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

(13)

Unit 18

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

Aug. 1 – Mar. 15

2 caribou **by registration permit**;  
however no more than 1 bull  
may be taken and no more than 1  
caribou may be taken from Aug.  
1-Jan. 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

(14)

Unit 19(A) that portion within  
the Lime Village Management

Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

2 caribou **by registration permit**;  
however no more than 1 bull  
may be taken and no more than 1  
caribou may be taken from Aug.  
1-Jan. 31

Aug. 1 – Mar. 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

Units 19(A) and 19(B) within  
the Nonresident Closed Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

2 caribou **by registration permit**;  
however no more than 1 bull  
may be taken and no more than 1  
caribou may be taken from Aug.  
1-Jan. 31

Aug. 1 – Mar. 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

Remainder of Units 19(A) and  
19(B)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

2 caribou **by registration permit**;  
however no more than 1 bull  
may be taken and no more than 1  
caribou may be taken from Aug.  
1-Jan. 31

Aug. 1 – Mar. 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

...

**ISSUE:** This proposal changes hunting regulations for the Mulchatna Caribou herd by changing the hunt structure from a general caribou hunt using a harvest ticket to a registration permit hunt in units 9 A, B & C, 17, 18 and 19A and B. The Department of Fish and Game also submitted an Agenda Change Request to the Board to include Game Management Units within the range of the Mulchatna Herd that was not on the call for proposals (Units 18, 19A, and 19B).

The Mulchatna Caribou Herd is presently under Intensive Management regulations, with predator control activities conducted in the major calving areas. Hunting seasons have remained open throughout most of the range of the herd as hunting mortality has not been considered an important factor in slowing herd growth. However, harvest reporting in some areas where Mulchatna caribou are taken remains problematic. Changing to a registration hunt throughout the herd's range would allow the department to better assess hunter harvest as well as the results of the Intensive Management program. In addition, the improved reporting will provide more information when responding to in-season requests to alter season dates and bag limits. The board and department have received regular requests from the public to extend the hunting season and requests from federal agencies to shorten or close the season. Improved reporting will allow the board to better address these concerns and ensure harvest opportunity is not lost.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Inaccurate harvest information will continue to be obtained.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** It is anticipated that more accurate harvest information will be obtained which will allow for better herd management and evaluation of the progress made towards achieving intensive management objectives.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** A better understanding of caribou harvest will enable managers to more effectively manage this herd.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050412652  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 46 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou.** Modify the caribou hunting season dates in Unit 17 as follows:

Close the caribou season in Unit 17 during the month of October and extend the season from March 15 to March 31. Bag limit would remain the same.

**ISSUE:** Harvesting caribou during the rut; and extending the season closing date from March 15 to March 31. Harvest of caribou during the rut when the meat is less desirable for human consumption is not the preferred time to hunt.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Prior to moving the season back from April 15, local hunters were accustomed to harvesting caribou in the spring to replenish their freezers after moose and fish were consumed. The month of April is the preferred time to put up dry meat while it is warmer but before the flies come out. When the season was moved back one month, local hunters lost opportunity to harvest caribou during the spring caribou migration. Along the Nushagak River, hunters wish to harvest caribou later in the spring while they are in closer proximity to the villages and reducing cost.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, closing the season during October will reduce waste. Caribou in rut does not taste good. Subsistence hunters do not hunt during the time when the caribou are in rut.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Local watershed hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those hunters who hunt caribou during the rut for “trophies.”

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Extending the season back to April 15. Though March 31 was a good compromise. When the Mulchatna Caribou Herd rebuilds, then we can reconsider lengthening the season again back to what it was before.

**PROPOSED BY:** Nushagak Advisory Committee EG041812533  
\*\*\*\*\*

*Note: The Board of Game does not have authority to change tag fees.*

**PROPOSAL 47 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou.** Open a nonresident caribou season in Unit 17B with certain conditions as follows:

Caribou hunting for nonresidents will be allowed on a limited basis on a guided hunt only basis. There will be no unguided hunts for nonresidents allowed to maintain excellent trophy selection and no more over harvest of caribou cows, calves, and subpar bulls. Tags will be sold at the rate of two tags per contracting outfitter who is licensed in a Guide Use Area at the price of \$1,000/tag. The tags being sold in this manner will greatly limit the number of caribou being taken and still allow some caribou hunting to keep hunting this area of Alaska on the minds of sportsmen from other parts of the country/world. The resulting nature of the tags will increase demand for Unit 17 as destination for trophy caribou hunters.

**ISSUE:** I would like to address the continued ban on nonresident caribou hunting. I have seen an increase in number of quality bulls in the field. It is time for nonresidents to be allowed to hunt them on a very limited basis.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will be continued pressure on the other caribou herds in Alaska causing the same fate as the Mulchatna Caribou Herd. Sportsmen from across the globe will lose interest in the area as a hunting destination. This will leave hunters to go to parts of Canada to get a good quality combination hunt for caribou and brown/grizzly bears. If this problem is not solved, there will be many years of lost income for the outfitters, villages, Alaska businesses who operate in the area.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** My proposal improves the hunting opportunities for both hunters and guides. It also brings in much needed money to the area/state because of the need for hotels, fuel, supplies, air service, tourism, etc. The most important dynamic that will be improved

is limited caribou hunting will recapture the attention of world hunters who are starting to focus their attention to other parts of the world and away from Alaska as a hunting destination. Areas such as Canada, Russia, Greenland, Africa are seeing a surge in demand for their hunts because of the direction the quality of some of the hunts in Alaska has gone in the last 10-15 years. This increase in attention will bring dollars into the area/state to help focus conservation programs from organizations such as the SCI on conserving the Mulchatna Caribou Herd instead of simply looking for a NEW area to send hunters. Limited hunting is better than no hunting for everyone and the resource.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters from around the world will benefit and so will the guides/outfitters who operate in Unit 17. The villages, and other service providers in the area will also see an increase in revenue and profits. Again, limited hunting is much better than no hunting. Right now we have zero hunting opportunity for non-resident caribou hunters in the area. Businesses all the way back to Anchorage will also see more money coming in from hunters who travel through to the Unit 17 destination. The \$1,000 tag cost will greatly increase the money received by the state and will pave the way for other similar opportunities throughout the state.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Currently, no nonresidents are allowed to hunt caribou in the area. So they won't be negatively affected. Guides in Russia, several provinces in Canada, Africa, and other parts of the Lower 48 will suffer from lost hunter's revenue because hunters will be spending their hunting dollar in Alaska instead of other places.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Limited tag lottery drawing would be an alternative solution. The current mind set of Alaskans and Alaska guides is that a limited tag drawing system is evil. This attitude will hamper the Board of Game and/or the State of Alaska from approving the limited tag drawing system do to a concern for political correctness. However, the current situation of no nonresident caribou hunting allowed in the area may make the limited tag drawing system seem like a good alternative because with the limited tag drawing system, hunting would be allowed. To repeat myself one more time, some hunting is better than no hunting; for the profitability of guides, outfitters, service providers, fuel users, etc. Thanks for considering bringing back limited caribou hunting opportunity for nonresident hunters.

**PROPOSED BY:** Willie Dvorak EG021012516  
 \*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 48 - 5 AAC 85.045 Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Establish a nonresident registration hunt in Togiak National Wildlife Refuge in Unit 17A as follows:

<b>Units and bag limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
Unit 17(A)		

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by registration  
; or

Aug. 25 - Sept. 20  
(Subsistence hunt only)

1 antlered bull by  
registration permit;  
during the period  
Dec. 1 - Jan. 31, a season of  
up to 14 days may be  
announced by emergency order

Dec. 1 - Jan. 31  
(Subsistence hunt only)  
(To be announced)

**NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:**  
**That portion within the Togiak National**  
**Wildlife Refuge; one bull with 50 inch,**  
**4 brow tines on one side**

**[NO OPEN SEASON.]**  
**September 1-20**

**ISSUE:** Moose populations in the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge (TNWR) have been increasing and resident hunting seasons and bag limits are liberal. Most lands near villages are not included in the TNWR so the refuge boundaries were chosen to minimize conflicts with local subsistence hunters. There are many remote areas of the Togiak Refuge that are used very little, if at all by local residents. After a discussion with the Togiak Advisory Committee Chair in 2011, I believe there may be a better boundary line than the Refuge boundary but this would need to be worked out in committee.

During the last board cycle it was explained that even though the moose population has exploded in this area, nonresidents will be excluded until moose in the area exceed their carrying capacity, which they are theoretically quickly approaching. This is the only time I have ever heard a hard number associated with carrying capacity in Alaska moose management. The use of carrying capacity to determine participation in a hunt seems counter intuitive. By definition, when you exceed the carrying capacity, the population will start to decline immediately, therefore falling below the threshold to ever allow participation. In most ungulate management situations biologists strive to not reach the carrying capacity for fear of a weather or disease related crash. I suspect this situation is no different. The season has been liberalized to include any-bull hunts, winter hunts, and cow hunts in past years, all methods to slow the growth of a herd. If these methods are successful in slowing the growth so the carrying capacity is not reached, nonresidents will never be allowed to hunt in this area under the current plan.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Nothing, status quo

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Nonresident hunters that have not had the opportunity to hunt moose in this National Wildlife Refuge, of which they are the trustees.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Include the Portion of TNWR in Unit 18, out of cycle for this meeting

**PROPOSED BY:** Aaron Bloomquist EG050712687  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 49 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.** Decrease the bag limit for brown bear in Unit 17B as follows:

The bag limit for all hunters in Unit 17 for brown/grizzly bears is one bear.

**ISSUE:** The regulations state that there is now a two brown bear bag limit for hunters. It should be changed to one bear per year.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Brown bears are arguably the greatest trophy North America has to offer hunters from around the world. If the bag limit is left at two, guides will encourage hunters to take the second animal. This does four things: 1.) Double the kill rate of a trophy animal; 2.) Decrease the perceived/actual worth of brown/grizzly bears as a trophy animal; 3.) Destroy/overharvest the species that best offers outfitters to make a living in Unit 17; 4.) Further eliminate the desire for nonresident/alien hunters to bring money into the area and State of Alaska.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** My proposal improves the quality of the resource of both numbers of brown/grizzly bears and their ability to become huge.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All outfitters and hunters who hunt in Unit 17 will benefit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Outfitters who hunt Russia and Canada stand to loose business due to excellent hunting for brown/grizzly bears in Unit 17.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Other solutions would be to mandate a payment to the state for the second brown bear taken by the outfitter/hunter to deter taking the second animal. I reject it because of the paperwork involved and the public relations/legal problems that would arise from such a solution.

**PROPOSED BY:** Willie Dvorak EG020912515  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 50 - 5 AAC 92.200. Purchase and sale of game.** Allow the sale of brown bear hides and skulls from Unit 17.

Brown bear hides and skulls may be sold but they must be sealed prior to sale in Unit 17.

**ISSUE:** Brown bears are very plentiful in Game Management Unit 17. Allow the sale of brown bear hides and skulls.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Brown bears are plentiful in Unit 17. Liberalization of bag limit, time and season has not affected brown bear populations, they are still very plentiful and are still increasing in numbers. They predate on moose and caribou, especially during the calving season. In regulation, black bear hides and skulls may be sold but they must be sealed prior to sale. We want to allow the sale of brown bear hides and skulls. This would provide additional economic opportunity hunters.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** It provides economic opportunity for local hunters in Game Management Unit 17.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Local hunters and hand-crafters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Nushagak Advisory Committee EG041212526  
\*\*\*\*\*

*This proposal was submitted at the request of the Board of Game.*

**PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear.** Change hunting regulations for black bear in Unit 17 to a bag limit of three bears per year and no closed season.

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

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
2		
...		
Unit 17		

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

3 [2] bears

No closed season  
[AUG. 1-MAY 31]  
(General hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

3 [1] bears

No closed season  
[AUG. 1-MAY 31]

...

**ISSUE:** The Board of Game requested the Department of Fish and Game submit this proposal to make black bear hunting season and bag limit similar to other areas.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Black bear season and bag limits in Unit 17 will remain the same.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those wishing to take black bears during the summer, or who wish to take more than the current bag limit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those hunters in the upper Nushagak River who may wish to see more black bears in the area during the fall when they are taken for food.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Leave current season and bag limit.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050412653

\*\*\*\*\*

# King Salmon Area – Units 9 and 10

---

**PROPOSAL 52 - 5 AAC 85.045 Hunting season and bag limit for moose.** Restrict nonresident moose hunting opportunity in Unit 9 as follows:

**5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.**

(8)

Unit 9(A) 1 bull by registration permit Sept. 1 - Sept. 15  
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: [No open season]

Unit 9(B)  
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: [No open season]

Unit 9(C), that portion draining into the Naknek River  
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: [No open season]

Remainder of Unit 9(C)  
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: [No open season]

Unit 9(D)  
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS [No open season]

Unit 9(E)  
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: [No open season]

**ISSUE:** Unjustified nonresident hunting opportunity in Game Management Unit 9 during a time of depressed moose populations.

In March 1999, the Board of Game found that moose in Units 9B, 9C, and 9E met the criteria to be considered “important for providing high levels of human consumptive use” under the state’s intensive management law: AS 16.05.255.

Moose populations are mandated by law to be prioritized as a subsistence resource for Alaska residents in times of shortage by AS 16.05.255(13)(d) which states: “the taking of moose, deer, elk and caribou by residents for personal or family consumption has preference over taking by nonresidents.”

The Alaska Supreme Court in *Shepherd v. State, Dep’t of Fish and Game*, 897 P. 2d 33 (Alaska 1995) “the resident preference serves the purpose of conserving scarce wildlife resources for Alaska residents; this unquestionably represents a legitimate state interest.”

Unit 9 (A, B, C, D, & E) have a positive C&T determination and combined ANS of 100 – 140 moose per year. The latest Unit 9 Moose Management Report states the total harvest for the RY

00 to RY 06 reporting period is even more alarming. Nonresidents harvested 656 moose compared to 491 moose by Alaska residents. Local residents only harvested 255 moose during that time! From 2000 – 2006 nonresidents harvested **257% more moose than local residents and 278% more moose than nonlocal residents.**

Resident moose harvest from 2000 to 2006 averaged just 70 moose per year. The Amount Needed for Subsistence (ANS) is 100 - 140 moose per year and tends to be based on local harvest needs only, which is a dismal 36 moose per year during this time frame.

From 2000 to 2006 nonresident hunters had an average 52% success rate, residents, both local and nonlocal, had just a 29% success rate. The ADF&G note the high migratory nature of this moose population. There is no justification to assume nonresident hunter's harvest moose that resident hunters would never harvest. Boat and airplane use is the preferred method of access for residents as well. **Residents may be denied traditional or prime hunting locations by the commercial guiding industry.**

The Board of Game has consistently abused and ignored the intent of the legislature in AS 16.05.255(13)(d) to prioritize moose harvest for residents in a time of shortage. What makes this abuse even more alarming is the fact that the NAPCH caribou herd has been closed to harvest in Unit 9, and the Mulchatna Herd is also severely depressed with restricted hunting, creating a far more significant need by residents for harvesting moose.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The intent of the Alaska legislature and Alaska law will continue to be ignored by the Board of Game **to prioritize limited subsistence moose harvest in Unit 9 for residents.**

Such continued abuse by the board when such obvious data sets regarding unjustifiable nonresident harvest are known can only be attributed to the overt influence of the commercial hunting industry in the management of Unit 9's ungulate populations. The Unit 9 working group recommendations continue to highlight that continued unjustified influence. For this "group" to recommend that resident hunters accept a registration hunt while simultaneously continuing nonresident hunting opportunity is beyond any reasonable justification and can only be attributed to the fact that commercial hunting participation level in that ADF&G selected group negatively influenced the Unit 9 working groups recommendations. The ADF&G did not allow the public to participate by phone nor did the department broadcast the meeting over the internet.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, reducing nonessential sport and trophy hunting will enhance the recovery rate of essential subsistence resources and prioritize existing depleted resources for resident harvest to meet the ANS harvest objectives, which complies with legislative intent and state law.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaskans that depend on subsistence resources in areas with depressed game populations. The ADF&G will benefit by having the authorization to limit nonessential human harvest, which is an important component of an effective adaptive management plan that promotes the recovery of depressed subsistence resources.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** In the short term, nonresident hunters will lose the opportunity to hunt in areas where resident subsistence need exceeds the amount of available game. In the long run, nonresident hunters will benefit from healthy game populations in the region, especially trophy hunters.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Further restricting resident harvest dates and horn restrictions. This was rejected due to the fact that restricting nonresident harvest will provide the necessary harvest opportunity for residents to meet the ANS harvest objectives established by the Board of Game while simultaneously promoting increasing moose populations in Unit 9.

Restricting nonresident hunting to remote subunits or non prime hunting dates. This is unacceptable due to the fact that moose highly migratory in Unit 9. Allowing nonresident harvest in any location will adversely affect resident harvest potential and will reduce the overall recovery rate of the moose population.

**PROPOSED BY:** Science Now Project EG050912708

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 53 – 5 AAC 85.025(4). Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou.** Establish caribou hunting seasons and bag limits for the Southern Alaska Peninsula Herd in Unit 9D as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open season</b>
-----------------------------	---	------------------------------------

(4)

Unit 9(D)

RESIDENT HUNTERS: [NO OPEN SEASON.]

<b><u>1 bull by Tier II permit only</u></b>	<b><u>Aug. 1—Sept. 30</u></b> <b><u>(Subsistence hunt only)</u></b>
---	--

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: No open season.

**ISSUE:** Results of recent surveys show that the Southern Alaska Peninsula caribou herd has made substantial progress towards recovery since targeted wolf removal was implemented between 2008 and 2010. Calf recruitment, fall bull:cow ratios, and population size have all increased markedly since 2007, and the negative population trend has been reversed. Herd recovery is ongoing and harvest is not yet recommended. However, establishing a hunt structure in regulation would expedite the opening of a caribou hunt once the population has recovered sufficiently.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Managers will be unable to open the herd to hunting when it has recovered sufficiently to allow for harvest.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Subsistence caribou hunters

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** None

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050412650  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 85.020.** **Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.** Modify the brown bear hunting regulations for Unit 9 as follows:

Unit 9A-E: One brown/grizzly bear every year residents and nonresidents, May 1-May 31, and September 1- October 31. Resident registration permit only, no tag required. Nonresident registration permit and tag required.

**ISSUE:** Lack of ungulate recruitment in Unit 9. Unit 9 has over 1/4 of all the brown bears in the State of Alaska. An attempt to harvest more brown bears was made through a special resident brown bear hunt near villages but was a failure because of the allowable hunting area. In fact it created a more restrictive bear season through a shorter season for all other areas in Unit 9. We have not hunted on the North Peninsula Caribou Herd since the late 90's, yet there are still only around 2,000 animals in this herd. The South Peninsula Herd is even smaller. Moose numbers are vague at best and we are probably headed for a Tier II classification. Predators take up to 85% of moose and caribou calves.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued or even further reduction in opportunity to harvest moose and caribou.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes Reducing predators will benefit calf recruitment for caribou and moose.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters dependant on moose and caribou for their families.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Special hunts have already failed. Predator control is compromised because of all the federal land in Unit 9.

**PROPOSED BY:** Fred Pike

EG043012594

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.** Eliminate the village registration permit hunts in Unit 9, allow the taking of nuisance bears, and/or open bear season as follows:

Eliminate the registration permit hunts (RB525). Allow residents of villages to shoot nuisance bears and/or open bear hunting season every year to reduce the number of bears in specific areas while remaining consistent with the policies behind the traditional bear hunting seasons.

**ISSUE:** Permit regulations: RB525 Pope Vannoy; RB525 Kokhanok Village; and RB525 Pedro Bay Airport.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Significant financial harm to contract holders, local small businesses, tourist revenue, Alaska Peninsula Corporation, State of Alaska, hunting practices harmful to local bear population and ecosystem, high rash of trespass issues, high risk of public safety issues.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. By eliminating regulations that cause harm and do not accomplish their objective, we will: 1.) Preserve the good bears for legal, revenue producing hunting and 2.) protect the local bears from the negative consequences to the population and local ecosystem caused by year-round and increased volume of hunting.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The adjacent village residents, local community (including small businesses), State of Alaska, Alaska Peninsula Corporation, contract holders, local bear population and ecosystem.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Robert Cusack

EG050312638

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 85.020 Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.** Increase the brown bear bag limit in Units 9 and 10 for the RB525 hunt as follows:

The new established resident registration hunts with a two bear per year limit within a specific distance of the communities in the area. With the tags and tag fee requirement remaining eliminated.

**ISSUE:** Change the number of brown bear taken from one to two in Units 9 and 10 under the near village RB525 permit.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** More bear to human confrontations in the villages. The local caribou herd will continue to be decimated.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The local caribou herd will have less of a predator issue and the herd would stand a better chance of survival.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The residents of the local villages, both safety and a future caribou herd for their subsistence lifestyle.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Defense of life and property. The high cost of time, ammo, cracker rounds and cost of shipping hides.

**PROPOSED BY:** False Pass Fish & Game Advisory Committee EG050712690

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 57 - 5 AAC 85.020 Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.** Modify the brown bear hunt area for the village registration permits (RB525) in Units 9 and 10 as follows:

Unit 10, False Pass – all lands reaching Swanson Lagoon southeast on Unimak Island to the furthest point of land on the Ikatan Peninsula. Extending inland westerly two and a half miles.

To include lands in Unit 9 on the east side of False Pass from Cape Krenitzin southeast on the Alaska Peninsula to the south side of Sankin Bay. Extending inland easterly two and a half miles.

**ISSUE:** Change the area of the village brown bear hunt in Units 9 and 10 under the near village RB525 permit.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** More bear to human confrontations in the villages. The local caribou herd will continue to be decimated.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The local caribou herd will have less of a predator issue and the herd would stand a better chance of survival.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The residents of the local villages, both safety and a future caribou herd for their subsistence lifestyle.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Defense of life and property. The high cost of time, ammo, cracker rounds and cost of shipping hides.

**PROPOSED BY:** False Pass Fish & Game Advisory Committee EG050712691  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 58 - 5 AAC 85.020 Hunting season and bag limit for brown bear, and 5 AAC 92.061. Special provisions for brown bear drawing permit hunts.** Establish a Katmai Preserve, specific registration hunt for brown bear in Unit 9 as follows:

Establish a Katmai Preserve, specific registration hunt (UCU's 702 & 703):

1. Limit brown bear harvest to one bear every four regulatory years by permit only (resident, nonresident and alien);
2. Define the parameters of the registration hunt in 5 AAC 92.061, modeled on the management structure developed for Unit 8;
3. Establish a harvest limit of 14 – 19 brown bears for Katmai Preserve;
4. No change in season dates is requested.

**ISSUE:** Unsustainable brown bear harvest in Katmai Preserve.

Katmai Preserve is roughly 645 square miles in size and has a current brown bear population estimated by the National Park Service (NPS) to be approximately 300 brown bears. (Katmai Commercial Hunting Guide Concession Information Pamphlet, May 2011)

The NPS limits nonresident and alien brown bear harvest numbers through a total client limit for the two guided sport-hunting concessions within the preserve.

Currently, the NPS has no control over the number of resident hunters that harvest brown bears in Katmai Preserve. The NPS has stated that approximately 70% of the fall brown bear harvest is by residents of Alaska. Since 1987, 93% of the combined spring/fall bear harvest have occurred in the fall hunting season.

In the spring of 2007, the NPS requested in writing to the Board of Game (board) that the board adopt regulations to maintain a spring/fall brown bear harvest rate of 14–19 bears. The subsequent brown bear harvest that occurred the fall of 2007 and spring of 2008 totaled 30 bears. NPCA's concern increased due to the fact that in the two previous fall/spring brown bear hunts, harvest rates for regulatory year (RY) 2003 totaled 34 bears, and RY 2005 also totaled 34 bears.

In 2011, the board adopted a registration hunt for Unit 9C, but failed to define a specific registration hunt for Katmai Preserve. As well, the board did not adopt a harvest guideline for the registration hunt in Unit 9C as a whole, nor within Katmai Preserve specifically. Concentrated harvest of brown bears can still occur within Katmai Preserve before harvest reports are submitted. The NPS reports that the majority of the harvest occurs the first week of the season, and reporting requirements allow a hunter to wait up to 10 days from the time of harvest before submitting his harvest details to the ADF&G. Emergency orders may be

ineffective in preventing high harvest rates due to conducive weather conditions, or other factors, promoting high harvest rates within Katmai Preserve.

In 2007, the NPS supported a Katmai specific registration hunt with defined harvest guidelines and suggested modeling the hunt on the brown bear hunt management structure for Unit 8, stating: “The NPS is concerned that the current trend of increasing harvest rates for brown bears in Katmai National Preserve cannot be maintained over the long term. This may lead to violation of our Congressional directive in ANILCA to manage for... high concentrations of brown/grizzly bears and their denning areas....” and “conservation of healthy populations of fish and wildlife.” Implementing a registration permit hunt in UCUs 702 and 703 modeled on the brown bear hunt in Unit 8 would address these problems and maintain opportunities for high quality brown bear hunts.”

In addition, in 2011 the ADF&G adopted a no closed season “near village” registration brown bear harvest permit (RB525) to address human bear conflicts. The intent was to relax the harvest restrictions for brown bears along the border of Katmai Preserve, specifically areas with high human use and an estimated high rate of unreported DLP (defense of life and property) harvest. Katmai Preserve bears are a transitory population. Levelok, Iaiugig, and Kokhanok airports, as well as Pope Vannoy Landing, and the Naknek drainage are all in close proximity to Katmai Preserve and open to brown bear harvest year round under RB525. Brown bear harvest under RB 525 could potentially impact brown bear populations within Katmai Preserve. Pending harvest reports for this “new” permit hunt, the BOG should be motivated to adopt a conservative harvest strategy for Katmai Preserve.

NPCA considers the brown bear population in Katmai to be heavily exploited over the last decade when spring/fall harvest rates have been nearly 100% above the NPS recommended level. Pending further investigation, including a formal NPS NEPA evaluation of historical and current brown bear harvest rates, the board must adopt regulations that ensure ecological damage, if it is occurring, is minimized by restricting harvest with Katmai Preserve to a defined harvest limit.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The Board of Game will continue to authorize, and the ADF&G will continue to implement, regulations that are inconsistent with documented NPS park purposes and values to conserve brown bear populations for “high density” in Katmai Preserve, including maintaining a natural population composition of age and sex cohorts in the population.

As defined in the current Master Memorandum of Understanding (MMOU) between the NPS and the State of Alaska, the state agreed to abide by federal law and congressional management mandates for lands managed by the NPS in Alaska. The NPS has repeatedly requested that the board adopt regulations ensuring a conservative brown bear harvest in Katmai Preserve pending further scientific investigations.

The state mutually agreed to the following: “To recognize that the taking of fish and wildlife by hunting, trapping, or fishing on certain Service lands in Alaska is authorized in accordance with applicable State and Federal law **unless State regulations are found to be incompatible with documents Park or Preserve goals, objectives or management plans.**” (emphasis added)

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Brown/grizzly bears have low population density and low recruitment, it is very difficult and expensive to estimate population size and trend, and bears may take many years to recover from population reductions. Adopting a preserve specific hunt structure that limits total brown bear harvest promotes long term sustainable harvest surplus for sport and subsistence hunters. The last decades harvest rates cannot continue.

In addition, adopting a conservative brown bear harvest strategy conforms to congressional intent that Katmai Preserve be managed for high densities of bears which conserves the natural sex and age structure of the population to the maximum extent possible.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The proposed amendment protects NPS park purposes and values, including the highest management value for the nonconsumptive wildlife viewing public where naturally regulated populations of bears and intact ecosystems are promoted to the maximum extent possible. The State of Alaska will benefit by enhancing compliance with congressional intent for the establishment of Katmai Preserve.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Special interest groups who prefer artificial management of ecosystems within Alaska's national preserves.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The NPS and NPCA have consistently requested that the board address perceived excess harvest of brown bears in Katmai Preserve. The NPS and NPCA have provided fact based justification for the need to manage the preserve in a preserve specific hunt. The NPS has requested the state cooperation in managing what is widely considered to be America's greatest park for bears.

The fundamental intention of the MMOU between the NPS and State of Alaska is to define guidelines for cooperative management between the state and federal government. Unfortunately, the board has consistently refused to address NPS concerns, comments, and proposals regarding Katmai Preserve.

**PROPOSED BY:** National Parks Conservation Association EG050912713  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 59 - 5 AAC 92.061. Special provisions for brown bear drawing permit hunts.**  
Allocate brown bear permits in Unit 10 and establish limits for number of applications allowed per guide as follows:

Limited draw permits for both resident and nonresident hunters in Unit 10, Unimak Island. Number of total permits per area/species based on sustainable yield as defined by the Department of Fish and Game.

A system is already in place and controls total harvest. Percentage of total permits dedicated to residents and nonresidents based on the previous 10 years average percentages of user groups that have applied for permits in the drawing area. According to the Owsichek decision: In

CCDW Fisheries v. Bunker, 775 P2d 1115, 112 n 14 (Alaska 1988), we noted that the public trust doctrine guaranteed fishermen access to public resources for private commercial purposes as well as for recreation. The same rationale applies to professional hunting guides under the common use clause. The common use clause makes no distinction between use for personal purposes and use for professional purposes. Using the previous 10 year average will keep the overall allocation at fair historical use numbers and will support the Common Use Clause since it makes no distinction between personal purposes and professional purposes.

Additional regulations for nonresident guided hunters: Nonresident hunters and contracting guide must sign a guide client agreement. The guide client agreement is a proven tool used in many areas of Alaska. It forms a relationship between the guide and hunter and prevents last minute head hunting and price undercutting by competing guides. Guides must be registered in the guide use area before the end of the drawing application period. Department of Fish and Game office staff checks the occupational licensing database of registered guides prior to the drawing application deadline to make sure that the guide listed on the guide client agreement is registered prior to the application deadline. If that guide is not registered then the client (applicant) is not entered into the drawing. Being registered in the area prior to the end of the application deadline ensures that guides can legally hunt in the guide use area and prevents flooding of the draw from prospecting guides that would not normally register that area. This is a good practice because it increases the odds of drawing a permit, makes the outcome of the draw more predictable so the guide can have a better business plan, and limits conflicts between guides since there will be less guides registered for the area.

The number of applicants per guide cannot exceed the number of nonresident permits available for that species and drawing area. This is also a good practice because it makes the competition for permits fair between guides. This is a fair and reasonable goal since flooding the draw by using a large booking agent only lowers the overall success for all hunters that apply. Guide client agreement must be on file with ADF&G prior to the end of the application period, otherwise application is void. The guide client agreement ensures that a client is associated with guide and that the guide is not submitting more hunters than there are permits available. An alternate list for both residents and nonresidents based on the drawing order with the next applicant eligible should a successful applicant back out of a hunt. This is a reasonable, fair, and obvious way of allocating permits should a hunter need to back out and decline a permit.

Nonresident hunters hunting with a second degree kindred relative are submitted in the resident hunter drawing. Historical averages based on the previous 10 year user group numbers have included nonresidents hunting with second degree kindred as being associated with resident hunter numbers. Changing this allocation will skew the fair percentages of permits to be awarded to residents and nonresidents. Implementing the items above individually will not have the desired effect. They must be implemented together because only then will the full benefit be realized by the system of measured designed meet the overall objective without loopholes that break down the integrity of the design.

**ISSUE:** Drawing permits for bears on Unimak Island.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Hunters may draw permits and not hunt with the outfitter on the guide client agreement. Flooding of the draw will continue which is not a desired guiding practice. Alternates will not be properly allocated. Viable guiding industry on the Unimak may be jeopardized.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal will improve the quality of product offered by each of the guides submitting clients for the draw and will make for a more predictable drawing outcome that is fair to all and supports the Common Use Clause.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All hunters will benefit from a better overall experience. Guides will benefit from a more predictable drawing outcome and will be able to offer a better product.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Nobody

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** This solution is used in another part of the state with undisputed positive results.

**PROPOSED BY:** Mike Zweng EG042112537  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 60 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping, and 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting season and bag limit for wolf.** Exclude National Park Service lands from certain wolf hunting and trapping regulations as follows:

Amend the wolf hunting and trapping regulations for lands managed by the National Park Service in Units 9 and 10 as follows:

**5 AAC 85.056 (2):**

...

Units 9 & 10, Unimak Island

**[On lands managed by the National Park Service]**

5 wolves per day                      August 10 – April [JUNE] 30                      (Resident and Nonresident)

**5 AAC 84.270 (13)**

...

Unit 9

**[On lands managed by the National Park Service]**

No limit                                      October 1 – April [JUNE] 30                      (Resident and Nonresident)

**ISSUE:** The Board of Game (board) should exempt lands managed by the National Park Service (NPS) from liberalized general sport hunting and trapping regulations adopted March 2011 by the board for wolves (*Canis lupis*) in Unit 9.

The Alaska Department of Fish & Game (ADF&G) expedited approval for the implementation of expanded wolf harvest season dates, justifying the action as necessary to promote the objectives of Alaska's intensive management law (AS 16.05.255), stating: "In recognition of the need to reduce wolf predation on caribou in Units 9 and 10, this emergency order uses the Commissioner's authority to extend wolf hunting and trapping seasons until June 30 and eliminates the delay in the implementation of the Board's regulations." (ADF&G Emergency Order April, 2011)

In 2012, the NPS subsequently restricted the state's general hunting and trapping regulations for wolves in Aniakchak, Katmai, and Lake Clark Preserves within Unit 9, citing NPS congressional authority to close or restrict the take of wildlife in preserves if state regulations are found to be inconsistent with park purposes and values pursuant to ANILCA section 1313 and federal regulations found at 36 CFR 13.40 (e ) and 13.50.

The 2012 Lake Clark National Park and Preserve Superintendants compendium restricting state wolf harvest regulations noted: "The take of denning wolves sanction practices that have the potential to impact the natural integrity of a native species. The practical effect of these allowances, open to all hunters and trappers, is increased efficiency for taking predator species and has potential to create pressures on the natural abundance, behavior, distribution, and ecological integrity of these native wildlife species. State laws or actions that seek to manipulate natural wildlife populations for human consumption, or have that practical effect, are inconsistent with NPS statutes, regulations, and policies and exceed Congress's authorization of sport hunting in ANILCA."

This proposal seeks to have state regulations comply with current federal regulations.

In further support of the NPS actions taken in 2012, NPS commented to the board dated October 25, 2007, on a proposal to extend wolf hunting seasons in to the summer months: "We [NPS] oppose the proposed season extension for wolf hunting because it could negatively impact the natural process of wolf reproduction. Ballard (Demographics, movements, and predation rates of wolves in northwest Alaska, PhD Dissertation, 1993) observed that packs were "regularly attending dens during May" in northwest Alaska, but noted that wolves in southern Alaska were regularly using dens by late April or early May. Hunting wolves in late spring and early summer jeopardizes pup production and survival."

The Board of Game ignored NPS comments and adopted wolf harvest regulations for summer months.

As defined in the current Master Memorandum of Understanding (MMOU) between the NPS and the State of Alaska, the state agreed to abide by federal law and congressional management mandates for lands managed by NPS in Alaska.

The state mutually agreed to the following: "To recognize that the taking of fish and wildlife by hunting, trapping, or fishing on certain Service lands in Alaska is authorized in accordance with applicable State and Federal law **unless State regulations are found to be incompatible with documented Park or Preserve goals, objectives or management plans.**" (emphasis added)

In March, 2011, the board adopted wolf control regulations under general sport hunting and trapping regulations, which apply to lands managed by the National Park Service (NPS), despite the board having previously adopted an intensive management plan for the region where this type of regulations would have been appropriately applied as an intensive management wolf control regulations, as defined in the current board wolf management policy (2011-185-BOG), which was adopted in 2011 as well and exempted NPS managed lands pending NPS approval.

The current wolf management policy states: “The Board and the Department have always distinguished between wolf management and wolf control.”

Methods the Board Will Consider When Implementing Wolf control Programs

- 1) Expanding public hunting and trapping into seasons when wolf hides are not prime.

The board also clearly identified wolf control regulations as complying with Alaska’s intensive management law: “More commonly, the Board may implement wolf control to comply with Alaska Statutes (AS 16.05.255) where ungulate populations are declared “depleted”...”

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** General sport hunting and trapping regulations will be unnecessarily complex and difficult for a hunter or trapper to access and understand which may lead to unintentional violations of NPS harvest restrictions.

Restrictions on state hunting and trapping regulations on NPS managed lands should be clearly identified in the states yearly hunting and trapping regulations booklet to promote broad public awareness of legal harvest regulations for wolves in Unit 9, including all harvest regulations variations between state and NPS managed lands.

The state will not be honoring the agreements found in the current MMOU between the NPS and the State of Alaska in which the state agreed to exclude NPS managed lands from state regulations found to be inconsistent with NPS park purposes and values.

The state will be ignoring congressional intent regarding the passage of ANILCA: “(t)he standard to be met in regulating the taking of fish and wildlife and trapping is that the preeminent natural values of the park system shall be protected in perpetuity and shall not be jeopardized by human uses. These are very special lands and this standard must be set very high: the objective for park system lands must always be to maintain the health of the ecosystem and the yield of fish and wildlife for hunting and trapping must be consistent with this requirement.” (congressional record)

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Promoting sustainable harvest regulations consistent with sound scientific management principles and the conservation of wildlife promotes a sustained harvestable surplus opportunity for sport and subsistence consumptive use. Restricting harvest to times of the year when pelts are in “prime” condition promotes the highest trophy value for sport hunters, and the highest economic return for trapping and subsistence use.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sport and subsistence hunters and trappers will benefit from long term sustained harvest opportunity. The proposed amendment protects NPS park purposes and values, including the highest management value for the non-consumptive wildlife viewing public where naturally regulated and intact ecosystems are promoted to the maximum extent possible. All who value ethical, humane, fair chase harvest principles for the consumptive take of wildlife on lands managed by the NPS in Alaska. The State of Alaska will benefit from improved compliance with the intent of ANILCA.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Special interest groups who prefer artificial management of ecosystems within Alaska’s National Preserves.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The NPS and NPCA have consistently requested that the board exempt NPS managed lands when state and federal management objectives differ. The fundamental intention of the MMOU between the NPS and State of Alaska is to define guidelines for cooperative management between the state and federal government. Unfortunately, the board has consistently refused to address NPS concerns, comments, and proposals.

While hunting and trapping is an appropriate activity which the NPCA supports for preserves in Unit 9, it must be subject to the natural ecological processes that have defined this region for a millennium. At times, there will be lower densities of wildlife in a naturally regulated system requiring limits on human harvest opportunity, especially sport trophy hunting, to minimize ecological risk and to prioritize federally qualified subsistence harvest opportunity.

This may be a necessary component for sustaining the long term integrity of ecosystems with complex, multi-dimensional relationships that were developed with minimal influence from man. Alaska’s preserves are where America puts its trust in nature!

**PROPOSED BY:** National Parks Conservation Association EG050912714  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 61 - 5 AAC 92.125. Intensive management plans.** Modify the intensive management plan for the North Alaska Peninsula Caribou herd as follows.

(m)**Northern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area.** Notwithstanding any other provisions in this title, and based on the following information contained in this subsection, the commissioner or the commissioner’s designee may conduct a wolf population reduction or wolf population regulation program in the Northern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area:

- (1) the Northern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area is established to facilitate growth in the Northern Alaska Peninsula (NAP) caribou herd on the mainland portions of Units 9(C) and 9(E) to aid in achieving intensive management objectives in an area encompassing approximately 19,461 square miles (50,403 square kilometers); the wolf reduction **area includes** [AREAS INCLUDE] all Alaska Peninsula drainages south of the south bank of the Naknek River and the southern boundary of Katmai National Park to a line from the southernmost head of Port Moller Bay to the head of American Bay, encompassing approximately 12,825 square miles (33,217 square kilometers);

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

(A) prey population information is as follows:

(i) the NAP was estimated at 20,000 caribou in the 1940s and again in the 1980s, but has declined to fewer than 3,000 caribou since the last peak population size; the most recent estimate of herd size was 2,000 - 2,500 caribou based on surveys conducted in October 2009;

(ii) the initial decline in population size was attributed to nutritional limitations imposed by a depleted range following the peak in the 1980s; parasites and disease were also suspected to have had a negative influence on the herd's status;

(iii) predator management was considered previously, but was not implemented because nutritional indices indicated that individuals of this herd were experiencing nutritional limitations that might be further aggravated by any attempts to increase herd size; indications of improved condition at this time include increased pregnancy rates, increased neonate weights, and increased calf weights; these changes alone have been insufficient to alter herd status;

(iv) pregnancy rates of cows that were 24 months of age or older increased from 57 percent in 2005 (n=315) to 84 percent in 2009 (n=104);

(v) birthmass of calves increased during the period of 2005 - 2007; - birthmass of male calves increased from 7.7 kg in 2005 (n=26) to 8.0 kg in 2006 (n=19) and 8.6 kg in 2007 (n=28); female calves born in 2005 weighed 7.8 kg (n=15), 7.3 kg in 2006 (n=30), and 8.0 kg in 2007 (n=22);

(vi) female calves captured at 10 months of age weighed 49.9 kg in 2005 and 56.7 kg in 2007; however the small sample size precludes statistical comparison;

(vii) research into calf mortality documented survival rates during the first two months of life that averaged 14 percent during the period of 2005 - 2007 (n=143), which was significantly lower than survival rates observed in several other herds studied in the state; survival during the first two weeks of life has averaged 40 percent and survival from two weeks to two months averaged 34 percent; cause of death during the first two weeks of life was primarily attributed to wolves (43 percent) and brown bears (31 percent); cause of death could not be assessed after calves reached two weeks of life due to logistic limitations;

(viii) calf-to-cow ratios in October averaged 10.3 calves per 100 cows during the period of 2003 - 2009 (range 7 - 16);

(ix) bull-to-cow ratios declined to 19 bulls per 100 cows during the period of 2004 - 2009 despite hunting closures in 2005;

(x) harvestable surplus is estimated to be 0 caribou based on chronic poor calf recruitment and reduced bull-to-cow ratio;

(xi) high levels of consumptive use have been a priority for the NAP; from 1990 - 1998 an average of 724 people reported hunting caribou, harvesting an average of 716 caribou annually; before the closure harvest was [HAS] regulated under the Tier II permit system since 1999;

(xii) state and federal caribou hunts were closed in 2005 due to the continued population decline and low calf recruitment; the closure remains in place as of 2010;

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

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

(ii) research into the causes of caribou calf mortality indicates that wolves are typically responsible for 43 percent of the calf deaths during the first two weeks of life;

(iii) wolf density in the Northern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area is estimated at seven wolves per 1,000 square kilometers; anecdotal evidence obtained from biologists, pilots, trappers, and local residents indicates that wolves are abundant throughout the area;

(iv) in 2008, the wolf population in the Northern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area was estimated to include 200 – 300 wolves and composed of 30 – 50 packs based on habitat type and prey base;

(v) an average of 24 wolves (range of 7 – 50 wolves) have been harvested annually in the Northern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area;

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

(vii) research into the causes of caribou calf mortality indicates that brown bears are typically responsible for 31 percent of the calf deaths during the first two weeks of life;

(viii) brown bears are considered abundant throughout the Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area; densities range from 100 – 150 bears per 1,000 square kilometers in the Northern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area;

(ix) brown bear harvests in the Northern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area have averaged 179 brown bear annually from 2000 – 2007;

(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 NAP is 6,000 – 15,000 caribou; the intensive management harvest objective is 600 – 1,500 caribou annually; population and harvest objectives have not been met for 15 years; intensive management objectives were established by the board based on historic information regarding population numbers, habitat limitations, human use, and sustainable harvests; the estimated NAP population in October 2009 was 2,000 – 2,500 caribou; hunting seasons for the NAP were closed in July 2005; no legal harvest of caribou has occurred for the NAP since the 2004 regulatory year;

(B) the wolf population objective for Unit 9 is to maintain a wolf population that can sustain a three-year-annual harvest of 50 wolves; the wolf population objective for Unit 9 is currently being met;

(C) the brown bear population objective for Unit 9 is 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; the brown bear population objective for Unit 9 is currently being met;

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

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

(B) the objectives of the program are to achieve a sex and age structure that will sustain the population, provide, for human harvest, and allow for population growth toward objectives; the goal of this program is to reduce the number of wolves in a specified wolf reduction area [AREAS] that demonstrates a history of repeated use by caribou; the [TWO] wolf reduction area is defined all lands that drain into the Bering Sea between the southern bank of the Naknek River in Unit 9(C) and Port Moller Bay in Unit 9(E), encompassing 10,734 square miles (27,802 square kilometers); [AREAS ARE AS FOLLOWS:]

[I] THE NORTHERN WOLF REDUCTION AREA IS DEFINED AS ALL LANDS THAT DRAIN INTO THE BERING SEA BETWEEN THE SOUTHERN BANK OF THE NAKNEK RIVER IN UNIT 9(C) AND THE NORTHERN BANK OF THE MESHIK RIVER IN UNIT 9(E) AND ALL LANDS IN BETWEEN AND INCLUDING ALINCHAK BAY AND KUJULIK BAY, ENCOMPASSING 9,047 SQUARE MILES (23,432 SQUARE KILOMETERS);]

[II] THE SOUTHERN WOLF REDUCTION AREA IS DEFINED AS ALL LANDS IN UNIT 9(E) THAT DRAIN INTO THE BERING SEA BETWEEN THE SOUTHERN BANK OF FRACTURE CREEK AND PORT MOLLER BAY, ENCOMPASSING 1,300 SQUARE MILES (3,367 SQUARE KILOMETERS);]

(C) the commissioner may initiate the reduction of wolf numbers in the Northern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area according to the following thresholds;

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

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

(iii) calf recruitment is an 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 the Alaska Peninsula Predation Management area until the following thresholds can be met without the benefit of wolf reduction:

(i) the bull-to-cow ratio can be sustained within management objectives and the fall calf-to-cow ratio can be sustained above 25 calves per 100 cows;

(ii) the population can grow at a sustained rate of five percent annually;  
or

(iii) harvest objectives can be met;

(E) the commissioner must suspend the wolf reduction program if any of the following conditions are observed, pending further review by the board, to determine if the program can be modified to achieve the objectives of this program before reinstating the program, expect that hunting and trapping by the public specified in other sections of this title may continue and are not subject to this subparagraph:

(i) caribou nutritional indices, as evidence by pregnancy rates, calf or adult body mass, or other condition indices, exhibit a declining trend from current values;

(ii) fall calf-to-cow ratios remain below 20 calves per 100 cows for three consecutive years following the initiation of the wolf reduction program;  
or

(iii) the bull-to-cow ratio remains below the caribou population objectives and does not increase for three consecutive years following the initiation of the wolf reduction program; **or**

**(iv) the survival rate of calves born in the wolf reduction area is not significantly increased as a direct result of the wolf reduction activities;**

(F) the wolf predation management objective for the Northern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area is to reduce the wolf numbers in wolf reduction areas within Units 9(C) and 9(E); because wolves will not be removed from all lands within the management area and because logistic limitations prohibit public access to the majority of lands within the management area, the majority of wolves in Unit 9(C) and 9(E) will not be affected by the management activities authorized by this plan; reduction of **predators** [; PREDITORS] by humans is necessary to achieve a sex and age structure that will sustain the herd, provide for human harvest, and allow for caribou population towards objectives; reduction of wolf numbers in prescribed wolf reduction areas is expected to increase caribou calf survival and recruitment and increase the bull-to-cow ratio to management objectives; reduction of bear numbers remains problematic due to the high density of brown bears in Units 9(C) and 9(E), logistical limitations, and competing management priorities for brown bears;

(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;

(B) the commissioner may issue public aerial shooting permits, public land and shoot permits, or ground-based shooting permits, allow agents of the state, or department employees to conduct aerial, land and shoot, or ground-based 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 agents or state owned, privately owned, or chartered 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) for up to 10 years beginning July 1, 2010, the commissioner may reduce the wolf populations in the Northern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area;

(B) annually the department shall, to the extent practicable, provide to the board a report of program activities conducted during the preceding 12 months, including implementation activities, the status of caribou and wolf 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 reduction activities

(i) when prey population management objectives are obtained;

(ii) when predation management objectives are met; or

(iii) upon expiration of the period during which the commissioner is authorized to reduce wolf numbers in the wolf reduction areas;

(B) the commissioner shall annually close wolf hunting and trapping seasons as appropriate to ensure that the minimum wolf population objectives for Unit 9 are met.

**ISSUE:** The definition of the Northern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area wolf reduction area was originally developed with the assumption that wolf control activities would not be implemented unless the program was also conducted on federal lands. Reduction of wolf predation on federal lands has been viewed as a necessary component of the program because the majority of NAP caribou calving occurs on federal lands and most calves die on federal lands, and calf recruitment is the primary factor limiting population growth. Because of the intention to include federal lands, the regulation originally excluded some state lands in the NAP range to ensure sustained yield of wolves on the Alaska Peninsula.

During the March 2011 Board of Game meeting, the board recognized that wolf reduction activities would not be authorized on federal lands and directed the department to initiate wolf reduction activities on state lands to improve the survival rates of caribou calves born on state lands. Because federal lands are no longer considered part of the wolf reduction area the exclusion of some state lands from the program is no longer necessary to ensure a sustainable wolf population remains in the area. More than 60% of the lands included in the Northern Alaska Peninsula Predation Management Area are NPS or USFWS lands and wolves have extensive areas where they are not subject to intensive management under this program.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Wolf reduction efforts will be confined to a smaller area, decreasing the effectiveness of the program.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Expanding the wolf reduction area is expected to increase effectiveness of the program and potentially benefit herd recovery.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Proponents of intensive management and participants in the wolf reduction program

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Opponents of intensive management

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050412656

\*\*\*\*\*

# Glennallen Area – Units 11 and 13

---

**PROPOSAL 62 - 5 AAC 85.045(11). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Reauthorize the drawing permit hunts for antlerless moose in Unit 13 as follows.

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
-----------------------------	---	------------------------------------

Unit 13

1 moose per regulatory year,  
only as follows:

...

**RESIDENT HUNTERS:**

...

1 antlerless moose by  
drawing permit only; up to 200  
permits may be issued;  
a person may not take a calf or a  
cow accompanied by a calf

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20  
(General hunt only)

...

**ISSUE:** Antlerless moose hunts must be re-authorized annually by the Board of Game. This regulation allows hunters to take a limited number of cows in specific areas to keep the population within objectives.

This Unit 13 antlerless hunt was initially adopted in March 2011. The first Unit 13 antlerless hunt under this regulation will take place in September 2012; 10 permits were issued for a western portion of Unit 13A only. For 2013, recommended permit numbers and hunt locations will be based on the most recent data, and announced prior to the Board meeting, to ensure adequate public and advisory committee review opportunity. The number of permits issued is projected to be far lower than the 200 allowed by regulation.

Moose in Unit 13 have generally increased at a rate of 3-5% per year in the intensive wolf management area during the past 10 years. As anticipated, moose increased in some portions of the unit faster than others.

Following moose survey results in November 2012, we will have an updated population estimate for Unit 13 as well as preliminary harvest data for 2012-13. Based on these data, we expect to recommend a limited antlerless hunting opportunity only for portions of Unit 13A for 2013-14. No additional antlerless opportunities are expected at this time.

The population objective for Unit 13A is 3,500 – 4,200; the population estimate was 3,530 moose in 2009, 3,490 in 2010, and 3,890 in 2011. These numbers are based on conservative extrapolation of count data and sightability estimates. There is also a good possibility there are more moose in the area that are not included in our estimate. Given the simplistic method of population estimation used in this unit, it is important to incorporate other population performance indicators such as harvest trends. The harvest objective for Unit 13A is 210 – 420. In 2009, the harvest was 268 and it improved to 289 in 2010. The preliminary 2011 harvest is 283. The number of bulls harvested in Unit 13A has more than doubled since 2000 (115 taken). Maintaining a healthy balance of bulls to cows is an important aspect of herd management. The objective for Unit 13 is 25 bulls:100 cows. This ratio has worked well in this unit and provides an adequate proportion of bulls for hunter satisfaction and reproduction. The highest density of moose in Unit 13A is in the western portion of the unit, though the composition was only 22 bulls:100 cows in 2010 (below the objective for the first time since 2003). The number of any-bull drawing permits in the area was reduced from 100 permits in 2010 to 30 permits in 2011 in response to the low the bull:cow ratio. The bull:cow ratio was higher (27:100) in 2011. In the eastern portion of the unit, the bull:cow ratio is higher, at 44:100 (last surveyed in 2010), though the habitat quality and density of moose are much lower. The ability to further increase the harvest of bulls from Unit 13A is limited.

Twinning data from radio-collared cow moose in western Unit 13A also provide productivity information in this area. Between 2008 and 2011, twinning rates have ranged from 26% to 33%, rates consistent with a nutritionally sound moose population. These rates are the highest recorded for this study area (data collection began in 1994).

The number of cows in western Unit 13A is expected to continue increasing given reduced predation. To maintain a healthy density and balance of moose in this area, a limited antlerless harvest opportunity in western Unit 13A may be necessary to slow the growth of this population as it approaches a level that will be sustainable in the long-term. Providing an antlerless hunt opportunity will maximize the annual sustained yield.

Key objectives for this area are to maintain a moose density sufficient to allow for harvest objectives to be met, while maintaining the current relatively high nutritional status of the population.

Intensive management efforts will be adjusted to ensure maintenance of population and harvest objectives concurrent with recommendations from the public, Advisory Committees, and the Board.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Portions of the Unit 13 moose population could outgrow available habitat, leading to nutritional stress, lower productivity, and higher mortality. Substantial harvest opportunity could be lost for many years to come. If antlerless hunts are not approved and Unit 13 moose begin to show signs of nutritional stress due to overpopulation, intensive management efforts will need to be curtailed, reducing hunt opportunities for bulls and cows.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes; by keeping the population within objective, harvest can be maximized, while avoiding nutritional stress which leads to increased susceptibility to adverse weather events, predation, parasites and disease.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All who wish a healthy, productive moose population in the Copper River basin, and those who wish to use moose for human consumption.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who disagree with the harvest of antlerless moose.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050712666

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 63 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Modify the cow moose drawing hunt for Unit 13 as follows:

Eliminate the current cow moose drawing hunt. Establish two new cow moose drawing hunts in Units 13A, 13B, 13C, and 13E. Will be triggered to be offered when the current moose population is above the midpoint of the moose population objective in each subunit. (See related proposal in this booklet submitted by Copper Basin Fish and Game Advisory Committee related to new population and harvest objectives for Unit 13. The hunts will not be offered when the current moose population is below the midpoint of the moose population objective in each subunit. Take up to 1% of total cow moose population yearly in each subunit. It will be for residents only and instructions to take only lone cows with no calves. Zones within the subunit will be defined with no more than 1% of the cow population in each zone to be taken in order to spread out the harvest. There will be two hunt numbers to apply for, the first being a fall hunt (October 1 to October 31), and the second a winter hunt (March 1 to March 31) to allow better access by snow machine to more remote zones of the unit. Permitted must report within 3 days of a kill.

**ISSUE:** Additional harvest opportunities for cow moose in Unit 13 to take advantage of the increasing moose population in an intensive management area.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** A resource will go untapped in an area targeted to be managed for abundance.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** With separate seasons from other moose hunts and low numbers of hunters in each zone it should be a fairly low impact type hunt. It should help to balance the harvest and the bull/cow ratio by taking some cows in a previously bull only hunting season.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Meat hunters will have additional opportunity to harvest a moose.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The cow hunt currently on the books allows only ten cow moose permits Unit wide and doesn't touch the potential that Unit 13 has considering the current increased moose population of approximately 19,000 as a result of wolf control.

**PROPOSED BY:** Copper Basin Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050112608  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 64 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose, and 5 AAC 92.530. Management areas.** Open a youth hunt for moose in Unit 13A as follows:

Create a draw permit youth only hunt for hunters 10 to 17 years of age in Unit 13A for cow moose (only cows without a calf could be taken) with a 10 day season August 5-15. No more than 1% of the cow moose population could be allocated, permit allocation numbers to be determined by the Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G).

Permit hunt conditions can be determined by ADF&G and the Board of Game as per other youth permit hunt conditions and restrictions. The same hunter education requirements currently required for Unit 13 would apply. The same licensing requirements would apply, hunters under 16 years of age not required to purchase a hunting license, hunters over 16 years of age and accompanying adult must have hunting license.

Our recommendations are that all permitted youth hunters must be accompanied by an adult 21 years of age or older and that any cow moose harvested under this permit be counted against the bag limits of the permitted youth hunter and the accompanying adult. Only the permitted youth hunter can shoot, except the accompanying adult can shoot the animal only if it has been wounded and to prevent it from escaping.

We recommend that no other mandates be tied to this permit that attach to the child or accompanying adult such as what other units those persons may hunt for moose that year if unsuccessful.

Keep things as simple as possible, the entire idea of this youth hunt is to allow more children to get involved in hunting with their families and mentors prior to the school term by having a hunt in an area with reasonably good access and a good chance of success, to allow our youth to experience hunting and providing food for their families and to ensure we have a next generation of hunters who will carry on our traditions.

**ISSUE:** Create a Youth Hunt in Region IV that starts before the school term as required by the Alaska legislature. Currently there are no youth hunts we know of that begin before the school term in Region IV (Central/Southwest). In Anchorage and Fairbanks areas the school term typically begins between August 15-20.

After speaking with the area biologist we believe Unit 13A has a growing moose population and that a small percentage of cow moose (without calves) can be harvested without negatively impacting herd growth or bull:cow ratios. By allocating cow moose only to youth hunters out of this population rather than bull moose we avoid conflicts and concerns from general season hunters that legal bull moose will be taken prior to the general season hunt.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED?** The Board of Game would not be meeting the mandate set by the Alaska legislature for youth only hunts that start before the school term. As school begins ever earlier in August and evermore hunts seem to begin later, we are losing youth hunting opportunities and hunter recruitment and ability of families to go hunting together for extended periods.

**DOES YOUR PROPOSAL ADDRESS IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED? IF SO, HOW?** Yes. The cow moose population in Unit 13A is abundant and some cow moose harvests will help us reach harvest objectives and provide a healthy source of meat to Alaskan families.

**WHO WILL BENEFIT IF YOUR PROPOSAL IS ADOPTED?** Youth hunters would benefit greatly by having a hunting opportunity prior to the beginning of the school term, which has been starting earlier and earlier in August.

Families would benefit by having more opportunity to hunt with their children prior to the school term, to be out in the field together camping and sharing experiences that are a great part of bonding and creation of memories that last a lifetime.

The hunting community would benefit with the creation of more youth hunting opportunities that help bring new hunters into the fold and recruit young hunters to carry on our hunting traditions.

The Board of Game would benefit by meeting the mandate set by the Alaska Legislature to have a youth hunt in each region that begins before the school term (Note: Anchorage School District classes began on August 16 in 2011, but began on August 21 in 2013.)

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER IF YOUR PROPOSAL IS ADOPTED?** Those opposed to antlerless hunts.

**LIST ANY OTHER SOLUTIONS YOU CONSIDERED AND WHY YOU REJECTED THEM.** Allow for all youth hunters 17 and under to participate, not just 10 to 17 years of age. We felt that 10-17 years of age for this hunt was most appropriate but didn't reject this and if the board would like to also include hunters under ten years of age we would support that.

Allow any moose harvested under this permit to only count against the youth hunter's bag limit. We rejected that idea because we felt this proposal would garner more support if it didn't mean more overall additional moose were harvested and if there was a per-se sacrifice by the accompanying adult to put this moose on his or her bag limit.

Create a youth hunt for other species or sexes in other subunits. Rejected due to population concerns or that it may take from other general hunting harvests or opportunities.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Chapter Backcountry Hunters & Anglers EG050112620  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 65 - 5 AAC 92.072. Community subsistence harvest hunt area and permit conditions, and 92.074(d). Community subsistence harvest hunt areas.** Modify the Copper Basin community subsistence harvest hunt in Units 11, 12 and 13 as follows.

A. The Board of Game (board) should return to a system whereby it separately reviews each group or community's eligibility to participate in the Copper Basin Community hunt. Each eligible group should be required to independently establish the season, bag limit and quota the group needs for a reasonable opportunity to meet its community-based subsistence pattern of taking and use. The current Community Subsistence Hunt (CSH) was adopted by the board based on the customary and traditional (C&T) community based pattern of use of the eight Ahtna communities named in 5 AAC 92.074(d). The current CSH moose and caribou quotas, and the moose season, are based on these communities; patterns of subsistence taking and use; it was determined that these quotas and seasons were necessary to provide a reasonable opportunity for the pattern of use in these communities. Thus, no further board action is required for these eight communities - the board should retain the caribou and moose quotas and seasons originally adopted for the eight villages.

The board should, however, require other groups and communities that want to participate in the Copper Basin CSH to establish eligibility separately, and if eligible, each group should be required to separately establish the quotas, seasons and other regulations that are necessary to provide a reasonable opportunity for that group. A distinct quota should be established for each group.

The board could accomplish this by providing public notice specifically to each group that has in the past participated in the Copper Basin Community hunt, and to the public at large, that effective for the 2013 hunt, groups seeking to participate in the CSH must present a proposal to the board demonstrating eligibility. A group's proposal should include: 1.) a description of the membership of the group or community; 2.) the area in which it seeks to subsistence hunt (a group may not need to use, or be able to show that it is eligible to use all of the area described in 5 AAC 92.074(d)); 3.) the group's established or intended pattern of community-based subsistence use in the area; 4.) and the quota, season, bag limits and other regulations necessary to provide the group with a reasonable opportunity to satisfy its community-based pattern of subsistence use (eligible groups will have different needs depending on the specific taking and use patterns, the number of members in the group, the sharing pattern, the area where hunting is concentrated, etc.).

In determining eligibility, the board should focus on the group's history and pattern of use in the specific area where the group seeks to hunt. Alternatively, a group without an established pattern of community-based subsistence use in the area should provide the board with specific information and a plan for how it intends to meet the pattern of use identified in the board's 2006

findings for moose and caribou in Unit 13 for the upcoming season. The board should focus on at least three of the criteria used in the 2006 findings when determining eligibility for the group; 1.) the group's dependence on the harvest of a wide diversity of wildlife and fish harvested from the CSH area as a mainstay of the community's subsistence way of life; 2.) the widespread sharing throughout the community of the resources (moose, caribou, salmon, berries, etc.) harvested from the area for subsistence uses; and 3.) the teaching of skills and values of the community's subsistence way of life from generation to generation and the participation of younger people in the hunting, fishing, gathering, preparation, preserving and other skills and values that are essential components of practicing a community-based subsistence way of life.

In order to make this a more objective standard, groups should have to show that the community members will spend at least 30 days in the CSH area focused on collecting a wide variety of resources - salmon, other fish, berries, moose, caribou, birds, small game. The group should also demonstrate that its wild resource harvesting efforts will be focused in this area; that, for example, its members largely rely on this area for salmon, other fish, berries and small game rather than depending on another area for these resources. The reliance on a wide diversity of resources from the area of subsistence use is perhaps the most important criterion of community-based subsistence use - it runs throughout the board's 2006 findings. It goes to the fact that the community-based subsistence use pattern is to use local resources - not to roam across the state in search of a single species here and another there.

Groups should also have to show established or planned programs or other ways that youth are or will be included, and how the teaching and participation from generation to generation will occur. Groups should have to demonstrate how it will practice the pattern of wide spread sharing that will be expected of group members, and this pattern should be consistent with providing for elders and others with need within the community. Widespread sharing is not demonstrated by a single "sharing event."

All of these elements should be established before the group can participate in the CSH. If a group cannot show an already established pattern of C&T community-based subsistence use of the area, then the group should have to provide a plan for engaging in this pattern, and demonstrate how it will verify that its members will live up to the commitments made in the plan presented to the board. Groups like Ahtna, that can demonstrate a long-established C&T pattern of community-based subsistence uses of the area, should have a reporting process that reflects the fact and the fact that this pattern is already engrained as an essential part of the community way of life. A more streamlined application, implementation and reporting process for communities like the Ahtna villages should be authorized. This will lessen the workload for the Department of Fish and Game and the communities while still achieving the intent of the CSH program for the Copper Basin area. Communities or groups without an established pattern of use could be authorized to use the streamlined process after five years of consistently engaging in the community-based pattern of use in the area.

B. The board should clarify that the caribou season for the Ahtna CSH stays open until the CSH quota is filled, and that CSH caribou season does not automatically close when the other Tier I subsistence hunts closes. The board expressed this intent during its 2010-2011 meetings on the CSH for the Copper River Basin. The board should reaffirm this intent. It is essential that the

board do so in order to ensure that the Ahtna communities will have a reasonable opportunity to harvest caribou. Without such a provision, the harvestable surplus of caribou could be taken in a fairly short period of time. If the CSH were to be closed at this point, it would not allow the communities sufficient subsistence hunting opportunity.

C. The board should also consider the following process to ensure that all individuals or families applying to participate in the other Tier I subsistence hunt for moose and caribou in Unit 13 are really engaged in a subsistence pattern of taking and use. If the board were to take this step, it would protect and provide more meaningful opportunity for genuine subsistence uses. It would make administration of the CSH and the individual Tier I hunt easier, more efficient and more consistent. It would also open up far greater opportunity for non-subsistence hunters. Individuals that want to participate in the Tier I individual hunt should have to fill out an application, and an affidavit, showing that their use of moose and caribou in the area is consistent with the C&T use pattern described by the board for Unit 13 in its 2006 findings. The application should reflect a focus on the three criteria as described in section A above. In particular, the application should require individuals to vouch that they will spend at least 30 days in the area (Unit 13) focused on collecting a wide variety of resources - salmon, other fish, berries, moose, caribou, birds, small game; that their wild resource harvesting efforts will be focused primarily in this area; that, for example, the applicant does, or intends to rely primarily on this area for salmon, other fish, berries and small game rather than harvesting these resources in other areas. Similar statements could be required relating to practicing other patterns of use reflected in the criteria and the 2006 findings.

Taking this step, and the others above, could be done only for Unit 13 and the Copper Basin CSH area, because of the nature of hunting pressure and use in this area. Any additional burden on the board and department in implementing these provisions would be significantly reduced over time. Ahtna believes this proposal is consistent with the state subsistence law and lays a foundation for implementing the law in a way that will serve all hunters in Alaska; it will ensure that those who are engaged in subsistence hunting, and who are entitled to the priority and reasonable opportunity provided by the law, are genuinely engaged in a pattern of subsistence taking and use.

**ISSUE:** The Board of Game took a big step in the right direction in authorizing a community subsistence harvest permit for the Copper Basin; 5 AAC 92.072; 074. Like any new program, however, changes are necessary to ensure that the board's intent is met. The eligibility for groups to participate in the CSH is far too broad resulting in the very real potential for abuse of the process by groups. The process for group reporting and accountability needs to be revised to ensure that groups participating are fully engaged in the community-based pattern of C&T uses identified by the board in its 2006 findings for the area. A more effective system need to be established for setting moose and caribou quotas for eligible groups and communities and it needs to be clear that the quota for caribou does not close at the same time as the other Nelchina hunts, but continues until the communities have had a reasonable opportunity to harvest the community quota.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** In both the 2011 and 2012 seasons, a large number of groups of 25 or more residents applied for the Copper Basin community

subsistence moose and caribou hunts. A group from as far away from as Juneau signed up for and participated in the community hunts. The application and reporting process did not ensure that these groups were genuinely engaged in the pattern of community-based subsistence taking and use the board identified in its 2006 Findings. As more residents, through the formation of small groups, take advantage of the loopholes in the current community hunt regulations, there is less subsistence opportunity for those communities that genuinely engage in this pattern of subsistence use. There is also less opportunity for other Alaska residents engaged in other subsistence and non-subsistence uses of moose and caribou in this area. The large number of groups currently taking advantage of the system creates problems for enforcement and management of the hunt. For example, the department must set extremely cautious quotas for any bull moose because of the large number of community hunters signed up for the program. The department and enforcement has also instituted an administrative process that is burdensome for genuine community subsistence users but is considered necessary to control the large number of groups that apply.

The community subsistence harvest permit hunt was created by the board to address community-based subsistence needs in the Copper River Basin. It was founded on the legal and factual basis that there is a distinct pattern of C&T community-based subsistence use of moose and caribou in the area identified by the board for the Copper River Basin. Changes are necessary to fulfill this intent. Otherwise, much of what the board sought to achieve is being significantly undermined. For those who want to exploit the process, the CSH process has become a replacement for “game” the old Tier II system the board sought to reform. Or worse, the current process allows those opposed to the CSH for philosophical or other reasons to crash the system and make it meaningless for those living a community-based subsistence way of life to do so.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Providing the opportunity for community and individual subsistence uses intended by the state subsistence law, and the board through its 2006 findings, while ensuring that those engaged in such uses are genuinely engaged in subsistence uses will improve all aspects of the harvest and hunting opportunity in Alaska.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those who are currently engaged in, or desire to genuinely begin engaging in a community-based or individual/family subsistence hunting lifestyle will benefit, as will all other hunters who will benefit from greater hunting opportunity through effective implementation of the state’s subsistence law.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** It is not the intent of Ahtna that any one should suffer. Hunters who are do not choose to engage genuinely in a subsistence pattern of taking and use will have more opportunity to participate in other non-subsistence hunting opportunities.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Ahtna has proposed other changes to the community subsistence hunt regulations that address similar concerns.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ahtna Tene Nene’ Customary & Traditional Use Committee EG050312629  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 66 – 5 AAC 85.045 Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose; 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures; 5 AAC 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures, and 5 AAC 92.072. Community subsistence harvest hunt area and permit conditions.** Repeal the community subsistence harvest hunt and other changes as follows:

Repeal the Community Harvest (Tier I) moose hunt and area. Replace the Tier I permit hunt with a registration general hunt for Alaskan with spike-fork or 50” or greater spread or 3 brow tines on at least one side antler restrictions with a season from September 1 – 20 for areas outside of newly created road corridors in Unit 13. Close hunt by subunit when the harvest objective is met.

Create a road corridor area along the Glenn, Richardson, Denali, Parks, and Tok-cutoff highway within Unit 13. Adopt a weighted drawing moose hunt for Alaskan residents for any bull and/or cow within the newly created road corridor from September 1<sup>st</sup> – 20th. Conditions for moose drawing hunt: Allow only one permit per household, applicants can not apply for moose permit in any other Unit for that year, all eatable meat taken from the field on the bone.

Nonresident moose hunting by drawing permit for 50” and larger spread or 4 brow tines may occur only after the maximum harvest objective identified in 5AAC 92.108 has been met in the Game Management Unit subunit.

**ISSUE:** The Board of Game (board) and ADF&G has illegally granted exclusive hunting privileges to a Customary and Traditional (C&T) game population that is actively managed to provide a harvestable surplus above the maximum amount necessary for subsistence (ANS) adopted by the board. AS 16.05.258(b)(2) does not require the board to continue Tier I hunts in order to provide a reasonable opportunity for subsistence. Federal moose harvest on federal lands in Unit 13, parts of Units 20D, 12 and 11 and abundant harvestable surplus due to active predator/prey management in Unit 13 all contribute to providing a reasonable opportunity for subsistence uses.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The State of Alaska will be violating state statutes and regulations and numerous Supreme Court decisions governing the allocation of C&T game populations when the harvestable surplus exceeds the maximum ANS Range. The statute, AS 16.05.330, authorizing community hunts is a relic of the 1986 rural priority subsistence law, and violate Article I, Section 1, and Article VIII, Sections 3, 15, and 17 of the Alaska State Constitution. The 1986 rural priority subsistence law was struck down by the Alaska Supreme Court in the 1989 McDowell decision.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, ADF&G staff could annually determine harvest limits by number, sex, and regulate harvest levels in the easily accessible road corridor in order to maintain sustainable bull/cow ratios. Closure of the registration hunt in the remainder of Unit 13 by Emergency Order would prevent habitat damage due to over-browsing.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The majority of Alaskans who have hunted moose in Unit 13 for decades and young Alaskans who would like to share public resources by gathering a wild food harvest and making it part of their tradition.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Some rural residents who would prefer continuing to have a priority to publicly owned resources on State and private lands under AS 16.05.258(b)(2)

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Have the Board of Game propose to reclassify Unit 13 a state non-subsistence Area, 5AAC 99.015. The Mat Valley Advisory Committee has submitted a proposal to the Joint Boards the last time they met to reclassify Unit 13 as a state Non-subsistence Area. The proposal was rejected by the Board of Fisheries members 0-7.

**PROPOSED BY:** Mat Valley Fish & Game Advisory Committee EG053112718  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 67 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures; 5 AAC 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures; and 5 AAC 92.072.**

**Community subsistence harvest hunt area and permit conditions.** Repeal the community subsistence harvest hunt and conditions and establish a weighted subsistence drawing hunt as follows:

Repeal the Community Harvest (Tier I) hunt and area 5AAC 92.072. Repeal hunt conditions 5AAC 92.050, 92.052. and 92.071. Replace the Tier I permit hunts with one weighted subsistence drawing hunt for Alaskan residents limited to numbers of permits and/or sex of animal necessary to achieve management goals, adopted by the Board of Game, for the Nelchina caribou herd.

**ISSUE:** The Board of Game (board) and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) has illegally granted exclusive hunting privileges to a Customary and Traditional (C&T) game population that is actively managed to provide a harvestable surplus above the maximum amount necessary for subsistence (ANS) adopted by the board. The board has adopted a hunt regime under AS 16.05.258(b)(2) that differentiates among subsistence uses based on the notion there are more than one use pattern for Nelchina caribou. Under AS 16.05.258(b)(2) the harvestable portion of the population has to be sufficient enough to provide for ALL subsistence uses. All Alaskans, regardless of what use “pattern” the ADF&G, Division of Subsistence (DOS) have assigned them, qualify for subsistence use if they so choose under AS 16.05.258(b)(2). The board shall provide a preference for subsistence uses, AS 16.05.258(b)(2)(B), again regardless of what use pattern has been assigned to them by DOS, before allowing any resident sport or nonresident hunt.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The state and the board will continue violating statues and regulations governing the allocation of C&T game populations when the harvestable surplus exceeds the maximum ANS range of the game population. The statute, AS 16.05.330, authorizing community hunts is a relic of the 1986 rural priority subsistence law, and violate Article I, Section 1, and Article VIII, Sections 3, 15, 17 of the Alaska State Constitution. The 1986 rural priority subsistence law was struck down by the Alaska Supreme Court in the 1989 McDowell decision.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, ADF&G staff could annually determine harvest limits by number and sex. Which would allow harvest levels necessary to assure enough harvest occurs to prevent the herd from out growing its range capacity, causing habitat damage or reduce the quality of health of individual animals in the Nelchina Caribou Herd.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The majority of Alaskans who have hunted the Nelchina Caribou Herd for decades and young Alaskans who would like to share public resources by gathering a wild food harvest and making it part of their tradition.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Some rural residents who would prefer continuing to have a priority to publicly owned resources on State and private lands during times of abundant harvestable surplus.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Have the board propose to reclassify Unit 13 a state non-subsistence Area under 5AAC 99.015 and adopt a weighted drawing hunt for resident Alaskans. This is an action that only the Joint Boards of Game and Fisheries can take. This solution has been proposed before, but rejected by the Board of Fisheries members 0-7.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Outdoor Council EG043012604  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 68 - 5 AAC 92.072. Community subsistence harvest hunt area and permit conditions, and 92 .074(d). Community subsistence harvest hunt areas.** Increase the number of people per group who can apply for the Copper Basin community harvest subsistence hunt as follows.

5 AAC 92.072(c)(1) a person representing a group of **50 or more** residents or members may apply to the Department of Fish and Game for a community harvest permit by identifying the community harvest hunt areas and the species to be harvested, and by requesting that the department distribute community harvest reports to the individuals who subscribe to the community harvest permit.

**ISSUE:** Increase the minimum number of people necessary to form a group for the Copper Basin Community Subsistence Harvest Program from 25 to 50 or more residents.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Increasing the number required for a community or group will help deter abuse of the community subsistence hunt program (CSH) by those who are taking unfair advantage of the program. Moreover, raising the minimum number of individuals that can form a group from 25 to 50 more accurately reflects the community pattern of subsistence use for the area recognized previously by the Board of Game. The community-based patterns of taking and use of subsistence resources, such as widespread sharing, designated community harvesters and other criteria are far less likely to be practiced in a meaningful and consistent way by a group of only 25 individuals.

In both the 2011 and 2012 seasons, a large number of groups of 25 or more residents applied for the Copper Basin community subsistence moose and caribou hunts. A group from as far away as Juneau signed up for and participated in the community hunts. As more residents take advantage of the loopholes in the current community hunt regulations, it results in less subsistence opportunity for those communities that genuinely engage in this pattern of subsistence use, and in less opportunity for other Alaska residents engaged in other subsistence and non-subsistence uses of moose and caribou in this area. The unexpected large number of groups creates problems for enforcement and management of the hunt. For example, Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) must set extremely cautious quotas for any bull moose because of the large number of community hunters signed up for the program. The ADF&G and enforcement has also instituted an administrative process that is burdensome for genuine community subsistence users, but is considered necessary to control the large number of groups that apply.

The community subsistence harvest permit hunt was created by the board to address subsistence needs and to create a hunt that would comply with customary and traditional use patterns. Customary and traditional hunting needs are not being met due to the increase of hunters taking advantage of this hunt.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Ensuring the opportunity for community subsistence uses as intended originally by the board will improve all aspects of the community subsistence harvest.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those who depend on and live a customary and traditional community based hunting lifestyle will benefit, as was the intent of the community harvest program. Increasing the number of a community group from 25 to 50 should help sort out applicants who truly follow the intent of the program from those who are taking unfair advantage of a program designed for specific purposes.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** It is not the intent of Ahtna that any one should suffer. An eligible group who meets the criteria will be allowed to hunt under the CSH program. Hunters who do not meet the criteria and number necessary to form a group of 50, would still be able to hunt under a drawing permit, Tier I and general hunting season. In fact, all hunters will benefit if the community hunt is only available to those truly engaged in that subsistence pattern of use.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Ahtna thought about increasing the number to 100 for a group to be formed, but we realize, too, the difficulty for any eligible group in attaining such a high number. Ahtna has also proposed other changes to the community subsistence hunt regulations that address similar concerns.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ahtna Tene Nene' Customary & Traditional Use Committee EG050312630  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 69 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose, and 5 AAC 92.072. Community subsistence harvest hunt area and permit conditions.** Increase the any bull quota for the Copper Basin community subsistence harvest moose hunt as follows:

Open Seasons, Bag Limits, Antler Restrictions

Unit 13

Up to 100 bull moose that do not meet general season antler restrictions (“any bulls”) with a hunting season date of August 20 to September 20, and/or spike or fork or 50” antlers, or 4 or more brow-tines on one side, with a season date of August 10 to September 20 can be taken under the Copper Basin Moose CSH hunt.

In addition the Department of Fish and Game should be directed to consult with the affected groups and communities prior to establishing the sub-unit quotas and to give more weight to meeting subsistence uses in balancing population growth versus harvest.

**ISSUE:** Increase the moose any bull quota to at least 100 in the Copper Basin Community Subsistence Harvest Permit Hunt (CSH) in order to provide the amount necessary to provide for subsistence uses for the communities eligible to participate in the community subsistence hunt.

Copper Basin CSH Groups have increased from 2010-2011 to 20+ groups participating in the community subsistence harvest permit hunt. If the board continues with a community harvest permit system that allows such broad participation by groups without more realistic and enforceable verification that participating groups are genuinely engaged in the customary and traditional pattern of community use intended by the CSH provisions, then more and more hunters and groups will choose to participate in the CSH. Consequently, it will be increasingly more difficult for the Ahtna villages and other legitimate communities and groups to harvest the amount of any bull moose necessary to meet their subsistence needs.

The lack of coordination between state and federal managers 2011 resulted in extremely conservative any bull quotas for some of the sub-units that the Ahtna hunters traditionally rely on most to harvest moose. The federal moose harvest by members of the CSH counts against the Copper Basin Community Subsistence Harvest Permit moose quota. This problem needs to be resolved by the agencies. The community quota should not be restrictively managed because of the communication problems between these agencies.

Direction needs to be provided to the department clarifying the need to provide reasonable quotas in the areas where subsistence hunting has traditionally been conducted by the communities rather than establishing small quotas in the most important areas and larger quotas in far removed inaccessible areas. In 2011, the department determined that the small quotas in important sub-units were met very early in the hunt, long before Ahtna hunters were provided sufficient subsistence hunting opportunity. The Department should engage in a process of consultation about the sub-unit quotas with the affected communities before deciding sub-unit quotas. Moreover, the goal of providing for sufficient subsistence opportunity should be given greater weight versus growing the Unit 13 moose population at the fastest rate when the department is determining allocation of sub-unit any bull moose subsistence quotas.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Subsistence users will not be provided a reasonable opportunity. The current any bull moose quota is insufficient to meet subsistence needs, given the way the department is managing eligibility and accountability for groups applying to participate in the community hunt, and the way the quota was divided among the sub-units. In the accessible road hunting areas the any bull moose quota was low, and in the inaccessible areas, such as Unit 13A and Unit 11 the quota for was significantly higher and not reachable, resulting in inadequate opportunity to meet subsistence needs.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those communities and groups that are genuinely and verifiably engaged in community subsistence use patterns and depend upon moose to sustain their way of life will benefit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who seek the fastest growth of the moose population despite the loss of subsistence opportunity. Those who seek to participate in the community subsistence hunt without fully committing to and engaging in the C&T pattern of use that defines community-based subsistence uses.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Ahtna has several proposals for making the community hunt more responsive to the board's intent in adopting this program and fulfilling the goals expressed in the board's 2006 findings regarding C&T use of moose and caribou in Unit 13.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ahtna Tene Nene' Customary & Traditional Use Committee EG050312628  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 70 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Establish general harvest moose hunts for nonresidents in Unit 13 as follows:

General harvest for nonresident moose in Unit 13.

**ISSUE:** Nonresident moose hunting in Unit 13, currently permit hunts DM335, DM336, DM337, DM338 and DM339.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Nonresident hunters will continue to be shut out of an opportunity to hunt in Unit 13 except by very few permits, guide and other service provider lose out on a source of income, the state loses income by not selling tags.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** As it stands a large portion of these tags are not being utilized. When we get more hunters in the field after moose we also have more participation pursuing predators which helps keep the balance. Hunters can also plan more than six months in advance for a hunt.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Nonresident hunters, service providers, and the State of Alaska.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** None.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Registration hunt capped at a number determined by ADF&G, expense for state in managing the hunt.

**PROPOSED BY:** Clint Mayeur

EG042712560

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 71 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Establish a nonresident moose hunt in Unit 13B; close the other Unit 13 subunits to nonresident hunting as follows:

Establish a nonresident hunting season in Unit 13B for moose outside a 5-mile corridor radius on each side of the Richardson Highway, and close other subunits of Unit 13 to nonresident hunting. Unit 13B nonresident hunters:

Unit 13B

Nonresident Hunters:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines; on one side by drawing permit only; with up to 150 permits may be issued

Nonresident - Open Season  
September 1 - September 20

**ISSUE:** Establish a nonresident hunting season in Unit 13B for moose outside a 5-mile corridor radius on each side of the Richardson Highway, and close other subunits of Unit 13 to nonresident hunting.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Adverse impacts to subunits in Unit 13 will continue to take negative effect on subsistence uses and hunters. This Unit experiences enormous hunting pressure every year. Subsistence hunters are experiencing great difficulty in harvesting a moose in Unit 13 because it is considered a prime hunting area. Unit 13 is a hunter destination for residents and nonresidents alike. Establishing a hunting area in Unit 13B for nonresidents will alleviate hunting pressure Unit 13 for Alaska residents who depend on moose as food source.

We believe that establishing a designated subunit for nonresident hunters will still provide access for them but also, too, allow Alaska residents opportunity to the resource without competing with nonresident hunters for a food source. This is a win-win situation for both Alaska residents and non-residents; both should have a successful hunt since there will be less competition for a limited resource.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Resident and nonresident hunters will benefit. Local business people, who depend on hunters purchasing good and services during hunting season.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one should suffer. Designated areas will be identified for both sets of hunters-resident and nonresidents.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** One thought had been to completely end nonresident hunting in all of Unit 13. A more positive solution is recommending a subunit for nonresident hunters with a 5 mile corridor.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ahtna Tene Nene' Customary & Traditional Use Committee EG050312634  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 72 - 5 AAC 92.050(4)(I). Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.**

Repeal the exclusive hunting restriction for Tier I caribou in Unit 13 as follows:

Repeal the regulation that limits hunting moose outside of Unit 13 if hunting caribou in Unit 13 with a Tier I permit. The new regulation would simply remove the requirement to hunt moose in Unit 13 if you have a Tier 1 caribou tag.

**ISSUE:** The requirement that came out last year that if you hunt caribou in Unit 13 on a Tier 1 tag, that you must hunt moose needs to be rescinded. How do the two even have any relation to one another?

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Moose numbers will decline, as there is too much hunting pressure on the moose. Most people that hunt caribou in Unit 13 use to hunt their moose in other units. The moose were pushed miles off the highway last year, causing them to congregate in the fall in habitat they were not use to. This will lead to more winter kill, and wolf and bear kills will go up, as the moose are weaker because of the extra hunting pressure in the fall.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, it improves habitat, increases moose populations from over hunting and takes away the moose/caribou link... which I still have no idea how the two animals are linked in this way. Different animals, different habitat, different feed in everyway...

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters that draw a Tier I tag will have the option to hunt moose in any other part of the state. Traditional hunters in Unit 13 will have less competition, and more opportunities to fill their freezers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** I can't think of a single thing that will suffer is this proposal is adopted. I would sure like to know what it is, so I could at least understand the reasoning behind the rule in the first place.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** What other solution is there? I'm not sure why it was there in the first place.

**PROPOSED BY:** Claude Bondy

EG042012536

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 73 - 5 AAC 92.050(4)(I). Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.**

Repeal the exclusive hunting restriction for Tier I caribou in Unit 13

No more than one Unit 13 Tier I subsistence permit for caribou may be issued per household every regulatory year; the head of household, as defined in 5 AAC 92.050(b), [AND ANY MEMBER OF THE HOUSEHOLD OBTAINING A UNIT 13 TIER I SUBSISTENCE PERMIT IN A REGULATORY YEAR FOR CARIBOU MAY NOT HUNT CARIBOU OR MOOSE IN ANY OTHER LOCATION IN THE STATE DURING THAT REGULATORY YEAR;]

**ISSUE:** Decoupling the requirement that permit holders of Unit 13 Tier I caribou permits and all household members cannot hunt moose or caribou in another location. This measure has been put in place to reduce the demand for caribou permits, but it has had an adverse effect on habitat and the resource due to exponential increase in moose hunting pressure and degradation of trails from the increased number of off-road vehicles.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The habitat will be degraded along the numerous road accessible trail systems such as in the Eureka area from the increased number of hunters pursuing moose. Hunting pressure will be excessive along any trail system within Unit 13. Success rates will drop. The hunting experience will be like combat fishing at Russian River. There are other more robust moose hunting areas such as in the Tanana Valley which would have handled some of the hunting pressure. This is a bad policy used to attempt to reduce demand for subsistence caribou permits.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, absolutely. Success rates will increase because the hunting pressure will decline and there will be a higher bull-cow ratio.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Moose; more legal bull moose will survive; higher bull-cow ratio. Moose hunters will have a higher success rate with reduced pressure.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Continue status quo. That is not a viable solution because the regulation has been in place for two seasons and the results are apparent: a degradation of habitat, a decline in the hunting experience due to density of hunters, increased pressure on legal moose population and a reduced success rate by moose hunters.

**PROPOSED BY:** Mat-Su Borough Fish and Wildlife Commission

EG050112616

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 74 - 5 AAC 85.020. Seasons and bag limits for brown bear, and 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures.** Allow the taking of brown/grizzly bear over registered black bear bait stations in Unit 13D as follows:

Allow for the taking of brown/grizzly bear over registered black bear bait stations in Unit 13D with the following conditions: Brown/grizzly bears taken over black bear bait stations will count against the statewide individual bag limit for brown/grizzly bears. No Brown/grizzly bears accompanied by cubs will be taken over registered black bear bait stations in Unit 13D. Brown/grizzly bears taken over black bear bait stations must be reported to the Department of Fish and Game within 5 days of kill. The Department of Fish and Game may suspend taking of brown/grizzly bears over black bear bait stations in Unit 13D by emergency order. Only the hunter who has registered active (actually registered, baited, and hunted) black bear bait stations located in unit 13D for each of the prior three regulatory years may take brown/grizzly bears over that black bear bait station in Unit 13D.

**ISSUE:** Allow taking of brown/grizzly bears over registered black bear bait stations in Unit 13D. Due to the following problems: Brown/grizzly bears dominate Unit 13D black bear bait stations. They habitually return to the black bear bait stations to feed. Brown/grizzly bears are safeguarded from legal hunting by the dense undergrowth/vegetation and extremely limited visibility common throughout Unit 13D. Brown/grizzly bears decrease hunter opportunity to successfully harvest black bears over registered bait stations. Black bear hunters spend a lot of money to get to their black bear bait stations (driving with increased fuel costs), in purchasing dog food and other “bait” to use at the black bear bait station, in containers to hold the bait, tree stands or ground blinds, and cameras to monitor the bait stations, etc.. Only to find that brown/grizzly bears had eaten all the bait and damaged stands, barrels, and monitoring cameras. Brown/grizzly bears create unsafe conditions-particularly for young hunters and observing children while walking into or sitting at black bear bait stations. Moose populations continue to be low in Unit 13D.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Hunters in Unit 13D will abandon black bear hunting over bait altogether due to frustration over dominating brown/grizzly bears over bait stations. Use of bait is the only viable means of consistently harvesting black bears in the densely vegetated black bear habitat common throughout Unit 13D. We will lose an excellent opportunity to introduce young hunters and observing children to outdoor recreation and hunting. Adult hunters will increasingly exclude young hunters and observing children from black bear hunting over bait due to the dangers of running into a brown/grizzly bear while approaching or sitting on black bear bait stations. If hunters start to abandon black bear hunting over registered bait stations in Unit 13D along with the difficulty of hunting opportunity to take brown/grizzly bears due to dense undergrowth and limited visibility, moose populations will continue to be low in Unit 13D. Brown/grizzly bears are taken by black bear hunters in defense of life or property at black bear bait stations. I expect that more occurrences of DLP over black bear bait stations will increase as the brown/grizzly bear populations continue to increase in Unit 13D. Brown/grizzly bears will continue to habituate black bear bait stations.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, allowing the legal take of brown/grizzly bears over

registered black bear bait stations will reduce the number of brown/grizzly bears currently dominating Unit 13D. Reducing the brown/grizzly bear populations in Unit 13D will hopefully allow for an increase in moose populations in Unit 13D. Allowing the legal take of brown/grizzly bears over registered black bear bait stations will also increase black bear hunting opportunities over black bear bait stations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Black bear hunters who spend a lot of money to drive to and manage bait black bear bait stations. Alaska residents who hunt moose in Unit 13D. By decreasing brown/grizzly bear numbers in Unit 13D will hopefully increase moose populations in Unit 13D.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** In general I don't believe anyone will suffer by this proposal if adopted. Some anti-hunting persons/groups may oppose the proposal on the grounds of hunting in general, but I do not see how they would actually suffer if the proposal is adopted.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Leaving the hunting of black bears over black bear bait stations and brown/grizzly bear hunting as it currently is. The problem with this is that every year more and more brown/grizzly bears are negatively affecting black bear bait stations. It is becoming more costly to run a black bear bait station, and more dangerous. Something need to be done to address the problem. By allowing the legal take of brown/grizzly bears over black bear bait stations will slightly reduce the population. The Department of Fish and Game can close by emergency order the taking of brown/grizzly bears over bait at any time they determine enough brown/grizzly bears have been taken in Unit 13D. See if the Department of Fish and Game could get registered black bear bait station hunters to allow them (fish and game) to utilize their black bear stations under a voluntary program coordinated with the hunter to radio collar brown/grizzly bears on black bear bait stations throughout Unit 13D. Try to gather additional information on brown/grizzly bear populations in Unit 13D to see the range of these bears and historical use of black bear bait stations year after year. The problem with this is that it will be an additional cost on the Department of Fish and Game's already limited budget. Will the radio collars work in the dense undergrowth/vegetation of most of Unit 13D? Anytime you have a voluntary program, you have to ask yourself if hunters will actually participate in a program like this. Allow the taking of brown/grizzly bears over black bear bait stations in all of Unit 13. I understand that this may be a bit of a controversial program for some. I know it has been brought up in years past and folks are afraid that it may put an end to all of black bear baiting. I don't agree with this feeling, however I feel that by trying this in subunit 13D specifically will be a good trial for the program. I selected Unit 13D for the reasons listed above in this proposal. Let's see how it works and allow the Department of Fish and Game the opportunity to close it down by emergency order if they see the need to.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alysia White

EG042912569

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 75 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear, and 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures.** Open Unit 13 to brown bear baiting as follows:

Regulation would read: Brown bear, limit in Unit 13 is one bear per year; brown bears can be taken over bait in registered bait stations.

**ISSUE:** We would like to see all of Unit 13 opened to brown bear baiting. There are a huge number of bears, particularly in Unit 13B and there are never enough hunters to keep these numbers down enough to help out moose and caribou.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Moose and caribou numbers will continue to decline.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This will improve caribou and moose calf survival, allowing for a more liberal season and more tags, thus increasing the opportunities for more Alaskan families to be able to have food in the winters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaskans who depend on wild game will have more chances to fill their freezers with moose and caribou.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The brown bear guides may suffer in the area if more bears are taken, unless the guides also set up bait stations, in which case, they may do even better.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1.) ADF&G proposed some aerial predator control for brown bears. This is not a good idea, since sportsman will not get a shot at them and it will be very unpopular with the public. 2.) Considered allowing nonresident hunters to be able to hunt brown bear in Unit 13 without a guide. This would help out immensely, but I don't think the state is ready to allow that.

**PROPOSED BY:** Claude Bondy EG041812531

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 76 - 5 AAC 85.020, Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear, and 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures.** Open Unit 13D to brown bear baiting as follows:

Establish a Unit 13D brown bear baiting season/permit, for residents and nonresidents, that coincides with the Unit 13 spring black bear baiting season (April 15 - June 30) and that brown bear baiting be administered in the same manner as black bear baiting. Black bear baits that are used year after year continue to draw in many brown bears which have a direct impact on the number of black bears that visit these bait stations when brown bears are present. In turn giving the hunter less opportunity to harvest a black bear.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Brown bear hunting opportunity will be unnecessarily restricted and black bear baiters will not be allowed to harvest brown bears that come into their baits. Black bear bait station permittees that spend a lot of time and effort keeping a bait station functional for several weeks trying to harvest a black bear will continue to have several brown bear encounters and less encounters with black bears. Brown bears will continue to dominate black bear baits and the opportunity for young and seasoned hunters to harvest black bears will continue to decrease.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, it will allow black bear baiters to harvest brown bears over their black bear baits. Also, it may result in a few more brown bears killed in Unit 13 D.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters wanting to bait brown bears and hunters trying to harvest black bears.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People opposed to hunting or brown bear baiting.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Randy Anderson EG043012606  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 77 - 5 AAC 85.020, Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear, and 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures.** Open Unit 13 to brown bear baiting as follows:

Allow brown baiting over black bear bait stations with same restrictions and season date of April 15 to May 31.

**ISSUE:** Allow brown baiting over black bear bait stations with same restrictions and season date of April 15 to May 31.

Brown bear population is thought to be healthy in Unit 13. A brown bear bait season will not threaten the population of brown bears in Unit 13. Brown bears prey upon calves of caribou and moose. A brown bear baiting season in Unit 13 will alleviate threats from brown bears preying upon calves of caribou and moose in Unit 13. Moose and caribou populations will increase, if this proposal were adopted.

Ending brown bear baiting season on May 31 instead of June 30 will not create a conflict of bear encounters during the fishing season. Regulations state that bait stations may be set up 1/4 mile from trails, and 1 mile from a house or other permanent dwelling. Bait stations will attract bears which will create problems for those who fish for salmon in the Copper River. Setting up a bait station 1 mile from a house will potentially create a confrontation between humans and bears.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Brown bears in Unit 13 will continue to prey upon calves of caribou and moose. The calf to cow ratios is below the objective in all

subunits of Unit 13, with the exception of 13E. In Unit 13A, it is 22:100 west, 33: 33:100 east; in Unit 13B it is 25:100; in Unit 13C it is 19:100 in Unit 13D it is 10:100. Calves will not be able to survive and build up moose population in Unit 13.

The survival rate of Nelchina Caribou Herd is considered good; however, a bad winter, predators and hunters could tip the balance and bring about a decline in the population.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Handicrafts could be made from brown bear fur.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Subsistence hunters will benefit by increased caribou and moose population in Unit 13. More calves will survive in Unit 13. Antler moose restricted hunts may be taken out of hunting regulations if more caribou and moose calves survive.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will actually suffer if an experimental brown bear bait season were opened in Unit 13. Some people may not approve of bait stations and will object to the killing of brown bears with a bait station.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Allow an experimental brown bear baiting season to be held for two years, with the same restrictions and seasons as black bear bait regulations.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ahtna Tene Nene' Customary & Traditional Use Committee EG050312631  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 78 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear; 5 AAC 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures.** Open Unit 13D to brown and black bear baiting as follows:

I propose having a spring and fall baiting season for both black and brown bear, open to both residents and nonresidents with all the current meat salvage requirements retained for black bear and also applied to brown bear. All guiding requirements would also be applicable for brown bear harvest.

Season dates would be: Spring - April 15 to June 30; Fall - August 20 to October 31. The Department of Fish and Game staff should be given free range to adjust seasons and bag limits if they see signs of over harvesting.

**ISSUE:** There is a large under harvested population of both black and brown bear in Unit 13D. A significant portion of Unit 13D is very difficult to access. There is no aerial predator control in this area and the moose population has not grown as it has in the rest of unit 13 where aerial wolf control is in effect. Brown and black bear have been proven to be significant predators of moose calves in other areas and I am sure this hold true in this area also.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Without baiting for both black and brown bear in this unit there will continue to be an under harvest of an abundant resource and the moose calves will not be given the optimum opportunity for survival and moose calf survival will

continue to be low. Under the current regulations it is cost prohibitive to have fly-in bait stations for just black bear as you have to abandon the bait stations when brown bear start to use them.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Taking bears over bait gives hunters a better opportunity to judge the bears for hair quality and size. By increasing the bear harvest in this sub-unit Fish and Game will be able to see if there is an increase in moose calf survival at the same time.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All bear hunters who would like to use bait stations will benefit by having an opportunity to harvest either a black or brown bear if it comes to their station, rather than having to abandon the station if a brown bear comes in. By increasing the bear harvest the moose calf survival should increase leading to more harvestable moose to benefit moose hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one is likely to suffer.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Dan Montgomery

EG043012597

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 79 - 5 AAC 92.015 Brown bear tag fee exemptions.** Exclude National Park Service lands from brown bear tag fee exemptions as follows:

**92.015 Brown bear tag fee exemptions.**

- (a) **Except for lands managed by the National Park Service,** a resident tag is not required for the taking of a brown bear in the following units:

**ISSUE:** Brown bear resident tag exemptions on lands managed by the National Park Service (NPS) in Alaska. Brown bear tag exemptions are justified by the Board of Game (board) to promote the opportunistic harvest of brown bears, mainly by individuals engaged in other activities such as hunting other species of game (non targeted harvest of bears), or summer recreating activities in general. When tag exemptions are combined with significant liberalizations in bag limits and extended seasons, the result has been a dramatic increase in brown bear harvest rates in much of Alaska.

In a 1998 ADF&G report to the board titled “Resident Brown Bear Bag Limits and Tag Fees,” the department stated: “The Department lacks adequate information on brown/grizzly population numbers in most areas of the state to manage harvest intensively on an annual basis. Because of the difficulty and high costs of estimating bear density, it is unlikely the Department will be able to gather such information on a wide scale in the foreseeable future.”

NPCA considers little has changed since that recommendation was made to the board.

The most aggressive large scale brown bear reduction program strictly relying on liberal general season hunting regulations, including revocation of resident tag requirements since 1995 and no

closed season since 2003 is occurring in Unit 13. Yet, it is noteworthy to point out that the board requires resident tags for brown bear harvest in Denali State Park, also located in Unit 13, while not requiring brown bear tags in Wrangell St. Elias National Park and Preserve, even though the park and preserve has the distinction of being recognized as a World Heritage Site by UNESCO.

Former ADF&G bear researcher, Sterling Miller, noted in “Trends in Intensive management of Alaska’s Grizzly Bears, 1980 – 2010” the dramatic increase in brown bear tag exemptions which included 95% of GMUs 11 – 25 by 2010. (72% of the state). In comparison, in 1980, no resident brown bear tag exemptions existed in these GMUs.

In a letter dated February 16, 2007, the NPS commented to the board on a proposal #72, brown bear tag exemption reauthorization for the historical Region II, by stating: “The intent of this proposal is to continue the brown bear tag fee exemption and thereby increase the harvest of brown bears to decrease predation on moose calves. This proposal is effectively an extension of the state’s intensive management and predator control program and should not be authorized on NPS managed lands. Should the board support this proposal, we request that NPS lands be specifically excluded.”

The board ignored the NPS request and authorized the tag fee exemptions for all NPS lands, while excluding Denali State Park.

Again in a letter dated February 11, 2009, the NPS requested exemption of NPS lands for the reauthorization of brown bear tag fee exemptions in the historic Region II stating: “The intent of this proposal is to continue the brown bear tag fee exemption and thereby increase the harvest of brown bears in order to decrease predation on moose calves. This proposal extends the state’s intensive management control objectives and NPS opposes the extension of such measures on NPS lands.” (emphasis added)

Once again the NPS was ignored.

Then in a letter dated February 18, 2011, the NPS commented in support of Proposal 109, requesting resident brown bear tag fees be reinstated for Denali and Wrangell St. Elias National Park and Preserve by stating: “This proposal would remove the tag fee revocation for all lands in Unit 13 and NPS managed lands in Units 11 and 16B. Consistent with the narrative in the proposal and based on several comments from past years, the NPS supports this proposal as it relates to all NPS lands. The proposed changes potentially affect NPS lands in Denali National Preserve and Wrangell St Elias National Preserve.” (emphasis added).

This time, the board refused to even discuss the proposal or the NPS request that accompanied it, preferring instead to reauthorize brown bear tag exemptions throughout the entire region, and once again, yet requiring brown bear tags in Denali State Park.

As defined in the current Master memorandum of Understanding (MMOU) between the NPS and the State of Alaska, the state agreed to abide by federal law and congressional management mandates for lands managed by the NPS in Alaska.

The state mutually agreed to the following: “To recognize that the taking of fish and wildlife by hunting, trapping, or fishing on certain Service lands in Alaska is authorized in accordance with applicable State and Federal law **unless State regulations are found to be incompatible with documented Park or Preserve goals, objectives or management plans.**” (emphasis added)

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The board will continue to authorize, and the ADF&G will continue to implement regulations that are inconsistent with documented NPS park purposes and values.

A continued lack of cooperation on the part of the State of Alaska regarding inconsistent state regulations pertaining to documented park or preserve goals, objectives or management plans may result in the promulgation of federal regulations.

Brown bear populations within lands managed by the NPS in Alaska will be vulnerable to unsustainable harvest and/or excessive emigration of brown bears to low density state lands bordering NPS parks, monuments and preserves.

In the 2007 brown bear management report, the ADF&G area biologist stated: “A major problem pertaining to brown bear management is the difficulty in obtaining population data... Because of this; population data are available for only a limited portion of Unit 13. All unit wide bear estimates are based on extrapolations of estimated densities. The problems associated with this are obvious, particularly given the differences in study area and census techniques.” – page 148)

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Brown/grizzly bears have low population density and low recruitment, it is very difficult and expensive to estimate population size and trend, and bears may take many years to recover from population reductions. Requiring brown bear tags promotes, as emphasized by the ADF&G, “an attitude in which most hunters held brown/grizzly bears in high esteem, to be harvested conservatively as part of a carefully planned hunting experience rather than incidental to other activities.” (1998 Report to board)

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The proposed amendment protects NPS park purposes and values, including the highest management value for the nonconsumptive wildlife viewing public where naturally regulated populations of bears and intact ecosystems are promoted to the maximum extent possible.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Special interest groups who prefer artificial management of ecosystems within Alaska’s national preserves.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The NPS and NPCA have consistently requested that the board exempt NPS managed lands when state and federal management objectives differ. The fundamental intention of the MMOU between the NPS and State of Alaska is to define guidelines for cooperative management between the state and federal government. Unfortunately, the board has consistently refused to address NPS concerns, comments, and proposals.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 80 - 5 AAC 92.108. Identified big game prey populations and objectives.**

Modify the moose population and harvest objectives for Unit 13B as follows:

Our Advisory Committee, based on over 150 years combined residency in Unit 13B, recommends a population objective of 4,000-5,000 moose, with a harvest objective of 240-280.

**ISSUE:** The population and harvest objective numbers are too high to support. Unit 13B has a estimated moose population of 1.7 moose per square mile. The majority of Unit 13B is high country, above timberline. The moose leave the high elevations in early November for river valleys where there is available feed. Very, very few moose stay in the country above timber, other than several dozen along the upper Tangle Lakes system. The present population abjective of 5,000-6,300 moose is not supported, nor is it supportable by scientific data.

The current harvest of 263 (2011) is lower than the current harvest objective of 310-620. Under the current regulations that harvest would be bulls only. The bull/cow ration in Unit 13B is 25 per 100---the current population estimate is 5,340 moose which computes to about 1,100 bull moose. Take 500 bulls from that population and the bull/cow ratio is reduced to an unacceptable range; approximately 13/100.

The condition of browse that Unit 13B moose utilize is currently unknown. Browse studies have just begun. Deep snow in 2012 forced concentrations in wintering areas that may not be sustainable. Calf production seems on the low end of the range in the low 20's per hundred cows.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The potential for a population crash such as occurred during the winters of 1970-71 and 71-72 may very well occur.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes; as it addresses winter survival and productivity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?**

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** This was a long discussion by our advisory group. Our solutions were mostly based around numbers. We discussed the need to manage bull/cow rations within the breeding areas rather that just unit wide. Harvest in Unit 13 is concentrated along the highway systems. Counting moose and figuring bull/cow ratios unit wide can lead to skewed data.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 81 - 5 AAC 92.108. Identified big game prey populations and objectives.**

Modify the moose population and harvest objectives for Unit 13 as follows:

Unit 13 Moose Population and Harvest Objectives

<b>Subunit</b>	<b>Moose Population Objective Range</b>	<b>Harvest Objective</b>	<b>Harvest Objective Range:</b>
13A	3,500-4,200	<u>7%</u>	<u>245-294</u> [210-420]
13B	5,300-6,300	<u>5%</u>	<u>265-315</u> [310-620]
13C	<u>2,000-3,000</u> [2,600-3,500]	<u>5%</u>	<u>100-150</u> [155-350]
13D	<u>1,500-2,200</u> [1,200-1,900]	<u>5%</u>	<u>75-110</u> [75-190]
13 E	<u>5,500-6,500</u> [5,000-6,000]	<u>5%</u>	<u>275-325</u> [300-600]

**ISSUE:** Moose population and harvest objectives in Unit 13 that may not be realistic, or good for the long term health of the Unit 13 animal populations.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Maybe nothing, or maybe unforeseen problems may develop from keeping the predator (wolf) population at unnaturally low levels for long periods of time in order to keep increasing moose numbers to abnormally high numbers. We feel current (2011) moose population and harvest levels are healthy and sustainable, and so adjusted the population and harvest objectives to match current levels with a range to allow some growth. This healthy population of moose was brought back from record declines and low numbers of 10 years ago mainly due to the successful wolf control program. It is time to take into consideration that we may have nearly enough moose for this area, as far as carrying capacity, and we feel it's time to start slowing up the growth of the moose herd by closing the same day airborne (SDA) on wolves for a period of time, to let the wolves build up to more natural numbers. We are really not sure how many moose the area can handle, and we don't want to find out the hard way.

This proposal, in conjunction with another proposal in this booklet written by the Copper Basin Fish and Game Advisory Committee rewording some of the Unit 13 Intensive Management Plan, will allow wolf control to slow down or stop for a period of time in most of the unit. The moose herd should continue to grow slightly for a couple more years until the wolf population jumps back up. Then hopefully a combination of increased harvest opportunity (cow hunt proposal) and higher wolf numbers will level out the growth of the moose herd.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The successful wolf control program in Unit 13 should shift gears and scale back for a period of time to allow the wolf population to return to more natural numbers, and this proposal will help to allow that to happen. Close monitoring of moose and wolf numbers will be essential. It is also essential that the wolf control tool be available to the

manager if needed. There will be increased moose hunting opportunity with the increased moose numbers. There will also be increased wolf trapping opportunity for the wolf trappers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Moose hunters will benefit. Wolf trappers will benefit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Leaving the numbers as they were would be status quo. Some of the harvest numbers seemed unrealistic, and also some population goals. Until the goals set are reached, the wolf control doesn't stop. We feel we have enough moose, so we changed the goals.

**PROPOSED BY:** Copper Basin Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050112609  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 82 - 5 AAC 92.125. Intensive management plans.** Modify the wolf population objective under intensive management for Unit 13 as follows:

We feel that the present wolf population trigger needs to be much closer to the mid-point of the population range. Also that the wolf population count that triggers the shut-off of intensive management (IM). should be confined to the IM area, not unit wide. Wolves counted in Unit 13D rarely migrate into the IM area.

We favor a protocol that would control the population closer to both the mid-point of the population range. The number of 135 was acceptable to us as long as the count was contained within the IM area. Wolf population is not a stand-alone item. The population could also be tied as a ratio of wolves/moose within the IM.

**ISSUE:** Low wolf numbers in Unit 13. We feel that a certain number of wolves are necessary in the Unit. The wolf population is artificially low which is leading to a number of issues that have unknown consequences. Some indicators are an excessive number of coyotes in the upper portions of the Unit. Ravens moving from traditional habitats. While neither of these things may become an issue, they certainly should give us a sign that something is changing. The current IM program only triggers at the extremes of the moose population or at the low end of the wolf population. The present wolf population in the central portion of Unit 13 is basically non-existent.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** That is the point; we don't know. Wolves provide a necessary balance to the eco-system.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. A few more wolves available for area trappers. Wolf tracks for non-consumptive users. Health of the ecosystem.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those who utilize wolves for sport or pleasure. Aerial hunters who participate in the IM program, by providing enough wolves to make it feasible. Moose hunters who value a healthy moose population.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Sub-unit wolf population control. Rejected as difficult to manage because of wolf pack range and poor history of sub-unit population estimates.

**PROPOSED BY:** Paxson Fish and Game Advisory Committee. EG043012585  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 83 - 5 AAC 92.125. Intensive management plans.** Modify the intensive management plan for Unit 13 as follows:

Reword the Unit 13 Intensive Management Plan under 5 AAC 92.125 (as of 2012) as follows:

- ...
6. other specifications the board considers necessary are as follows:
- ( A ) the commissioner will suspend wolf control activities
    - ( i ) when wolf inventories or accumulated information from permittees indicate the need to avoid reducing wolf numbers **in the IM** area below the management objective of **100** [135] wolves specified in this subsection;
    - ( ii ) when spring conditions deteriorate to make wolf control operations infeasible;
    - ( iii ) no later than April 30 in any regulatory year; or
    - (iv) when prey population **meets or exceeds the midpoint of population objectives by subunit**; [AND HARVEST OBJECTIVES ARE RELIABLY ATTAINED;]
  - (B) wolf control activities will be terminated upon expiration of the period which the commissioner is authorized to reduce predator numbers in the predator control plan area;
  - (C) **wolf control activities will commence by subunit when prey population falls below the minimum objective.** [THE COMMISSIONER WILL ANNUALLY CLOSE WOLF HUNTING AND TRAPPING SEASONS AS APPROPRIATE TO ENSURE THAT THE MINIMUM WOLF POPULATION OBJECTIVE IS MET.]

**ISSUE:** Reword some of the Unit 13 Intensive Management Plan as a way to give the manager more direction and flexibility to scale back in a successful wolf control plan. We need recognizable triggers to start and stop wolf control activities in intensive management areas. Another problem with the wording as it is: Wolf trapping and hunting has to stop when wolf control activities stop. We feel that the regular wolf trapping and hunting seasons should not be affected in any way by the wolf control seasons. It should be mentioned that this proposal was submitted along with another proposal by the Copper Basin Fish and Game Advisory Committee in this same booklet setting new moose population and harvest objectives for Unit 13, that would trigger action or inaction of wolf control that is different than what would be the triggers if the objectives are left as is.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Managers will not have a definite trigger point as to when to start or stop wolf control activities.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Better triggers for wolf control activities.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Wolf trappers will benefit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one should suffer because of this proposal.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** It was suggested to regulate the wolf take by subunit instead of unit wide, as some areas of the unit are more open and easier to take wolves. As a result, the more open subunits may end up early in the winter with less than the desirable density of wolves (spring management objective), and should probably be closed to taking wolves earlier in the winter. However, the total unit wide numbers when balanced with the areas more timbered and thus more difficult to take wolves, are averaged together and then more in line with the unit wide goal. It was explained that there is almost no budget for counting wolves as it is, and the additional cost to do it by subunit would not be possible with the current monies available.

**PROPOSED BY:** Copper Basin Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050112610  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 84 - 5 AAC 92.108. Identified big game prey populations and objectives; 5 AAC 92.110. Control of predation by wolves; 5 AAC 92.115. Control of predation by bears; and 92.125 Intensive management plans.** Establish a predator control program in Units 11 and 12 as follows:

Establish a positive finding, determine population objective and harvest objective under 5AAC 92.108 for Mentasta Caribou Herd and establish a new wolf and bear control program in Unit 11 and Unit 12 on Ahtna's inholdings. Predator control program would be in Unit 11 on Ahtna's checkerboard in holdings south of Suslositna Creek to Sanford River.

**ISSUE:** Establish a positive finding, determine population objective and harvest objective under 5 AAC92.108 for Mentasta Caribou Herd and establish a new wolf and bear control program on Ahtna's in holdings. Predator Control Program would be on Ahtna's checkerboard in holdings south of Suslositna Creek to Sanford River.

Ahtna's checker board land status shouldn't be a deterrent to establishing a newly created predator control program. Ahtna's in holdings within these proposed boundaries will allow airplanes to land on nearby rivers, lakes and ponds to take wolves and bears. This program will be a success, and the Mentasta Caribou Herd population will increase and subsistence needs will be met.

Predation of wolves and bears are known to be the problem of poor Mentasta Caribou Herd population. Mentasta Caribou Herd has been on a severe decline since the 90s, and is continuing

to decline. A newly created predator control program and a positive finding for the Mentasta Caribou Herd in the two units will increase opportunities to harvest a caribou. When the herd increases so that a hunt can occur, hunters will have another caribou herd to hunt for and harvest in Unit 11 and Unit 12.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The last population Mentasta Caribou Herd count in 2010 was at 326. The low population is due to wolves and bears preying upon calves of this caribou herd. The Mentasta Caribou Herd is in jeopardy. A predator control program is imperative to build up this herd, before it continues to be severely impacted by predators.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone will benefit, if a new predator control program is established in Unit 11 and Unit 12 findings for Mentasta Caribou Herd, harvest objectives and population objectives were established. Mentasta Caribou Herd will only increase and more hunters will have more opportunities of harvest a caribou.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will actually suffer. Some people may dislike predator control programs because they think it is inhumane.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** There is no other solution to this problem. Mentasta Caribou hunting season has been closed since mid-nineties due to predation by wolves and bears.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ahtna Tene Nene' Customary & Traditional Use Committee EG050312632  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 85 - 5 AAC 92.108. Identified big game prey populations and objectives, 5 AAC 92.110. Control of predation by wolves, 5 AAC 92.115. Control of predation by bears; and 5 AAC 92.125. Intensive management plans.** Establish a predator control plan in Unit 11 as follows:

Establish a positive finding, determine population objective and harvest objective under 5 AAC 92.108 for Unit 11 moose and establish a new wolf and bear control program in Unit 11 on Ahtna's in holdings. Predator control program would be in Unit 11 on Ahtna's checkerboard in holdings between Boulder Creek and Sanford River, and south of Mineral Springs to Kuskulana River.

**ISSUE:** Establish a positive finding, determine population objective and harvest objective under 5 AAC 92.108 for Unit 11 moose and establish a new wolf and bear control program in Unit 11 on Ahtna's in holdings. Predator Control Program would be in Unit 11 on Ahtna's checkerboard in holdings between Boulder Creek and Sanford River, and south of Mineral Springs to Kuskulana River.

Ahtna's checker board land status in Unit 11 shouldn't be a deterrent to establishing a newly created predator control program. Ahtna's in holdings within these proposed boundaries will allow air planes to land on nearby rivers, lakes and ponds to take wolves and bears. This program will be a success, and the moose population will increase and subsistence needs will be met.

Predation of wolves and bears are known to be the problem of poor moose and Mentasta Caribou Herd population in Unit 11. A newly predator control program and a positive finding for moose in Unit 11 will increase opportunities to harvest a moose in Unit 11. Impact in Unit 13 from hunters is increasing each year and many local people will have to hunt in Unit 11 to meet subsistence needs.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Moose in Unit 11 is at a low density mainly due to wolves and bears preying upon calves of moose. Moose population range is .5 to .9 per square mile. If a predator control program is not established in Unit 11 for moose, the population of moose will continue its downward spiral.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone will benefit, if a new predator control program is established in Unit 11 and findings for moose, harvest objectives and population objectives were established. Moose population will increase.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will actually suffer. Some people may dislike predator control programs because they think it is inhumane.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** There is no other solution to this problem. Lengthy seasons for hunting wolves and bears are already in place to attempt to increase moose population.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ahtna Tene Nene' Customary & Traditional Use Committee EG050312633  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 86 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf, 5 AAC 84.270. Trapping seasons and bag limits; and 92.125 Intensive management plans.** Close an area near Denali National Park in Unit 13 to taking wolves as follows;

The area of Unit 13 west (and north) of the Parks Highway to the boundary of Denali National Park, and the area of Unit 13 within 5 miles east (and south) of the highway, is closed to any taking of wolves.

**ISSUE:** The unacceptable level of take on state lands of wolves that use Denali National Park. The Park's wolf populations are significantly reduced, to an extent due to take on state lands adjoining and just east and south of the Park boundary. These wolves provide enormous viewing opportunities for several hundred thousand visitors each year, and the continued take of even a few prominent individual wolves, such as the Alpha female from the Grant Creek pack in April

2012, represents a significant loss of viewing opportunities. The Grant Creek female loss represents the loss of breeding potential to that pack, and to the eastern Park area. As well, wolves on state lands adjacent to the Park are a source for repopulation of the Park's depleted wolf populations. Thus, the Board of Game should establish a no-take wolf buffer along the eastern edge of Denali National Park.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There would be continued loss of wolf populations in Denali National Park, and a resulting loss of their ecological value, intrinsic value, and significant tourism value. As was seen with the loss of the Alpha female from Gant Creek pack in April 2012, even the loss of one important reproductive female can cause the reproductive capacity of the eastern Park wolf populations to be reduced, thus compromising viewing opportunities by visitors.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The proposal will provide additional protection for Denali National Park wolf populations, and thereby provide the highest and best use of this resource.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All visitors to Denali National Park, science, and the wolf populations of the park.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Two or three recreational trappers/hunters who are active along the eastern boundary of the National Park.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Rick Steiner

EG043012592

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 87 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou, and 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas.** Allow use of off-road vehicles for elderly and disabled to hunt caribou in Unit 13 as follows:

To allow the use of 4-wheelers in state parks to access hunting for elderly and/or disabled people.

**ISSUE:** Access for elderly and/or disabled people to hunt.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Many of Alaskan longtime residents will lose their ability to participate in hunting caribou.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Elderly and/or disabled.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one – others have the ability to access the resource.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Was told that no permit was available.

**PROPOSED BY:** Betty Oliver

EG050712692

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 88 - 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game.** Modify the hunting season open date and bag limit for Ptarmigan in Unit 13 as follows:

Unit 13B, ptarmigan season: August 20 to March 31; 5 per day, 10 in possession.

**ISSUE:** Ptarmigan season and bag limit for Unit 13B

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Hunters will be missing an opportunity to hunt a healthy bird population.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The ten day later opening allows for young birds to grow to near adult size. Much of the Unit 13B bird hunting takes place along the Denali Highway where nesting times are significantly later than in many other areas near the road system. Many times the some broods are not fully-featured by the current August 10 opener.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** It would benefit hunters who utilize ptarmigan as a food source, rather than solely for sport.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Early season sport hunters.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** February closure date. Rejected to allow hunters a bit more access in better weather conditions. Same August 10 start date as now. Rejected as we have never felt this season date made any since for ptarmigan. It was originally implemented for grouse.

**PROPOSED BY:** Paxson Fish & Game Advisory Committee

EG043012588

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 89 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep.** Establish and muzzleloader and archery hunt for Dall sheep in Unit 13A as follows:

The preferred solution would to create a primitive weapons hunt for Unit 13A allowing muzzleloader and archery equipment only for harvesting full curl Dall rams. This would reduce pressure on the herd. A less preferred solution would be to create a drawing permit hunt. The boundaries could be from the Glenn Highway down Caribou Creek then up Flume creek and over the pass to McDougal Creek to Flat Creek to Little Nelchina River and back to the Glenn Highway.

**ISSUE:** The Horn Mountains in Unit 13A receive a tremendous amount of Dall sheep hunting pressure because of easy off-road vehicle access resulting in substantial pressure on the resource, both from sheep hunters and from incidental harvest from caribou and moose hunters. This results in a poor quality hunting experience, tremendous pressure on the sheep herd, and user conflicts.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued heavy hunting pressure is detrimental to the Dall sheep population and creates a poor hunting experience. This area is used by considerable numbers of hunters during the Nelchina caribou hunt.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Allowing muzzleloaders and archery equipment only would reduce the take of marginally legal rams and improve the quality of the herd and improve the quality of the hunting experience.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Archery and muzzleloader hunters will benefit from an improved hunting experience. The Dall sheep population would benefit from decreased hunting pressure.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Moose and caribou hunters who hunt sheep incidental to their moose or caribou hunt.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** A drawing permit hunt could be considered but hunting opportunities for muzzleloader hunters are severely limited in Alaska and should be expanded.

**PROPOSED BY:** Scott Peterson EG042212540  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 90 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep.** Modify the resident sheep hunt and bag limit for Unit 13 as follows:

Increase hunter opportunity by eliminating draw requirement (DS160 and DS165) for resident sheep hunters in Unit 13D beginning in 2014. Nonresident draw tags (DS260 and DS265) to be fixed to approximately the current quota of 10 to 12 tags. Return entire area to full curl requirement.

Although sheep numbers in Unit 13D are still well below historic highs, the area is known for its trophy potential and is likely to attract a percentage of resident hunters away from areas of high pressure. The proposal also allows nonresident tags to be maintained at current levels for no net loss of opportunity to that user group.

**ISSUE:** Several major sheep hunting areas in the state are seeing increased pressure from both resident and nonresident hunters. This is most notable in the Central Alaska Range and Brooks Range, both areas which are well known and are served by a number of transporters. For

example, during the 2005-2010 time frame, large increases in the number of resident hunters were seen in Units 20A (+28%), 26C (+93%), and 25A (+87%).

The increase in sheep hunter numbers in these popular areas has resulted in reduced hunt quality and localized overcrowding for many users, as well as both real and perceived conflicts between resident and nonresident guided hunters. It is also likely that a high percentage of the mature rams are being harvested in these areas on an annual basis. These issues are evidenced by the numerous proposals in recent years to restrict certain user groups or convert sheep areas to draw.

At least some of the increase in hunting pressure in these Units can be attributed to the displacement of resident sheep hunters from Units 13D and 14A by low levels of mature rams in 2005-2007 and the subsequent implementation of the new draw areas in 2008. This reduction in hunter opportunity has caused significant hunter dissatisfaction both directly through loss of hunting area, and indirectly by increasing hunter numbers in popular units.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED?** Unless hunter opportunity is increased in other areas of the state, there will continue to be high levels of hunting pressure in the certain open areas. This will result in further hunter dissatisfaction and additional proposals to the Board of Game to restrict certain user groups, allow some type of resident advantage, or convert additional areas to draw.

**DOES YOUR PROPOSAL ADDRESS IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED? IF SO, HOW?** I believe the elimination of the resident draw requirement for Unit 13D will help reduce the rise in hunting pressure and the various user conflicts and hunter dissatisfaction currently at issue in the Brooks Range and Central Alaska Range. In addition, I believe that it will have no significant biological impact on the sheep populations of the Chugach Range.

The creation of the Unit 13D draw areas were in response to a combination of heavy hunting pressure and a reduced sheep population. This had resulted in poor hunt quality and the annual harvest of a high percentage of the mature rams and was a justifiable decision at that time. However, since the elimination of over-the-counter tags in Unit 13D the number of mature rams in the Unit 13D appears to have since stabilized and success rates for hunters in these areas have increased to a notable degree. As examples, between 2008 and 2010 the success rate for DS165 increased from 5% to 35%, and DS265 (nonresident) increased from 40% to 100%. That the success rate for all Unit 13D tags are currently well above statewide averages indicates that some additional harvest is possible.

Based on typical pre-2006 harvest rates for resident hunters and the current harvest rate for nonresident hunters, I estimate that harvest levels for Unit 13D West (DS160/260) and Unit 13D East (DS165/265) combined would be approximately 20 to 30 rams under this proposal. Although slightly higher than the current harvest under the draw program, it would still be significantly lower than the combined resident/non-resident harvest of approximately 45 to 70 rams from these areas between 2000 and 2005. It should be noted that Unit 13D has traditionally been popular with guides, and subsequently non-resident hunters have historically taken the larger percentage of the sheep from Unit 13D. By keeping non-resident hunters on a limited

draw, the total harvest will remain well under pre-2005 levels while still having an impact on overall hunter distribution in the state.

During discussion and comment on numerous sheep proposals in the last Board of Game cycle, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) stated a number of times that full curl regulations are an adequate guard against biological damage to the resource. If this is the case, then there should be no major biological concerns with allowing a measured amount of additional harvest in 13D. In exchange for this additional harvest in Unit 13D, hunt quality and available rams will be increased for hunters in other areas of the state.

**WHO WILL BENEFIT IF YOUR PROPOSAL IS ADOPTED?** Resident hunters will benefit by having increased hunting opportunity in a high quality trophy area and decreased competition in other areas. Nonresident guided hunters in other areas of the state will benefit from a decrease in competition from residents.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER IF YOUR PROPOSAL IS ADOPTED?** Nonresident guided hunters in Unit 13D will see increased competition for available rams from resident hunters. ADF&G will no longer be able to tightly control harvest in these areas. Given the typical low success rate (~20%) for resident hunters in open areas, this is unlikely to be a significantly issue.

**LIST ANY OTHER SOLUTIONS YOU CONSIDERED AND WHY YOU REJECTED THEM.** 1.) I considered the inclusion of portions of Unit 14A in this proposal, which would create additional high quality opportunity for hunters. However Unit 14A is more easily accessible and may not be able to sustain the amount of pressure at this time. If the ADF&G believes that portions of Unit 14A could again handle harvest ticket/full curl regulations, this would be a preferred option.

2.) I considered the effect of also eliminating the draw requirement for non-resident hunters. However with the significantly higher success rates of non-resident guided hunters and the currently low sheep populations, I believe that this would again result in unsustainable harvest levels. If the guide concession program currently under consideration goes in to effect, this may be an acceptable option.

**PROPOSED BY:** Isaac Rowland EG050112619  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 91 - 5 AAC 85.055 Hunting season and bag limit for Dall sheep.** Change the Dall sheep bag limit to full curl, convert the draw hunts to general hunts for Units 13 and 14A, and limit nonresident allocation as follows:

All Dall sheep hunts in all of Unit 13 and Unit 14A would become full curl only with general hunts. No drawing in these areas, with nonresidents limited entry (less than 5 tags to nonresidents).

**ISSUE:** Resident sheep hunters have too little roadside access to sheep.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued discontent between residents, nonresidents and guides.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** It allows Alaska residents areas with ease of access.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The Anchorage resident who has a short window of opportunity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Nonresidents and a few guides.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Nonresidents allowed to hunt sheep, reducing the number of statewide.

**PROPOSED BY:** Steve Flory Sr.

EG050912706

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 92 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep.** Modify bag limit to full curl in Units 14A and 13D as follows:

I would like to see a return to the full curl, eight years old or broomed on both sides harvest limitation.

**ISSUE:** Current regulations allow for hunters who have drawn a sheep tag in Units 14A and 13D West to harvest any ram without size limitations. This leads to the harvest of rams who have not yet had a chance to breed. The sheep population in all of the Chugach is depressed, which has necessarily led to the greatly decreased hunt opportunity under the drawing permit system. Killing immature rams before they have a chance to breed and an under harvest of mature, old rams is occurring under these regulations. Too many hunters with these permits kill the first ram they come to. There are more large old rams than there are permits and the rams are dying of old age without being harvested. If we only harvested mature, full curl rams from this unit we could double the number of permits issued.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The population will not rebound as quickly, and less rams will reach breeding age and trophy status. There will continue to be decreased hunter opportunity and rams will continue to die of old age before hunters have an opportunity to harvest them. Under current any ram regulation, less permits are issued because it is easier to be 'successful' because of the harvest of immature rams.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** More rams will live to be full curl trophies and breed-able age.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All trophy sheep hunters, who will see more sheep live to trophy age. All sheep hunters as more permits could be offered under more selective full curl regulation.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who are willing to kill a sub-mature ram and get drawn for the permit.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Daniel Montgomery

EG043012598

\*\*\*\*\*

# Palmer Area - Units 14A, 14B, and 16

---

**PROPOSAL 93 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Reauthorize the drawing permit hunts for antlerless moose in Unit 14A as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
Unit 14(A) 1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows: ...		
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 1000 antlerless moose permits may be issued ...	Aug. 20-Sept. 25 (General hunt only) Nov. 1-Dec. 25 (General hunt only)	No open season

**ISSUE:** Antlerless moose hunts must be re-authorized annually by the Board of Game. Moose surveys conducted in November 2011 resulted in an estimate of 7,467 moose in subunit 14(A). This estimate was slightly greater than the post-hunt objective of 6,000 – 6,500 moose and is an increase from the results of the 2008 survey that produced an estimate of 6,613 moose. The observed bull cow ratio (19 bulls:100 cows) and calf ratio (40 calves:100 cows) were lower than the ratios observed during the composition survey in 2009 (25 bulls:100 cows and 49 calves:100 cows). Snow depth accumulations in the subunit during the 2006-2010 winters were considered average and survival of calves and adults were likely good; however the effect of the deep snow winter in 2011 are unknown.

Based on current projections, the subunit 14A moose population is expected to grow and continue to exceed population objectives. If the density of moose is allowed to increase, we anticipate an increase the number of moose-human conflicts, and moose may experience nutritional stress as the population nears carrying capacity. Cow harvests are warranted to prevent control the moose population’s growth and recommended as a way to provide additional moose hunting opportunity in the Mat-Su Valley.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Portions of the Unit 14A moose population could grow beyond the ability of the habitat to sustain the population. Increased cases of starvation, conflicts with humans, and vehicle collisions will occur.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes; excessively high moose density can lead to nutritionally stressed animals in the harvest.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All who wish a healthy, productive moose population in the Mat-Su Valley, and those who wish to use antlerless moose for human consumption.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who disagree with the harvest of antlerless moose.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050712667  
 \*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 94 - 5 AAC 085.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Modify the season and/or bag limit for moose hunting in subunit 14A as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(12)		
Unit 14(A)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
...		
1 bull with [SPIKE-FORK ANTLERS OR] 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side, by bow and arrow only: or	Aug. 10 – Aug. 17 (General hunt only)	Aug. 10 – Aug. 17
1 bull [WITH SPIKE-FORK ANTLERS OR] 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side:	<u>Aug. 25 - Sept. 20</u> [Aug. 25 - Sept. 25]  (General hunt only)	<u>Aug. 25 - Sept. 20</u> [Aug. 25 - Sept. 25]

**ISSUE:** This is a placeholder proposal that will allow the Board of Game to modify hunting regulations in subunit 14A if warranted. The department will collect additional information about the subunit 14A moose population to determine if either the season or bag limit should be

altered to keep the bull ratio within management objectives. The proposal may also be withdrawn if surveys indicate that objectives are being met and no changes are needed.

During November 2011, the moose population in subunit 14A was surveyed and estimated to include 7,467 moose. The bull ratio was 19 bulls:100 cows, which is below the objective of 20-25 bulls:100 cows and lower than the bull ratio observed in 2008 (23 bulls:100 cows). The 2011 survey was followed by an above average snow fall winter that may have reduced the survival of calves and bulls, which are more susceptible to nutritional stress. Although it is uncertain how the deep-snow winter affected the population or the bull ratio at this point, it may be necessary to take corrective action to reduce bull harvest if the bull ratio has fallen below the management objective. The department will survey the 14A moose population during the fall of 2012 to evaluate the effects of the deep snow and make further recommendations pending the outcome of the surveys.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The bull ratio in the subunit 14A moose population may be below objective and could remain below objectives for some time.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes; low bull ratio may reduce hunter success rates from the bull component of the harvest over time and if the bull ratio trends downward it may eventually affect the productivity of this population.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those who want to see bull to cow ratios in this population within objective, want a healthy, productive moose population in 14A, and want to see a potential increased bull harvest in the long term.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** These proposals will likely reduce the bull harvest in the short term.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050412657  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 95 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides.** Require moose hunters in Unit 14A to submit jaw bone and antlers to ADF&G as follows:

Require that all moose hunters who harvest a bull moose in Unit 14A bring the lower jaw and antlers to an ADF&G office for aging and measuring within 10 days of killing the animal. This regulation could sunset after 2 years -- unless ADF&G was interested if further data collection. Data collection will also provide additional information concerning the number of illegal antlered moose which may be harvested in this area.

**ISSUE:** Moose aging and antler measuring. Many Unit 14A hunters believe that a significant number of the annual reported bull moose harvested in this area may have illegal antler configuration or widths. Some also feel that a significant portion of bull moose from this area may never grow legal antlers under the current spike/fork/50 inch/ 3 brow tine antler restricted

harvest in this area. Without verified data these concerns cannot be adequately addressed. The Matanuska - Susitna Borough Fish and Wildlife Commission requests collection of accurate data concerning bull moose age, antler width, and antler configurations in Unit 14A.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** High numbers of illegal harvested bull moose may occur and continue to occur if sufficient data is not available for this game unit.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** It would help the ADF&G manager to more accurately determine how well the current antler configuration regulations match the bull moose being harvested from the Unit 14A moose population and at what ages moose in the population become antler legal. Results of this data collection may justify the current selective harvest regulations or suggest a better alternative that more closely matches the antler configurations present in the Unit 14A moose population

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All Unit 14A moose hunters could benefit from better knowledge of moose antler configuration present in the population.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** All successful Unit 14A hunters who harvested a bull moose would be required to submit their specimens for aging and measurement for at least a couple years.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** A.) A requirement aimed at aging and measuring just moose larger than spike/fork was considered, but a discussion with an ADF&G wildlife biologist indicated that information about the smaller bulls harvested within the Unit 14A population would be valuable as well. B.) In discussion with the previous area wildlife manager, we considered other time requirements, and another time requirement would be acceptable. However, we found 10 days to be more consistent with other moose specimen reporting requirements already in place throughout Alaska.

**PROPOSED BY:** Mat-Su Borough Fish and Wildlife Commission EG042612555  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 96 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Establish a winter antlerless moose hot-spot hunt in 14B to address vehicle collisions and nuisance moose issues in the Matanuska / Susitna Valley areas and reauthorize the existing winter antlerless moose hot-spot hunt in Unit 14A as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(12)		

Unit 14A  
1 moose per regulatory year,

only as follows:

...

1 moose by  
hot-spot permit only; by

shotgun **or archery** only; up to 200  
permits may be issued

Winter season to  
be announced by  
emergency order  
(General hunt only)

No open season

Unit 14B

1 **moose** [BULL] per regulatory year,  
only as follows:

...

**1 moose by  
hot-spot permit only; by  
shotgun or archery only; up to 100  
permits may be issued**

**Winter season to  
be announced** by  
emergency order  
**(General hunt only)**

**No open season**

**ISSUE:** The hot-spot registration hunt in subunit 14A is an effective tool to address public safety concerns related to moose-vehicle collision and nuisance management issues. This proposal would expand the hunt into subunit 14B to address similar concerns. It also would allow the use of bow and arrow to harvest moose in areas where local ordinances prohibit the use of firearms.

Moose-vehicle collisions result in property damage and may result in human injury or death. . . An average of 266 moose per year were killed in the Mat-Su Valley area during the last few years of average snowfall and substantially more were killed during higher snowfall years.

The department's intent is to use this registration hunt target moose in areas with high rates of moose-vehicle collisions to reduce vehicle accidents and provide additional harvest opportunity. Hunters would be selected from a list of pre-registered hunters that are prioritized by random selection. Hunters will need to respond quickly (i.e. within 24 hours) to harvest a moose from specifically defined "hot-spot" moose-vehicle collision area.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Portions of the subunit 14S and 14B moose populations will continue to be killed on the roads and highways of the Matanuska – Susitna Valley area. Increasing conflicts with humans and vehicle collisions will occur as the human population of the Mat-Su Borough continues to grow.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes; moose harvested under this regulation will generally have better quality meat than that provided through the state's road kill program.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All who wish to have a healthy, productive moose population in the Matanuska-Susitna valleys, reduced motor-vehicle/moose collisions, conflicts and provide antlerless moose for human consumption.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who disagree with the harvest of antlerless moose and/or winter moose hunts.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Winter drawing antlerless moose hunts

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050412655  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 97 - 5 AAC 085.045(14). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.**

Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt on Kalgin Island in Unit 16B as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(14)		
...		
Unit 16(B), Kalgin Island		
1 moose per regulatory year, by registration permit only	Aug. 20 - Sept. 20	Aug. 20 - Sept. 20

...

**ISSUE:** Antlerless moose hunts must be re-authorized annually. The population objective for this predator-free, 23-mi<sup>2</sup> island is 20-40 moose, a density of 1-1.75 moose/mi<sup>2</sup>. During a November 2011 survey, department staff counted 53 moose, approximately 2.3 moose/mi<sup>2</sup>. Because of concerns of over-population and deteriorating habitat conditions, a drawing permit hunt for cows was initiated in 1995. In an attempt to reduce the population quickly, the Board established a registration hunt for any moose for the fall 1999 season. The population of moose on Kalgin Island is high at this time and remains above the objective of 20-40.

The "any moose" registration hunt is recommended to provide additional mortality on this predator-free island population. A registration hunt also allows the department to continue gathering biological information from specimens provided by successful hunters. The difficult hunting conditions and limited access will minimize the danger of over-harvest.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Without a liberal harvest including cows and calves, the population will continue to overuse forage resources and decline through starvation and reduced reproduction.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** If the island population size is kept at or near objective levels, moose will have adequate available forage and therefore, show less sign of being nutritionally stressed.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters who make the effort to get to Kalgin Island will have the opportunity to take any moose.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Seasonal residents of Kalgin Island have been concerned about hunters trespassing on their land and cabins. The current season dates concentrate hunter activity when most seasonal residents are present.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** A general season for any moose will also work to lower moose densities, but would diminish the ability to collect biological information.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050712674  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 98 - 5 AAC 85.045 Hunting season and bag limit for moose.** Modify the moose hunting season dates in Unit 16A as follows:

Open season for residents / nonresidents: September 1 – 30 with spike fork/50 inch.  
Open season for residents only: December 9 – 15 with spike fork only.

**ISSUE:** Change hunting in Unit 16A back to the month of September 1- 30. It is way too hot to try to keep meat from spoiling in the field in August. Also, reinstate the one week in December for spike fork hunt.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Too many locals and weekend warriors don't and will not hunt in August because of meat spoilage. It's too hot.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, hunters can see and harvest for food to offset high cost of meat in the store.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All people. We now kill so many with vehicles on the roads.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The poachers. No one I see.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Gives more opportunity to take the resource and stops all moose being killed on the road system.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 99 – 5 AAC 85.045 Hunting season and bag limits for moose.** Align the resident and nonresident moose season dates in Unit 16B as follows:

Review the most recent survey and harvest data for mainland Unit 16B and align the nonresident season with the resident season which is August 20 - September 25, unless the data shows a biological reason not to.

**ISSUE:** In March 2011, the Board of Game (board) re-opened a general nonresident moose season in the remainder of Unit 16B after being closed for over ten years. Because they didn't have any recent historical data on how much nonresident harvest to expect, they provided a lesser season for non-residents than for residents. The current general nonresident moose season (spike fork, 50 inch or 3 brow tines) for the remainder of Unit 16B is 22 days and the resident season is 37 days. Unit 16B remainder has much higher bull cow ratios than Units 14A, 14B, and 16A, which all have identical resident and nonresident seasons for spike fork, 50 inch or 3 brown tine bulls. When the board meets in 2013, new moose population and harvest data by residents and nonresidents should be available. Unless there are biological reasons to do otherwise, I would hope resident and nonresident seasons in mainland Unit 16B could be identical.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Surplus bulls in Unit 16B will continue to go to waste instead of providing needed game management funds to the state, and revenue and income to local businesses and guides.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Many areas of Unit 16B have bull cow ratios well above 50. So many surplus bulls can compete with cows and calves and slow population growth in a herd that we are trying to rebuild.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Guides, local businesses, and the Department of Fish and Game from additional funding.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Some residents might notice increased competition from guides or air taxis that cater to nonresidents.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Option #2: Align all general season resident and nonresident moose seasons in Units 14A, 14B, 16A and mainland 16B to run from August 20 - September 25. I still like this option, but opted to only address Unit 16B because there might be resistance to making the season five days longer in Units 14A and 14B due to this past hard winter, even though the August 20 - 25 harvest shouldn't amount to much.

Option #3: Align all general season resident and nonresident moose seasons in Units 14A, 14B, 16A and mainland 16B to run from August 25 - September 25. I really like this option too and

feel it is the best plan for Units 14A, 14B, 16A and mainland 16B as a whole, but again, opted to deal only with Unit 16B because there may be resistance to a five- day reduction in the Unit 16B season, even though effort is limited in mid-August.

**PROPOSED BY:** Wayne Kubat

EG050912704

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 100 - 5 AAC 85.045 Hunting season and bag limit for moose** Close the nonresident season in the Unit16 intensive management area as follows:

(14)

16A

**[In areas of Unit 16A where intensive management is authorized, as defined in 5 AAC 92.125(d), nonresident hunting of moose is closed]**

16B

**[In areas of Unit 16B where intensive management is authorized, as defined in 5 AAC 92.125(d), nonresident hunting of moose is closed]**

**ISSUE:** Nonresident sport or trophy hunting for moose populations with a positive Customary and Traditional (C&T) finding that are also identified in Unit 16’s intensive management plan as a region with a reduced moose population requiring intensive management to rebuild the prey populations. Areas that have too few moose for resident Alaskans.

Unit 16 has not met the *minimum* management population’s objectives for moose. Any excess bulls should be made available to resident Alaskans, including those that lost hunting opportunity in 2012 in neighboring Units 7 and 15 (Kenai Peninsula).

Moose populations are mandated by law to be a priority subsistence resource for Alaska residents by AS 16.05.255(13)d which states: “the taking of moose, deer, elk and caribou by residents for personal or family consumption has preference over taking by nonresidents”

The Alaska courts have also confirmed this: “the resident preference serves the purpose of conserving scarce wildlife resources for Alaska residents; this unquestionably represents a legitimate state interest” *Shepherd v. State, Dep’t of Fish and Game*, 897 P. 2d 33 (Alaska 1995.)

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Nonresident hunters will continue to compete with resident Alaskans for limited subsistence resources in areas with a positive customary and traditional use finding for those subsistence resources, in particular, moose in Unit 16.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, reducing nonessential sport and trophy hunting will enhance the recovery rate of essential subsistence resources.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Resident Alaskans that depend on subsistence resources in areas with depressed game populations, especially local residents living within intensive management areas trying to reduce prey harvest.

The Department of Fish and Game will benefit by having the authority to limit nonessential human harvest, an essential component of an effective adaptive management plan that promotes the recovery of depressed subsistence resources.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** In the short term, nonresident hunters will lose the opportunity to hunt in areas where resident subsistence need exceeds the amount of available game. In the long run, nonresident hunters will benefit from healthy game populations in the region, especially trophy hunters.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Changing the Alaska statute that requires moose, deer, elk and caribou to be prioritized for resident harvest but that was unacceptable and contrary to the Alaska way of life.

Restricting nonresident hunting to remote subunits or non-prime hunting dates. This is unacceptable due to the fact that moose and caribou are highly migratory. Allowing nonresident harvest in any location of an active predator control area will adversely affect resident harvest potential and will reduce the overall recovery rate of the prey species.

**PROPOSED BY:** Science Now Project EG050912709

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 101 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.**

Prohibit hunting with off road vehicles in Unit 16B until after 3:00 am following the day riding as follows:

I would like to regulate 4-wheeler and other off road ground transportation (hereafter referred to collectively as 4-wheelers) in a manner similar to the restrictions imposed on aircraft operations so that it is against the law to hunt or help someone else take a moose in Unit 16B until after 3 a.m. on the day following the day on which you have ridden on a 4-wheeler.

**ISSUE:** Rational: Unit 16B moose have been low in numbers for several years and the current winter is most likely going to set things back even further in regard to the moose population. Helicopters were made illegal for hunting many years ago, because it was determined that they gave hunters a very high advantage. Airplanes and boats were not included in this restriction, because they had limited access. Planes could only land on suitable lakes or rivers in the case of float operations, and there were limited spots available when operating on wheels; obviously boats required hunters to remain near navigable waters. Even though those means of transportation caused hunters to actually hunt on foot after landing, the further requirement was made that one had to wait until after 3:00 a.m. on the day following a flight before hunting.

At present, a growing number of hunters are able to travel over a great variety of area and terrain using 4-wheelers; some drive constantly through one swamp after another, destroying immense areas of habitat as the trails widen due to soft terrain, as they literally hunt from the machine. 4-wheelers have used them to gain an advantage similar to what was eliminated in the case of helicopters, as they are certainly a far more widespread method to cover ground than the traditional airplanes and boats. This proposal will allow hunters to use 4-wheelers to reach their hunting area, but following that, they must set up and hunt from a camp, just as pilots are now required to do. It will also allow them to retrieve a moose after it has been harvested, and this gives them an advantage over aircraft and boat hunters. Policing of this will not be easy, but in the current era when most hunters have either a cell phone capable of taking pictures, or a camera, they can aid in this effort and this possibility will help cause hunters to remain legal.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Some 4-wheeler operators will continue to drive around hunting from their 4-wheelers. This will result in more and more damage to the habitat. Swamps, in particular, will be damaged by the continually widening trails caused by constant travel. The headwater tributaries of salmon streams will be crossed more and more frequently as some drivers explore constantly. Moose will be continually harassed and pushed around by traffic. The hunting routines of those individuals who have traveled to their hunting area by boat, plane, 4-wheelers, and foot will be constantly disturbed, as they call, glass, and still hunt for moose near their camps. Moose will be continually harassed by the noise and movement of 4-wheelers.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. The habitat, both land, vegetation, and streams, will be damaged less by the reduced traffic. The moose will not be continuously pushed around and disturbed and may actually end up with some areas of sanctuary, because some spots will be too difficult to access from an established camp or cabin. It will cut down somewhat on the destruction of habitat, and will place all hunters on a more level playing field, by causing all hunting to once again be undertaken either by foot or when using a boat in the prescribed manner. It will reduce harassment of cows with calves as well as illegal bulls, since they would not be continually pushed around by 4-wheelers. It will have the effect of causing some sanctuary areas to develop in places too far removed from good camping locations and cabins.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Who will benefit if your proposal is adopted? All hunters who set up a camp and hunt in the old traditional manner of glassing, calling, and still hunting will have a higher quality of hunt since they will not be disturbed by continual traffic of vehicles. Moose and other game will also benefit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Who is likely to suffer if your proposal is adopted? Only those hunters who truly hunt from their 4-wheelers will have their method modified. Hunters will still be able to retrieve a moose after it has been harvested, using their 4-wheeler. This proposal will also make it more difficult for those individuals who illegally fly and then quickly return with a 4-wheeler, or have a friend in a plane while they hunt from their 4-wheeler, since they cannot hunt from their 4-wheeler. These illegal activities will be somewhat self-policing, since in this era, most hunters have either a camera or a cell phone which takes pictures. Anyone

seen harvesting an animal while driving their 4-wheeler is hunting illegally, and can be turned in by other hunters.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** John Abrams

EG040512522

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 102 - 5 AAC 85.025(8). Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou.** Establish a drawing permit hunt for caribou in Unit 14A and a winter season that can be offered if harvest opportunity exists as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(8)		
Units <b>14 (A) and</b> 14(B)	Aug. 10-Sept.20 <b><u>(Winter Season to be announced)</u></b> (General hunt only)	Aug. 10-Sept.20 <b><u>(Winter Season to be announced)</u></b>
1 <b>bull</b> [caribou] by drawing permit only [; UP TO 100 PERMITS MAY BE ISSUED]		
...		

**ISSUE:** Currently no season exists for caribou in subunit 14A although a fall caribou hunt is offered in the adjacent subunit of 14B. Anecdotal information suggests that a population of caribou inhabits the western Talkeetna Mountains year round in both 14B and 14A. The department plans to deploy radio-collars to evaluate the population’s size and status to determine if it is currently being underutilized. The collars will also be used to evaluate caribou movements and distribution. If the department determines that this population can sustain additional harvest a winter hunt may be offered. Expanding the existing draw permit hunt into subunit 14A will open more hunting opportunity and give the department more flexibility to manage this population.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Caribou seasons in Unit 14A will remain closed.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes; department biologists will have the flexibility to limit or expand hunts based on the ability of the population to sustain harvest.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters who want the opportunity to harvest caribou in 14A.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who disagree with harvesting caribou.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050412654

\*\*\*\*\*

**Proposal 103 - AAC 92.125 Intensive management plans.** Review and modify the Unit 16 intensive management program and the progress that has been made towards meeting the program's objectives.

...

(d) **Unit 16 Predation Control Area:** the Unit 16 Predation Control Area is established, which is focused primarily on mainland Unit 16(B), and consists of all lands within the mainland portion of Unit 16(B) and that portion of Unit 16(A) west of a line beginning at the confluence of the Yentna and Susitna Rivers, then northerly along the western bank of the Susitna River to the confluence with the Deshka River, then northerly to 61° 48.80' N. lat., 150° 21.77' W. long., then west to 62° 01.47' N. lat., 150° 24.06' W. long., then north to the northern end of Trapper Lake at 62° 01.47' N. lat., 150° 16.67' W. long., then west to 62° 01.47' N. lat., 150° 24.06' W. long., then north to 62° 09.65' N. lat., 150° 24.06' W. long., then west to the southwestern end of Amber Lake at 62° 09.65' N. lat., 150° 33.42' W. long., then north to 62° 18.03' N. lat., 150° 33.42' W. long., then west to 62° 18.03' N. lat., 150° 51.04' W. long., then north to 62° 27.97' N. lat., 150° 51.04' W. long., then west to the Denali National Park boundary at 62° 27.97' N. lat., 151° 09.22' W. long., encompassing approximately 11,105 square miles; this predator control program does not apply within National Park Service lands unless approved by the federal agencies; notwithstanding any other provision 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 in the Unit 16 Predation Control Area, conduct a black bear population reduction or black bear population regulation program in the Unit 16 Predation Control Area, and conduct a brown bear population reduction or brown bear population regulation program in that portion of the Unit 16 Predation Control Area draining into Cook Inlet between the south bank of the McArthur River and the north bank of the Beluga River:

(1) the discussion of wildlife population and human use information is as follows:

(A) prey population information is as follows:

(i) the moose population for mainland Unit 16(B) was estimated in fall 2010 to be 4,788 – 6,932 moose, based on aerial surveys in 2008 – 2010 in the unit; this population is composed of subpopulations that reside wholly in the unit; however, a subpopulation from the flanks of Mount Yenlo and in the upper Lake Creek drainage mixes in winter with moose from Unit 16(A) in the Kahiltna River drainage, and a subpopulation from the flanks of Mount Susitna and the drainages of Alexander Creek and lower Yentna River winters with moose from Units 14(A), 14(B), and 16(A) in the lower Yentna and Susitna Rivers;

(ii) habitat does not appear to be limiting the moose population, or a factor in calf survival, and is not expected to limit the moose population at objective levels; while the majority of the unit is covered with mature forests, moose habitat

has changed little since the high moose densities of the early 1980s; prescribed burning has been the only economically viable option for improving moose habitat and opportunities to conduct controlled burns are limited by climate, access, and privately-owned lands with structures dispersed throughout the unit; the minimum moose density objective is 1.0 moose per square mile for mainland Unit 16(B) based on the intensive management objective of 6,500 - 7,500 moose; there are approximately 6,500 square miles of available moose habitat; presently, mainland Unit 16(B) moose population estimates place the moose density at 0.90 moose per square mile;

(iii) the age structure of the population is believed to have shifted towards the older age classes in the late 1990s as recruitment decreased and the moose population declined; the number of yearling bulls estimated in the mainland Unit 16(B) survey data from 2008 - 2010 showed ratios of nine to 16 yearling bulls to 100 cows; assuming these numbers to be half of the year's cohort, this indicates an approximate yearling recruitment rate of 11 - 19 percent of the observed moose;

(iv) the bull-to-cow moose ratio for mainland Unit 16(B) in fall 2008 - 2010 was estimated to be 39 - 60 bulls per 100 cows; this is higher than the average bull-to-cow ratios of 24 - 44 observed in the unit in the mid-1990s; thus, the herd is presently above the management objective for this parameter;

(v) limited flights to count newborn calves and natality data from radio collared moose indicated that a minimum of 80 percent of adult cows over two years old gave birth, with 50 percent of these having twins; together, these data indicated a birth rate of approximately 122 calves per 100 cows or greater;

(vi) the calf-to-cow moose ratio during fall moose surveys from 2003 to 2005 ranged between 14 and 23 calves per 100 cows when a wolf predation control program was in effect, with estimated over-winter calf mortality of 40 percent, resulting in a calf recruitment rate of 8 - 14 moose per 100 cows; the calf-to-cow ratio during fall moose surveys from 2008 to 2010 ranged from 11 to 19 calves per 100 cows when black bear and wolf predation control programs were in effect, with estimated over-winter calf mortality of 12.5 percent, resulting in a calf recruitment rate of 10 - 17 moose per 100 cows; the increased calf recruitment in 2008 to 2010 is a result of the increased over-winter calf survival that is likely associated with reduced wolf predation during the winter months; information collected from radio collared moose in November following parturition indicate a five year average calf survival rate of 14.5 percent for calves six months of age or less in the northern portion of Unit 16(B); the results of a research study that used radio collars estimated a 20 percent survival rate for calves six months of age or less in the southern portion of Unit 16B during 2010; the reason for the difference between natality and recruitment is largely due to predation;

(vii) research studies of radio collared moose estimate that the adult cow survival rate is 90 - 95 percent;

(viii) the harvestable surplus for 2010 is estimated to be 250 bulls, which is above the minimum of 199 - 227 harvestable moose needed to meet the amount necessary for subsistence; the increase in harvestable moose is a result of the

increased bull to cow ratios likely due to the limited resident-only harvest since 2001 and increased bull recruitment;

(ix) the intensive management population objective established by the board for the mainland Unit 16(B) moose population is 6,500 - 7,500 moose, and the intensive management harvest objective is 310 - 600 moose;

(x) the decline in the mainland Unit 16(B) moose population is attributed to poor calf survival, high adult mortality, and the inability of the population to recover from the impacts of deep snow during the winters of 1984 and 1989; the mainland Unit 16(B) moose population is considered to be reduced substantially from the early 1980s when estimates ranged from 8,500 - 10,000 moose, and is currently below the intensive management population objective;

(xi) without the continuation of an effective wolf predation control program and an effective bear predation control program, moose in the mainland Unit 16(B) are likely to persist at low numbers or continue to decline; results from moose mortality studies, and predator and prey studies, conducted throughout Alaska and similar areas in Canada indicate that reducing the number of wolves and bears in unit 16(B) can reasonably be expected to increase survival of calves as well as older moose, particularly yearlings;

(B) the human use information for prey population is as follows:

(i) reported subsistence harvest has varied from 30 to over 120 moose, and some additional subsistence harvest occurs within the general fall hunting season (Tier I) when one is held; during the regulatory year 2006 – 2007, Tier II subsistence harvest was 104 moose; in regulatory year 2007 – 2008 the Tier II subsistence harvest was 126 moose; in regulatory year 2008 – 2009 the Tier II harvest was 146 moose; in regulatory year 2009 – 2010 the combined subsistence harvest was 206 moose;

(ii) high demand for subsistence moose is demonstrated by the 750 - 1,100 applicants who annually apply for the Tier II permits available for mainland Unit 16(B); additional subsistence demand exists within the unit and is captured by the limited general resident-only hunting opportunity that has occurred in September in recent years;

(iii) all general season and fall Tier II moose bag limits were reduced in 1993 to one bull with a spike or fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with three or more brow tines on one side; nonresident moose hunting opportunity was first reduced to a portion of Unit 16(B) in 1993 and completely eliminated in 2001; all general season hunting was closed in 2001 and 2002 and only a limited Tier I subsistence (resident-only) season was allowed in 2003 – 2005 and 2009 – 2010; the average general season harvest was 388 from 1983 - 1989 and declined to 168 from 1990 - 1999;

(iv) there is a small, limited demand for moose to provide for rural federal subsistence hunting on federal lands within mainland Unit 16(B); there is some interest in moose for viewing opportunities in portions of the unit where guides and other operations provide services that promote wildlife viewing;

(v) it is unlikely that the demand in mainland Unit 16(B) for moose for subsistence and general hunting opportunity will decline; given the increasing human population in the nearby Anchorage and Matanuska-Susitna Valley areas,

as well as historic local subsistence use, it is probable that demand will match any increase in harvestable surplus gained through active management of the moose herd;

(C) the predator population information is as follows:

(i) the fall 2010 wolf population in mainland Unit 16(B) was estimated to be 40 - 79 wolves in 8 – 9 different packs; a density of approximately 0.6 – 1.2 wolves per 100 square miles; the spring 2007 population estimate for black bears in Unit 16(B) was 3,200 – 3,500; the estimate for brown bears in Unit 16(B) was 625 - 1,250;

(ii) habitat carrying capacity for wolves and bears is dependent on prey and food availability and competition from other predators; carrying capacity for wolves and bears in mainland Unit 16(B) has not been determined; however, harvest from sealing records, supplemented by reports from trappers, hunters, and others, have indicated that the wolf population had increased and the black bear and brown bear populations had stabilized or increased;

(iii) in mainland Unit 16(B), the current moose-to-wolf ratio is between 61 and 173 moose per wolf; the pre-control estimated ratio for 2003 was as low as 17:1; historically, estimates have ranged as high as 250 moose per wolf in this unit;

(iv) alternate prey include caribou, sheep, beaver, and hare; for most wolves in mainland Unit 16(B), there are few options for alternate prey; small populations of caribou and sheep exist in the higher elevations of the western side of the unit; however, pack territorial structure probably prohibits most wolves from accessing this resource, thus, limiting them to smaller prey such as beaver and hare; black and brown bears typically feed on salmon when available and forage on a variety of vegetation throughout the summer and fall; moose and caribou calves are often prey during the spring when inexperience with predators and limited mobility makes them particularly vulnerable; the limited numbers and distribution of caribou make them unavailable to most predation in mainland Unit 16(B); brown bears also take black bears as prey and this has been reported in numerous observations by hunters, trappers and others in mainland Unit 16(B);

(v) the number of moose that are killed by wolves in any given year in this area is highly dependent on the depth of winter snowfall, competition with other predators, and the abundance of alternate prey; in Alaska and areas of Canada where moose are the primary prey of wolves, studies documented kill rates ranging from four to seven moose per wolf per winter; using this range with our current population estimate of wolves in mainland Unit 16(B), wolves are estimated to be capable of taking between 160-553 moose per winter; research elsewhere in Alaska has indicated that up to 52 percent of neonate moose calves were killed by brown bears; other work has shown significant increases in calf survival following bear removal and population reduction;

(vi) research studies into the causes of moose calf mortality in Unit 16(B) estimated that 80 percent of the calves born during the summer of 2010 died within the first 6 months of life; of the mortalities that were investigated 50 percent were caused by brown bear, 22 percent were caused by black bear, six percent were caused by a bear but the bear species could not be determined based

on evidence found at the mortality site, 16 percent were caused by a predator but the species could not be determined based on evidence found at the mortality site, and six percent drowned;

(vii) mortality factors affecting wolves in mainland Unit 16(B) include human harvest, other wolves, and disease; harvest of wolves in the unit has increased from a low of two wolves in the winter of 1990 - 1991 to 50 wolves in the winter of 2003 - 2004; the total wolf take for 2004 - 2005 was 115 wolves, with 91 of those wolves taken in the predator control program that was initiated in January 2005; the average take of wolves from 2006 to 2009 is 24.8 wolves;

(viii) it is the intent of this plan to maintain wolves and bears as part of the natural ecosystem within the geographical area described for the plan; however, studies in Alaska and elsewhere have repeatedly concluded that annual reductions in wolf populations are required to reduce wolf population levels and predation on their prey; wolf harvest objectives in mainland Unit 16(B) have been set in order to achieve a reduction of at least 60 - 80 percent of the pre-control wolf population estimate of 175 - 180 wolves; to achieve the desired reduction in wolf predation, but ensure that wolves persist within the plan area, the wolf population objective for mainland Unit 16(B) is set at between 22 and 45 wolves; reductions in brown and black bear populations that have resulted in increased calf survival have been shown in other parts of Alaska and Canada; harvest objectives for black and brown bears in mainland Unit 16(B) were set with consideration for maintaining stable but lower populations of both species and reducing predation on moose calves;

(ix) without a predation control program in the mainland Unit 16(B) area, it can be expected that the wolf and black bear populations will increase; current trends in fuel prices, low fur prices, and low quality of wolf pelts in the unit due to the louse infestation, have resulted in a decrease in the wolf hunting and trapping effort in the area, thus, removing the major cause of wolf mortality; difficult access, thick cover, and the availability of other bear hunting opportunities have resulted in a failure to meet harvest objectives in the general season prior to the start of control activities; continuing the predator control programs is expected to reduce the predator populations and subsequently allow the moose population to increase toward the intensive management population objective;

(D) the human use information for predator population is as follows:

(i) annual harvest of wolves in mainland Unit 16(B) with a firearm, excluding same-day-airborne take, has been highly variable since the early 1980s and has ranged from 0 - 27 wolves; from 2005 to 2009, firearms have accounted for an average of 5 wolves annually, or 16 percent of the harvest; harvest of wolves with the use of a snare or trap has similarly been highly variable and has ranged from 1 - 48; from 2005 to 2009, traps and snares have accounted for six wolves annually, or 20 percent of the harvest;

(ii) mainland Unit 16(B) receives less trapping pressure than some other areas of the state; the hunter harvest of wolves has always been opportunistic, and is difficult to predict; the trapper harvest of wolves is limited by the number of trappers willing to spend the time targeting this furbearer amidst variable winter

travel conditions; winters have begun later, and have been highly variable in temperature and snowfall in recent years creating hazardous conditions for winter hunters and trappers; in addition to open creeks and regular overflow, many large rivers in the area have stayed open until late-winter, or even year-round, completely eliminated trapping pressure from remote areas of the unit;

(iii) most Unit 16(B) trappers will continue to pursue wolves in the unit regardless of same-day-airborne wolf control efforts; trappers in the unit pursue many different furbearers and do not consider the control program a detriment to their opportunities; if the wolf control program were to be discontinued trapper harvest would likely increase to some extent; hunters that take wolves in mainland Unit 16(B) do so opportunistically and would not be seriously affected by the status of the wolf control program;

(iv) annual harvest of black bears in mainland Unit 16(B) has been variable; the average annual harvest from 1980 - 1989 was 103.0 black bears, from 1990 - 1999 it was 92.0 black bears, from 2000 - 2004 it was 124.6 black bears, and from 2005 - 2009 it was 319 black bears; annual harvest of brown bears in mainland Unit 16(B) has increased; from 2002 - 2004 the average harvest was 23.3 brown bears and from 2004-2010 the average annual harvest was 106.6 brown bears;

(v) most Unit 16(B) bear hunters will continue to hunt bears in the unit regardless of bear control efforts; in fact, many hunters have reported hunting in the unit due to recently increased opportunities to take black and brown bears; guide use and resident hunter effort has not shown a decline since the board has authorized increased bag limits for brown bears, more black bear bait-hunting opportunities, and expanded seasons;

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

(A) the fall 2010 moose population was estimated to be 4,788 - 6,932 moose, compared to the intensive management objective of 6,500 - 7,500 moose; the intensive management objective was developed by the board based on historical moose population size and trends, habitat condition, sustainable harvest levels, and human use;

(B) the pre-control population of wolves in the fall of 2003 was 160 - 220 wolves; studies in Alaska and elsewhere have repeatedly concluded that annual reductions of wolves are required to diminish wolf population levels and predation by wolves on their prey; consistent with scientific studies and department experience, the objective of this plan is to substantially reduce wolf numbers compared to the pre-control level in order to relieve predation pressure on moose and allow for improved recruitment to the moose population; by maintaining the wolf population at objective levels, progress towards moose composition, population, and harvest objectives will be realized; this plan also has as a goal to maintain wolves as part of the natural ecosystem within the described geographic area; to achieve the desired reduction in wolf predation, but ensure that wolves persist within the plan area, the wolf population in mainland Unit 16(B) will be reduced to no fewer than 22 wolves;

(C) the spring (late winter) wolf population objective for Unit 16(B) was set at 22 - 45 wolves based on prior estimates of the wolf population size in the area when the moose population achieved high densities in the past;

(D) in spring 2007, the brown bear population for mainland Unit 16(B) was 625 - 1250 bears; the black bear population for mainland Unit 16(B) was 3,200 – 3,500 bears; significant reductions in the black bear and brown bear populations would reduce the amount of predation on moose while being consistent with the management goal of reaching a desirable predator-to-prey ratio by allowing the bear populations to decline;

(E) based on research in Alaska and Canada, a 60 percent or greater reduction in the bear population within the predation control area specified in this program is expected to result in an increase in moose survival; to achieve the desired reduction in bear predation, but ensure that bears persist within the predation control area, the minimum black bear population objective for the control area is 600 black and 250 brown bears, which represents an 81 percent reduction from the pre-control minimum estimated population of 3,200 black bears, and a 60 percent reduction from the pre-control estimated brown bear population of 625 brown bears;

(3) the justifications for predator control implementation plan are as follows:

(A) the board determined that the moose population in mainland Unit 16(B) is important for providing high levels of human consumptive use; the board established objectives for population size and annual sustained harvest of moose is consistent with multiple use and principles of sound conservation and management of habitat and all wildlife species in the area; the objectives of the predation control program are to halt the decline of the moose population within the predation control area and to increase the fall (post-hunt) moose population to the intensive management objective of 6,500 - 7,500 moose, providing a sustainable annual harvest of 310 - 600 moose;

(B) the population objectives for moose in mainland Unit 16(B) are not being met, largely due to high predator numbers and the inability of the moose population to recover given the high predation rates;

(C) a reduction in predator numbers is necessary to enhance survival of mainland Unit 16(B) moose, to halt the population decline, and to achieve population objectives in the predation control area; during the 1970s and 1980s, same-day-airborne hunting of wolves by the public, at little or no cost to the department, effectively kept the wolf population at levels well below present levels, both black and brown bear densities were low, and moose populations were increasing or stable; trapper and hunter harvests in the last 10 years have averaged less than 2.5 wolves per trapper and hunter;

(D) moose population objectives are not being met, although trapper and hunter harvests of wolves and harvests of black and brown bears have increased over the last 10 years for mainland Unit 16(B); [MAXIMUM HARVEST OPPORTUNITY APPEARS TO HAVE BEEN PROVIDED ALTHOUGH THE WOLF NUMBERS HAVE BEEN ABOVE THE POPULATION OBJECTIVE SINCE THE EARLY 1990S;] the [CURRENT] spring **wolf** population objective in the control area is 22 - 45 wolves in 3 - 5 packs[, AND THE FALL 2010 WOLF POPULATION ESTIMATE IS 40 – 79 WOLVES IN 8 – 9 PACKS]; the [CURRENT] population objectives **for bears** in the control area **are** [IS] 600 black bears and 250 brown bears;

(E) previous programs utilizing same-day-airborne hunting of wolves effectively kept the wolf population at levels well below present levels, and moose populations were increasing or stable; airplane-based control of wolf populations is necessary to reduce numbers over short periods of time and allows for a more timely recovery of the moose population; during moderate to severe winters wolves and moose congregate in river

corridors; expansion of the control program into portions of Unit 16(A) was necessary to effectively reduce wolves that occupy these corridors;

(F) multiple measures have been taken to improve survival of moose within mainland Unit 16(B); general predator hunting and wolf trapping seasons alone have failed to result in sufficient reductions of predators and increased numbers of moose; liberalization of seasons, bag limits, and other restrictions on harvest for bears and wolves have shown no detectable effect on the moose population in the unit; there has been a year-round season for black bear with a three bear limit and no tag required for brown bear with a two bear limit;

(G) presently known alternatives to predator control for reducing the number of predators are ineffective, impractical, or uneconomical in the Unit 16(B) situation; hunting and trapping conducted under authority of ordinary hunting and trapping seasons and bag limits is not an effective reduction technique in sparsely populated areas such as Unit 16(B); numbers of hunters and trappers are relatively low and so far have been unsuccessful in increasing the harvest of wolves or bears to the extent of having a positive effect on the moose population; the inherent wariness of wolves, difficult access, and relatively poor pelt prices also explain low harvest rates; application of the most common sterilization techniques, including surgery, implants, or inoculation, are not effective reduction techniques because they require immobilization of individual predators, which is extremely expensive in remote areas; relocation of wolves or bears is impractical because it is expensive and it is very difficult to find publicly acceptable places for relocated predators; habitat manipulation is ineffective because it may improve the birth rate of moose in certain circumstances, but it is poor survival, not poor birth rate that keeps moose populations low in rural areas of mainland Alaska; supplemental feeding of wolves and bears as an alternative to predator control has improved moose calf survival in experiments; however, large numbers of moose carcasses are not available for this kind of effort and transporting them to remote areas of Alaska is not practical; stocking of moose is impractical because of capturing and moving expenses; any of the alternatives to a predation control program are not likely to be effective in achieving the desired level of predator harvest;

(4) the permissible methods and means used to take predators are as follows:

(A) hunting and trapping of wolves by the public in the Unit 16 Predation Control Area during the term of the program will occur as provided in the hunting and trapping regulations set out elsewhere in this title, including use of motorized vehicles as provided in 5 AAC 92.080;

(B) the commissioner may issue public aerial shooting permits or public land and shoot permits as a method of wolf removal under AS 16.05.783;

(C) hunting of black and brown bears by the public in the Unit 16 Predation Control Area during the term of the program will occur as provided in the hunting regulations set out elsewhere in this title, including use of motorized vehicles as provided in 5 AAC 92.080;

(D) the commissioner may reduce the black bear and brown bear populations within the Unit 16 Predation Control Area **by the** following methods and means under a department developed control permit:

(i) legal animal is any black bear, including sows and cubs; and any brown bear, except sows with cubs of the year, and cubs of the year;

(ii) no bag limit;

(iii) same-day-airborne taking of black bears if the permittee is at least 300 feet from the airplane;

(iv) same-day-airborne taking of bears if the permittee is at least 300 feet from the aircraft, including the use of any type of aircraft, such as fixed-wing aircraft or helicopter, to access bear baiting stations from April 15 through October 15; except that helicopters may not be used from August 5 through September 25;

(v) April 15 through October 15 baiting season for bears; up to four bear bait stations per permittee; bear baiting allowed along the Unit 16 shorelines of the Susitna River, Yentna River below the confluence with the Skwentna River, the Deshka River (Kroto Creek) below the confluence with Trapper Creek, and Alexander Creek outside a 100-yard buffer on each side of the river; bear baiting within one mile of a cabin if the cabin is on the opposite side of a major river system from the bear baiting station and other permit conditions are met; control permittees must possess a valid Alaska hunting license, except that a resident who is 10 - 15 years of age at the start of the season and has successfully completed a certified hunter education course and a department orientation for predator management, is allowed to hunt on behalf of a permit holder who is at least 16 years of age, under the direct immediate supervision of that permit holder, who is responsible for ensuring that all legal requirements are met; a control permittee may maintain and use another control permittee's bait station with written permission from the other control permittee;

(vi) same-day-airborne taking of bears if the permittee is at least 300 feet from the aircraft, including the use of any type of aircraft, such as a fixed-wing aircraft and helicopter, [TO ACCESS BEAR FOOT-SNARING CAMPS] from April 15 through October 15, except that a helicopter may not be used from August 5 through September 25; a helicopter may be used only to transport resident permittees, gear, and harvested bears and parts of bears directly to and from a foot-snaring camp; up to 10 helicopter permits may be issued at the discretion of the department and a permittee must attend a department-approved orientation course;

(vii) taking of bears by foot snaring by permit only from April 15 through October 15; [IF FOOT SNARING IS BASED OUT OF REMOTE CAMPS, NO MORE THAN FIVE FOOT SNARING CAMPS MAY BE IN OPERATION AT ANY TIME, AND AT LEAST TWO PERMITTEES MUST BE PRESENT IN EACH CAMP] **permittees must be accompanied by another person, age 16 or older,** when **conducting foot snaring activities** [FOOT SNARES ARE] in the field; foot snaring permits will be issued at the discretion of the department based on previous trapping experience, ability to help train other participants, and length of time available for participation in a snaring program; a selected foot snaring permittee must successfully complete a department-approved training program, must be a resident 16 years of age or older, and report all animals taken by the permittee to the department within 48 hours of taking;

(viii) foot snares may only be placed on the ground directly under the bucket snare or in buckets and must be checked by the permittee at least once each day;

(ix) all brown bears that are cubs of the year or a sow accompanied by cubs of the year incidentally snared must be immediately reported to the department; if practicable, an incidentally snared brown bear will be released by department staff; no more than 10 incidentally snared brown bears may be killed each year by all snaring permittees in the aggregate; hides and skulls of incidentally snared brown bears are the property of the state and must be salvaged and delivered to the department;

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

(A) through July 1, 2017, the commissioner may reduce the wolf and bear populations in the Unit 16 Predation Control Area;

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

(6) other specifications that the board considers necessary are as follows:

(A) the commissioner will suspend wolf control activities

(i) when wolf inventories or accumulated information from permittees indicate the need to avoid reducing wolf numbers below the management objective of 22 - 45 wolves specified in this subsection;

(ii) when spring conditions deteriorate to make wolf control operations infeasible; or

(iii) no later than April 30 in any regulatory year;

(B) the commissioner will suspend black bear control activities

(i) when black bear population inventories or accumulated information from permittees indicate the need to avoid reducing black bear numbers below the management objective of 600 black bears specified in this subsection;

(ii) no later than June 30 during any regulatory year;

(C) the commissioner will suspend brown bear control activities

(i) when brown bear population inventories or accumulated information from permittees indicate the need to avoid reducing brown bear numbers below the management objective of 250 brown bears specified in this subsection;

(ii) no later than June 30 during any regulatory year

(D) predator control activities will be terminated

(i) when prey population management objectives are attained; or

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

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

**ISSUE:** This proposal was submitted to by the Department of Fish and Game to prompt a review of the Unit 16 intensive management program and the progress that has been made

towards meeting the program's objectives. The proposal also recommends minor changes to the regulation to eliminate requirements that are no longer necessary.

Intensive management of predators began in 2004 when the public was first authorized to take wolves from the air with the goal of reducing the wolf predation on moose, and improvements in overwinter survival rates of moose were observed. The program was modified to address limitations imposed on the moose population by black bear predation in 2007 and brown bear predation in 2011. To date, liberalizations made to reduce bear numbers have not been effective at reducing the bear population to the intensive management program's objectives and the Department has not been able to document an increase in moose survival or recruitment that can be attributed to the bear control programs.

During the February 2012 Board of Game meeting, the department will provide a review of the program, progress made towards objectives, and the results of a 2012 moose calf survival study.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The Unit 16 intensive management program will continue to be conducted with no changes to the program or its objectives.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** A review of the program will allow the Board of Game to evaluate population objectives for moose, wolves and bears and allow the board to tailor program in a manner that best serves the public.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** None

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** None

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050412651  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 104 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping, and 5 AAC 92.125 Intensive management plans.** Prohibit the snaring of bears in the Central/Southwest Region.

Snaring of bears is illegal in Central/Southwest Region (Game Management Units 9, 10, 11, 13, 14A, 14B, 15, 16, 17).

**ISSUE:** The Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) does not have the data to insure that bears will not be overharvested by the use of snaring, especially combined with an absence of bag limits, open seasons, and newly approved methods of take. Bear snaring is controversial and not tolerated by the public as an acceptable method of take. Authorizing a black bear trapping season in Alaska, especially in areas bordering National Parks; Preserves is inappropriate and will invariably have a negative impact on bear populations in our National Parks & Preserves as well as present an unacceptable safety risk to the public. Bear snaring in areas of high use is not

only dangerous, but is not the highest use of this resource. Wildlife viewing is an important part of our state's economy and brings valuable economic development of any communities and businesses around the state. Though touted as safe, humane and effective way to kill bears, we, along with thousands of Alaska would disagree. Bear snaring has not been legal in Alaska since statehood for many good reasons, including the following:

Safety: Allowing bear snaring stations as close as 1/4 of a mile from residences, roads and trails is anything but responsible and safe. There is no way for the public to know where bear snaring is taking place. Fish and Game currently does not provide a map or locations where bear snaring bait stations are located thereby putting the public at risk of inadvertently encountering a free-roaming adult or sibling of a bear caught in a snare as they recreate during the summer.

Humane: The practice of baiting a bear and snaring it is anything but humane. Unless there is someone attending the site (which is not required) and can kill the bear immediately upon capture, we seriously doubt that a bear doesn't suffer as a result of being snared. Indeed, the ADF&G had to kill several brown bears due to injuries received from struggling to free themselves after being caught in a snare in Unit 16. The fair chase ethic that many Alaskans abide by is affronted by the practice of bear snaring. Bears have been and remain an iconic species that deserves better treatment than this.

Effective: Bear snares are indiscriminate, allowing the capture of brown bears, sows with cubs and cubs. This method of culling is not only socially unacceptable but is inconsistent with modern wildlife management practices. Bears have a relatively low reproductive rate and the taking of sows with cubs and cubs has been universally discouraged over the years. With the singular focus of ADF&G to boost ungulate populations, there is still little evidence that intensive management works over the long term. Many areas where intensive management has been conducted has resulted in reduced twinning rates, reduced growth of calves, increased age of first reproduction, and poor body condition including starvation in extreme situations.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** It is likely that bears will become a diminished resource as a result of the new policy. More people and pets will be faced with a public safety issue. The tourism industry will suffer. The classification of bears as furbearers is a wasteful and inappropriate use of the resource. Bears could become food-conditioned, thereby creating a potential hazard for people.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, bear snaring is an indiscriminate method of take. A trapper can still harvest a bear under a trapping license by using a firearm and bait station to attract a free roaming bear. Under this method, a trapper can be selective in harvesting the bear and avoid taking non-target species and cubs or females with cubs. Bear snaring is a wanton waste of our resources.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaskans and visitors who value wildlife and sound biological management of our wildlife resources, and who want the opportunity to view wildlife in our national and state parks.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will suffer. This practice only promotes waste and disrespect for wildlife.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Reverse the decision to classify black bears as a furbearer.

**PROPOSED BY:** Valerie Connor EG050212622  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 105 - AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping, and 5 AAC 92.125 Intensive management plans.** Prohibit the snaring of bears in the Central/Southwest Region as follows:

Snaring of bears, black and grizzly, would be prohibited in the Central/Southwest Region. The only exceptions would be for state wildlife personnel under specific emergency situations where a bear or bears have become a public nuisance or danger. Even then, it should be used only as a means of relocating the bears.

**ISSUE:** Snaring of bears, both black and grizzly, is being instituted in various areas of the state either on a public-activity basis or an experimental basis. With the classification of black bears as a furbearer subject to trapping, there is an incentive to take them in large numbers regardless of gender or the presence of dependent offspring. The result for an species with an extremely low reproductive rate is that both the present and the next generation are subject to removal from the population without any real regard to management. Bears caught in snares will be killed and any management changes to that situation would only take place after the damage is done.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** For one thing, wildlife management in Alaska as viewed by both residents and non-residents, will decline further in credibility and public acceptance. There is no real justification for this method or increased take, a position held by many Alaskans. Yet, it is being proposed by a handful of interested parties who have no reason other than yet another way to kill bears. Bear-baiting, which is repugnant to many, both hunters and non-hunters, gives enough opportunity that snaring is not justified. Too, enforcement by the wildlife division of the Alaska State Troopers is apt to be spotty at best. Presently, we have less than 100 wildlife troopers for the entire state. They are already stretched very thinly in terms of manpower and resources just trying to maintain the hunting/trapping regulations already in effect. To expect them to additionally take on the burden of having to inspect a flood of snaring sites is likely to overwhelm their capabilities and lead to poorly-maintained sites without any real enforcement. Additionally, there are the dangers to hikers and other non-consumers using the land who may come upon a situation where one bear is caught while its siblings or mother remain free in the area, creating the very real possibility of severe injuries or fatalities. The humaneness often touted as a feature of these snares is debatable. For an animal that has never been restrained to suddenly be unable to move more than a few feet in any direction is very likely to produce a considerable and stressful reaction. As the present proposals allow 3 days between checking snares, this means any bear caught will be going that entire period without water or food or the ability to protect itself against any other predator. That's assuming the snares are checked according to schedule. Therein again rises the problem of enforcement. Should a sow with cubs be caught, the cubs will be stressed severely by their

mother's response. Equally, if a cub is caught, there will be an extremely stressed bear sow roaming the area.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** With liberal bear hunting seasons and bag limits, the widespread use of bait-stations, the onslaught against bears in Alaska has been increasing. This is a species with a low reproductive rate yet it has high value as a tourism draw with bears being one of the “big three” species most often cited as viewing opportunities. Rather than indiscriminate killing of bears, they should be managed with a view towards their vital role in a healthy environment. It is much easier not to create problems at the onset as opposed to trying to repair damage after it has been done.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Viewers of wildlife, both resident and non-resident, will benefit from the opportunities these animals present. In 2008, the entire revenue from hunting/trapping fees and licenses totaled \$124 million while the revenue from tourism was over \$538 million. Additionally, the ethical hunter that believes in fair chase will benefit by not having to deal with snare sites and the attendant problems and dangers thereof. The indiscriminate killing of bears would negatively impact healthy, sustainable bear populations, a situation affecting both hunters and non-hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Remove bears from the furbearer classification. I do not reject this; I heartily endorse it. With snaring in place, the opportunity for a black market in bear gall bladders is greatly enhanced as is the waste of bears. There is not a huge demand for bear pelts and not all bears taken by this method will have suitable pelts. The probability of wastage is high.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Wildlife Alliance EG042912576  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 106 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear, and 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures.** Open Unit 16 to brown bear baiting for residents and nonresidents in the spring and fall as follows:

We propose a spring brown bear baiting season from April 15<sup>th</sup> to June 30<sup>th</sup> and fall season from August 20<sup>th</sup> to October 31<sup>st</sup>. It would be open for both residents and nonresidents.

**ISSUE:** There is a large population of brown bear and black bear in Unit 16 and because of the limited access in this unit and it being heavily treed it is difficult to hunt bears in this Unit without bait. Brown bear and black bear together predate about 70% of moose calves in this Unit. Currently only residents can hunt brown bear over bait and that is only with a predator control permit. We propose having a general season that allows both residents and nonresidents to hunt brown bear over bait in Unit 16, with both a spring and a fall season. We have just had a severe winter and set a record for snowfall. We are sure this will have a very negative impact on

the moose population with a large winter kill and we need to have an increase in harvest of all bears in this Unit.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will continue to be a large population of both brown and black bear that are under harvested in this Unit and they will have a negative impact on a struggling moose population.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Taking brown bear over bait will give hunters more opportunity to evaluate hair quality and size and the possibility of seeing more bears.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All bear hunters will have more opportunity to harvest brown bear without having to participate in a predator control program. The increase in harvest of both bear species will reduce the predation on moose calves and help the moose population rebound.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Nobody will suffer.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee EG042412547  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 107 - 5 ACC 85.020 Brown Bear Season and Bag Limits.** Retain the current no closed season for brown bear in the remainder of Unit 16B as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(14)		
Remainder of Unit 16(B)	No closed season	No closed season
2 bears every regulatory year		

**ISSUE:** The current brown bear season in Subunit 16B will expire in 2013 unless it is reauthorized by the Board of Game (board). When the regulation expires the season will revert to the former dates of August 10 to May 31.

During the March 2011 Board of Game meeting in Wasilla, the board liberalized the brown bear hunting in Subunit 16B by establishing a year-round season to increase bear harvests and reduce brown bear predation on moose calves. Moose population and harvest objectives have not been

met for several years for Unit 16B and are currently below intensive management objectives. Department research conducted since 2004 has shown that brown bears and black bears are important predators of moose calves and that calf recruitment is limiting population growth and recovery in the area.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Brown bear hunting in Subunit 16B will revert to a August 10 to May 31 season.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters who wish to have the opportunity to harvest a brown bear between June 1 and August 9.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050412649  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 108 - 5 AAC 92.125(d) Intensive management plans.** Suspend/relax the intensive management of wolves in Unit 16 as follows:

Amend 92.125(d) to achieve a reduction of 0–30% of the pre–control wolf population estimates of 160 to 220 wolves in Unit 16B.

Determine a pre-control wolf population in Unit 16A, and set a wolf population reduction objective of 0 – 30% of that population estimate. Amend the intensive management (IM) plan to reflect this finding for Unit 16A.

**ISSUE:** Intensive management of wolves in Unit 16, including the lack of wolf population objective for Unit 16A in the IM plan.

The most recent Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) moose calf mortality data (2010) reported zero newborn moose calf mortality attributed to wolves, yet the board continues to aggressively reduce the wolf population in Unit 16; the population objective for wolves in Unit 16B is a minimum of only 22 wolves.

In Unit 16A, the aerial gunning of wolves borders Denali State Park and borders where the objective to maintain a minimum population is not even identified in the plan, so within the IM area in Unit 16A, the reduction of the wolf population to zero appears to be authorized as long as at least 22 wolves are “estimated” to remain in Unit 16B.

The current objective authorizes reductions of wolves to a density of just 1 wolf / 500 mi<sup>2</sup>. Such a low density is not justified when compared to the 2010 moose calf mortality data and adult female moose survival rates.

The ADF&G have long stated that the minimum wolf IM objective has been met in Unit 16 with the combined take of aerial hunting and ground based harvest, including trapping and sport hunting harvest rates, yet the department has virtually no scientific survey or census data to verify that, at minimum, 22 wolves remain in the 11,000 mi<sup>2</sup> identified in the plan. Instead the department relies on anecdotal information, including what can only be assumed to be biased reports from permitted aerial SDA pilots and gunners.

In 2009, the ADF&G reported to the board: “The spring population objective of 22 – 45 wolves in Unit 16B was most likely achieved as we estimated between 38 and 49 wolves for the unit”

The total harvest of wolves (hunt, trap, SDA) to achieve this low population density was 41 wolves, it is likely that few resident wolves, if any, remain in the 11,000 mi<sup>2</sup> defined in this IM plan.

Unit 16 is bordered by Denali State Park and two National Parks. Low densities of wolves within the IM region bordering these parks creates a density “sink” whereby wolves emigrate out of the park to fill the “void” created by the states intensive management program in Unit 16. It can be reasonably assumed that resident wolf populations that reside primarily in both state and federal parks are harvested in the bordering aerial gunning that occurs in Unit 16.

The IM plan specifically states that adult cow survival rates are between 90 – 95%. The state has no direct evidence in Unit 16 to support the assumption that excessive predation by wolves on adult cows, or neonates, would result from ending, or relaxing, the intensive management of wolves in this program.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Wolf populations in Unit 16 will be unnecessarily reduced to unacceptable low densities, which may result in a significant increase in the coyote population.

Wolf populations primarily inhabiting Denali State Park, Denali National Park & Preserve, and Lake Clark National Park will be harvested in the states SDA program as wolves in these higher density regions emigrate to low density regions within the 11,000 mi<sup>2</sup> aerial wolf control zone bordering these parks and preserves. This negatively impacts other users of the resource; in particular, the wildlife viewing public which primarily visits state and national parks to view wildlife, and in particular, wolves.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, wolves provide a highly sought after resource for subsistence and sport trappers. The financial return for wolf pelts is one of the highest for any species in Alaska. Allowing the wolf population to return to a more natural regulated density to the maximum extent possible will promote higher sustainable harvest for both trapping, who value the economic return, and sport hunters, who value the wolf as a trophy animal.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The ADF&G will benefit by having a region where coyote densities are minimized by naturally regulated wolf populations. Wolves and coyotes do not get along and the ADF&G, as well as the resident subsistence hunter, has much more to lose by

allowing coyotes to increase unchecked, than they do in restoring a natural balance in the wolf population.

The wildlife viewing public who visit Denali State Park and National Park are there to primarily view wildlife, in particular, wolves. State actions that may reduce the wolf populations in parks should be conservative, and for the shortest duration possible.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who consider the only good wolf, a dead wolf.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Revoking the IM plan entirely. To achieve the goals of increasing moose densities while simultaneously authorizing nonresident trophy hunting for moose in the same region, the board is handicapping the ADF&G's ability to adaptively manage human harvest and is assuming significant ecological risk in doing so. But, it appears prudent, science based management of nonresident hunting opportunity is not an option with the current Board of Game.

**PROPOSED BY:** Science Now Project

EG050912707

\*\*\*\*\*

# Regional and Multiple Units

---

*Note: The Board of Game does not have authority to remove the guide requirement for hunting certain big game animals or to increase permit and tag fees.*

**PROPOSAL 109 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Season and bag limits.** Open resident hunting seasons ten days before nonresident seasons, allocate 90 percent of harvest to residents; remove guide requirements, and increase tag and permit fees for Central/Southwest Region Units as follows:

ALL resident hunting seasons for ALL species 10 days prior to nonresident hunters. Remove the guiding requirement for sheep, goats, and brown bears. Raise ALL nonresident harvest tags and permit fees. Allocate 90% of harvests to residents and 10% to non-residents.

**ISSUE:** I would like the Board of Game to address the problem of favoring guides and their nonresident clients over the needs of Alaskan Residents. Specifically, I would like the Board of Game to address the declining hunting opportunities residents are facing and the competition we face from the guiding industry in filling our freezers.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Residents will continue to see their hunting opportunities diminish. The Board of Game and the Guiding industry will continue to claim that non-resident hunters provide monies for the management of our game and bring in much needed dollars to the State when in fact they don't. Residents live here, spend their money YEAR round, buy services and goods YEAR round and support a multitude of businesses in their pursuit of game. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game spends about \$42 million dollars per year in support of the Commercial Fishing Industry, yet only receives about \$16 million in revenue from the Commercial Fishing Industry. Clearly, if the Department of Fish and Game--and the Board of Game --were concerned about much needed dollars, we can find savings in other avenues.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** You bet. We live here and these are OUR resources. Not the feds, not nonresidents, and surely not the Guides. The Board of Game needs to start to manage our wildlife for Alaskan Residents and we have seen for too long now, declining populations of our game and most especially, declining hunting opportunities for us and our children. The future does not look bright if we continue--if you, the Board of Game, continue, to manage our wildlife species the way you have. We have an excellent Department of Fish and Game--some of the best and brightest biologists in the world--yet your actions, and in many cases, lack of action--has made them ineffective as managers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaskan Residents--and that's all that really matters. That and our game resources. This should be the metric for each and every decision you make. Does it help the Alaskan resident--current and future? Your last meeting on the Interior failed in this regard on several fronts.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Guides and the guiding industry and that is fine with the vast majority of ALASKANS.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Continue on the same management path as you have--and that is unacceptable. It is time to put Alaskans first. It is time to think of Future Alaskans--specifically, our children. These are our game resources--we expect you to manage them for our benefit and for our children's benefit. The Board of Game--current and past-- has failed to do this, and I reject this as being acceptable.

**PROPOSED BY:** Jake Sprankle

EG043012587

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 110 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep.** Open resident sheep seasons seven days before nonresident seasons for the Central/Southwest Region Units as follows:

Resident hunting season for Dall sheep shall be August 3rd to September 20th. Nonresident hunting season shall be from August 10th to September 20th. Drawing permit areas will start seven days earlier for Alaska residents and if there is a split season, the second half will be shortened by seven days for nonresidents such that residents can start the second half seven days prior to nonresidents.

**ISSUE:** The Board of Game needs to address the lack of full curl legal rams available to Alaska residents. While sheep populations have been stable to slightly declining, the availability of legal rams, much less trophy rams, has been significantly reduced and is in serious decline. Success rates for resident sheep hunters will never be on par with nonresidents if not allowed an earlier jump from the efficiency of their guides.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Alaskan resident hunters will continue to suffer from the mismanagement of this species by the Board of Game. Alaskan youth will never have the opportunity afforded to their parents and grandparents to successfully hunt healthy populations of Dall sheep with ample populations of large rams. Alaska wildlife belongs to all Alaskans and these resources should be managed as such.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Resident hunters will have an improved quality of hunt and avoid conflicts with guides and their clients. Nonresident hunters will have an improved quality of hunt by avoiding conflicts with resident hunters. Transport services associated with sheep hunting will improve as this will lessen the bottleneck on transporters seen at the beginning of each season, especially during poor weather. This may also increase the safety of hunters and transporters by spreading out the season and users more. Current Alaska residents and future Alaskans may be more interested in hunting Dall sheep, its management, and the future of Dall sheep hunting if they had greater opportunity to locate and harvest a legal ram, much less quality rams.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaska residents, Alaska youth, and future Alaskans. Dall sheep populations may also improve as more people may feel like they have a chance at successfully harvesting a quality ram and will be more interested in the management of the resource. This benefits Alaska, all of Alaska's game resources, and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one, though some will say nonresident hunters, nonresident guides, and resident guides may suffer. Harvest records, however, show that resident sheep hunters are much less successful than nonresidents because of their guides. This is largely due to time guides can give to pre-season scouting, which is done mostly by fixed wing aircraft. While success rates for resident hunters will hopefully increase, there is little reason to think that nonresident success rates will decline significantly. Pre-season scouting will still be available to guides. Sheep populations will not suffer directly - again because resident hunter success rates are consistently low. Future sheep populations, however, may suffer and receive little support or interest, if today's youth and future generations cannot hunt healthy populations of sheep, as is currently the case. You will be hard pressed to find any Alaska resident who is not a guide or associated with a guiding business, who does not favor this proposal. If not sure whether to favor Alaska residents over nonresidents, please look at any other state and how they manage their resources for the benefit of their residents and not for the financial benefit of a few.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Close nonresident hunting of Dall sheep for five years or until healthy populations of sheep with sufficient populations of legal rams is re-established. Charge resident hunters non-resident harvest fees during this interim to offset any loss of funding from loss of non-resident tags. This would be the best management practice the Board of Game (board) could do, as it would best serve current and future Alaska residents, and most of all best serve the Dall sheep population as a whole. I rejected this solution based on past performance of the board where political and financial interests of a few, trumped the best interests of Alaska residents, Alaska game resources, and Alaska itself.

**PROPOSED BY:** Jake Sprankle EG042412552  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 111 - 5 AAC 85.055. Seasons and bag limits for Dall Sheep.** Open resident sheep seasons seven days before nonresident seasons for the Central/Southwest Region Units as follows:

Region IV Units - Season Dates for Dall Sheep:  
Residents: August 5th – September 20th  
Nonresidents: August 12th – September 20th

**ISSUE:** Preference for Alaska residents to have an early start date for Dall sheep hunting.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Alaskans will keep experiencing conflict in the field with commercial operators (guides) and overcrowding will diminish the quality of the hunt for residents. All of the western states have high allocations of game (usually 90%) for their residents and about 50% of Alaska's sheep are harvested by nonresidents, which would

never be allowed in other states. The lack of a quality experience and the diminishing number of legal rams is causing a reduction in the number of Alaskans wanting to hunt and enjoy a resource we all own.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** More legal rams would be harvested by residents and our youth would have an opportunity to have a positive experience sheep hunting. All sheep hunters would not be trying to enter the field on the same day and the air taxi services wouldn't be so overloaded – generally a safer situation for all hunters. An early start date would extend the time for entering the field, creating less conflict between resident and nonresident hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All Alaskans – especially our youth. Nonresidents will also have a better experience because many residents will be out of the field when they enter creating more solitude for their hunt.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Commercial operators will complain but they are using a resource we all own. Other states don't force nonresidents to use a guide and they have high game allocations for their residents (usually 90%). Nonresident guides can't legally hunt sheep, goats, and brown bears themselves but they enjoy and make money on a resource owned by all Alaskans. This is not anti guide or nonresident but PRO – ALASKAN.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The Board of Game has been very kind to the guiding industry at the expense of the resident hunter. Nonresident tag fees bring a lot of money to the state and this helps support the Department of Fish and Game. How do other western states survive giving their residents high allocations of game? Other western states require nonresidents to apply for drawing permits (elk, deer, antelope, bear, sheep, goat, moose, cougar, etc.) 6 to 8 months in advance of the season, they have a preference point system, and high tag fees with no guide requirements. They make money to support their programs and give their residents very (usually 90%) high allocations of game. Nonresidents can come to Alaska the day before hunting season and buy a nonresident tag over the counter the day before the season at a fraction of the price other states charge. Why doesn't Alaska manage game for residents and our Department of Fish & Game like other states? If the Board of Game doesn't start showing some preference to residents, Alaskans need to contact the governor and their representatives asking them to confirm board members who put residents as priority #1 or vote for politicians that support a preference for Alaska residents.

**PROPOSED BY:** Tom Lamal and Darcy Etcheverry EG043012578  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 112 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep.** Open resident sheep seasons five days before nonresident seasons for Central/Southwest Region Units as follows:

Region II Units - Season Dates for Dall Sheep:  
Residents: August 5<sup>th</sup> - September 25th  
Nonresidents: August 10 - September 20th

**ISSUE:** Early start date and later ending date for Alaskan resident sheep hunters

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The overcrowding will just get worse. The Brooks Range was a zoo in 2011, the other ranges will become that way soon. If there isn't a fix there will be more upset hunters. Then we will get some new Board of Game members

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Alaskan residents will be given a better chance to enjoy this state to harvest meat for their family. There won't be such a scramble by so many different hunters trying to get any legal sheep,

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaska residents and Alaskan game!

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Guides.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Make ALL guides in Alaska that guide out of state hunters for sheep, bear and goat be Alaskan residents (live here year round) not just for the guiding season) if an out of state hunters needs a guide to hunt these animals, then out of state guides are not qualified. I rejected this idea because that would be a huge hit to the guiding industry.

**PROPOSED BY:** Jacques Etcheverry

EG043012593

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 113 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep.** Open resident sheep hunting seasons five days before nonresident seasons for the Central/Southwest Region as follows:

Region II Units - Season Dates for Dall Sheep:

Residents: August 5th to September 20th

Nonresidents: August 10th to September 20th

**ISSUE:** The Board of Game needs to address the serious problem of overcrowding at the start of the sheep season and the lack of legal rams for the resident hunters. Alaska wildlife is 1st and foremost for the Alaskan resident.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The conflicts between resident and nonresident hunters will continue to increase and the overall successful hunting experience for both groups will decline.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Both the resident and the nonresident hunters will have an improved hunt by avoiding conflicts between the two groups. This will also improve safety by not having everyone rush into the field at the same time.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All Alaskan residents.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** In my opinion no one would suffer, but the non-resident and resident guides will say that they will suffer.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Leonard Jewkes EG042912573  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 114 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits.** Open resident hunting seasons seven days before nonresident seasons for Central/Southwest Region Units as follows:

Whatever opening date is determined for any species, the new regulation would indicate the opening for nonresidents would be seven days later.

**ISSUE:** Big Game hunting for residents opens seven days before non-residents for all big game.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** This proposal will allow resident hunters to have a seven day early access period to hunt game populations without interference from nonresident hunters who may be utilizing professional guide services or hunting on their own. Opening day numbers would be thinned out, transporters would be able to cater to more people, or at least spread the movement of people over more days. The result would be a less chaotic experience for everyone.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal would improve the hunting experience for the Alaska resident. Our State Constitution indicates the wildlife resources belong to the people of Alaska. It should only be considered as fair for the people to have access to our wildlife without interference from nonresidents. Other States use staggered starts with nonresidents for hunting seasons and the same benefits should be extended to Alaskans.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone will benefit from this proposal. Residents will have an opportunity to pursue game in a less crowded field. Nonresidents would have the same type of experience. With opening day being thinned out the remainder of each season would be much smoother.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** I can't see any group suffering from this proposal. Hunting pressure would be thinned, commercial services would be spread out and Alaska would be in line with many of the other hunting states.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No other solutions were considered.

**PROPOSED BY:** Terry Marquette EG042812566  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 115 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits.** Limit sheep drawing permits to 10% for nonresidents for Central/Southwest Regions as follows:

Drawing by permit only with 90% of the permits going to residents and 10% of the permits for nonresidents. The total number of permits for any one given area will not exceed harvest of 40% of the legal Rams in the hunting area.

**ISSUE:** I would like the boards full consideration to consider moving ALL Dall sheep hunting in Region IV to drawing permit only, limiting the number of non-resident permits to 10% or less of the total permits allowed for any specific area. The 10% allocation of this state owned resource to nonresidents should be more than adequate and provide a preference for the residents of the state that own the resource.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Several of the problems already exist and are getting worse. The state is not managing the resource to the fullest potential both monetarily and for trophy quality or age structure to promote better hunting and more funding available to manage. Many areas saturated with guides non-resident hunters are becoming more and more exclusive for guides to lock down access by threat and air taxes flying in the area trying to keep hunting areas they think they own private. Area conflicts are increasing with hunters and guided nonresident hunters.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, both the resource harvest will improve age structure and quality of the trophy's hunted and limit hunter conflicts. Increased management dollars to promote a healthier number of sheep and better understanding of actual sheep numbers by regular census taking.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All hunter in general will benefit with less user conflicts and improved trophy quality and opportunities. Providing a quoted for both residents and non residents should allow for plenty of opportunity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Better planning for all users to apply for a permit would not be considered suffering, just making an adjustment. Guides may feel they are suffering with a limited client base, because now they can do most anything they want.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Limit the amount of non resident sheep hunters to a simple 10% permit quota of the resource take-in each area based on the last 10 year harvest average to drawing permit and leaving all current harvest tag only areas still open to residents. I feel the drawing permit system needs more participation to generate additional revenue for the state to improve state wide sheep management.

**PROPOSED BY:** Doug Lammers EG042912570  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 116 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits.** Limit drawing permits to 10% for nonresidents for Central/Southwest Region Units as follows:

Nonresidents will only be granted 10% of the hunting permits offered for any big game hunting permit draw.

**ISSUE:** In Region IV (Central/Southwest) Units, nonresident hunters will be limited to receiving no more than 10% of the permits issued for any hunt drawing.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The wildlife resources of Alaska belong to the residents of Alaska first and foremost. It is only fair that the bulk of hunting draw permits go to Alaskan residents first and a smaller portion be extended to nonresidents. Extending 10% of any hunting draw coincides with the percentage extended by other States for similar hunting permit draws. Without this nonresident limitation Alaskans who desire to use this resource pay the application fee (which is non refundable) and consequently get bumped by a nonresident are being denied access to their own resource.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal secures the Alaskan resident as having first priority status for acquiring big game permits through the drawing process.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The Alaskan resident will benefit from this proposal.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will suffer.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No other solutions considered.

**PROPOSED BY:** Terry Marquette EG042812567  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 117 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits.** Allocate 90% of drawing permits to residents for Central/Southwest Region hunts and exclude nonresidents in hunts with less than ten permits as follows:

A minimum of 90% of drawing permits will go to Alaska residents for all species. If a certain Unit has less than 10 permits available nonresidents are not eligible to participate in that drawing.

**ISSUE:** Drawing permit preference for Alaska residents – All species.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Alaska needs to put a cap of 10% on nonresident participation in drawing permits. This will put us in line with the other western states that have preferences for their residents which is usually 90% for drawing permits.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** An Alaskan preference for drawing permits will improve the quality of the

hunt for resident hunters and give more opportunities to our youth. This will take away a lot of the conflict with sheep, goats, and brown bear where nonresidents are forced to hire a guide.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All Alaskans.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The commercial operators (guides) will complain on sheep, goats, and brown bears but the other western states don't force nonresidents to use a guide for any species. The guides don't support preference points for residents or a high allocation of permits going to resident hunters. The commercial operators are using a resource we all own and residents would like the Board of Game to adopt proposals that reduce conflict in the field between guides and resident hunters.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The Board of Game has been very kind to the guiding industry at the expense of the resident hunter. Nonresident tag fees bring a lot of money to the state and this helps support the Department of Fish and Game. How do other western states survive giving their residents high allocations of game? Other western states require nonresidents to apply for drawing permits (elk, deer, antelope, bear, sheep, goat, moose, cougar, etc.) six to eight months in advance of the season, they have a preference point system, and high tag fees with no guide requirements. They make money to support their programs and give their residents very (usually 90%) high allocations of game. Nonresidents can come to Alaska the day before hunting season and buy a nonresident tag over the counter the day before the season at a fraction of the price other states charge. Why doesn't Alaska manage game for residents and our Department of Fish and Game like other states? If the Board of Game doesn't start showing some preference to residents, Alaskans need to contact the governor and their representatives asking them to confirm board members who put residents as priority #1 or vote for politicians that support a preference for Alaska residents.

**PROPOSED BY:** Tom Lamal EG043012581  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 118 - 5 AAC 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures.**

Develop a permit allocation formula for second degree of kindred hunters in Units 10, 13, and 14 as follows:

We suggest that nonresident drawing permit hunt success be established on a 75 and up to 25 percent basis with the up to twenty-five percent provided to second degree of kindred hunters.

**ISSUE:** Second degree of kindred allocation within drawing permit hunts. In many cases where nonresident hunter opportunity has been limited to drawing permit hunts and guide required species, there are very few permits available. Professional hunting guides have to maintain their business overhead and land use authorizations based on the hope that they will have clients who draw a permit. Second degree of kindred drawing permit success is growing. This factor works against a guide business owner whose clients also compete for these permits. We would like the Board of Game to develop an allocation formula that provides for second degree of kindred opportunity but also allows for a guide business owner to have knowledge that there are permits available for guided hunting opportunity.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Second degree of kindred drawing permit success will continue to marginalize or eliminate guide business owners and their contribution to the State.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, guided hunting provided a very important part of the rural Alaska economy. Second degree of kindred hunters have a much higher level of no-show which leaves opportunity wasted for other hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Professional guide business owners who need some assurance that they will have a chance for their clients to draw permits.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Some second degree of kindred hunters.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo: does not provide for a viable business plan.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Professional Hunters Association Inc. EG050412640  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 119 - 5 AAC 85.060 Hunting season and bag limit for coyote.** Open coyote hunting year round in the Central/Southwest Region Units as follows:

Open coyote season year round, no bag limit in Region IV (Central/Southwest).

**ISSUE:** Standardize hunting regulations in regard to coyote. Make coyote hunting open year round with no closed season or bag limit.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Confusion over season.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, reduces predation by coyote.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sheep hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Year round trapping – too many problems.

**PROPOSED BY:** Steve Flory, Sr. EG050912715  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 120 - 5 AAC 85.060 Hunting season and bag limit for coyote.** Close the taking of coyotes on National Park Service lands during summer months and reduce the bag limit in the Central/Southwest Region as follows:

Amend the coyote hunting regulations for lands managed by the National Park Service as follows:

85.060

(1) Coyote

Units 9, 11, 13, 16-17 (NPS Preserves)

**On lands managed by the National Park Service**

**10 coyotes per day** [NO LIMIT] August 10 – **April 30** [MAY 25] (Resident and Nonresident)

**ISSUE:** Harvest of coyotes on lands managed by the National Park Service during the summer months when coyotes have adult dependent pups in the den, when adults are more susceptible to harvest due to denning activities, and pelts are not in “prime” condition, limiting their trophy value for sport hunters.

In essence, summer harvest of coyotes simply promotes opportunistic harvest by hunters, both resident and nonresident, with no tangible purpose other than population reduction. Summer harvest also creates a significant concern regarding the ethical, fair chase principles that guide responsible harvest of wildlife when the legal harvest of pups is allowed with no obvious or apparent need or use of the animal. Alaska trapping regulations for coyotes in these Units limits harvest to no later than April 30<sup>th</sup> of each year.

Liberal state hunting regulations for coyotes are often justified by the Board of Game (board) with the assumption that coyotes are negatively impacting ungulate densities in the regions where they are found and by promoting opportunistic hunting opportunity it will result in lower densities of coyotes.

The state has no scientific data to support the assumption that any ungulate populations in Alaska are being depressed due to coyote predation. State law or actions that seek to manipulate natural wildlife populations with the assumption of benefiting another species, assuming such benefit will result in higher rates of human consumption of ungulates, or have that practical effect, are inconsistent with NPS statutes, regulations, and management policies and exceed Congress’s authorization of sport hunting in ANILCA.

As with wolves, the take of coyotes during the summer months of May, June and July sanction practices that have the potential to impact the natural integrity of wildlife populations inhabiting lands managed by the NPS. The practical effect of summer harvest dates is increased efficiency for taking coyotes during a time of year when they are susceptible to harvest due to denning activities. This has the potential to create pressures on the natural abundance, behavior, distribution, and ecological integrity of this species which in turn creates unacceptable impacts to NPS preserve purposes and values.

For wolves, the NPS has determined this type of harvest opportunity is an unacceptable impact to park purposes and values and has revoked the legal harvest of wolves during May, June and July in Unit 9. (2012 Lake Clark Superintendents Compendium)

The harvest of predators during the summer denning months is clearly not an acceptable harvest authorization for sport hunting on lands managed by the NPS in Alaska and the board needs to recognize this fact.

In a letter dated February 2007, the NPS commented on a proposal to extend the coyote hunting season past April 30: “This proposal would extend the hunting season for coyote in GMU 9 from April 30 to May 25 to align with the current GMU 9 wolf hunting season. The current season offers ample opportunity to take ten coyotes per day from August 10 through April 30, and we question the need to extend the hunting season into May **when pelts are generally in less than prime condition**.... Should the Board support this proposal, we request that NPS lands be specifically excluded.”

The Board of Game ignored the NPS and adopted the proposal and included lands managed by the NPS.

In a letter to the board dated February 29, 2009, the NPS stated:

“This proposal would establish a year-round coyote hunting season with no limit on the number of animals that may be taken. **We oppose extending the hunting season into months in which whelping occurs and when pelts are generally in less than prime condition**. Should the Board support this proposal, we request that NPS lands be specifically excluded.” (emphasis added).

The board ignored the NPS and adopted regulations to extend coyote hunting season in all of the historical Region II to May 25.

In a letter dated February 18, 2011, the NPS again stated its concern: “These proposals would increase the coyote hunting limit in Region IV units from 10 coyotes per day to an unlimited number annually, have no closed season and reduce salvage requirements to the skull only. **Raising the limit to no limit could have unforeseen environmental consequences that need not be encountered**.” (emphasis added)

The board adopted an unlimited harvest limit for coyotes, ignoring NPS concerns and requests.

As defined in the current Master Memorandum of Understanding (MMOU) between the NPS and the State of Alaska, the state agreed to abide by federal law and congressional management mandates for lands managed by the NPS in Alaska.

The state mutually agreed to the following: “To recognize that the taking of fish and wildlife by hunting, trapping, or fishing on certain Service lands in Alaska is authorized in accordance with applicable State and Federal law **unless State regulations are found to be incompatible with documented Park or Preserve goals, objectives or management plans**.” (emphasis added)

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** State sport hunting regulations will continue to be inconsistent with state trapping regulations which promote pelt quality and maximum trophy or financial benefit to the trapper. The state limits trapping of coyotes statewide to no later than April 30 each year.

Promoting harvest policies that are not based on recognized scientific management principles may negatively impact harvest opportunity for federally qualified subsistence hunters, the primary purpose for consumptive take of wildlife for lands managed by the NPS in Alaska.

NPS park management purposes and values will be negatively impacted, including diminishing opportunities for current or future generations to enjoy, learn about, or be inspired by park resources or values.

The NPS may restrict harvest of coyotes during summer denning months by compendium, as they did for wolves in Unit 9, adding complexity to harvest regulations if the state is unable to provide NPS hunting restriction information in the yearly hunting regulation book. Promoting compliance with federal and state wildlife harvest regulations should be a priority.

A continued lack of cooperation on the part of the State of Alaska regarding documented Park or Preserve goals, objectives or management plans may result in the promulgation of federal regulations.

The state will be ignoring congressional intent regarding ANILCA: “(t)he standard to be met in regulating the taking of fish and wildlife and trapping is that the preeminent natural values of the park system shall be protected in perpetuity and shall not be jeopardized by human uses. These are very special lands and this standard must be set very high: the objective for park system lands must always be to maintain the health of the ecosystem and the yield of fish and wildlife for hunting and trapping must be consistent with this requirement.”

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Promoting sustainable harvest regulations consistent with recognized scientific management principles for the conservation of wildlife enhances the potential for a long term sustained harvestable surplus for sport and subsistence consumptive use which promotes the highest trophy and economic value.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sport and subsistence hunters and trappers will benefit from long term sustained harvest opportunity.

The proposed amendment protects NPS park purposes and values, including the highest management value for the nonconsumptive wildlife viewing public where naturally regulated and intact ecosystems are promoted to the maximum extent possible.

All who value ethical, humane, fair chase harvest principles for the consumptive take of wildlife on lands managed by the NPS in Alaska.

The State of Alaska will benefit from improved compliance with the intent of ANILCA.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Special interest groups who prefer artificial management of ecosystems within Alaska's National Preserves.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The NPS and NPCA have consistently requested that the board exempt NPS managed lands when state and federal management objectives differ. The fundamental intention of the MMOU between the NPS and State of Alaska is to define guidelines for cooperative management between the state and federal government. Unfortunately, the Board of Game has consistently refused to address NPS concerns, comments and proposals.

While hunting is an appropriate activity which NPCA supports in preserves, it must be subject to the natural ecological processes that have defined this region for a millennium. At times, there will be lower densities of wildlife in a naturally regulated system requiring limits on human harvest opportunity, especially sport trophy hunting, to minimize ecological risk and to prioritize federally qualified subsistence harvest opportunity.

This may be a necessary component for sustaining the long term integrity of ecosystems with complex, multi-dimensional relationships that were developed with minimal influence from man.

Alaska's preserves are where America puts its trust in nature!

**PROPOSED BY:** National Parks Conservation Association EG050912711  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 121 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping; 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf; 5 AAC 92.125. Intensive management plans.** Prohibit the taking of wolves March through November in the Central/Southwest Region as follows:

Wolf take is prohibited in all Central/Southwest Region Units prior to November 1 and after March 1. That is, wolf take is prohibited between March 1 and November 1.

**ISSUE:** Currently, state law allows taking of wolves in some Units prior to November 1, while pups remain dependent on their parents. As well, state law in some Units allows taking of wolves after March 1, after mating has usually occurred and while females may be pregnant. The Board of Game should end this practice, as take prior to November 1 and after March 1 can result in substantially higher numbers of wolves lost to the population - pups - than are accounted for in harvest statistics. This unaccounted for loss of pups and breeding adults - which is likely very significant - causes a loss of additional recruitment to the population. As well, wolf hides are not in prime marketable condition prior to November in most areas, and thus taking wolves prior to November constitutes a waste of the resource.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If wolves continue to be taken prior to November 1, while pups remain dependent on parents; or after March 1, when many adult females are pregnant, wolf populations will continue to lose reproductive capacity and

recruitment, causing an overall loss of population and erosion of family structure. This is a waste of a valuable resource.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. As stated above, hides of wolves taken prior to November 1 are of lower market value, and this is a clear waste of the resource. As well, the loss of dependent pups prior to November 1, or unborn pups from females taken after March 1, constitutes a clear and unnecessary loss of recruitment to wolf populations in all Units.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Wolf populations, wolf family structure and integrity, viewers of wolves, and science. As well, trappers and hunters will benefit as the proposal will result in an increase in wolf populations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Few, if any. The proposal will enhance wolf populations, which would then be more available for harvest by hunters / trappers from November - March.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Rick Steiner

EG043012605

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 122 - 5 AAC 92.015 Brown bear tag fee exemption.** Reauthorize the brown bear tag fees for the Central/Southwest Region as follows:

**5AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemption**

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

- (1) Unit 11;
- (2) Units 13 and 16(A), that portion outside of Denali State Park;
- (3) Unit 16(B) and 17;

“”

(11) Unit 9, within the following areas, unless a smaller area is defined by the department in an applicable permit:

(A) Unit 9(B), within five miles of the communities of Port Alsworth, Nondalton, Iliamna, Newhalen, Pile Bay, Pedro Bay, Pope Vanoy Landing, Kakhonak, Igiugig, and Levelock;

(B) Unit 9(C), within five miles of the communities of King Salmon, Naknek, and South Naknek;

(C) Unit 9(D), within five miles of the communities of Cold Bay, King Cove, Sand Point, and Nelson Lagoon;

(D) Unit 9(E), within five miles of the communities of Egegik, Pilot Point, Ugashik, Port Heiden, Port Moller, Chignik Lake, Chignik Lagoon, Chignik Bay, Perryville, and Ivanof Bay;

(12) Unit 10, within three miles of the community of False Pass, unless a smaller area is defined by the department in an applicable permit.

...

(b) In addition to the units as specified in (a) of this section, if a hunter obtains a subsistence registration permit before hunting, that hunter is not required to obtain a resident tag to take a brown bear in the following units:

(1) Unit 9(B);

(2) Unit 9(E), that portion including all drainages that drain into the Pacific Ocean between Cape Kumliun and the border of Unit 9(D) and Unit 9(E);

(3) Unit 17;

...

**ISSUE:** Brown bear tag fee exemptions must be reauthorized annually or the fee will be automatically reinstated.

General Season Hunts: The Board of Game liberalized brown bear hunting regulations including the tag fee exemption to increase the harvest of brown bears in Units 11, 13, and 16, except lands within Denali State Park, during the March 2003 Board of Game meeting and in Unit 17 during the March 2011 Board of Game meeting. The tag fee exemption in these Units achieves a greater harvest of brown bears by allowing opportunistic take and attempts to reduce brown bear numbers to reduce bear predation on moose calves. Continuation of the exemption is necessary to encourage hunters to take brown bears in these units.

The Board also exempted brown bear tag fees for bear hunts near communities in Unit 9 to address public safety concerns in communities during the board meeting in March 2011. Brown bears are abundant in Unit 9 and are managed as a trophy species. Brown bears are frequently observed in communities where they destroy property in search of food or garbage and occasionally kill pets. The liberalized bear seasons and bag limits adopted along with the elimination of the tag fee were intended to allow people to take bears before they destroy property, to promote a greater acceptance of the unit's bear population, and to resolve some of the compliance issues associated with the take of DLP bears.

Subsistence Brown Bear Hunts: The board waived the brown bear tag fee requirement for subsistence brown bear hunts in Unit 17 and portions of Unit 9. Subsistence brown bear harvest rates are low and well within sustainable limits. Exempting the resident tag fee has not caused an increase in subsistence harvest in these units. Continuation of the exemption accommodates cultural and traditional uses of brown bears in these units and provides an alternative for hunters who take brown bears primarily for their meat.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If the board does not reauthorize the tag fee exemption the fee will be reinstated and hunters will not be able to legally harvest a bear unless they purchase a \$25 brown bear tag. This action would likely reduce the harvest of bears in most of the affected units and in some cases redirect brown bear hunters to other units.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** In Units 11, 13, 16, and 17 where the goal of both the board and the Department is to increase the harvest of brown bears to decrease the predation on moose calves. In Unit 9 the exemption is intended to increase local acceptance of the high-density brown bear population and preserve a management strategy designed to maintain a high quality of bears being harvested.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters who are reluctant to purchase the \$25 brown bear tag, opportunistic hunters who encounter a brown bear while hunting other species, and residents who've expressed concerns about brown bears that are frequently observed in rural communities.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050712680

\*\*\*\*\*

# Interior Region

---

**PROPOSAL 123 – 5 AAC 85.045(a)(9). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.**  
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Units 19D, 20A, 20B and 20D.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(17)		
...		
Unit 19(D), that portion in the Upper Kuskokwim Controlled Use Area		
1 antlered bull by registration permit; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 25	No open season.
1 moose by registration permit; during the period Feb. 1–Feb. 28, a season may be announced by emergency order	(To be announced)	No open season.
Unit 19(D), that portion between and including the Cheeneetnuk and Gagaryah River drainages, excluding that portion within 2 miles of the Swift River		
<b>RESIDENT HUNTERS:</b>		
1 antlered bull; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 20	
1 antlered bull by	Sept. 1–Sept. 25	

registration  
permit; or

1 moose by registration  
permit; during the  
period Feb. 1–Feb.  
28, a season may  
be announced by  
emergency order

(To be announced)

No open season.

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch  
antlers or antlers  
with 4 or more brow  
tines on one side

Sept. 1–Sept. 20

Remainder of Unit 19(D)

1 antlered bull; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 20

No open season.

1 antlered bull  
by registration  
permit; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 25

No open season.

1 moose by registration  
permit; during the  
period Feb. 1–Feb. 28,  
a season may be  
announced by  
emergency order

(To be announced)

No open season.

...

(18)

Unit 20(A), the  
Ferry Trail  
Management Area,  
Wood River  
Controlled Use  
Area, and the  
Yanert Controlled  
Use Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with spike-fork  
antlers or 50-inch

Sept. 1 - Sept. 25  
(General hunt only)

antlers or antlers  
with 4 or more brow  
tines on one side; or

1 antlerless moose by  
drawing permit only; up  
to 2,000 permits may  
be issued in combination  
with the remainder of  
Unit 20(A); a person  
may not take a cow  
accompanied by a calf;  
or

Aug. 15 - Nov. 15  
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by  
registration permit only;  
a person may not  
take a  
cow accompanied by  
a calf; or

Oct. 1 - Feb. 28  
(General hunt only)

1 bull by drawing permit  
only; up to 1,000 permits  
may be issued in  
combination with the  
remainder of  
Unit 20(A); or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 25  
(General hunt only)

1 bull by drawing  
permit only; by  
muzzleloader only;  
up to 75 permits  
may be issued in  
combination with  
nonresidents in  
Unit 20(A)

Nov. 1 - Nov. 30  
(general hunt only)

**NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:**

1 bull with 50-inch  
antlers or antlers  
with 4 or more brow  
tines on one side;  
or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 25

1 bull with 50-inch  
antlers or antlers

Nov. 1 - Nov. 30

with 4 or more brow  
tines on one side  
by drawing permit  
only; by muzzleloader  
only; up to 75 permits  
may be issued in  
combination with  
residents in Unit 20(A)

Remainder of Unit 20(A)

**RESIDENT HUNTERS:**

1 bull with spike-fork  
antlers or 50-inch  
antlers or antlers  
with 3 or more brow  
tines on one side; or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 25

1 antlerless moose by  
drawing permit only;  
up to 2,000 permits  
may be issued in  
combination with  
Unit 20(A), the  
Ferry Trail Management  
Area, Wood River  
Controlled Use Area,  
and the Yanert  
Controlled Use Area;  
a person may not take  
a cow accompanied  
by a calf; or

Aug. 15 - Nov. 15  
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by  
registration permit  
only; a person may not  
take a  
cow accompanied by  
a calf; or

Aug. 25 - Feb. 28

1 bull by drawing permit  
only; up to 1,000  
permits may be issued  
in combination with  
Unit 20(A), the  
Ferry Trail

Sept. 1 - Sept. 25

Management Area,  
Wood River  
Controlled Use  
Area, and the  
Yanert Controlled  
Use Area;

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch  
antlers or antlers  
with 4 or more brow  
tines on one side;

Sept. 1 - Sept. 25

Unit 20(B), that  
portion within  
Creamer's Refuge

1 bull with spike-fork  
or greater antlers, by bow  
and arrow only; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 30  
(General hunt only)  
Nov. 21–Nov. 27  
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1–Sept. 30  
Nov. 21–Nov. 27

1 antlerless moose by  
bow and arrow only, by  
drawing permit only; up  
to 150 bow and arrow  
permits may be issued  
in the Fairbanks  
Management Area;  
a recipient of a  
drawing permit is  
prohibited from  
taking an antlered  
bull moose in the  
Fairbanks  
Management Area; or

Sept. 1–Nov. 27  
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1–Nov. 27

1 antlerless moose  
by muzzleloader by  
drawing permit only;  
up to 10 permits may  
be issued; a recipient  
of a drawing permit  
is prohibited from  
taking an antlered  
bull moose in the

Dec. 1 – Jan. 31  
(General hunt only)

Dec. 1 – Jan. 31

Fairbanks  
Management Area

Unit 20(B), remainder  
of the Fairbanks  
Management Area

1 bull with spike-fork  
or greater antlers, by  
bow and arrow only; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 30  
(General hunt only)  
Nov. 21–Nov. 27  
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1–Sept. 30  
Nov. 21–Nov. 27

1 antlerless moose by  
bow and arrow only,  
by drawing permit  
only; up to 150 bow and  
arrow permits may be  
issued in the Fairbanks  
Management Area; a  
recipient of a drawing  
permit is prohibited  
from taking an  
antlered bull moose  
in the Fairbanks  
Management Area

Sept. 1–Nov. 27  
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1–Nov. 27

Unit 20(B), that portion  
within the Minto  
Flats Management Area

1 bull; or

Aug. 21 – Aug. 27  
(Subsistence hunt  
only)

No open season.

1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch  
antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow  
tines on one side; or

Sept. 8 – Sept. 25

No open season.

1 antlerless moose by  
registration permit only;

Oct. 15–Feb. 28  
(Subsistence hunt  
only)

No open season.

Unit 20(B), the  
drainage of the  
Middle Fork of  
the Chena River

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 300 permits may be issued; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Aug. 15–Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	No open season.
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Oct. 1–Feb. 28 (General hunt only)	No open season.
1 bull; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 20	Sept. 1–Sept. 20
1 bull, by bow and arrow only; or	Sept. 21–Sept. 30	Sept. 21–Sept. 30
1 bull by drawing permit only; by muzzleloader only; up to 60 permits may be issued in combination with the hunt in the Salcha River drainage upstream from and including Goose Creek;	Nov. 1–Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season.
Unit 20(B), that portion of the Salcha River drainage upstream from and including Goose Creek		
1 bull; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 20	Sept. 1–Sept. 20
1 bull, by bow and arrow only; or	Sept. 21–Sept. 30	Sept. 21–Sept. 30
1 bull by drawing permit only; by muzzleloader	Nov. 1–Nov. 30	No open season.

only; up to 60 permits may be issued in combination with the hunt in the Middle Fork of the Chena River;

Unit 20(B), that portion southeast of the Moose Creek dike within one-half mile of each side of the Richardson highway

1 bull; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 20

Sept. 5–Sept. 20

1 moose by drawing permit only; by bow and arrow or muzzleloader only; up to 100 permits may be issued

Sept. 16–Feb. 28  
(General hunt only)

No open season.

Remainder of Unit 20(B)

1 bull; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 20

Sept. 5–Sept. 20

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 1,500 permits may be issued in the Remainder of Unit 20(B); a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or

Aug. 15–Nov. 15  
(General hunt only)

No open season.

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf;

Oct. 1–Feb. 28  
(General hunt only)

...

Unit 20(D), that portion lying

west of the west  
bank of the Johnson  
River and south  
of the north bank  
of the Tanana River,  
except the Delta  
Junction  
Management Area  
and the Bison  
Range Youth Hunt  
Management Area

**RESIDENT HUNTERS:**

1 bull with spike-fork or  
50-inch antlers or  
antlers with 4 or more  
brow tines on one side;

Sept. 1–Sept. 15  
(General hunt only)

or 1 bull by drawing  
permit; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 15  
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose  
by drawing permit  
only; up to 1,000  
permits may be issued  
in combination with  
that portion in the  
Delta Junction  
Management Area; a  
person may not take  
a calf or a cow  
accompanied by a  
calf; or

Oct. 10–Nov. 25  
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by  
registration permit only; a  
person may not take a calf  
or a cow accompanied by  
a calf

Oct. 10–Nov. 25  
(General hunt only)

**NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:**

1 bull with 50-inch antlers  
or antlers with 4  
or more brow tines  
on one side

Sept. 5–Sept. 15

Unit 20(D), that portion within the Bison Range Youth Hunt Management Area

1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or 1 antlerless moose, per lifetime of a hunter, by drawing permit only; up to 10 permits may be issued; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf

Sept. 1 -Sept. 30  
(General hunt only)

Sept.1–Sept. 30

Unit 20(D), that portion within the Delta Junction Management Area

**RESIDENT HUNTERS:**

1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only; up to 30 permits may be issued; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 15  
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 1,000 permits may be issued in combination with that portion lying west of the west bank of the Johnson River and south of the north bank of the Tanana River; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a

Oct. 10–Nov. 25  
(General hunt only)

calf; or

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf

Oct. 10–Nov. 25  
(General hunt only)

**NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:**

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only; up to 30 permits may be issued

Sept. 5–Sept. 15

...

**ISSUE:** Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. Our goal is to provide for a wide range of public uses and benefits, and to protect the health and habitat of moose populations. Antlerless hunts are important for improving or maintaining the ability of moose habitat to support current populations. They also help regulate moose population growth, help to meet Intensive Management (IM) objectives for high levels of harvest, and provide subsistence hunters with a reasonable opportunity to pursue moose for subsistence uses without reducing bull-to-cow ratios.

**Unit 19D:** A February any moose hunt will be announced as needed to keep the moose population in Unit 19D, particularly within the Upper Kuskokwim Villages Moose Management Area (MMA, specified in 5 AAC 92.125 (f)(2)(A)) at healthy levels and to provide additional hunting opportunity. The decision to hold this to-be-announced season will be based on 2-year average twinning rates and other available biological information. We will establish the hunt area and harvest quota under discretionary permit authority based on the best population information available and September harvest data. Permits will be available in Unit 19D throughout the February season and a 2-day reporting requirement will be imposed so the harvest quota is not exceeded.

**Unit 20A:** The purpose of antlerless moose hunts in Unit 20A is to regulate population growth, to meet the Intensive Management (IM) mandate for high levels of harvest, and to provide subsistence hunters with a reasonable opportunity to pursue moose for subsistence uses in Unit 20A outside the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence Area (part of the western Tanana Flats). Our goal is to protect the health and habitat of the moose population and to provide for a wide range of public uses and benefits. The number of moose in Unit 20A was estimated at 17,768 in 2003. Research indicated this high-density moose population was experiencing density-dependent

effects, including low productivity, relatively light calf weights, and high removal rates of winter forage.

Our objective beginning in regulatory year 2004 (RY begins 1 July and ends 30 June, e.g., RY04 = 1 July 2004 through 30 June 2005) was to reduce moose numbers to the population objective of 10,000–12,000 moose (2.0–2.5 moose/mi<sup>2</sup>) unless indicators of moose condition showed signs of improvement at higher densities. The Unit 20A population was estimated at 12,724 moose in Unit 2011. Based on harvest rates and population trends observed during RY96–RY11, continuation of these antlerless hunts is necessary to regulate the population at stable levels near this population objectives

The Unit 20A antlerless moose hunt provides additional harvest opportunity which helps to meet human consumption interests and intensive management (IM) harvest objectives. In addition, this hunt has been successful in reversing moose population growth and in increasing moose harvest and hunter participation.

**Unit 20B:** *Fairbanks Management Area (FMA)* — The purpose of this antlerless hunt is to provide opportunity to harvest a surplus of antlerless moose in the FMA and potentially reduce moose–vehicle collisions and nuisance moose problems.

The number of moose–vehicle collisions in the FMA are high and pose significant safety risks to motorists. In addition, moose nuisance issues continue to place significant demands on property owners. To increase hunting opportunity and harvest and reduce moose–vehicle collisions, the department incrementally increased the number of drawing permits for antlerless moose in the FMA during RY99–RY10. Moose–vehicle collisions and moose nuisance problems have declined during RY06–RY11, presumably, in-part due to the higher antlerless moose harvests of XX to XX during RY09–RY11.

*Minto Flats Management Area (MFMA)* — The primary purpose of this antlerless hunt is to provide a reasonable opportunity for subsistence uses.

Population estimation surveys indicate the MFMA moose density is high (>4. moose/mi<sup>2</sup>). The annual reported harvest of antlerless moose taken during RY96–RY10 was approximately 1% to 2% of the MFMA moose population and is likely sustainable.

*Unit 20(B), drainage of the Middle Fork of the Chena River and the Remainder of Unit 20B* — The antlerless moose harvest in this area is designed to curb growth of this population that has surpassed the upper limit of the IM population objective of 12,000–15,000 moose and helps to meet IM harvest objectives for Unit 20B. Increasing population estimates (from 12,313 in 2001 to 20,173 in 2009) and high calf:cow ratios (37–43:100 during 2003–2009) indicate numbers are increasing. Moreover, moose densities are relatively high (2.2 moose/mi<sup>2</sup>) in central Unit 20B surrounding Fairbanks.

The drawing permit hunts for antlerless moose were approved by the board in 2006 to take advantage of relatively high and increasing moose numbers in central Unit 20B. The overall Unit 20B moose population continues to grow at 4% per year, despite significant roadkill and harvest

of more than 200 cows annually (258 in 2009, 265 in 2010), representing 1.2% of the prehunt population estimate (21,105 moose). The goal is to increase the cow harvest until the growth is stopped to prevent over use of the habitat.

To mitigate hunter conflicts, we spread hunters out over space and time. Each of 16 hunt areas has permits in three time periods: one before the general hunt, one during, and one after. This way we maintain few hunters at a time in each permit area, yet expect to achieve a harvest of 400–500 cows.

Mortality from vehicle and train collisions has been high, averaging 149 moose killed annually by motor vehicles in Unit 20B. By focusing harvest in the more heavily roaded central Unit 20B, road kill may be reduced.

Finally, extensive burns in northcentral Unit 20B will provide excellent habitat in the future. With improving habitat, continued high predator harvest, and relatively mild winters, we can expect continued high productivity and survival of moose, along with increased yield.

**Unit 20D:** The density of moose in Unit 20D reached the IM population objective of 8,000–10,000 moose in about 2005. The highest density of moose was in southwest Unit 20D at 5.6 moose/mi<sup>2</sup> during 2006. The moose population in this area was demonstrating the effects of increased competition for food, with a moderately low level 2-year average twinning rate of 14%. Also, browse surveys indicated that moose are consuming moderately high quantities (25%) of available browse over winter. Antlerless moose hunts during 2006–2009 helped reduce the density of moose in southwest Unit 20D to 3.9 moose/mi<sup>2</sup>. Continued antlerless hunts are likely needed to maintain the population at the optimal density and will contribute toward meeting the IM harvest objective of 500–700 moose. Registration permits will be issued only if additional harvest is needed in specific areas to maintain optimal moose densities.

Extensive management and research data to guide antlerless hunt decisions were collected in 2010, including calf weights, twinning rates, a population estimate, an extensive browse utilization survey, and aerial survey sightability information. These data are currently being analyzed to determine the continued need for antlerless hunts in southwest Unit 20D.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The moose population may increase to unacceptable levels or may need reduction when new data is available and analyzed. Opportunity to hunt a harvestable surplus of cow moose will be lost, and our ability to meet intensive management harvest objectives will be compromised. Subsistence hunters in the portion of Unit 20A outside the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence Area (part of the western Tanana Flats) may not have a reasonable opportunity to pursue moose for subsistence uses. Delta Junction and Fairbanks residents may benefit from reduced moose–vehicle collisions and moose–human conflicts.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. This reauthorization of antlerless moose hunts will likely improve or maintain the ability of moose habitat to support the current moose population. Hunting opportunity and harvest will increase and allow the department to manage these moose populations at optimum levels. The additional harvest will help in meeting intensive management harvest

objectives. It will also allow hunters to harvest moose toward meeting the intensive management harvest objective without reducing bull-to-cow ratios to low levels.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Meat and subsistence hunters will benefit from the opportunity to harvest cow moose. Moose populations will benefit by having moose densities compatible with their habitat.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those opposed to harvest of antlerless moose.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050712676  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 124 - 5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemptions.** Reauthorize resident grizzly bear tag fee exemptions throughout Interior and Eastern Arctic Alaska as follows:

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

...  
(4) Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26(B), and 26(C)

...

**ISSUE:** Resident brown bear tag fees were put in place statewide during the mid 1970s to discourage incidental harvest, elevate the status of brown and grizzly bears to trophies, and to provide revenue. Today, Region III populations are healthy, grizzly bears are highly regarded as trophies, and revenue can be generated from non-tag fee sources. The board must annually reauthorize all resident tag fee exemptions.

Eliminating resident grizzly bear tag fees throughout Interior and Eastern Arctic Alaska (Region III) simplifies regulations, increases resident hunter opportunity, and is not likely to cause declines in these grizzly bear populations. This reauthorization would assist with our objective of managing Region III grizzly bear populations for hunter opportunity and would continue to allow hunters to take grizzlies opportunistically. During regulatory years 2006–2009, 35% of grizzlies harvested by resident hunters in Region III were taken incidentally to other activities (compared to 4% incidental take in regions I and II and 17% statewide).

We estimate that a kill rate of at least 6 percent, composed primarily of males, is sustainable. Human-caused mortality in most of Region III has been consistently less than 6% of the population. Where harvests are elevated (i.e. Units 20D, 20B, 20A, and portions of 26B), grizzly populations are managed through changes in seasons and bag limits. Resident tag fees that were in place prior to 2010 appeared to have no effect on harvest in these areas.

As part of this request to reauthorize exemption of grizzly tag fee throughout Region III, we recommend that the board, at a minimum, continue to reauthorize the tag fee exemptions for subsistence registration permit hunts in Units 19A and 19B (downstream of and including the Aniak River drainage), 21D, and 24.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Harvest opportunity will be lost and hunters will be required obtain the \$25 resident tag. Subsistence users in areas where tag fees are currently exempt will be required to purchase a tag to harvest grizzly bears for food.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Residents who are unable to purchase the \$25 tag before hunting, due to lack of vendors or economic reasons, will be able to opportunistically and legally harvest grizzly bears.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who believe the \$25 resident tag fee is useful in managing grizzly bear populations and those who believe grizzly bears should not be harvested to provide food for subsistence hunters.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Decrease the Region III grizzly tag fee to \$10. This would require legislative action.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050712681  
\*\*\*\*\*

*Note: The Board of Game deferred this proposal from the 2012 Interior Region; it was previous listed as proposal 194. At the request of the board, amended language will be forthcoming and available prior to the Central/Southwest Region meeting.*

**PROPOSAL 125 - 5 AAC . Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou.** Open a youth only hunt for Fortymile Caribou.

Unit 20, August 10th - 15th. Fortymile Caribou Herd youth hunt.  
One bull caribou open to Alaska residents 16 years and younger with the completion of the hunter education class.

**ISSUE:** I would like to see the Board of Game adopt a change to the Fortymile Caribou Herd. While I understood the need to make it a bull only hunt and make the open date later in the season (August 29th) we have lost an opportunity for the children in our state with the starting of school in much of the state earlier than the Aug 29th hunt opening. I would like to propose an August 10 thru August 15 opening for any bull caribou for residents of the state 16 years old and under with the completion of the hunter safety course. A five day hunt in which the harvested number of animals would be counted toward the seasonal quota established by the board.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** We have lost a great big game hunting opportunity for our children.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Both. Still maintaining close control on the number of

animals taken to preserve and reestablish the herd and improving the quality of our children's concept of Alaska's natural resources and what we must do to protect them.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The children of this great state. One of our most valuable resources.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Some adults that regularly hunt the Fortymile Herd may be affected by the number of animals taken during the youth hunt that will apply to the seasonal allowable harvest quota.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED:** Making it a youth hunt with a set number of tags to be applied for during the draw. I thought that it may be rejected because of the increased clerical work load. And as most of us realize as we get older, it's about getting out and participating in the hunt. The kill is not the most important thing. A great lesson for kids.

**PROPOSED BY:** Larry DeBoard

EG042511317

\*\*\*\*\*

# Statewide

---

**PROPOSAL 126 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.** This regulation would prohibit some pack animals from being used for big game hunting.

**5 AAC 92.085.** The following methods and means of taking big game are prohibited in addition to the prohibitions in 5 AAC 92.080.

(x) the aid or use of domestic goats (*Capra spp.*) and sheep (*Ovis spp.*) as pack animals is prohibited in sheep, goat, or muskox hunting.

**ISSUE:** Disease, primarily pneumonia, has caused major die off events in wild sheep populations in the lower 48 states. Once such a die off occurs, disease persists in the surviving animals and in many cases, the population is not able to recover. To date, Alaska has not documented such a large scale, pneumonia caused, die-off. Studies conducted at Washington State University and by the Idaho Game and Fish Department have demonstrated an empirical link between wild sheep contact with domestic sheep and these disease events.

Alaska's wild sheep and goat populations are at risk as we have large populations dispersed across large expanses of contiguous habitat. Once introduced, disease could easily be transmitted across long distances as animals move through their ranges and congregate. Further, Alaska animals are immunologically naive, as they have no prior exposure to these pathogens and the result of exposure to these diseases could be severe. Most populations of muskox in Alaska are in a state of population decline for unknown reasons. These animals are particularly sensitive to disease introductions, having the lowest genetic diversity from multiple population bottlenecks.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If a regulation is not adopted the risk of disease transmission to Alaska's wild ungulate populations will remain and may increase if the use of domestic goats and sheep as pack animals increased in the future. If disease transmission occurs the economic and conservation impacts could be large.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** If this regulation is adopted, it could prevent die-offs that could reduce sheep, goat, or muskox populations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sheep, goat and muskox hunters, wildlife viewers, and wildlife enthusiasts that harvest and enjoy these resources.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Pack stock operators/hunters who choose to use domestic goats or sheep as pack animals.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED:** We considered restrictions of other domestic pack animals that may pose lesser risks of disease transmission to wildlife. Also, although the transmission of respiratory disease from pack goats and sheep to Dall sheep, mountain goat and muskox can only be prevented with absolute certainty through prevention of any contact, herd health programs may be feasible to reduce and manage the risks for use in some circumstances.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game at the request of the Board of Game

EG050412658

\*\*\*\*\*

# Southcentral Region

---

## *Proposal Index*

### **Cordova Area – Unit 6**

- 127 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6A.
- 128 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6B.
- 129 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6C.
- 130 Modify the bag limit for hunting black bear in Unit 6D.

### **Anchorage Area – Unit 14C**

- 131 Reauthorize existing antlerless hunt for Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER).
- 132 Re-authorize the antlerless moose season in the Twentymile/Portage/Placer hunt area in Units 7 and 14C.
- 133 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in the Anchorage Management Area in Unit 14C.
- 134 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Birchwood Management Area and the remainder of Unit 14C.
- 135 Reauthorize the antlerless portion of the any-moose drawing permit in the upper Ship Creek drainage in Unit 14C.
- 136 Reduce the permit allocation and modify the bag limit for Unit 14C Dall sheep.
- 137 Issue more tags for Chugach Park Dall sheep drawing (DS123).
- 138 Create a new drawing hunt in Chugach State Park closed areas for Dall sheep.
- 139 Re-open the “Ram Valley” area of the Eagle River Drainage sheep drawing tag (DS123).

### **Kodiak Area - Unit 8**

- 140 Reduce the bag limit for deer in Unit 8 and modify the season dates.
- 141 Extend the season and increase the bag limit for goat in Unit 8.
- 142 In Unit 8, a wounded goat counts as the bag limit.

### **Kenai Peninsula Area – Units 7 & 15**

- 143 Modify bag limit for moose to 50" or greater, 3 brow tines in Units 7 and 15.
- 144 Retain the current moose harvest regulations for Units 7 and 15 through 2014.
- 145 Enhance moose habitat and modify hunting seasons and bag limits for moose on the Kenai Peninsula.
- 146 Modify seasons and bag limits for general season moose hunts in Units 7 and 15 on the Kenai Peninsula.
- 147 Suspend aerial taking of wolves in Unit 15A and modify the population and harvest objectives for moose.
- 148 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Unit 15C.
- 149 Allow the harvest of up to 100 antlerless moose in Unit 15C.
- 150 Allow the use of motorized land vehicles during certain hours in the Lower Kenai Controlled Use area.
- 151 Re-institute closure of Palmer Creek/Lower Resurrection Creek areas in Unit 7 to moose hunting.
- 152 Remove the reference to brown bear drawing hunts on the Kenai Peninsula.
- 153 Modify the registration season dates and the bag limit for brown bear in Unit 15A and 15C.
- 154 Allow brown bear baiting in Unit 15 intensive management areas.
- 155 Allow for the incidental harvesting of brown bears over black bear bait sites in Units 15A and 15C.
- 156 Open a brown bear registration hunt in Units 7 and 15; and allow the incidental take of brown bear at black bear bait sites.

- 157 Modify the black bear salvage requirement for Units 7 and 15.
- 158 Increase the bag limit for black bear in Units 15A and 15C.
- 159 Open wolf, coyote and lynx hunting in Skilak Loop.
- 160 Open a no closed hunting season for wolf in Units 7 and 15.
- 161 Lengthen the spring season with a decreased bag limit for ptarmigan on the Kenai Peninsula.

### **Regional and Multiple Units**

- 162 Open resident sheep seasons seven days before nonresident seasons for Southcentral Region Units.
- 163 Open resident sheep seasons seven days before nonresident seasons for Southcentral Region Units.
- 164 Open resident sheep hunting seasons five days before nonresident seasons for Southcentral Region Units.
- 165 Open resident hunting seasons seven to ten days before nonresident seasons for Southcentral Region Units.
- 166 Open resident hunting seasons seven days before nonresident seasons for Southcentral Region Units.
- 167 Open resident hunting seasons ten days before nonresident seasons, allocate 90 percent of harvest to residents, remove guide requirements, and increase tag and permit fees for the Southcentral Region.
- 168 Limit drawing permits to ten percent for nonresidents in Southcentral Region Units.
- 169 Allocate 90% of drawing permits to residents for Southcentral Region hunts and exclude nonresidents in hunts with less than ten permits.
- 170 Limit Dall sheep drawing permits to ten percent for nonresidents for Southcentral Region Units.
- 171 Develop a permit allocation formula for second degree of kindred hunters in Units 14C and 15.
- 172 Prohibit the taking of wolves March through November in the Southcentral Region.
- 173 Prohibit snaring of bears in the Southcentral Region.

- 174 Prohibit snaring of bears in the Southcentral Region.
- 175 Open a no closed hunting season for coyote with no bag limit for the Southcentral Region.

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME**  
**Southcentral Region Meeting**  
**(Game Management Units 6, 7, 8, 14C, and 15)**  
**March 15 – 19, 2013**  
**Kenai Cultural Center**  
**Kenai, 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, March 15, 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, March 16, 8:30 AM**

**PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY Continued**

**BOARD DELIBERATIONS (Upon conclusion of public testimony)**

**Sunday, March 17 – Tuesday, March 19, 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 at: [www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=gameboard.meetinginfo](http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=gameboard.meetinginfo) 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](http://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 March 1, 2013 to make any necessary arrangements.

# Cordova Area – Unit 6

---

**PROPOSAL 127 - 5 AAC 85.045.(4) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6A as follows:

<b>Seasons and Bag Limits (4)</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
Unit 6 (A), all drainages into the Gulf of Alaska from Cape Suckling to Palm Point		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
<b>RESIDENT HUNTERS:</b>		
1 bull by registration permit only; up to 30 bulls may be taken; or	Sept. 1-Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 drawing permits may be issued	Sept. 1-Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	
<b>NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:</b>		
1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 5 drawing permits may be issued		Sept. 1- Nov. 30
Remainder of Unit 6(A)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
<b>RESIDENT HUNTERS:</b>		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or	Sept. 1- Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; up to 20	Nov. 15-Dec. 31 (General hunt only)	

antlerless moose may be taken

**NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:**

1 bull with 50-inch antlers  
or antlers with 3 or more  
brow tines on one side; or

Sept. 1- Nov. 30

1 antlerless moose by  
registration permit; up to 20  
antlerless moose may be taken

Nov. 15-Dec. 31

...

**ISSUE:** Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. We recommend continuation of the antlerless season to promote population stability. The desirable post-hunt population size in Unit 6(A) west of Cape Suckling is 300 to 350 moose. A census completed during January 2008 yielded a population estimate of 230 moose with 17% calves. An additional 45 moose were observed east of the census area in February 2012. The antlerless hunt has not been open since 2005 because the population has been below management objective.

The desirable post-hunt population size in Unit 6(A) east of Cape Suckling is 300 to 350 moose. A census completed during February 2008 yielded a population estimate of 275 moose with 8% calves. No antlerless hunts were held because of previous poor calf survival and population level below the management objective. However, if recruitment does improve, antlerless hunts may be needed to hold the moose population at objective levels.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If antlerless hunts are eliminated in Unit 6(A), hunting opportunity will be needlessly lost.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Individuals who desire to hunt antlerless moose in Unit 6(A).

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who are opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050412662

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 128 - 5 AAC 85.045.(4) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6B as follows:

Units and Bag Limit (4)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
<p>...</p> <p>Unit 6(B) 1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows: 1 antlered moose by registration permit only; up to 30 antlered moose may be taken; or</p>	<p>Aug. 27- Oct. 31 (General hunt only)</p>	<p>No open season</p>
<p>1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 drawing permits may be issued for antlerless moose;</p>	<p>Aug. 27- Oct. 31 (General hunt only)</p>	<p>No open season</p>

...

**ISSUE:** Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. Desirable post-hunt population size is 300-350. A survey completed during January 2012 indicated a population of 270 moose with 16% calves. Antlerless hunts have not been held during recent years because the population is below the management objective. However, if the population increases to the desired level, antlerless hunts may be needed to hold the population at objective levels.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If the moose population in Unit 6(B) increases and a season is possible, antlerless hunts will provide additional hunting opportunity.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Individuals who desire to hunt antlerless moose in Unit 6B.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who are opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050712664  
 \*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 129 - 5 AAC 085.045.(4) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.**  
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6C as follows:

Seasons and Bag Limits (4)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
... Unit 6(C)  1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 40 permits for bulls and up to 20 permits for antlerless moose may be issued  ...	Sept. 1-Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season.

**ISSUE:** Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. The population objective is 400 moose. A census completed during February 2012 yielded an estimate of 600 moose, 21% of which were calves. Because the available antlerless harvest quota in Unit 6(C) is currently harvested under a federal subsistence season administered by the U. S. Forest Service, we have not held the antlerless hunt since the 1999-2000 season. We recommend re-authorizing the state antlerless hunt as a back up to the federal subsistence hunt. Continuation of the antlerless hunts will be necessary to hold the population at objective levels.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Hunting opportunity will be lost, and the population may exceed the objective, which is based on the availability of adequate habitat during severe winters.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters desiring to take a moose in Unit 6(C).

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050712665  
 \*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 130 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear.** Modify the bag limit for hunting black bear in Unit 6D as follows:

One boar every regulatory year. One sow every two regulatory years. Hunters who harvest a sow black bear may not hunt black bear in Unit 6D the following regulatory year.

**ISSUE:** Black bear harvest in Unit 6D (Prince William Sound) is declining but still higher than pre-Whittier Road. It is unknown whether current harvest is sustainable. Since 2000 the season has been shortened twice, from June 30 to June 10 and from September 1 to September 10. This proposal is an alternative to reducing opportunity for hunters to be in the field and has the potential of enhancing the population and improving opportunity for hunters.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Maybe nothing, maybe a significant reduction of hunter opportunity if the bear population declines. Reducing sow harvest, if possible, seems like the best goal. Reducing the season in September was aimed at reducing sow harvest as sow harvest was high during that period.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Reducing sow harvest will increase the number of offspring and improve opportunity for all hunters. Most species that are easily gender identifiable have restrictions aimed at protecting the breeding females. Although difficult, it is possible in many cases to make an educated guess on bear gender based on overall size of boars and in some cases the conformation of mature sows and their lack of size.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All hunters if it increases the bear population.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Hunters who advertently or inadvertently harvest a sow and wish to harvest black bears in Prince William Sound annually.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** One bear every two years. Rejected as overly restrictive at this time and encouraging boar only harvest has the potential to increase opportunity for hunters rather than reduce it.

**PROPOSED BY:** David Pinguoch EG042312694  
\*\*\*\*\*

# Anchorage Area – Unit 14C

---

**PROPOSAL 131 – 5 AAC 85.045 (12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.**  
 Reauthorize existing antlerless hunt for Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER) as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
...		
Unit 14(C), Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER) Management Area	Day after Labor Day —Mar 31 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day —Mar 31

1 moose by regulatory year by drawing permit, and by muzzleloading blackpowder rifle or bow and arrow only; up to 185 permits may be issued

...

Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. During summer, an estimated 200-300 moose inhabit the Anchorage metropolitan area. This number can increase up to 700-1,000 moose during the winter, depending on the overall population size. Many of these moose come from the Ship Creek valley and Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson. Many of these moose move into the metropolitan area during December – January. Where high densities of moose occur, they cause severe overbrowsing in some areas and lead to increased incidences of collisions with motor vehicles and conflicts with humans. Maintaining antlerless moose hunts on JBER will help reduce human-moose conflicts, as well as reduce moose-vehicle collisions.

A November 2011 aerial Gasaway census yielded a population estimate of 335 moose, with a bull:cow ratio of 37 bulls per 100 cows and a calf:cow ratio of 14 calves per 100 cows in the Ship Creek Drainage and on JBER lands. This population has a history of rapid increase following mild winters. The number of antlerless permits issued is based on the population estimate, bull: cow ratios, as well as snow death and estimated winter mortality. In the 2011/2012 season, 67 either sex permits and 3 antlerless permits were issued and 21 cows harvested.

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

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The moose population will continue to overbrowse winter habitat and mortality of moose attributable to collisions with vehicles and starvation during severe winters will continue.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Moose hunters and wildlife managers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People opposed to hunting antlerless moose, or opposed to hunting in general.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

None. These hunts have been successful in creating additional moose hunting opportunity in the state’s most heavily populated area with little or no controversy.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game and JBER EG050712672

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 132 - 5 AAC 085.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Twentymile/Portage/Placer hunt area in Units 7 and 14C as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(5)  ... Unit 7, the Placer River drainages, and that portion of the Placer Creek (Bear Valley) drainage outside the Portage Glacier Closed Area, and that portion of Unit 14(C) within the Twentymile River drainage		

**RESIDENT HUNTERS:**

1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits for bulls will be issued in combination with nonresident hunts, and up to 70 permits for antlerless moose will be issued	Aug. 20—Oct. 10 (General hunt only)
---	--

**NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:**

1 bull by drawing permit only;  
up to 60 permits for bulls  
will be issued in combination  
with resident hunts

Aug. 20—Oct. 10

...

**ISSUE:** Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. A November 2011 aerial composition count of moose in the Twentymile, Portage, and Placer river drainages found 178 moose with a bull:cow ratio of 21 bulls per 100 cows and a calf:cow ratio of 29 calves per 100 cows. This population has a history of rapid increase following mild winters; consequently, in 2009, antlerless permits were issued for the first time since 2004. Thirty antlerless permits were issued for 2009, 2010, and 2011. Harvests for 2009, 2010, and 2011 were 25 bulls and 17 cows, 15 bulls and 15 cows, and 19 bulls and 8 cows, respectively.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The population will probably increase and could suffer major losses during a severe winter. Habitat may be overbrowsed, reducing carrying capacity in subsequent years, and road and train kills will increase.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** People who obtain a drawing permit, wildlife viewers and motorists driving in the Portage area. Visitor use is high and viewing is an important activity in this area.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who are opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050712671  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 133 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in the Anchorage Management Area in Unit 14C as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
-----------------------------	---	------------------------------------

...

Unit 14(C), that portion known as the Anchorage Management Area

Day after Labor Day -Nov. 30 (General hunt only)

No open season

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only, and by bow and arrow, shotgun, or muzzleloader only; up to 50 permits may be issued

...

**ISSUE:** Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually. During summer, an estimated 200-300 moose inhabit the Anchorage metropolitan area. This number can increase up to 700-1,000 moose during the winter, depending on the overall population size. Many of these moose come from the upper Campbell Creek valley, which lies within Chugach State Park. Most of these moose move into the metropolitan area during December – January. Where high densities of moose occur, they cause severe overbrowsing in some areas and lead to increased incidences of collisions with motor vehicles and conflicts with humans. Maintaining antlerless moose hunts in the Anchorage Management Area will help reduce human-moose conflicts, as well as reduce moose-vehicle collisions.

Ten antlerless permits were issued for the upper Campbell Creek and McHugh Creek drainages in 2009, 2010, and 2011. Hunters took 5 cows in 2009, 5 cows in 2010, and 2 cows in 2011.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The moose population will continue to overbrowse winter habitat and mortality of moose attributable to collisions with vehicles and starvation during severe winters will continue.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** People who acquire permits for antlerless moose hunts. People who believe there are too many moose in the Anchorage Bowl.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People opposed to hunting antlerless moose, hunting moose in parks, or hunting in general.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None. This hunt has been successful in creating additional moose hunting opportunity in the state’s most heavily populated area with little or no controversy. It may also ameliorate over-browsing the limited winter range and reduce vehicle collisions and conflicts with residents in nearby urban areas.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050712668

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 134 - 5 AAC 085.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.**  
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Birchwood Management Area and the remainder of Unit 14C as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(12)		
...		
Unit 14(C), that portion known as the Birchwood Management Area	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30
1 moose by drawing permit, by bow and arrow only; up to 25 permits may be issued		
...		
Remainder of Unit 14(C)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits may be issued	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season
...		

**ISSUE:** Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Composition counts are not flown in the Birchwood Management Area. However, we believe that a small resident population of 10-15 moose, as well as an equal number of animals from the northern reaches of the Joint Base Elmendorf Richardson, frequents the area. Five bull permits were issued in 2009, 2010, and 2011. Archers took 2 bulls in 2009, 1 bull in 2010, and no bulls in 2011. Very little

public land exists in this management area and most of it is city parkland closed to discharge of weapons. Large parcels of land owned by Eklutna Native Corporation could not be hunted by permittees because no access permits were issued, and this land is quickly turning into subdivisions. The one large block of public land remaining in this hunt area is Beach Lake Park, where discharge of firearms and bows is not allowed by city park ordinance.

Composition counts are seldom flown in the Remainder of Unit 14C due to lack of funding. One hundred thirty-nine cows were counted during the fall 2001 trend counts in Knik/Hunter and Peters Creek count areas. The moose populations in these areas appeared to be at or above carrying capacity; however, to manage the moose population conservatively, lacking recent trend data, the number of antlerless permits was reduced from 20 to 10 in 2007, and then to 5 permits in 2010. Hunters in Knik/Hunter took 1 cow in 2008, 1 cow in 2009, 2010, and 2011. Permittees in Peters Creek took no cow moose in 2008 and 2009, 1 cow in 2010, and 1 cow in 2011.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The opportunity to harvest antlerless moose will be lost, and urban moose-human conflicts will likely increase.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Persons who acquire permits for antlerless moose hunts.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People opposed to antlerless moose harvest or hunting in general.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050712669  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 135 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Reauthorize the antlerless portion of the any-moose drawing permit in the upper Ship Creek drainage in Unit 14C as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
-----------------------------	---	------------------------------------

(12)

...

Unit 14(C), that portion of the Ship Creek drainage upstream of the Joint Base

Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER)  
Management Area

1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 50 permits may be issued; or	Day after Labor Day --Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day --Sept. 30
1 bull by registration permit only	Oct. 1—Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	Oct. 1—Nov. 30
...		

**ISSUE:** Moose use the upper Ship Creek drainage throughout the year. However, the highest density appears to be in fall and early winter when rutting and post-rut concentrations occur. In most years, accumulated snow packs force most of the moose out of the upper Ship Creek drainage in December. The moose move to lower-elevation wintering areas on the Joint Base Elmendorf Richardson (JBER), and other portions of the Anchorage Bowl. A November 2011 census on JBER and upper Ship Creek yielded a population estimate of 335 moose with a bull:cow ratio of 37 bulls per 100 cows and a calf:cow ratio of 14 calves per 100 cows. Fifty either-sex drawing permits were issued for upper Ship Creek drainage in 2009, 40 either-sex permits were issued in 2010, and 20 bull only permits were issued for 2011. Hunters took 10 bulls and 5 cows in 2009 and 8 bulls and 1 cow in 2010. No cows were harvested in 2011, as no antlerless permits were issued due to a population concern.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive. An either-sex drawing moose hunt should allow greater harvests in an area with limited access.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Moose will continue to be under-harvested, with concomitant problems in nearby urban areas and occasional large die-offs during severe winters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Moose hunters and wildlife managers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People opposed to moose hunting.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None. A late-season registration hunt for any bull was held in 2007-2011 to harvest additional moose from upper Ship Creek drainage.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050712670  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 136 - 5 AAC 85.055(a)(7). Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep.**  
Reduce the permit allocation and modify the bag limit for Unit 14C Dall sheep as follows:

Department of Fish and Game biologists assigned to Unit 14C should be given greater discretion in determining the number of permits issued, and conditions placed on permits. Until the cause of the decline in the health of Dall sheep in Chugach State Park is better understood by qualified biologists, the total number of permits issued should be reduced by at least 50% and the full curl rule removed, or relaxed.

**ISSUE:** The decline in health of Dall sheep in Chugach State Park which is demonstrated in part by the decline in population of Dall sheep in Chugach State Park.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Until we know what the cause of the decline may be we cannot predict what will happen if the decline in health is not addressed.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The proposal is aimed at giving qualified biologists greater flexibility in managing the hunt of Dall sheep so that the health of Dall sheep may be improved.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters and wildlife viewers alike.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Professional guides and the ADF&G will lose revenue if the number of permits is reduced.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** A temporary ban on hunting of Dall Sheep in Chugach State Park was considered, but this has been rejected because we hope that if given the authority to micro manage the hunt, and the flexibility to experiment with removal of the full curl mandate, the department's wildlife biologists will do the right thing for our wildlife.

**PROPOSED BY:** Kneeland Taylor EG050112618  
\*\*\*\*\*

**Proposal 137 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep.** Issue more tags for Chugach Park Dall sheep drawing (DS123) as follows:

<b>Units and bag limits</b>	<b>Resident Open season</b>	<b>Nonresident Open season</b>
14 (c) DS123 area	<u>Aug. 10-Sept. 30</u>	<u>Aug. 10-Sept. 30</u>
1 ram with full curl horn or larger by DS123 drawing, <u>at least 3 tags will be issued, up to 6 tags may be issued</u>		
....		

**Issue:** DS123 was established several years ago to provide a very limited opportunity to harvest trophy Dall sheep in previously closed areas of Chugach State Park. Currently only one tag is given annually. Although this hunt was opposed by some that prefer sheep are not hunted in the Park, there have been no conflicts to date. My wife was lucky enough to draw this tag and I was

impressed at the number of mature legal rams in the area. There were at least six legal rams in the South portion of this area (Suicide Peaks) and, although we did not hunt the South Eagle River portion, pilots reported several legal rams also in this area. If Ram Valley is also re-opened this would add additional legal rams to the total. There has been an average of less than one ram taken from this area since it has opened. This area is also open for the Chugach Governor's tag and at least one ram has been taken from this area with the Governor's tag. It is unlikely that this area will be used regularly by the Governor's tag hunter because there is a high probability that larger rams are found elsewhere in the Chugach in any given year. This area is less than 1% of the total sheep habitat in the Chugach draw areas.

Sheep drawing tags are some of the most popular in Alaska and we should take every opportunity to expand opportunity, especially in areas near population centers such as Chugach State Park.

An alternative would be to split up this area and issue one or two tags for each section. Example: South Eagle River (1-2 tags), Ram valley (1 tag), Suicide Peaks (2 tags).

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The majority of the rams in this area will continue to die of old age.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCT PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, presently there is very little harvest, no harvest in many years.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sheep hunters. Those willing to make the effort to access this area after being lucky enough to draw the longest odds tag in Alaska.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Persuade the area biologist to issue more tags area. This has been discussed and was not well received.

**PROPOSED BY:** Aaron Bloomquist EG050712684

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 138 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep.** Create a new drawing hunt in Chugach State Park closed areas for Dall sheep as follows:

<b>Units and bag limits</b>	<b>Resident Open season</b>	<b>Nonresident Open season</b>
<b><u>14 (C)</u></b>	<b><u>Day after Labor Day Sept 30</u></b>	<b><u>Day after Labor Day-Sept 30</u></b>
<b><u>Drainages:</u></b>		
<b><u>Falls Creek, South Fork of Eagle River, McHugh Creek, Campbell Creek (both forks), Rainbow Creek, Rabbit Creek</u></b>		

**1 ram with full curl horn or larger by drawing, up to 6 tags may be issued, hunters may not take a ram within 1/2 mile of a maintained road.**

**ISSUE:** These areas are near urban Anchorage and are bounded by currently open Dall sheep hunting areas. The adjoining area, DS123 was established several years ago to provide a very limited opportunity to harvest trophy Dall Sheep in previously closed areas of Chugach State Park. Currently only one tag is given annually. Although this hunt was opposed by some that prefer sheep are not hunted in the Park, there have been no conflicts to date.

Some of these areas are very near highly used areas and the Seward Highway. I chose the Day after Labor Day as the opener to minimize conflicts with other park users and to correspond with other seasons that are in very highly used areas of Chugach Park. I have also chose to include a 1/2 mile closed area from maintained roads mainly to eliminate hunting rams that are hanging out near the Seward Highway. Although animals are often taken very near highways in Alaska, this is an extremely dangerous stretch of road. A sheep hunter taking a ram from near the road could cause major traffic hazards.

The hunt should start with only one tag issued for the entire area and possibly increase if no problems arise, similar to DS123.

Sheep drawing tags are some of the most popular in Alaska and we should take every opportunity to expand opportunity, especially in areas near population centers such as Chugach State Park.

This is also one of the only areas on earth where a person with physical disabilities may have a reasonable chance to take a Dall ram. These areas are close enough to improved roads and trails that even someone that is wheelchair bound could participate in a hunt with a couple of motivated porters or assistants. The board may consider making this hunt available to those “permanently wheelchair bound or similarly disabled,” the same definition as the brown bear bait exemption.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The rams in this area will continue to die of old age and even occasionally be hit by cars.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCT PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, presently there is no harvest.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sheep hunters. Those willing to make the effort to access this area after being lucky enough to draw the longest odds tag in Alaska.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** An alternative would be to split up this area and issue one tags for each section. An archery only hunt could be considered in the more highly used areas around McHugh Creek. Consider a hunt for those with disabilities only.

**PROPOSED BY:** Aaron Bloomquist

EG050712685

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 139 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep.** Re-open the “Ram Valley area of the Eagle River Drainage for the DS123 sheep drawing tag as follows.

<b>Units and bag limits</b>	<b>Resident Open season</b>	<b>Nonresident Open season</b>
<b><u>14 (C) Ram Valley</u></b>	<b><u>Aug 10-Sept 30</u></b>	<b><u>Aug 10-Sept 30</u></b>
<b><u>1 ram with full curl horn or larger by DS123 drawing</u></b>		

...

**ISSUE:** DS123 was established several years ago to provide a very limited opportunity to harvest trophy Dall Sheep in previously closed areas of Chugach State Park. Currently only one tag is given annually. Although this hunt was opposed by some that prefer sheep are not hunted in the Park, there have been no conflicts to date.

It recently came to my attention that the overzealous Anchorage area biologist had closed a portion of this hunt area “Ram Valley.” My wife was lucky enough to draw this tag and I was disturbed to find that this area was closed without Board of Game approval.

This closure had nothing to do with this hunt but was justified because a ewe hunter had strayed into the area and illegally killed an ewe sheep. This seems to have caused the private landowner that owned the main access route from Eagle River Valley to deny access to the public. This is not the only access route. The illegal hunter accessed (according to the Anchorage area biologist) from Peters Creek over the top so it would stand to reason that others could do the same.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The area will remain closed because it is not likely for the area biologist to change her mind.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCT PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, presently there is no harvest.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sheep hunters. Those willing to make the effort to access this area after being lucky enough to draw the longest odds tag in Alaska.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Persuade the area biologist to re-open this area. This has been tried and failed.

**PROPOSED BY:** Aaron Bloomquist

EG050712621

\*\*\*\*\*

# Kodiak Area – Unit 8

---

**PROPOSAL 140 - 5 AAC 85.030 Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.** Reduce the bag limit for deer in Unit 8 and modify the season dates as follows:

For the area off the road system, change the limit to one buck for nonresidents. For the area off the road system change the limit to two bucks for residents. Change the nonresident season to October 1 – December 2. A large percentage of bucks drop their antlers the first few days of December.

**ISSUE:** Due to the extremely harsh winter of 2011-12 the deer population has dropped dramatically. Some estimates are 90% in areas. Presently multiple does and fawn(s) may be harvested by resident and nonresidents. Also (three) multiple bucks may be harvested by residents and nonresidents.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** It will take significantly longer for the population to rebound to carrying capacity. It is presently at 10 – 20%. State managers do not have a budget to accurately study deer on Kodiak, so detailed information does not exist.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All future users of the resource. Specifically, resident subsistence hunters whose bag limit will remain at three by decreasing competition for the remaining resource. That's all residents of Unit 8.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Short-sighted individuals who are only interested in the present and not the health of the entire resource. Nonresidents who wanted to harvest multiple trophy bucks.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Change the resident season. It allows harvest before and after non-resident hunting for those who want the meat.

**PROPOSED BY:** Brian Peterson EG050712688  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 141 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat; and 5 AAC 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit.** Extend the season and increase the bag limit for goat in Unit 8 as follows:

Unit 8

1. Extend season: Season dates for RG480 - August 20-March 20.
2. Increase bag limit - RG480 to two goat bag limit, only one in the field at a time.
3. Bag limit for RG480 does not count against other goat areas in the state.

**ISSUE:** Over population of mountain goats in area RG480

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued over population of mountain goats resulting in possible habitat destruction and potential health issues.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Increased opportunity for mountain goat hunting, hopefully increasing harvest thus curbing the population.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The Kodiak Mountain Goat Committee is a joint committee of the Kodiak AC, ADF&G, USFWS, and the Kodiak Regional Subsistence Advisory Council. We are in agreement that everyone will benefit and it is in the best interest of the resource.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1.) Same day airborne - enforcement problem with other areas. 2.) Allow harvest of nannies with kids -ethical problems.

**PROPOSED BY:** Kodiak Mountain Goat Committee EG042412550  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 142 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat; and 5 AAC 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit.** In Unit 8, a wounded goat counts as the bag limit as follows:

On the Kodiak Archipelago if you wound a goat you may not pursue another goat for the remainder of the regulatory year (two goat bag limit areas excluded). Wounding means the animal was touched with a hunting projectile (arrow or bullet).

**ISSUE:** Ethical hunting practices/ wounding loss/ exceeding bag limits.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Hunters will continue to wound goats and continue hunting or exceed the one goat bag limit thus taking away hunting opportunities for other goat hunters.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Less emergency closures, more goats available for hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters pursuing mountain goats in Unit 8.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Nobody

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Kodiak Mountain Goat Committee EG042412549  
\*\*\*\*\*

# Kenai Peninsula Area – Units 7 & 15

---

**PROPOSAL 143 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Modify bag limit for moose to 50" or greater, 3 brow tines in Units 7 and 15 as follows:

The new regulation should state that in Units 7 and 15 a legal bull consists of one which has antlers 50 inches or larger, or with 3 or more brow tines on at least one side.

**ISSUE:** The restrictive antler size requirements that is causing a reduction in opportunity to harvest moose on the Kenai Peninsula. Moose harvests on the Kenai Peninsula went from 400 to 600 annually between the years 2000 and 2010 to approximately 30 in fall 2011. With these same restrictions and low bull recruitment due to heavy bear and wolf predation it is unlikely harvest numbers will increase much in 2012.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The Kenai Peninsula will continue to see declining moose harvests and if a person wants a good chance at harvesting a moose will be forced to go to other areas of the state.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, changing the regulations so bulls with three or more brow tines on at least one side become legal will likely allow for another 30 to 40 moose to be harvested on the Kenai Peninsula, while still protecting enough bulls to grow the struggling bull:cow ratios.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All moose hunters who once again want to see healthy bull populations and better harvest rates on the Kenai Peninsula like there were seven or eight years ago.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who will want to shoot spike/forks, without realizing that there isn't enough calf production caused by heavy bear and wolf predation to support a spike/fork hunt.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Allow spike antlered bulls, while keeping the 50-inch or four brow tine regulations. The previous statement is a second option, but I would rather see the reinstatement of the three brow tine regulations. I think the 50-inch or three brow tine regulations would be better for the moose population because of low calf survival. The yearling bulls need decreased hunting pressure on them, because the ones that do escape predation need to be able to grow past the yearling stage, after which they can mature and become better breeding bulls. I do not think calf survival rates are high enough to support a bull harvest, where antlers with spike/fork, 50-inch or three brow tines on at least one side are all definitions of a legal moose. If those regulations were allowed bull:cow ratios would drop to below 10:100 similar to what they did in the fall of 2010 (according to Alaska Department of Fish and Game aerial surveys). If harvests are to be increased back to 400 to 600 bulls annually, then high predation rates must be addressed in order to increase calf survival. Allowing 50-inch or 3 brow tine bulls to satisfy legal requirement will allow for some increased harvest, while still keeping it low

enough that the moose population can support it until low calf survival is addressed through liberalized predator hunting.

**PROPOSED BY:** Brian Blossom

EG032512519

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 144 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Retain the current moose harvest regulations for Units 7 and 15 through 2014 as follows:

The current regulation would remain in place through the 2014 moose hunting season.

**ISSUE:** This proposal seeks to extend the current moose harvest regulations in Units 7 and 15 for two additional seasons. The current regulations restrict harvest for the general hunting season to antlered bulls with an antler spread of 50-inches; or greater or at least four brow tines on one side. This regulation went into effect for the fall 2011 season and was expected to provide an adequate increase in bull/cow ratios in two successive seasons. While bull numbers seemed to be significantly enhanced after the first season of this regulation, a particularly hard winter in 2011/2012 has led to significant moose mortality. Moose populations are already in serious decline in most areas of the Kenai Peninsula and the gains made in the 2011 season seem to have been eradicated by the following harsh winter. With that it appears appropriate to extend the current regulations through the 2013 and 2014 seasons.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The Kenai Peninsula moose population will continue to have minimal calf production due to the insufficient number of breeding bulls.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, the regulation that is being requested to extend was adopted to promote a healthy bull/cow ratio, which has not been the case for a number of years. A healthy bull/cow ratio promotes calf production and thus, the resource continues to propagate.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Ultimately all who utilize moose as a significant portion of their diet.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** In the short-term, those who targeted spike/fork horn moose.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Close the moose season entirely while bull/cow ratios come up to viable numbers. Bulls in the 50-inch or four brow tine class are relatively inaccessible and seemingly the number taken will not adversely affect the intent of the regulation.

**PROPOSED BY:** Kenai/Soldotna Fish and Game Advisory Committee

EG042012535

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 145 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Enhance moose habitat and modify hunting seasons and bag limits for moose on the Kenai Peninsula as follows.

- 1.) Enhance moose habitat by prescribed burns, crushing and pruning vegetation.
- 2.) 50-inch or 4 brow tines for a legal moose (no cow hunting allowed).
- 3.) Spike bull only if a bull to cow ratio has increased.
- 4.) A closed moose season for all nonresidents.
- 5.) Maintain the registration hunt for brown bears. September 1 - 30.
- 6.) Increase predator control on wolves to proper management levels.

**ISSUE:** The present state of the moose population on the Kenai Peninsula. The declining moose population and the low bull to cow ratio.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The moose population will continue to decline to a dangerous level.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal would allow the moose population to grow and add more bulls to be recruited into the population for better quality harvest.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All moose hunters would benefit in the future.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Some hunters at first but all would benefit as the population grows to management levels.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Thomas Netschert

EG042412548

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 146 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Modify seasons and bag limits for general season moose hunts in Units 7 and 15 on the Kenai Peninsula as follows:

Consider making a change, based on ongoing survey work, that consists of one or a combination of several of the following changes to the moose season in Units 7&15 which will liberalize the current general season bag limit but have it be more restrictive than the spike-fork (SF), 50 inch or 3 brow tine restriction that was in place from 1987-2010. (Various possibilities will be presented after obtaining 2012 harvest and survey data, and data from ongoing moose research.)

- Retain the current restrictive bag limit but allow a certain number of drawing permits for any bull or for bulls with a specific antler configuration (i.e., spike bulls).
- Adopt a more liberal general season bag limit (i.e., fork- 50-inch or 4 brow tines) and also initiate a limited drawing hunt for bulls with the number permits determined by the Department of Fish and Game.

- Reinstatement of the SF-50 inch or 3 brow tine regulation but have the spike-fork portion of the bag limit be eliminated for 2 seasons when bull:cow ratios fall below objective levels (e.g., 20 bulls:100 cows) for 2 consecutive years.
- Change season dates to September 1-20 or other possible dates.
- Allow spike bulls to be taken instead of spike forks.
- Initiate a limited drawing hunt for cows in areas that can sustain the harvest.

**ISSUE:** Given a recent decline in bull:cow ratios across many areas in Units 7 & 15, the Board of Game temporarily restricted the bag limit of bulls in 2011 from SF-50 inch or three brow tines to only bulls with 50-inch or 4 brow tines. From 2011 survey information it appears that this restriction has increased the bull:cow ratio in most areas we surveyed. Additional fall 2012 information will be forthcoming which will help guide the decision process. A higher sustainable harvest that will not reduce the bull:cow ratio below objective levels will require a change in the current restrictive bag limit.

Since we still need an additional year of data to help model the changes in bull:cow ratios with the current restrictions, we have no specific plan outlined in this proposal. However, the options above outline a general framework that will allow for various potential seasons and bag limits, and their modeled consequences, to be discussed with local ACs and the board. Additional 2012 harvest and survey data are needed to fully model the efficacy of potential changes. Data that will be forthcoming will help build a series of options presented to ACs and the board for changing or retaining the harvest strategy and bag limit in Units 7&15.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The Board of Game’s 2011 changes were designed to be temporary in nature and allow the bull cow ratio to increase and should be within objectives by the 2013 season. We will fail to take advantage of additional harvest opportunity if changes are not considered.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. An adjusted harvest strategy will allow for improved sustainable harvests and stability in the bull:cow ratio.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All people interested in having sustainable moose populations, whether hunters or non-consumptive users.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The public that desires high bull:cow ratios. Additional harvest will stabilize the bull cow ratios within objectives.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Various solutions will be presented to the public, Advisory Committees and the Board of Game for consideration.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050412647  
 \*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 147 - 5 AAC 92.108. Identified big game prey populations and objectives; and 5 AAC 92.125. Intensive management plans.** Suspend aerial taking of wolves in Unit 15A and modify the population and harvest objectives for moose as follows:

Suspend aerial wolf management. Change the intensive management objectives.

Unit 15A moose population objective [3,000-3,5000] to 2,000-2,900.

Unit 15A moose harvest objective [180-350] to 120-290.

**ISSUE:** Current intensive management (IM) objective, Unit 15A and aerial wolf management for Unit 15A.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Current IM objectives if met will put the health of the moose population in jeopardy and would not be sustainable. If aerial wolf management were to take place, it would likely have some increase in the moose population. But can the range support more moose at this time? Would we have a healthier moose population because of this action? I believe that the current data we have now suggest the range cannot support any more moose. We do not have the data that shows what impact predators have on calf mortality.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes it does. The need to review IM objectives should be reviewed periodically. In this case the objectives were made when habitat was in its best condition for supporting a large number of healthy moose. I believe for a short term goal, reducing the IM objectives would achieve several advantages. 1.) We would have a much healthier and more productive moose population. 2.) This would allow DWC to gather more recent and accurate data. DWC would be able to compile data on productive, calf weights, twinning rates, age of pregnancies, rump fat, calf mortality and composition. 3.) Would allow all applicable agencies to develop a short range and long range plan for habitat rehabilitation. 4.) After surveys are conducted to what levels predators or which predator's effect calf survival and moose productive. With this data we can determine what level of actions is necessary if any for predator management. If predators are found to have biological impact on productive and calf survival we can look at removing some restriction limitations, increase number of permits.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All users of the resource. Consumptive user will have a healthier moose to harvest. As short term goals are met and habitat is increased more opportunity in harvest will result. The same is true for seeing moose. Moose would be in a healthier condition and not as venerable to winter die off.

Non-consumptive user would benefit from a short term reduction in IM objectives because a healthier more productive moose population would be notice by seeing moose in their non-hunting actives. Managers would not have to suggest, to use tools such as wolf or bear management controls.

I also believe as the habitat improves and if the data reflects bear have a significant take of moose calves, refuge managers would have to review their restrictions on bear and number of permits issued.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who believe humans taking wildlife resources, is unnatural management.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Last year’s action the Board of Game took. I believe the current plan will fail before the habitat issue is improved. I also believe the common denominator in the success of other predator management programs throughout the state was good to very good habitat. I believe this would be the first sub-unit that has a range condition of “poor habitat.” To try to increase moose population on a poor range will not be sustainable.

**PROPOSED BY:** Allen Barrette EG053112722  
 \*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 148 - 5 AAC 085.045.(13) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.**

Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Unit 15C as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits (13)</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
...		
Unit 15(C), that portion south of the south fork of the Anchor River and northwest of Kachemak Bay		
1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or	Aug. 20—Sept. 20 (General Hunt only)	No open season
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; the taking of calves, and females accompanied by calves, is prohibited; up to 100 permits may be issued	Aug. 20—Sept. 20	Aug. 20-Sept. 20
...		

**ISSUE:** Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. The Homer benchland in Unit 15C often holds high moose densities in winters when deep snow pushes the moose down into human populated areas. Even without deep snow, a high number of moose die due to malnutrition and negative interactions with humans are common as moose become more aggressive in their search for food around human residences.

In November 2011, 344 moose were counted and 26% were calves (39 calves:100 cows, 14 bulls:100 cows) in a partial survey of the hunt area. The winter of 2011-2012 was severe in much of Southcentral Alaska. The number of permits issued will depend on the Fall survey information for this area. Fifty permits were issued in each of the last 10 years resulting in an average harvest of 23 cows per year. We recommend reauthorization of the antlerless hunt.

In March 2012 the Board of Game authorized an intensive management program including aerial wolf control. The antlerless hunt boundaries are included in the defined control area. There has been considerable discussion relative to holding an antlerless hunt within a predator control boundary. The Department of Fish and Game will evaluate this antlerless hunt relative to the severe winter and implementation of the control program and make appropriate recommendations whether to issue permits. In addition if the hunt is to go forward we may recommend separating the moose management objectives from the predator control objectives.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Deep snow winters will result in a high number of moose deaths due to malnutrition and continued conflicts between aggressive moose and humans.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** A limited antlerless moose hunt may improve overall browse quality.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Wildlife viewers and hunters receiving permits.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Individuals opposed to hunting.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050712673  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 149 - 5 AAC 5 AAC 085.045.(13) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.**

Allow the harvest of up to 100 antlerless moose in Unit 15C as follows:

Allow up to 100 antlerless moose to be harvested by drawing permits.

**ISSUE:** Bull/cow ratio in Unit 15C; allowing an antlerless harvest in Unit 15C.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Loss of some opportunity when we have a surplus of antlerless moose.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Using 2011 data, but depending winter survival (2011-2012) and fall surveys (population and composition). There could be opportunity to harvest some antlerless moose. Using “up to” language to give the Division of Wildlife Conservation the discretionary authority to provide some opportunity to harvest antlerless moose.

Because proposals have to be submitted up to ten months before the Board of Game can take action, some important data will affect the outcome or logic of this proposal. If the moose population is consistent from 2011 data, we are solidly in the middle of our IM population objective, and with the spike/fork component being added back into the population we still have an imbalance in our bull/cow ratio. So we would have some opportunity to harvest antlerless moose to help out the imbalance.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** If the moose population is growing, and the winter survival was better than projected, then those who harvest moose would benefit from this added opportunity. Also those who were harvesting the spike/fork component of the population, loss opportunity (due to board action) this could replace some of that loss opportunity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those opposed to the harvest of antlerless moose.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** It is hard to consider other solutions ten months out, without proper data to justify them. I'll have to rely on written comments and give the Board of Game hard numbers.

**PROPOSED BY:** Allen Barrette

EG050912717

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 150 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas.** Allow the use of motorized land vehicles during certain hours in the Lower Kenai Controlled Use area as follows:

You may hunt, transport moose meat or hunters between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. or during the dark of night.

**ISSUE:** Age discrimination. The last 10 days of hunting “the best time to hunt” has turned into a young man’s sport. With few trees, to hang meat and no use of machines makes it almost impossible for a senior citizen to harvest moose.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Age discrimination will continue and senior citizens will continue having unequal access to harvesting a moose.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, the quality of meat harvested would be improved, be less wanton waste, be less encounters with bears, and be less use of ATVs as a hunting tool “road hunting”.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Senior citizens.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** “Road hunters” or hunters who pursue moose with the use of ATVs, putting forth little ethical effort.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1.) A five day senior hunt offered immediately after the regular season with the use of ATVs. 2.) Keep things as they are, however, allow seniors unlimited ATV use. Both should be ruled out because of discrimination and the environment would continue to suffer.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ernest Suoja

EG050712689

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 151 - 5 AAC 92.510(a) Areas closed to hunting.** Re-institute the closure of Palmer Creek/Lower Resurrection Creek areas (Unit 7) to moose hunting as follows:

Palmer Creek/Lower Resurrection Creek Closed Area.

Palmer Creek drainage to its confluence with Resurrection Creek, and Resurrection Creek drainage from the confluence with Palmer Creek downstream to Turnagain Arm, closed to taking of moose.

**ISSUE:** The Board of Game’s 2011 decision to open the Palmer Creek/Lower Resurrection Creek drainages to moose hunting, after the areas had been closed for over 30 years, which resulted in multiple user conflicts, conflicts with private property, and displacement of Hope residents and others during the hunting season. A detailed explanation of the problem follows:

Prior to 2011, the Palmer Creek/Lower Resurrection Creek drainages had been closed to moose hunting for over thirty years. This closure had the full support of the Hope Village Council, which is the governing body for Hope and Sunrise. Members of the Village Council include moose, bear, and caribou hunters, hunting guides, fishing guides, gold miners, white water rafters and kayakers, runners, hikers, berry pickers, mushroom pickers, wildlife viewers, and business people providing services to visitors, which is the major industry in the area.

Since the original closure, there has been substantial development in the lower Resurrection Creek drainage, and patterns of daily uses by Hope residents and visitors increased substantially in the Palmer Creek drainage, including hiking, biking, running, wood gathering, berry picking, mushroom picking, bear hunting, bird hunting, and wildlife viewing. In 2011, the Board opened both areas to moose hunting. A “road hunt” resulted on Palmer Creek Road and Resurrection Creek Road with four illegal bulls taken out of a total of six bulls harvested in both areas. The moose hunt created public safety issues and conflicted with the uses by Hope residents and others to such an extent that many long-time users felt displaced during the hunting season. The two areas are distinct and so were the problems.

Lower Resurrection Creek: In this proposal, Lower Resurrection Creek is that part of the Resurrection Creek drainage in Unit 7 downstream from the confluence of Palmer Creek with Resurrection Creek, about four and a half miles from Turnagain Arm. The confluence of the two streams occurs at the end of Resurrection Creek Road, which runs along the east side of Resurrection Creek to the trail head for the Resurrection Pass Trail to Cooper Landing.

Hope originated as a mining town in 1895 at the mouth of Resurrection Creek on Turnagain Arm. Prior to the 1960s, Resurrection Creek Road mainly provided access to the mining claims along Resurrection Creek. However, after the earthquake in 1964 led to widespread damage in the original town site, more and more residents, businesses, and community facilities were located along Resurrection Creek Road. In the last thirty years, the pace of that development has increased substantially. Now, property along both sides of Resurrection Creek Road has been developed, including homes, residential subdivisions, various businesses, and active mining claims, as well as public property devoted to community facilities such as the Hope School, the Hope Post Office, the Borough material site, and the Hope Airport. Land ownership maps on the Kenai Peninsula Borough website for the lower Resurrection Creek Valley help illustrate this.

The 2011 opening of moose hunting in this area resulted in many complaints by residents of trespasses occurring. There were two separate incidents where illegal bulls were shot in the yard of a resident and left to waste. In one case, the illegal bull was bloated by the time it was found, in the other a bear was feeding on the carcass. Other residents reported hunters along Resurrection Creek Road and in community areas like the Hope Airport.

The Village Council held a well attended meeting on April 21, 2102, to discuss the moose hunts in the Lower Resurrection Creek and Palmer Creek drainages. The meeting was also attended by the ADF&G biologist. At that meeting, several residents who were long time moose hunters expressed their belief that the harvest of six bulls from these two areas, four of which were illegal, would contribute to the ongoing decline of the moose population. These hunters believed the closed areas had provided a sanctuary for a few breeding bulls which had allowed additional moose for hunting in the open area of Resurrection Creek valley upstream from the Palmer Creek confluence. The area biologist was asked why the department and the board would open another area to moose hunting when that was the case. Numerous residents expressed their opinion at the meeting and after that, because of the proximity to homes and community facilities, it was irresponsible to open the Lower Resurrection Creek area to moose hunting.

The Hope Village Council believes the unfortunate results of the 2011 moose hunt in this area stem from a misperception about land ownership and use patterns in the lower Resurrection Creek valley and along Resurrection Creek Road. Since this area was first closed to moose hunting thirty years ago, numerous residents, businesses, and community facilities have been located there. Whatever the reason for the original closure, the Village Council now believes that it is impossible to hunt moose in the lower Resurrection Creek valley without either (1) trespassing on private property, including residences, residential subdivisions, active mining claims, and other businesses, or (2) hunting unsafely in a confined area, which is state or borough land, but is established for community purposes (ie. Hope Airport, Borough material site) and bordered by residences.

The Hope Village Council believes the Lower Resurrection Creek area should be closed again to moose hunting because the hunt is incompatible with the private property and uses of many residents living in, working in, and using the area for community purposes.

Palmer Creek: This area includes the Palmer Creek drainage from its headwaters at the Swetmann Mine to its confluence with Resurrection Creek. The valley was glaciated, so it has

steep sides and a narrow valley floor. Palmer Creek itself is a steep, rocky creek. Access to the drainage is by way of Palmer Creek Road, a gravel Forest Service road which transects up the middle of the valley on the east side of Palmer Creek. The drainage can be broken down into two parts: the lower valley, which does have stands of spruce and birch, and the upper valley which is mostly above timberline.

The dividing line between lower and upper Palmer Creek is generally considered to be at the Forest Service's Coeur D'alene Campground, three miles after the Palmer Creek Road enters the drainage. Because the lower valley is narrow and steep, the Palmer Creek Road provides a vantage point to view virtually all parts of this lower valley. This part of the valley has been heavily used by Hope residents and others for the past 30 years to hike, run, bike, camp, pick berries, gather wood, pick mushrooms, and view wildlife, which has mostly meant birds and some moose. These uses are increasing every year. For example, the University of Alaska ski team now trains before ski season by running on Palmer Creek Road and in the trails off the road, guided bird watching groups now frequent the valley, and in 2010-2011 the area experienced a significant increase in mushroom hunters from Anchorage during August and September. Until the 2011 hunt, residents and visitors did spend time in this part of the valley viewing bulls in rut. Black bear hunting by Hope residents and others does occur, but it is usually an activity conducted well away from the road, and to our knowledge there has never been a complaint about bear hunting. Caribou hunting is not really done in the lower valley because the few caribou in the area are in the upper drainage.

Palmer Creek Road continues from the Coeur D'alene Campground through the upper valley to the head of the drainage where historic lode mines operated many years ago. This part of the valley is almost entirely above timberline, and thus the road provides views of virtually all parts of the drainage. Along the road are many smaller camping areas established by the Forest Service along Palmer Creek. This area is also heavily used for hiking, running, camping, biking, berry picking, and mushroom picking. Caribou hunting by Hope residents and others does occur on the tundra covered and rocky ridges in the upper valley, which are typically an hour hike or climb up from the valley floor and the Palmer Creek Road.

To the knowledge of the Hope Village Council, four bulls were killed in the 2011 moose hunt in the lower Palmer Creek Valley. Two were legal and two were not. At the Hope Village Council meeting on April 21, 2012, various residents complained that the hunt was nothing but a "road hunt" for people from Anchorage or Kenai that led to the area becoming a "shooting gallery." The Village Council understands that there were several instances of parties stalking and competing for the same bull, with shots even being taken by one party while another was on a stalk. Two residents complained that the hunt was irresponsible given the level of other uses. Numerous residents have reported that they did not feel safe in the Palmer Creek drainage during the moose hunt. At the April 21, 2012, meeting, a large majority of the residents present indicated they had been displaced by the moose hunt from engaging in their typical fall uses of lower Palmer Creek valley. The Hope Village Council understands that the 2011 proposal to open Palmer Creek to moose hunting suggested the opening would create opportunities to hunt and float out. No one in the community of Hope is aware of anyone ever having floated the creek in a raft, canoe, or kayak, probably because it has a substantial waterfall in its lower reaches and then plunges downhill in the last mile to Resurrection Creek.

The Hope Village Council believes that the long time closure in Palmer Creek should be re-established because the hunt displaced numerous local residents and others from their traditional activities which have developed over 30 years, and resulted in many residents and others being fearful of being in the area during the hunt. Since this area was first closed to moose hunting thirty years ago, the uses by individual users other than moose hunters have increased substantially, and the hunt occurred at a peak time when many other users were accustomed to being there. Whatever the reason for the original closure, the Village Council now believes that it is impossible to conduct a moose hunt in the Palmer Creek drainage without the hunt displacing local residents and visitors.

The Hope Village Council believes the Palmer Creek drainage should be closed again to moose hunting because the hunt cannot be conducted without displacing many residents and visitors from use patterns developed over decades.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued trespasses, displacing of other users, and unsafe hunting.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Property owners in Resurrection Creek Valley. Residents of Hope and others who have long time established different uses of the Lower Resurrection Creek Valley and in the Palmer Creek drainage.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Road hunters for two bulls.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Although it is possible to separate the areas, the Hope Village Council has not considered proposing to reinstate only the closure in the Lower Resurrection Creek valley because so many residents and others use the Palmer Creek drainage and would be displaced by a hunt continuing there.

**PROPOSED BY:** Hope Village Council EG050912705  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 152 - 5 AAC 92.061. Special provisions for brown bear drawing permit hunts.**  
Remove the reference to brown bear drawing hunts on the Kenai Peninsula as follows:

**5 AAC 92.061. Special provisions for brown bear drawing permit hunts.**

...

(b) In the [UNITS 7,] **Unit** 10[, AND 15] brown bear drawing permit hunt, a nonresident may apply for and obtain a permit only as follows:

(1) the department may issue a drawing permit under this section only to a successful nonresident applicant who meets the requirements of this section;

[ (2) UNITS 7 AND 15, THE DEPARTMENT SHALL ISSUE A MAXIMUM OF 10 PERCENT OF THE DRAWING PERMITS TO NONRESIDENTS AND A MINIMUM OF 90 PERCENT OF THE DRAWING PERMITS TO RESIDENTS.]

...

**ISSUE:** At the January 2012 Board of Game meeting the Board of Game adopted a proposal that changed the Unit 7 and Unit 15 brown bear season from a drawing permit hunt to a registration permit hunt. With this change the references to Units 7 and 15 are no longer needed. This proposal requests that the board repeal references to Units 7 and 15 in 5 AAC 92.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The codified regulations will continue to have wording that is not needed and no longer applies to this regulation.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** We expect this will result in less confusion when reading the codified regulations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Anyone who references this section in the codified regulations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050412648  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 153 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.** Modify the registration season dates and the bag limit for brown bear in Unit 15A and 15C as follows:

Open up a registration brown bear hunt beginning April 1 and ending May 31, then restarting again September 1 to run until November 1st. The bag limit shall be one brown bear every regulatory year in intensive management areas 15A and 15C, and one brown bear every four regulatory years in non-intensive management areas on the Kenai Peninsula.

**ISSUE:** Low moose calf survival and struggling moose populations, the high brown bear population, and the limited hunting opportunities available to harvest some of these brown bears on the Kenai Peninsula.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The high concentration of brown bear will continue to prey heavily on moose calves causing low calf recruitment, and causing sustainable harvest levels of moose on the Kenai Peninsula to be well under management objectives.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, brown bears have been almost unavailable to hunters on

the Kenai Peninsula for the last dozen years, and human harvest is mainly reduced to DLPs around homes and roadways. The brown bear population has increased substantially over the last 20 years and there has been a lack of hunting opportunities offered in order to keep the brown bear population in check. I have personally seen some very large brown bears on the Kenai and have been unable to harvest any of these bears. There are a lot of bears in the nine to ten foot category, and if the seasons were available it would provide a chance for someone to harvest one of these trophy bears. Plus removing some of these bears from the population will help increase moose calf survival rates, not to mention probably brown bear cub survival rates. Going by 2011 ADF&G survey data from count areas 20, 21, and 24 in Unit 15C approximately 82 percent of cows counted didn't have a calf with them come November. It is my belief the large brown bear population is the primary cause of this statistic. Allowing the season to start September 1 instead of September 15 and October 1, which are the current fall season dates will give moose hunters a better opportunity to harvest a bear while they are in the process of moose hunting. It will also give hunters a chance to hunt brown bears as they come into moose kill sites.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Black bear baiters who have a hard time harvesting black bears over bait anymore because of all the brown bears that come around and chase the black bears away, people that have seen large brown bears and would appreciate the chance to harvest one of these bears, Kenai residents who would like to feel safe hiking around their neighborhoods without carrying a gun because of fear of running into an aggressive brown bear, and lastly all moose hunters who would once again like to have the chance to harvest bulls that fall under the spike/fork, 50-inch or three brow tine regulations. Currently bear and wolf predation is so heavy on calves, that recruitment is low enough the Kenai Peninsula moose population currently has a hard time sustaining a harvest of 100 bulls on the whole Kenai Peninsula.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** - People that don't care if there is a moose hunting season on the Kenai Peninsula.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** There is the possibility of having just a general season brown bear hunt rather than a registration hunt based on a quota of bears, but due to the Kenai Peninsula brown bear population being managed as an island population it will probably always be managed on a quota system. Since the brown bears have been managed by a quota of 8 or 10 reproductive female brown bears for quite some time with no effects on the increasing brown bear population at all, it seems to be time to raise this quota in order to slow the growth of the population and help increase moose calf survival. I realize the Board of Game doesn't have the authority to raise the quota of female brown bears, but since the Division of Wildlife Conservation, State representatives of the Fish and Game Department, and local biologists will all be present at the 2013 Board of Game meeting it is a good time to discuss raising this quota. Seeing that quotas of eight to ten reproductive females have had no effect on the brown bear population, the quota should be raised to at least 20 reproductive females. It is feasible to not even have a quota in Unit 15A and 15C until they once again fall within harvest objectives for moose. Brown bear and wolf predation on moose needs to be addressed through more liberalized hunting seasons and methods, or the Kenai Peninsula moose population will continue to struggle and sustainable hunter harvests will remain well below management objectives.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 154 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures.** Allow brown bear baiting in Unit 15 intensive management areas as follows:

Allow the harvest of brown bears at black bear bait stations in intensive management areas in Unit 15A and 15C.

**ISSUE:** The high brown bear population on the Kenai Peninsula and the difficulty they are causing hunters who hunt black bear at bait stations to be successful. The large population is also hard on the moose calf crop in the spring.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Black bear baiting on the Kenai Peninsula will continue to get more difficult, moose calf survival will remain low, and the overall moose population will continue to struggle.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, it will help moose calf survival and also allow black bear baiters to be more successful by harvesting some of the brown bears that come around black bear bait stations and chase all the black bear away. With the moose population struggling, it is a good time for Kenai Peninsula residents to supplement their winter meat supply with black bear, but this is becoming difficult in the spring at bait stations because of the high amounts of brown bear that come around and chase the black bear away. If a person makes a food barrel where brown bears can get to the food, then they beat and tear the barrel up and destroy the bait site.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Moose hunters, people who bait and hunt black bear, and residents that know the brown bear population has gotten too high.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who don't want brown bears to get shot.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None, the Kenai Peninsula has come to a point where brown bear populations must be managed better, so moose populations can recover and harvests can once again reach management objectives. The quota of 10 reproductive female brown bears on the Kenai Peninsula needs to be increased.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 155 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures.** Allow for the incidental harvesting of brown bears over black bear bait sites in Units 15A and 15C as follows:

Allow for the incidental harvesting of brown bears over black bear bait sites. Brown bears will not be the target animal. However, when brown bears do come into black bear bait sites, hunters will have the means to appropriately sex the animal and ensure that a sow with cubs is not taken. The season would run from April 15 to June 30.

**ISSUE:** Hunting of brown bears has been expanded to a registration hunt starting October 1, 2012. While this is a solid move on the boards part in regards to predator control, as hunters, we need to ensure that reproductive aged sows are not killed during this hunt. Most hunters do not have the opportunity or skill to correctly sex these animals prior to harvesting them. While we do want to see the brown bear population put into check with the currently low moose population in Units 15A and 15C, hunters must correctly identify the appropriate bear for harvesting.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If hunters kill too many reproductive aged sows, the brown bear hunt will be shut down during the current hunting season.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes it does. It will help prevent hunters from harvesting reproductive aged female brown bears. Hunters will have adequate time at the black bear bait sites to age and sex the animal that is moving through the area.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone will benefit from this proposal. It will be a solid means of selectively harvesting adult aged male brown bears.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Loren Reese

EG042712559

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 156 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear, and 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures.** Open a brown bear registration hunt in Units 7 and 15 and allow the incidental take of brown bear at black bear bait sites as follows:

Open registration brown bear season for Units 7 and 15 from September 15 - May 30, bag limit - one bear every regulatory year. I would also like a stipulation added that allows for the incidental harvest of brown bears while hunting black bear bait sites. All regular black bear baiting rules would apply.

**ISSUE:** Increase the harvest opportunity for brown bears on the Kenai Peninsula.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The brown bear population will continue to increase. As it stands, each year we are experiencing increased numbers of human bear interactions, particularly in residential areas, along hiking trails, etc. Also, as one of the major predators of moose, by reducing their numbers, it will help improve the survival rate of adult and calf moose.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, it will increase our hunter harvest opportunities greatly, and also assist in recovering our struggling moose population.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters that wish to harvest brown bears, and moose hunters, as this will assist in recovering our moose population. Also, non-consumptive users that enjoy seeing and photographing moose will have more opportunities to do so.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** I also considered adding a clause to wave the tag fee and only have a 30-day sealing requirement. Since hunting brown bears tends to be a touchy subject for some, I felt this may send too much of a rogue message.

**PROPOSED BY:** Bob Ermold

EG043012589

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 157 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides.** Modify the black bear salvage requirement for Units 7 and 15 as follows:

For black bears in Units 7 and 15, either the hide and skull, or the meat must be salvaged and removed from the field.

**ISSUE:** The problem regards the requirement of salvaging and removing the hide and skull of black bears.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Fewer hunters who enjoy eating black bear meat and black bear hunting will continue to hunt after they place a black bear rug or two on their wall. Fewer hunters participate in black bear hunting due to the requirement of salvaging and removing the hides and skulls.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** It improves relations between black bear hunters and anti-hunters by salvaging, and not wasting the meat. It removes the trophy stigma.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters who enjoy eating black bear meat and have no interest in salvaging black bear rugs and skulls which have no food value. The most common reason for hunters discontinuing hunting for black bears, is the fact they do not need any more bear rugs. Hauling out the weight of black bear skulls and hides for no reason other than satisfying a law, makes no sense. I love the taste of black bear meat, especially from

mountainous areas that require a major commitment for success. The added weight and effort needed to haul out the skull and hide, is the reason so many black bears are not taken when opportunities arise.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None. The current law effectively prevented me from taking a black bear 12 miles up a drainage. If I had not been required to salvage the hide and skull, I would have taken the black bear and salvaged the meat.

**PROPOSED BY:** Jim Hjelmgren

EG042112539

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 158 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear.** Increase the bag limit for black bears in Units 15A and 15C as follows.

As part of an increased effort on behalf of the hunters to help stimulate the predator control program on the Kenai Peninsula, the new proposal would state: Allow for the harvesting of five black bears per regulatory hunting season in Units 15A and 15A. In Unit 15C, this would pertain to the area north of Kachemak Bay.

**ISSUE:** Units 15A and 15C are in an intensive management nightmare in regards to the moose population and predator control. The local Department of Fish and Game has been less than proactive in their approach to solve this issue and the Kenai Wildlife Refuge has been less accommodating in regards to working with the public and the department in helping to solve the crisis with the dwindling moose population.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The residents will no longer be able to have a moose hunting season in Units 15A and 15C.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. By doing so, this would allow the hunters whom are willing to harvest predators, take five black bears each out of the equation. With the new restrictions for moose hunting, the number of hunters taking moose has significantly dropped. Having the ability to harvest five black bears will enable many families to fill their meat needs for the year.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone. Hunters and non-hunters both will benefit from this. Ultimately, there will be an increase in the moose population if this proposal is passed and taken advantage of by the hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** I can think of no one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** I considered going unlimited on black bear with no sealing requirements. However, after thinking on it, I believe five would be the appropriate number to help improve the moose population.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 159 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf; 5 AAC 85.060. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals; and 5 AAC 92.530. Management areas.**

Open wolf, coyote and lynx hunting in Skilak Loop as follows:

Allow predator hunting on the entire Skilak Loop area from November 10 through March 31. Areas not open in the Skilak Loop area to predator hunting would be: 1/4 mile within Engineer and Hidden Lake Camp grounds - 1/4 mile from the upper and lower boat launches. Species allowed for harvest would be wolf, coyote, and lynx (lynx season runs from November 10 through January 31.) Individuals would be allowed, as they currently are in the open area of hunting of the Skilak Loop section, to walk in from the road.

**ISSUE:** The Skilak Loop area in Unit 15A is a 17 mile loop that currently allows hunting access for the first three to four miles on the right hand side of the road only. Traditionally, this area gets used most heavily during the months of May through October for folks getting camping and hiking. The Skilak Loop area has very minimal use during the winter months. Predator hunting is currently allowed on the right hand side of the road up to within a 1/4 mile of the Skilak Lake boat launch. This is about a total of four miles of hunting access only. There is very limited road access in Unit 15A for predator hunting all together.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will continue to be an underutilized hunting opportunity for people whom enjoy predator hunting. The cow moose hunt in this area was just closed due to very low population numbers for moose in this specific area. While there appears to be an adequate food supply for moose in the area, the population continues to drop due to predation from wolves, coyote, and bear. By not allowing full access to predator hunting in this area during the critical winter months, hunters are not being allowed to help balance the moose and predator populations.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** There is an abundance of fur bearers located in this area. By allowing predator hunting in this proposed area, individuals whom enjoy predator hunting would have greater opportunity to harvest fur bearers with currently allowed prescribed firearms.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Any individual who holds a valid hunting license that enjoys getting out predator hunting.

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** I did consider proposing opening up the Skilak Loop area to general hunting. This proposal would have included the general hunting of bears in this area. However, after considering individuals and groups that use the Skilak Loop area during late spring, summer, and early fall months for camping and hiking, I chose to reject this proposal to keep these individuals from gaining maximum benefit from the area during this time frame.

**PROPOSED BY:** Loren Reese

EG033012521

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 160 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf.** Open a no closed hunting season for wolf in Units 7 and 15 as follows:

Wolf: Units 7 and 15: No closed season.

**ISSUE:** This proposal seeks to enhance the opportunity for wolf harvest in Units 7 and 15 by adopting a “No closed season” regulation. With the current intensive management plan and predator control measures in place with the target goal of a significant reduction in the wolf population that includes aerial wolf hunting it seems at cross purpose to close the season at all. Wolves are difficult to hunt however; there are incidental opportunities for harvest that should be taken advantage of. No closed season; accomplishes that. This proposal would include a sunset clause that would insist the season revert back to the current regulation, August 10<sup>th</sup> - April 30<sup>th</sup> once wolf numbers are reduced to the desired number.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Opportunities to harvest wolves will be lost.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, the reduction in wolf populations has been identified as a significant issue in the overall scheme of intensive management for moose populations on the Kenai Peninsula, this proposal furthers the ability to accomplish the mission and enhance moose numbers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those who would like to harvest a wolf and ultimately all who utilize moose as a food source.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who oppose wolf hunting.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No other options seem appropriate.

**PROPOSED BY:** Kenai/Soldotna Fish & Game Advisory Committee

EG042312545

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 161 - 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game.** Lengthen the spring season with a decreased bag limit for ptarmigan on the Kenai Peninsula as follows:

Units 7 & 15 ptarmigan. August 10<sup>th</sup> - February 28: 10 birds per day - 20 in possession;  
March 1 - April 30: 5 birds per day - 10 in possession.

**ISSUE:** Ptarmigan season in Units 7 and 15 currently closes on March 31. The period between mid-December and early March is largely not huntable for foot hunters using hunting dogs. Snow conditions are difficult and often times dangerous due to avalanche concerns. Daylight

does not allow a snowshoe into the high country with any time to hunt, From mid-March into late April, snow conditions and daylight allow foot hunters to access the high country and take a few ptarmigan. The spring breeding season does not get underway until the snow is out of the high country at the end of April. In order to allow the foot hunter a fair opportunity to hunt ptarmigan in the spring this proposal would request an extension of the ptarmigan season that would close it on April 30 instead of March 31. In order to minimize any impact this extension would have it also proposes that from March 1 through April 30 the bag limit be five ptarmigan. There does not seem to be any viable subsistence utilization of ptarmigan in the winter months on the Kenai Peninsula. Ptarmigan are taken primarily by recreational snow machiners who encounter coveys and shoot them with .22 pistols or rifles. There is no real justification to have a ten bird limit on upland game birds that are subject to a fair amount of pressure, which the Kenai Peninsula ptarmigan currently are. Reducing the limit to five birds would actually be very reasonable for the entire season. There seems to be no data available on populations of ptarmigan in the Kenai Mountains but there is on the ground evidence that populations of ptarmigan are affected in the more accessible areas of the Kenai.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The current regulation effectively eliminates harvest by foot hunters during the majority of the open season, maintaining the current regulation will continue to minimize winter opportunities for foot hunters.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal provides for an opportunity that does not currently exist and in doing so promotes the utilization of these birds while ensuring a continued healthy population.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters who prefer to hunt upland game without benefit of motorized vehicles.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** It does not seem that anyone would suffer. A five bird limit is still generous for upland game birds in any arena.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** An option would be to change the season/bag limit to read: Units 7 and 15: Ptarmigan August 10 - April 30 5 birds per day 10 birds in possession This is a reasonable limit on any upland game bird population. Upland hunters who spend time walking the high country of the Kenai Peninsula find that ptarmigan are not as prolific as a ten bird per day limit suggests. Many upland bird hunters have expressed the desire for a five bird limit in the interests of the resource. But many Alaskans believe in getting all they can as often as they can and thus it seems unlikely that a reduction in bag limit for the entire season would be embraced.

**PROPOSED BY:** Kenai/Soldotna F&G Advisory Committee

EG042012534

\*\*\*\*\*

# Regional and Multiple Units

---

**PROPOSAL 162 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep.** Open resident sheep seasons seven days before nonresident seasons for the Southcentral Region Units as follows.

Resident hunting season for Dall sheep shall be August 3rd to September 20th. Nonresident hunting season shall be from August 10th to September 20th. Drawing permit areas will start seven days earlier for Alaska residents and if there is a split season, the second half will be shortened by seven days for nonresidents such that residents can start the second half seven days prior to nonresidents.

**ISSUE:** The Board of Game needs to address the lack of full curl legal rams available to Alaska residents. While sheep populations have been stable to slightly declining, the availability of legal rams, much less trophy rams, has been significantly reduced and is in serious decline. Success rates for resident sheep hunters will never be on par with non-residents if not allowed an earlier jump from the efficiency of their guides.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Alaskan resident hunters will continue to suffer from the mismanagement of this species by the Board of Game. Alaskan youth will never have the opportunity afforded to their parents and grandparents to successfully hunt healthy populations of Dall sheep with ample populations of large rams. Alaska wildlife belongs to all Alaskans and these resources should be managed as such.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Resident hunters will have an improved quality of hunt and avoid conflicts with guides and their clients. Nonresident hunters will have an improved quality of hunt by avoiding conflicts with resident hunters. Transport services associated with sheep hunting will improve as this will lessen the bottleneck on transporters seen at the beginning of each season, especially during poor weather. This may also increase the safety of hunters and transporters by spreading out the season and users more. Current Alaska residents and future Alaskans may be more interested in hunting Dall sheep, its management, and the future of Dall sheep hunting if they had greater opportunity to locate and harvest a legal ram, much less quality rams.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaska residents, Alaska youth, and future Alaskans. Dall sheep populations may also improve as more people may feel like they have a chance at successfully harvesting a quality ram and will be more interested in the management of the resource. This benefits Alaska, all of Alaska's game resources, and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one, though some will say nonresident hunters, nonresident guides, and resident guides may suffer. Harvest records, however, show that resident sheep hunters are much less successful than nonresidents because of their guides. This is largely due to time guides can give to pre-season scouting, which is done mostly by fixed wing aircraft.

While success rates for resident hunters will hopefully increase, there is little reason to think that nonresident success rates will decline significantly. Pre-season scouting will still be available to guides. Sheep populations will not suffer directly - again because resident hunter success rates are consistently low. Future sheep populations, however, may suffer and receive little support or interest, if today's youth and future generations cannot hunt healthy populations of sheep, as is currently the case. You will be hard pressed to find any Alaska resident who is not a guide or associated with a guiding business, who does not favor this proposal. If not sure whether to favor Alaska residents over nonresidents, please look at any other state and how they manage their resources for the benefit of their residents and not for the financial benefit of a few.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED:** Close nonresident hunting of Dall sheep for five years or until healthy populations of sheep with sufficient populations of legal rams is re-established. Charge resident hunters nonresident harvest fees during this interim to offset any loss of funding from loss of non-resident tags. This would be the best management practice the Board of Game could do, as it would best serve current and future Alaska residents, and most of all best serve the Dall sheep population as a whole. I rejected this solution based on past performance of the board where political and financial interests of a few, trumped the best interests of Alaska residents, Alaska game resources, and Alaska itself.

**PROPOSED BY:** Jake Sprankle EG042412551  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 163 - 5AAC 85.055. Seasons and bag limits for Dall Sheep.** Open resident sheep seasons seven days earlier than nonresident seasons for the Southcentral Region Units as follows:

Region II Units - Season Dates for Dall Sheep:  
Resident: August 5 – September 20  
Nonresident: August 12 – September 20

**ISSUE:** Preference For Alaska Residents - EARLY START DATE

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Alaskans will keep experiencing conflict in the field with commercial operators (guides) and overcrowding will diminish the quality of the hunt for residents. All of the western states have high allocations of game (usually 90%) for their residents and about 50% of Alaska's sheep are harvested by nonresidents, which would never be allowed in other states. The lack of a quality experience and the diminishing number of legal rams is causing a reduction in the number of Alaskans wanting to hunt and enjoy a resource we all own.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** More legal rams would be harvested by residents and our youth would have an opportunity to have a positive experience sheep hunting. All sheep hunters would not be trying to enter the field on the same day and the air taxi services wouldn't be so overloaded – generally a safer situation for all hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All Alaskans – especially our youth. Nonresidents will also have a better experience because many residents will be out of the field when they enter creating more solitude for their hunt.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Commercial operators will complain but they are using a resource we all own. Other states don't force nonresidents to use a guide and they have high game allocations for their residents (usually 90%). Nonresident guides can't legally hunt sheep, goats, and brown bears themselves but they enjoy and make money on a resource owned by all Alaskans. This is not anti-guide or nonresident but pro-Alaskan.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The Board of Game has been very kind to the guiding industry at the expense of the resident hunter. Nonresident tag fees bring a lot of money to the state and this helps support the Department of Fish and Game. How do other western states survive giving their residents high allocations of game? Other western states require nonresidents to apply for drawing permits (elk, deer, antelope, bear, sheep, goat, moose, cougar, etc.) 6 to 8 months in advance of the season, they have a preference point system, and high tag fees with no guide requirements. They make money to support their programs and give their residents very (usually 90%) high allocations of game. Nonresidents can come to Alaska the day before hunting season and buy a nonresident tag over the counter the day before the season at a fraction of the price other states charge. Why doesn't Alaska manage game for residents and our Department of Fish & Game like other states? If the board doesn't start showing some preference to residents, Alaskans need to contact the governor and their representatives asking them to confirm board members who put residents as priority #1 or vote for politicians that support a preference for Alaska residents.

**PROPOSED BY:** Tom Lamal and Darcy Etcheverry EG043012577  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 164 - 5 AAC 85.055. Seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep.** Open resident sheep hunting seasons five days before nonresidents for Southcentral Region Units as follows:

Region II Units - Season Dates for Dall Sheep:  
Residents: August 5th to September 20th  
Nonresidents: August 10th to September 20th

**ISSUE:** The Board of Game needs to address the serious problem of overcrowding at the start of sheep season and the lack of legal rams for the resident hunter. Alaska wildlife is 1st and foremost for the Alaskan resident.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The conflicts between resident and nonresident hunters will continue to increase and the overall successful hunting experience for both use groups will decline.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Both the resident and the nonresident hunters will have an

improved hunt by avoiding conflicts between the two groups. This will also improve safety by not having everyone rush into the field in the same time.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All Alaskan residents

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** In my opinion one would suffer, but the nonresident and resident guides will say that they will suffer.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** NA

**PROPOSED BY:** Leonard Jewkes EG042912575  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 165 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Hunting seasons and bag limits.** Open resident hunting seasons seven to ten days before nonresident seasons for Southcentral Region Units as follows:

Resident hunting seasons begin 7-10 days before nonresident seasons.

**ISSUE:** Inequitable hunting opportunities for Alaskan residents. Most hunting states provide an early and/or extended hunting season for resident hunters. Alaska does not. We need to keep our residents fed and active in the management of our game, not depend nor allow the high dollar hunters from outside who support every small portion of our economy through the use of guide services. The local hunters are the folks who live here year around and keep the dollars local. We need to focus our game management on Alaskans.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Alaskan hunters will become disenchanting and revolt.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** No, just the quality of the hunt

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaskans.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** There really isn't any other solution, except to ban nonresident hunters completely, and that's probably not going to fly

**PROPOSED BY:** Shaune O'Neil EG042712556  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 166 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits.** Open resident hunting seasons seven days before nonresidents seasons for Southcentral Region Units as follows:

Whatever opening date is determined for any species the new regulation would indicate the opening for nonresidents would be seven days later.

**ISSUE:** Big game hunting seasons open seven days before nonresidents for all species of big game.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** This will allow resident hunters to have access to game populations without interference from nonresidents who may be utilizing professional guide services or hunting on their own. Opening day numbers would be thinned out, hunter transporters will be able to cater to more people, or at least spread the movement of people over more days and primarily allow residents a less chaotic hunt.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal would improve the quality of the hunting experience for the Alaskan resident. Our State Constitution indicates the wildlife resources belong to the people of Alaska. It should only be considered as fair for the people to have access to our wildlife resource without interference from nonresidents. Other states use staggered starts with nonresidents and the difference should be the same in Alaska.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone will benefit from this proposal. Residents will have the opportunity to access game in a less crowded field. Nonresidents would have the same type of experience. With opening day being thinned out the remainder of all hunting seasons would be much smoother.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** I can't see any group suffering from this proposal. Hunting pressure would be thinned, commercial services would be spread out and Alaska would be in line with many of the other hunting states.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No other solutions considered.

**PROPOSED BY:** Terry Marquette EG042812565  
\*\*\*\*\*

*Note: The Board of Game does not have the authority remove guide requirements for hunting certain species nor to increase tag and permit fees.*

**PROPOSAL 167 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Season and bag limits.** Open resident hunting seasons ten days before nonresident seasons; allocate 90 percent harvest to residents; remove guide requirements, and increase tag and permit fees for the Southcentral Region as follows:

Start ALL resident hunting seasons for ALL species 10 days prior to nonresident hunters. Remove the guiding requirement for sheep, goats, and brown bears. Raise ALL nonresident harvest tags and permit fees. Allocate 90% of harvests to residents and 10% to nonresidents.

**ISSUE:** I would like the Board of Game to address the problem of favoring guides and their nonresident clients over the needs of Alaskan residents. Specifically, I would like the Board of Game to address the declining hunting opportunities residents are facing and the competition we face from the guiding industry in filling our freezers.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Residents will continue to see their hunting opportunities. The Board of Game and the guiding industry will continue to claim that nonresident hunters provide monies for the management of our game and bring in much needed dollars to the State when in fact they don't. Residents live here, spend their money YEAR round, buy services and goods YEAR round and support a multitude of businesses in their pursuit of game. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game spends about \$42 million dollars per year in support of the commercial fishing industry, yet only receives about \$16 million in revenue from the commercial fishing industry. Clearly, if the Department of Fish and Game--and the Board of Game --were concerned about much needed dollars, we can find savings in other avenues.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** We live here and these are OUR resources. Not the Feds, not nonresidents, and surely not the guides. The Board of Game needs to start to manage our wildlife for Alaskan residents and we have seen for too long now, declining populations of our game and most especially, declining hunting opportunities for us and our children. The future does not look bright if we continue--if you, the Board of Game, continue, to manage our wildlife species the way you have. We have an excellent Department of Fish and Game--some of the best and brightest biologists in the world--yet your actions, and in many cases, lack of action--has made them ineffective as managers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaskan Residents--and that's all that really matters. That and our game resources. This should be the metric for each and every decision you make. Does it help the Alaskan resident--current and future? Your last meeting on the Interior failed in this regard on several fronts.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Hunting Guides and the Guiding Industry and that is fine with the vast majority of ALASKANS.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Continue on the same management path as you have--and that is unacceptable. It is time to put Alaskans first. It is time to think of future Alaskans--specifically, our children. These are our game resources--we expect you to manage them for our benefit and for our children's benefit. The Board of Game--current and past-- has failed to do this, and I reject this as being acceptable.

**PROPOSED BY:** Jake Sprankle

EG043012586

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 168 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits** Limit drawing permits to ten percent for nonresidents in Southcentral Region Units as follows:

Nonresidents will only be granted 10% of the hunting permits offered for any big game hunting permit drawing.

**ISSUE:** In Region II (Southcentral Region) nonresidents will be limited to receiving no more than 10% of the permits issued for any hunt drawing.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The wildlife resources of Alaska belong to the residents of Alaska first and foremost. It is only fair that the bulk of hunting draw permits go to Alaskan residents first and a smaller portion be extended to nonresidents. Extending ten percent of any hunting draw coincides with the percentage extended by other states for hunting permit draws. Without this nonresident limitation, Alaskans who desire to use this resource pay the application fees (which are non-refundable) and consequently get bumped by a nonresident are being denied access to their own resource.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal secures the Alaskan resident as having first priority status for acquiring big game permits through the drawing process.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The Alaskan resident will benefit from this proposal.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will suffer.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No others considered.

**PROPOSED BY:** Terry Marquette EG042812564  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 169 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits.** Allocate 90% of drawing permits to residents for Southcentral Region hunts and exclude nonresidents in hunts with less than ten permits as follows:

A minimum of 90% of drawing permits will go to Alaska residents for all species. If a certain Unit has less than 10 permits available nonresidents are not eligible to participate in that drawing.

**ISSUE:** Drawing permit preference for Alaska residents – All species.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Alaska needs to put a cap of 10% on nonresident participation in drawing permits. This will put us in line with the other western states that have preferences for their residents which is usually 90% for drawing permits.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** An Alaskan preference for drawing permits will improve the quality of the

hunt for resident hunters and give more opportunities to our youth. This will take away a lot of the conflict with sheep, goats, and brown bear where nonresidents are forced to hire a guide.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All Alaskans.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The commercial operators (guides) will complain on sheep, goats, and brown bears but the other western states don't force nonresidents to use a guide for any species. The guides don't support preference points for residents or a high allocation of permits going to resident hunters. The commercial operators are using a resource we all own and residents would like the Board of Game to adopt proposals that reduce conflict in the field between guides and resident hunters.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The Board of Game has been very kind to the guiding industry at the expense of the resident hunter. Nonresident tag fees bring a lot of money to the state and this helps support the Department of Fish and Game. How do other western states survive giving their residents high allocations of game? Other western states require nonresidents to apply for drawing permits (elk, deer, antelope, bear, sheep, goat, moose, cougar, etc.) six to eight months in advance of the season, they have a preference point system, and high tag fees with no guide requirements. They make money to support their programs and give their residents very (usually 90%) high allocations of game. Nonresidents can come to Alaska the day before hunting season and buy a nonresident tag over the counter the day before the season at a fraction of the price other states charge. Why doesn't Alaska manage game for residents and our Department of Fish and Game like other states? If the Board of Game doesn't start showing some preference to residents, Alaskans need to contact the governor and their representatives asking them to confirm board members who put residents as priority #1 or vote for politicians that support a preference for Alaska residents.

**PROPOSED BY:** Tom Lamal

EG043012581

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 170 - 5 AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep drawing permit hunts.** Limit Dall sheep drawing permits to ten percent for nonresidents for the Southcentral Region as follows:

Drawing by permit only with 90% of the permits going to residents and 10% of the permits for nonresidents. The total number of permits for any one given area will not exceed harvest of 40% of the legal rams in the hunting area.

**ISSUE:** I would like the board's full consideration to consider moving ALL Dall sheep hunting in Region II to drawing permit only, limiting the number of nonresident permits to 10% or less of the total permits allowed for any specific area. The 10% allocation of this state owned resource to nonresidents should be more than adequate and provide a preference for the residents of the state that own the resource.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Several of the problems already exist and are getting worse. The state is not managing the resource to the fullest potential both monetarily

and for trophy quality or age structure to promote better hunting and more funding available to manage. Many areas saturated with guides and nonresident hunters are becoming more and more exclusive for guides to lock down access by threat and air taxis flying in the area trying to keep hunting areas they think they own private. Area conflicts are increasing with hunters and guided nonresident hunters.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, both the resource harvest will improve age structure and quality of the trophies hunted and limit hunter conflicts. Increased management dollars to promote a healthier number of sheep and better understanding of actual sheep numbers by regular census taking.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All hunter in general will benefit with less user conflicts and improved trophy quality and opportunities. Providing a quoted for both residents and nonresidents should allow for plenty of opportunity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Better planning for all users to apply for a permit would not be considered suffering, just making an adjustment. Guides may feel they are suffering with a limited client base, because now they can do most anything they want.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Limit the amount of nonresident sheep hunters to a simple ten % permit quota of the resource take in each area based on the last ten year harvest average to drawing permit and leaving all current harvest tag only areas still open to residents. I feel the drawing permit system needs more participation to generate additional revenue for the state to improve state wide sheep management.

**PROPOSED BY:** Doug Lammers EG042912570  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 171 - 5 AAC 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures.**  
**Statewide provisions.** Develop a permit allocation formula for second degree of kindred hunters in Units 14C and 15 as follows:

We suggest that nonresident drawing permit hunt success be established on a 75 and up to 25% basis with the up to 25% provided to second degree of kindred hunters for Units 14 and 15.

**ISSUE:** Second degree of kindred allocation within drawing permit hunts. In many cases where nonresident hunter opportunity has been limited to drawing permit hunts and guide required species, there are very few permits available. Professional hunting guides have to maintain their business overhead and land use authorizations based on the hope that they will have clients who draw a permit. Second degree of kindred drawing permit success is growing. This factor works against a guide business owner whose clients also compete for these permits. We would like the Board of Game to develop an allocation formula that provides for second degree of kindred opportunity but also allows for a guide business owner to have knowledge that there are permits available for guided hunting opportunity.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Second degree of kindred drawing permit success will continue to marginalize or eliminate guide business owners and their contribution to the State of Alaska.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, guided hunting provided a very important part of the rural Alaska economy. Second degree of kindred hunters have a much higher level of no-show which leaves opportunity wasted for other hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Professional guide business owners who need some assurance that they will have a chance for their clients to draw permits.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Some second degree of kindred hunters.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo: does not provide for a viable business plan.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Professional Hunters Association Inc. EG050412640  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 172 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping, 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf, 92.125. Intensive management plans.** Prohibit the taking of wolves March through November in the Southcentral Region as follows:

Wolf take is prohibited in all Southcentral Region Units prior to November 1 and after March 1 for the Southcentral Region. That is, wolf take is prohibited between March 1 and November 1.

**ISSUE:** Currently, state law allows taking of wolves in some Units prior to November 1, while pups remain dependent on their parents. As well, state law in some Units allows taking of wolves after March 1, after mating has usually occurred and while females may be pregnant. The Board of Game should end this practice, as take prior to November 1 and after March 1 can result in substantially higher numbers of wolves lost to the population - pups - than are accounted for in harvest statistics. This unaccounted for loss of pups and breeding adults - which is likely very significant - causes a loss of additional recruitment to the population. As well, wolf hides are not in prime marketable condition prior to November in most areas, and thus taking wolves prior to November constitutes a waste of the resource.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If wolves continue to be taken prior to November 1, while pups remain dependent on parents; or after March 1, when many adult females are pregnant, wolf populations will continue to lose reproductive capacity and recruitment, causing an overall loss of population and erosion of family structure. This is a waste of a valuable resource.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. As stated above, hides of wolves taken prior to November 1 are of lower market value, and this is a clear waste of the resource. As well, the loss

of dependent pups prior to November 1, or unborn pups from females taken after March 1, constitutes a clear and unnecessary loss of recruitment to wolf populations in all Units.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Wolf populations, wolf family structure and integrity, viewers of wolves, and science. As well, trappers and hunters will benefit as the proposal will result in an increase in wolf populations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Few, if any. The proposal will enhance wolf populations, which would then be more available for harvest by hunters/trappers from November - March.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Rick Steiner

EG043012605

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 173 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping, and 5 AAC 92.125. Intensive management plans.** Prohibit snaring of bears in the Southcentral Region.

Snaring of bears, black and grizzly, would be prohibited in the Southcentral Region. The only exceptions would be for state wildlife personnel under specific emergency situations where a bear or bears have become a public nuisance or danger. Even then, it should be used only as a means of relocating the bears.

**ISSUE:** Snaring of bears, both black and grizzly, is being instituted in various areas of the state either on a public-activity basis or an experimental basis. With the classification of black bears as a furbearer subject to trapping, there is an incentive to take them in large numbers regardless of gender or the presence of dependent offspring. The result for an species with an extremely low reproductive rate is that both the present and the next generation are subject to removal from the population without any real regard to management. Bears caught in snares will be killed and any management changes to that situation would only take place after the damage is done.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** For one thing, wildlife management in Alaska as viewed by both residents and nonresidents, will decline further in credibility and public acceptance. There is no real justification for this method or increased take, a position held by many Alaskans. Yet, it is being proposed by a handful of interested parties who have no reason other than yet another way to kill bears. Bear-baiting, which is repugnant to many, both hunters and non-hunters, gives enough opportunity that snaring is not justified. Too, enforcement by the wildlife division of the Alaska State Troopers is apt to be spotty at best. Presently, we have less than 100 wildlife troopers for the entire state. They are already stretched very thinly in terms of manpower and resources just trying to maintain the hunting/trapping regulations already in effect. To expect them to additionally take on the burden of having to inspect a flood of snaring sites is likely to overwhelm their capabilities and lead to poorly-maintained sites without any real enforcement. Additionally, there are the dangers to hikers and other non-consumers using the land who may come upon a situation where one bear is caught while its siblings or mother remain free in the area, creating the very real possibility of severe injuries or fatalities. The humaneness often touted as a feature of these snares is debatable. For

an animal that has never been restrained to suddenly be unable to move more than a few feet in any direction is very likely to produce a considerable and stressful reaction. As the present proposals allow three days between checking snares, this means any bear caught will be going that entire period without water or food or the ability to protect itself against any other predator. That's assuming the snares are checked according to schedule. Therein again rises the problem of enforcement. Should a sow with cubs be caught, the cubs will be stressed severely by their mother's response. Equally, if a cub is caught, there will be an extremely stressed bear sow roaming the area.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** With liberal bear hunting seasons and bag limits, the widespread use of bait-stations, the onslaught against bears in Alaska has been increasing. This is a species with a low reproductive rate yet it has high value as a tourism draw with bears being one of the big three species most often cited as viewing opportunities. Rather than indiscriminate killing of bears, they should be managed with a view towards their vital role in a healthy environment. It is much easier not to create problems at the onset as opposed to trying to repair damage after it has been done.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Viewers of wildlife, both resident and nonresident, will benefit from the opportunities these animals present. In 2008, the entire revenue from hunting/trapping fees and licenses totaled \$124 million while the revenue from tourism was over \$538 million. Additionally, the ethical hunter that believes in fair chase will benefit by not having to deal with snare sites and the attendant problems and dangers thereof. The indiscriminate killing of bears would negatively impact healthy, sustainable bear populations, a situation affecting both hunters and non-hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Remove bears from the furbearer classification. I do not reject this; I heartily endorse it. With snaring in place, the opportunity for a black market in bear gall bladders is greatly enhanced as is the waste of bears. There is not a huge demand for bear pelts and not all bears taken by this method will have suitable pelts. The probability of wastage is high.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Wildlife Alliance EG042912576  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 174 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping, and 5 AAC 92.125. Predation control areas implementation plans.** Prohibit snaring of bears in the Southcentral Region as follows.

Snaring of bears is illegal in the Southcentral Region (Game Management Units 6, 7, 8, 14C, and 15).

**ISSUE:** The Department of Fish and Game simply does not have the data to insure that bears will not be overharvested by the use of snaring, especially combined with an absence of bag

limits, open seasons, and newly approved methods of take. Bear snaring is controversial and not tolerated by the public as an acceptable method of take. Authorizing a bear trapping season in Alaska, especially in areas bordering National Parks and Preserves is inappropriate and will invariably have a negative impact on bear populations in our National Parks and Preserves as well as present and unacceptable safety risk to the public. Bear snaring in areas of high use is not only dangerous, but is not the best and highest use of this resource. Wildlife viewing is an important part of our state's economy and brings valuable economic development to many communities and businesses around the state. Though touted as a safe, humane and effective way to kill bears, we, along with thousands of Alaskans would disagree. Bear snaring has not been legal in Alaska since statehood for many good reasons, including the following:

**Safety:** Allowing bear snaring stations as close as 1/4 of a mile from residences, roads and trails is anything but responsible and safe. There is no way for the public to know where bear snaring is taking place. The Department of Fish and Game currently does not provide a map or locations where bear snaring bait stations are located, thereby putting the public at risk of inadvertently encountering a free-roaming adult or sibling of a bear caught in a snare as they recreate during the summer.

**Humane:** The practice of baiting a bear and snaring it is anything but humane. Unless there is someone attending the site (which is not required) and can kill the bear immediately upon capture, we seriously doubt that a bear doesn't suffer as a result of being snared. Indeed, the ADF&G has had to kill several brown bears due to injuries received from struggling to free itself in just a few hours of being caught in a snare in Unit 16. The fair chase ethic that many Alaskans abide by is affronted by the practice of bear snaring. Bears have been, and remain, an iconic species that deserves better treatment than this.

**Effective:** Bear snares are indiscriminate, allowing the capture of brown bears, sows with cubs and cubs. This method of culling is not only socially unacceptable but is inconsistent with modern wildlife management practices. Bears have a relatively low reproductive rate and the taking of sows with cubs and cubs has been universally discouraged over the years. With the singular focus of the Department of Fish and Game to boost ungulate populations, there is still little evidence that intensive management works over the long term. Many areas where intensive management has been conducted has resulted in reduced twinning rates, reduced growth of calves, increased age of first reproduction, and poor body condition including starvation in extreme situations.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** It is likely that bears will become a diminished resource as a result of the new policy. More people and pets will be faced with a public safety issue. The tourism industry will suffer. The classification of bears as furbearers is a wasteful and inappropriate use of the resource. Bears could become food-conditioned, thereby creating a potential hazard for people.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, bear snaring is an indiscriminate method of take. A trapper can still harvest a bear under a trapping license by using a firearm and bait station to attract a free roaming bear. Under this method, a trapper can be selective in harvesting the bear

and avoid taking non-target species and cubs or females with cubs. Bear snaring is a wanton waste of our resources.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaskans and visitors who value wildlife and sound biological management of our wildlife resources, and who want the opportunity to view wildlife in our national and state parks.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will suffer. This practice only promotes waste and disrespect for wildlife.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Reverse the decision to classify black bears as a furbearer.

**PROPOSED BY:** Valerie Connor EG050212623  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 175 - 5 AAC 85.060 Hunting season and bag limit for coyote.** Open a no closed hunting season coyote for with no bag limit for Southcentral Region Units as follows:

Coyote hunting – no closed season; no bag limit.

**ISSUE:** Standardize hunting regulations in regard to coyote. Make coyote hunting open year round with no closed season or bag limit.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Confusion over season.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, reduces predation by coyote.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sheep hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Year round trapping – too many problems.

**PROPOSED BY:** Steve Flory, Sr. EG050912716  
\*\*\*\*\*