

Advisory Committee
Comment Index
Alaska Board of Game
January 11-15, 2013

- AC01 Arctic Advisory Committee
- AC02 Upper Lynn Canal Advisory Committee
- AC03 Craig Advisory Committee
- AC04 Icy Straight Advisory Committee
- AC05 Fairbanks Advisory Committee
- AC06 Southern Norton Sound Advisory Committee
- AC07 Northern Norton Sound Advisory Committee
- AC08 Juneau Douglas Advisory Committee
- AC09 Juneau Douglas Advisory Committee
- AC10 Icy Straight Advisory Committee
- AC11 Sitka Advisory Committee
- AC12 Sitka Advisory Committee
- AC13 Kotzebue Sound Advisory Committee
- AC14 Noatak Kivalina Advisory Committee
- AC15 Northern Seward Peninsula Advisory Committee
- AC16 Petersburg Advisory Committee



NORTH SLOPE BOROUGH

Department of Wildlife Management

P.O. Box 69
Barrow, Alaska 99723

Phone: Central Office : (907) 852-2611 ext. 350
 or: (907) 852-0350
 FAX: (907) 852 0351
Arctic Research Facility: (907) 852-0352



RAYNITA "TAQULIK" HEPA, DIRECTOR

November 26, 2012

Carmen Daggatt, Arctic Regional Coordinator-Boards Support
Alaska Dept. of Fish & Game
P.O. Box 689
Kotzebue, Alaska 99752

e-mail: carmen.daggett@alaska.gov

Subject: Arctic Advisory Committee Comments on Proposals to the Board
of Game that will be heard at the March 2013 meeting

Dear Ms. Daggatt:

The Arctic Advisory Committee (Arctic AC) held a meeting on October 3-4, 2012 in Barrow, Alaska. A quorum was present including members: Enoch Oktollik (Wainwright); William Hopson (At-Large, Barrow); Warren Lampe (Point Lay); Eli Nukapigak (Nuiqsut); Charles Hugo (Anaktuvuk Pass); Ronald Oviok, Sr. (Point Hope); and Herman Kignak, Sr. (Atqasuk).

The Arctic AC **supported** Proposal 44-5 AAC 92.015(a), (4), (8), (9), & (13) and AAC 92.105 (b) (4), (7), (8), & (10) which would re-authorize resident brown bear tag fee exemptions for subsistence and general season hunts in Units 18, 22, 23, and 26A.

The Arctic AC **supported** Proposal 43-5 AAC 85.045(a) (24), which would allow an antlerless moose season in portions of Unit 26A.

Thank you for considering the Arctic Advisory Committee's recommendations on these proposals.

With warm regards, I remain

Michael Pederson, Executive Manager
Arctic Advisory Committee



Checklist

Upper Lynn Canal F&G A/C voter record and comments/ BOG proposals 2012/2013

Proposal #	Yes	No	abstain	Summary of discussion about this proposal
6 support	5	2		Even though F&G recommended take no action as they have the ability to change bait station dates and this is a regulatory issue, the board wanted to go on record as supporting the idea so there would be no question and it would remind F&G of our desires. Our Skagway rep raised a concern that while it seemed a good idea to separate the brown and black bear season in the Chilkat Valley, it wasn't an issue in Skagway and maybe the regulation could be made to keep them separate. It was felt the gain of fewer brown bears hanging out at bait stations where they can't legally be hunted outweighed the loss of time at bait stations black bear hunters would lose. Also noted was the fact hunters still had the same amount of time to hunt black bears, just less to do it from a bait station. It was suggested there might be other creative ways F&G could regulate the issue, ie. bait station closures in different areas, or different times in the season.
				(Please note one member had to leave after the vote on proposal #6 which changed the number voting to 6 instead of the count of 7 on proposal #6. There was still a quorum of committee members voting.)
1 oppose	6	0		agreed with F&G position there was not enough data about deer numbers to support the change
12 take no action	6	0		The board listened to a recap of the issue from F&G and their recommendation not to adopt since trying to fix the burr points problem with the proposal would lead to muddling the issue more. Since it was not in our area we decided to take no action.
16 oppose	6	0		The board agreed with F&G recommendation of do not adopt. It felt F&G biologists manage the herd conservatively, often close particular locations in an area using the point quota system and at this time and the numbers appear to be OK. It was noted that the proposal points to the vulnerability of the goat herd if too many nannys are taken.
17 oppose	yes 5	no 1		The board heard from F&G that there is a lot of country not near roads and not hunted which makes the overall hit on hen grouse minimal in the big scheme. We also heard from our local Wildlife trooper that killing a female by accident would put an unnecessary burden on hunters that make a mistake since the proposal would turn that action into a misdemeanor crime. Our one opposing vote supported the proposal with the rationale that you hunt hooters in the spring, and the only ones you find are hooting and males so it shouldn't be difficult to discern between male and female.



Craig Advisory Board meeting November 28, 2012

Members in attendance:

Stu Merchant
Kirk Agnitsch
Bill Farmer
Brian Castle
Steve Stumpf
Ellen Hannan
Mike Douville

Others in attendance:

Kirk Whitehead
Jeff Reeves
Steve Bethune
Angel from Craig Tribal

7:15 pm meeting called to order

Minutes from last meeting unanimously accepted

Old Business: Bill Farmer commented on feedback he received at the board of fish meetings. He commented on how our board worked together to understand proposals and can usually come to a consensus in our decisions. He said these unanimous decisions held considerable weight and that all proposals we voted in favor of and against in this manner passed or failed in the same manner with the board.

Board of Game Proposals

Proposal	In favor	Opposed	Comments



11	0	7	We support the F&G stance of following current practices that are in place and give them a fair opportunity to see how they work. This proposal as presented was too broad with seven points. Our advice to the individual that presented this proposal would be to present separate proposals for each point. The overall proposal was impossible to support.
Discussion on Southern Southeast Alaska Controlled Use Area. We took a vote that was 7 in favor and 0 opposed of allowing the current sunset to take affect on the controlled use area. We unanimously feel that the limited non-resident draw tags are a sufficient enough tool to mange the black bear resource.			
13	7	0	
16	1	6	All members were in agreement that this proposal was necessary for unit 4. The six opposed members felt there was no action needed in unit 1 since there were no population issues in this area. One member felt this proposal was a good decision for both units 1 & 4
31	7	0	Going back to proposal 16 all members were in favor of this proposal for unit 4.
17	0	7	
20	0	7	
21	0	7	We felt that the fur in unit 2 is not "prime" on several species as early as November 10.



23	0	7	
24	0	7	
25	0	7	
26	0	7	
27	0	7	
28	0	7	

Additional information and discussion

General election to be held in January for open seat (alternate).

New contact Frances Leach while Shannon Stone is out.

Bill Farmer or Brian Castle to Board of game meeting January 11-15

Angel with Craig Tribal Association spoke on a traditional territories management plan that would limit non-resident and non-community members from harvesting fish & game within 1-2 miles of villages. Primarily on saltwater and freshwater fish that have been defined as traditional and customary stocks. Craig Tribal is noting what Klawock and Hydaburg are working on for their plans at this time.

She also talked about a sea otter management plan that is in the final stages. Mike Douville advised her that all the tribes needed to support Don Young's bill, which would allow the sea otter hides to be exported. He said if all the tribes do not support this bill it will go nowhere.

Next meeting to be held in January 2013, time to be determined.

Meeting Adjourned 9:45 pm



Icy Strait Advisory Committee

Comments for Board of Game Proposals

To be reviewed at the Board of Game meeting January, 2012

Proposal #20:

We ask that the board **Not Adopt** this proposal. The toll that the wolves in this unit take on the moose, deer and goat populations is kept in check in part by the taking of wolves by hunters and trappers. Curtailing the season further would result in greater mortality of the game species prized in this unit for subsistence and sustenance.

Proposal #22:

We encourage the board to adopt this proposal. Allowing trappers to retain coyotes until the close of wolf season in these units would end the practice of having to turn the coyotes over to F&G as they are incidentally caught during wolf effort. This would allow the trapper to realize an increase in monetary compensation for the efforts required to retrieve and deal with the coyotes.

Proposal #29:

We encourage the board to adopt this proposal as it was forwarded by a member of the community of Gustavus and was initially supported and forwarded by our committee.

Proposal #31:

We ask that the board **Not Adopt** this proposal. The management plan already in effect for these units has provisions for the taking of Nanny goats and we feel this plan is adequate to deal with the effect of the taking of Nanny goats in these hunts. The department can also close these hunts by emergency order if populations fall to levels too low to support a hunt.



Proposals #33 through #36:

We ask that the board **Not Adopt** these proposals. We feel the current management plan in place and being used by ADF&G to manage brown bears in unit 4 is working and is adequate to address these conservation and harvest issues.

Proposal #37:

We encourage the board to Adopt this proposal as it allows for the taking of otter which are often incidental in the pursuit of beaver. We agree that otter are an under-utilized resource and the efforts of those trappers who catch them incidentally would be compensated as the fur could be sold rather than turned over to F&G.



Fairbanks Advisory Committee Recommendations on Southeast Alaska BOG Proposals

Region Wide Proposals

Proposal #23

Action: No Action-due to action on #24

Description: Open resident hunting seasons 7-10 days before non-resident seasons for all species.

Discussion:

Proposal #24

Action: Oppose

Description: Open all resident seasons 7 days before non-resident seasons

Discussion: The Fairbanks AC vote on this proposal was 6 For, 7 Against, and 2 Abstaining.

Those opposing this Proposal indicated that many of the Subsistence hunts already have a resident preference, early start date, built into them. They also testified that if this type of proposal were to pass the State would lose a lot of funding due to the non-resident purchase of big game tags and licenses, and the associated matching (3:1) Pittman-Robertson funds. This money goes directly to the wildlife management programs in Alaska.

Those testifying for this proposal felt that all Alaska game resources belong to Alaskans first, and therefore Alaskans should get a priority, as every other Western State does for its game resources. They pointed out that most Western States provide some type of early start date or other types of resident preference for its game resources up to and including upland game birds. Regarding the funds from the sale of big game tags, and matching Pittman-Robertson funds, they pointed out that Alaska has the lowest non-resident tag fees of any Western State. They recognized that the Board of Game does not have the authority to increase tag fees, however the Legislature does, and if this type of proposal were to be implemented the Legislature would have to act to increase tag fees across the board.



Proposal #25

Action: No Action due to action on #26

Description: Open all resident seasons 10 days before non-resident seasons, and allocate 90% of harvest to residents.

Discussion:

Proposal #26

Action: Support

Description: Allocate 90% of drawing permits to residents and eliminate non-resident participation in hunts with 10 or less permits

Discussion: The Fairbanks AC vote on this proposal was 8 For, 6 Against, and 1 Abstaining.

Those testifying for this proposal felt that Alaska game resources belong to Alaskans first and therefore Alaskans should have a priority over non-residents for that resource. They indicated that most Western States limit non-residents to a much less percentage of their game resources than 10%. They also felt that if this or a similar proposal was implemented, it would be higher quality hunt for both residents and non-residents, by reducing conflicts between commercial operators and residents in the field. Those supporting this proposal indicated that they recognized that this would have a large impact on guides and a severe reduction in guided hunts and the income that guided hunts contribute to wildlife management programs in Alaska. They indicated that, if passed, the Alaska Legislature would have to increase tag fees across the board to make up the difference, as Alaska currently has the lowest non-resident big game tag fees of any Western State.

Those testifying in opposition to this proposal felt that, if passed, this type of proposal would have a huge impact on guides, guided hunts, and the resultant large reduction in the income generated by non-resident tag fees and the associated matching (3:1) Pittman-Robertson funds. Additionally, there was testimony that, if passed, this proposal could impact some permit hunts in that Region that are non-resident only, particularly some black bear hunts for “non-resident hunters not using registered guides”.

Proposal #27

Action: No Action-due to action on #26



Description: Limit drawing permits to 10% for non-residents for all species.

Discussion:

Proposal #28

Action: No Action-due to action on #26

Description: Limit non-resident permits to 15% of available.

Discussion:

Proposal #44

Action: Support

Description: to reauthorize brown bear tag exemptions for units 18, 22, 23, 26A.

Discussion: The Fairbanks AC supports this department proposal to reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemptions in these units. There appears to be a proliferation of bears in all units, and these exemptions allow a hunter to take a brown bear if one is encountered while hunting other species.



Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee

Chairman Terry Marquette

The FAC Trapping Sub Committee met on the evening of 8 Nov. 2012 at 6:00pm. To discuss and make recommendations to the full FAC, in regards to the trapping proposals for the upcoming deadline written comments period.

Attendance was Al barrette (chair), Tom Lamal, Emma Lee Grennan, Mark Albert, Bill Larry, and Ray Heuer.

Staff Nissa P.

Public Joe Latart (ATA President) and Pete Buist.

Our recommendations to the full FAC are as follows.

Proposal 7 Adopt. Comments were made that Fisher are a non-native game animal and should not have a chance to populate in Alaska and compete for habitat with our native game. Encourage the BOG to adopt a season for fisher, so the trapper could keep the fisher. Or just allow the trapper to report the fisher he/she has caught to the Department (seal it if it need be) and then the trapper will retain it.

Proposal 15 Do Not Adopt. We noted that the BOG should follow Subsistence Law before any restrictions are enacted on subsistence trappers. This also is a perceived over harvest with no data to prove it. If there becomes a concern of over harvest the Department also has EO authority. Also we believe if permits have been issued to build roads. The EIS would have noted the concern of martin.

Proposal 18, 19 Do Not Adopt. Both of these proposals are not asking for any change to regulation or introducing a new regulation. Currently trappers are not allowed to harvest black bears with the use of a snare.

Proposal 20 Do Not Adopt. Current seasons are good. Wolf populations are sustainable and are the harvest.

Proposals 21, 37, 38, and 39 Support. We like the concept of aligning as many alike fur bearer seasons in a region as possible. There are wide verities of advantages for this aligning. Like a trapper will have less opportunity to harvest out of season fur bearers, less complicated regulation on openings and closures, and AWT will not have to prove the intent of a trapper's active by what sets they have out in the field.

The FAC would deferrer the exact dates of trapping seasons to the regional users. We do encourage the BOG to a line the seasons and starting seasons on the 10th of Nov. is a good place to start.

Proposal 22 Amend and Adopt. We would ask the BOG that you a line it with other alike fur bearer seasons like fox, lynx, and otter, as to keep from creating another incidental catch situation. We encourage you not to start the coyote trapping season before any other fur bearer season. The FAC likes the 10th of Nov.



This ends our comments

Al Barrette Chair Trapping Subcommittee.



Southern Norton Sound Meeting in St. Michael

Minutes 11.13.12, Meeting start time 12:10 pm

1. Establish Quorum and Attendance

AC Member Attendee	Representative Info	ADF&G Attendee	Representative
Norbert Otten Jr.	Alternate St. Michael	Letty Hughes	Wildlife Biologist
Art Ivanoff	Unalakelet	Tony Gorn*	Area Biologist
Merlin Henry	Koyuk	Brendan Scanlon*	Sport Fish Biologist
Peter Martin Sr.	Stebbins	Scott Kent*	Comm. Fish Biologist
Henry Oyoumick*	Unalakelet	Jim Menard*	Comm. Fish Biologist
Wade Ryan*	Unalakelet	Nicole Braem*	Subsistence
Michael Sookiyak Sr.	Shaktoolik		

***Indicates Telephonic participation**

AC Members not present:

Allen Atchak-Stebbins
Milton Cheemuk-St. Michael
Kris Mashiana-Unalakelet

General Public:

Vera S. Niksik
James Niksik Sr.
Frankie Myoumick
Andrew Lockwood
James Niksik Jr.

2. Elections

There was supposed to be an alternate for St. Michael that Milton Cheemuk arranged, but we don't know who.

Norbert Otten elected to serve on the St. Michael Advisory Committee serve next to Milton Cheemuk

Vote on establishing Norbert Otten as the representative from St. Michael.

3. Motion to Approve the Agenda

Michael Sookiyak requests addition to agenda Item four to include a prayer

Motion to add a prayer

Motion to approve the meeting minutes

All approve



None opposed

4. Invocation prayer-Michael Sookiyak

5. Approval of last meeting minutes

Motion to approve minutes

Question:

All support

None opposed

Minutes adopted

6. Game Report

Letty Hughes

Gives paperwork for updated meeting materials

Tony Gorn gives Unit 22 Wildlife Report

Gives information about the moose census 545 moose in 2012. In 2008 and 2012 the percent yearlings was complete there was a series of years in 2008 there was 21 % short yearlings in 2012 there was %19 short yearlings. It is encouraging we still have to remember the amount of moose densities is terribly low less than .25% moose per square mile. From where we were a decade ago we are doing better but they are still low.

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about past suggestions for having moose surveys in the St. Michael-Stebbins region. Mr. Ivanoff will write a letter to have financial allocation for additional surveys to take place on the Southern portion of Norton Sound around St. Michael and Stebbins.

Tony Gorn: Recalls receiving the letter about having moose surveys in St. Michael and Unalakleet. The next time we can come down to Unalakleet in 2015. Gives response, I took another two super cubs with me to Unalakleet. The idea was to get a good solid Unalakleet census. The intent was to send two super cubs south to collect data on St. Michael and Stebbins but that didn't happen because of weather in the region and additional data had to be collected on the Seward Peninsula musk ox census. Explains we cannot do a moose census at this point, but we can do a trend count. We can't do a moose census, but we can do a trend count. We are interested in looking at the moose count in the lower Yukon it is getting really high.

Peter Martin: Questions about only have antlered moose hunts. Inquires about getting an antlerless moose hunt in Southern Norton Sound (St. Michael-Stebbins Region).



Tony Gorn: That is another good reason to look at moose in your back yard if you want to be having antlerless moose hunts. Would consider having an antlerless moose hunts based on information.

Letty Hughes: Gives past fall harvest report from 22A. With the increase in the moose population it increased the number of possible moose harvests to 22. That was with the city of Unalakleet to extend the season to the 20th of September. We had 16 moose taken as part of that EO, part of that EO plan was to have a winter moose hunt. The plan was that if there was enough moose left over in the quota to allow a winter hunt in Unalakleet. This is not for 22A it is for the Unalakleet region only. Answers question about the hunting with the general season hunting harvest times.

Tony Gorn: I don't know if you remember going back and forth over the past couple years.

Peter Martin: Explains the reasoning for the hunting season extension each year because of the bad weather and not being able to get the moose quotas.

Letty Hughes: Explains that it is necessary for Unalakleet to send in a request to have the moose hunting season extended.

Peter Martin: in the past five years we have requested extensions. We may need to request extension again. We need this subsistence moose meat for our community.

Tony Gorn: We have been responding to the questions of St. Michael and Stebbins to extend the season throughout the winter. We should look for a solution so that St. Michael and Stebbins don't have to keep reapplying for an extended season.

Merlin Henry: I never have heard anything about 22E I have never heard anything about the moose. I didn't see any bull moose in that area only cows.

Letty Hughes: We have been focused our moose census for 22B was West of the Darby Mountains. In the eastern portion in the Koyuk area. There are a few moose taken from Elim and Koyuk, but I am not sure .

Tony Gorn: 22E is a really big area. We focus our energy in the scariest areas. There isn't any biological concerns in Koyuk and Elim and the harvests are relatively low. IF you look at the reg book that the moose seasons are really long in that region because there are no biological concerns. I have heard a lot about a lot of female moose and not a lot of male moose. I thought that high it was linked to the high water causing a change in distribution the male moose. The areas where you see most of the male moose was underwater this year. The Koyuk River area we try to get to, it has been about 3 years and we try to do trend counts.

Merlin Henry: There was a lot of high water this year in the Koyuk River from all of the rain. The people who got moose were lucky to get their moose. Inquires about getting a proxy permit for hunting for elders.



Inquires about barren female, How come it is not in the reg book. I have heard about barren females and I heard we can get them. How come I don't know if I can get a barren female.

Letty Hughes: I have the paperwork for the hunting by proxy permit and I can help you fill that out, there is a winter hunt right now from November 1st to December 31 for the Koyuk-Elim area

Letty Hughes: For 22B there isn't a regulation for an antlerless moose hunt. There would need to be a proposal put in for an antlerless moose hunt.

Tony Gorn: There are a couple of spots in the area in 22C we have an antlerless moose hunt. In an area like 22E, from the trend count we have completed. From talking to people from flying around it doesn't sound/look like 22E that the density of the moose population is not that high. Moose are like people, moose as they get older they get less likely to be able to have a calf. That does not mean that the older female moose cannot have calves. It would be better to leave that cow in the population so it can try again in another year. When we have low moose densities it is hard to justify an antlerless moose hunt.

Art Ivanoff: We can ask for more resources to conduct surveys so we can increase moose hunts and to consider more time hunting. It sounds like the resources are spread too thin to allow information to be collected to allow various hunts. If you had more funding would you be able to get more information on the moose populations in this area?

Tony Gorn: That is a loaded question. It is always good to have more data on an area. Right now 22B has the longest hunting seasons with four months of hunting opportunity. The reason why we focus on energy on places like Unalakleet is because we have higher harvest rates We have two and half people in the Nome office, we can't get everywhere that we want and that is just the way that it is.

Art Ivanoff: I think that this region needs to have more money thrown into the coffers so that they can do their jobs sufficiently. Though there are long hunting season in Koyuk, it sounds like they would like to have more hunting opportunity same with St. Michael and Stebbins. I would like to write a letter to our senators and representatives to seek additional funding for the Department of Fish and Game to conduct more research so that people in the villages can have more opportunity. 24,000 sq miles is a big area and it sounds

Michael Sookiyak: The hunter's in Shaktoolik are talking about having very high ratios of cows to bull ratios in Unit 22A. Comments there are more cows than bulls in unit 22A, there were no real concerns for the moose populations in Shaktoolik. The cow to bull ratio according the hunter is not good.

Art Ivanoff: I like the idea to engage the senator's, representative and the Governor's office.

James Niskisk Sr.: Wonders when the last moose census area in the Stebbins/St. Michael area.

Tony Gorn: We have never completed a moose census, it estimates the number of moose per square mile. It is a project that takes a very long time to do. We do trend count surveys in the spring and fall time. I am willing to share all of the data that I have from trend counts from all of the years that we have done it. We were in the South part of A was about four years ago. We did a trend count not a



census. The census gives you the number of moose per square mile where as the trend count gives you an idea of bull:cow ratios, the number of calves, and a lot of times trend counts you can do in a day or two day. The population survey can take the better part of two weeks. We have a five week period to conduct surveys in this region. If you give your name to Letty, I will give you all of the results that we have. I'll get them to you. The last trend count we did was last fall. It was a trend count not an abundance survey. Population surveys are useful to determine population density. You can do trend count in two days versus two weeks.

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about having a long enough time to hunt for the moose. We took direction last year to submit a letter to get future moose hunting in the region. We will do it again to get resources allocated for surveys so that the St. Michael-Stebbins area can have a more liberal hunt. Our question is if the data is sufficient.

Tony Gorn: This is a great dialog, you want to have more surveys and know more detail about the populations. We want to do more surveys. I just want everyone to understand, that what your implying is that more surveys are going to lead to more liberal hunts. Take a look the regulation book. You have more liberal hunt times and if you add more surveys it is possible that the hunts may not be more liberal. I want to perfectly clear about the possibility. We respond to the squeaky wheel and if you look at the regulation book that often means that there are more stringent regulations. If we get more information that very well lead to more stringent regulations.

Art Ivanoff: Having the data is important to have the management of the resources. I think that is a really good point and it is important to have good conservation like around the Unalakleet River. Are there any other

Wade Ryan: I have no further comments

Letty Hughes: Musk Ox management

What you see in front of you is the hunts, last year we went back into tier two hunts with the exception of 22E except the Koyuk Elim area. There hasn't been any musk ox harvested in that area. The tier II has opened. I was in Koyuk last Tuesday at the IRA helping people fill out Tier II permits with supplements for 22B, 22C, 22C, 23 you have until December 17 online.

Art Ivanoff: Tony would you like to add to what Letty had to say.

Tony Gorn: Basically the musk ox population on the Seward Peninsula it is in a bad shape between 2010 and 2012 the population declined 13% annually so between 2010 and 2012 it decline in total by %25. That is why we are now in tier two. Recruitment rates and bull cow ratios are low. The Seward Peninsula musk ox situation is not great. Over the years we know that musk ox has moved in to the Nuvalik Hills, it changed the way we did the surveys. We estimated 84 musk area. We went back to the Mullato Hills and landed next to every group of musk ox that we could find and took down data on the groups aging them. The results were very encouraging. The bull cow ratio went up as well as an increase



in the number of yearlings. The total number of animals is still quite low. The ones that are living in that area are doing really good even though the population is low right now.

Wade Ryan: Inquires about musk ox

Wade Ryan: Inquires

Tony Gorn: We do not want to overharvest bulls. We need to be very conservative. We have learned that. In 2011 I told the board of game that we found these animals. We need 100 musk ox for the subsistence, we can't kill 100 musk we are in Tier II, we have 39 musk ox allotted. I would expect to be in tier II for the foreseeable future. If we started a musk ox hunt in 22A we would start in tier two and everyone in the state of Alaska could hunt. Explains tier two selection and the point system. This means that all Alaska residents can apply for these permits and the hunts are determined by where you live, how much you pay for food and gas etc.

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about action items.

Tony Gorn: The only thing that you need to think about proposals for having a hunt need to be submitted on May 1st. The next meeting will be on January 2014. The tier two time application is now. This is a slow process; there is a population of 80 to 100 musk ox. I would think you would want to put a lot of thought into what you are doing and take it into the Board of Game. We have been very successful as a group working together.

Wade Ryan: Inquires about the time frame for when the regulations would go into action..I don't have any problems with this idea

Tony Gorn: Explains I know this process is slow. I think we are going to want to think very hard about what we want to do and getting it right the first time. You have been very patient and I think that if we work together as a department and AC we have been very successful with getting proposals put together in the past if we work together.

Wade Ryan: I don't have any problems with the regulations because the population is so low right now.

Michael Sookiyak: I put this question to my community during the last annual meeting. There was more questions than interest in the musk ox hunt. They agreed at the last annual meeting to wait for additional information from the meeting in their behalf.

Henry Oyoumick: Wants to know how often we have these survey's

Tony Gorn: We have these surveys every two years. Explains the details of the survey methods.

Art Ivanoff: I want to welcome and introduce Henry Oyoumick to the group. I think Tony and Wade should work together to get a hunt on for a proposal.

Letty Hughes: Explains brown bear tagging fee exemption waiver fee for 22A.

Art Ivanoff: We need to cover the tagging fee



Letty Hughes: Explains brown bear harvest data for Unit 22. I have the upper bar graph for the total number of bears harvested. I have it broken down by subunit. From 1990 to 1997 we were harvesting, explains the total number brown bear harvests. Without the tag fee we increased are harvest to 93 bears a year and increased our harvest by 80%. This information is taken by brown bear sealing. Explains the number of bears harvested (Refers to data included in the handout).

Tony Gorn: Thanks for the opportunity. I didn't hear everything that Letty said. The Southern Norton Sound needs to vote on the brown bear tagging fee.

Proposal 40 Continued Exemption for the brown bear tag fee. We are asking the \$25 fee be waived or otherwise it defaults back in.

Motion: to support the proposal

Second:

Question called

All supported

None opposed

Motion carries

B. Fisheries

Scott Kent: I am not sure what you want me to focus on. Summarized what has been happening Southern Norton Sound. We have the lowest king salmon return on record. We have just under 3000 king salmon for the entire Unalakleet drainage. We did make our escapement goals this year and we didn't make them last year because of high waters at the towers. This year the counts were good at the towers. The weir counts was much lower. The forecast for a muThe magnitude of the run was extremely weak this year.

Michael Sookiyak: Requests information from the Shaktoolik River and when it will be available.

Scott kent: 800-1200 chinook. We are still in the process of finalizing our data.

Art Ivanoff: it seems like the count wasn't there. It didn't pan out in 2012. It wasn't a good year

Scott Kent: There were a lot more reds in the river. It got to the point that there weren't many chum, there were many kings. Explains issues with difficulty with miscounted fish. The projected harvest was over 130 fish.

Art Ivanoff: you did suspect that we did make our escapement for 2011.

Scott Kent: They were using both tower counts and wier counts and there are problems with both because.



Art Ivanoff: Explains the necessity for escapement goals, and the establishment of making these stocks making them stocks of concern.

Henry Oyoumick: do you have data taken from Golovin on down. The amount of fish taken from Golovin on down.

Scott Kent: you don't want to have it go to tier II. We have almost 30 years of comparable data. It is hard to project.

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about the test net necessity. How valuable is the data you are collecting from the test net.

Scott Kent: I don't the value at the moment that being said that the data may be more profitable long run. If we can figure out the way to get the kings in the bag and allow people to conduct better subsistence.

Art Ivanoff: I would like to take up the opportunity to sit down with you. I wanted to sit down the village of Unalakleet for the test net. Perhaps a pre-fisheries meeting in the spring time to see if the test net is necessary. The question is if we aren't making escapement goals what is the point of the test net.

Scott Kent: my understanding about running the sonar in the Southern Norton Sound Area.

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about the Chinook salmon in the Southern Norton Sound. What I heard from NSEDC because escapement wasn't met. The reason it wasn't operated by because of escapement goals was not met. They took one male and one female. The kings met the escapement goals.

14:20 Meeting Break

Tony Gorn: Summary Robert Bell incident. It is part of musk ox provision, and how we have administer the musk ox hunt. To allow the appropriately musk. Seward Peninsula has a positive customary and use finding. What does the Seward Peninsula musk ox hunt look like? Explains no trophy use of the horns of the musk ox. There has always been some level of trophy destruction.

Michael Sookiyak: I was very disturbed by Bob Bell's actions. I felt disturbed about his actions. The people that I shared this story with in Shaktoolik had the same feelings.

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about Northern Norton Sound actions.

Michael Sookiyak: I think it would be beneficial for this board to consider action on this incident to prevent further incidents versus for other incidents to happen. It may be worth it work with the Northern Norton Sound AC meeting.

Peter Martin: Inquires about the Bob Bell incident.

Tony Gorn: There have been several hunters that are being investigated for the trophy destruction.

Art Ivanoff: inquires about taking action



Michael Sookyiak: Makes a motion to work with Northern Norton Sound to draft a letter about this incident.

Motion Seconded:

Question called:

Motion Carries to draft a letter.

AYK Finfish

#115

Nicole Braem: Gives information about customary trade.

Comments:

Michael Sookyiak: Suggests that the Southern Norton Sound supports this proposal

Henry Oyounick: I would oppose this because of the low numbers for Chinook versus other species

Merlin Henry: What about Koyuk people sell smoked salmon in the store. What I understand here how much money they can make. Inquires about the amount that they make from selling the smoke salmon.

Norbert: With the Chinook salmon being so low, I don't know if this is good idea

Motion

Discussion:

All Support

None Opposed

Motion Carries Proposal #115.

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about the committee participation on the proposals.

Michael Sookyiak: I think we should move on to proposal #120

Proposal #120

Scott Kent: Reads the proposal. It would prohibit the sale of King Salmon that are incidentally caught. It would give the department some flexibility in the regulation of the salmon fishery.

Department Position: Supports with reservations.

Art Ivanoff: Wrote this proposal in with along NSEDC.

Wade Ryan: inquires about the length of time that this proposal would be effective for.



Scott Kent: This would be effective for three years. It is important information to report king salmon and when they get them.

Art Ivanoff: Requests about the changes that department wants.

Scott Kent: explains the midpoints of the range and the necessities of using different parts of the range.

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about supporting

Motion for

All support

No opposition

Motion carries #120

Proposal #121

Scott Kent: Presents the proposal to the committee

Department: Supports this proposal; gives department comments

Art Ivanoff:

Motion on the floor

Discussion

Question called

All support

None opposed

Motion Carries #121

Art Ivanoff: We are only voting on proposals that effect Southern Norton Sound

All support

None opposed

Proposal #126: proposed by Wes Jones

Scott Kent: Presents the proposal

Department Comments: Department Supports this proposal.

Wade Ryan: Inquires about June 8th to September 7th fishing time frame.



Scott Kent: There is some agreement to disagree with NSEDC.

Art Ivanoff: I am in favor of the proposal. I like the idea of supporting the proposal.

Michael Sookiyak: there are some years when we feel like the salmon are running late and the season is running later. Motion to support proposal

Seconded:

Discussion on 126:

Question 126

All support

None Opposed

Motion Carries

Proposal #127: Allows EO authority for the use of mesh

Scott Kent: Reads proposal #127 and presents the proposal to the AC along with department comments

Department Position: Supports the proposal, will allow for more harvesting of pink salmon.

Henry Oyoumick: inquires about the length change that will be affected by this regulation changing

Art Ivanoff: I like the idea of allowing people, as long as there is not an environmental issue

Michael Sookiyak: I am concerned about fisherman who don't have the big enough boats to handle all of the gear.

Art Ivanoff: I think your concern is a good one and I think for those people who are well equipped.

Motion to support proposal #127

Seconded

Question:

All support

None opposed

Motion Carries

Proposal #128-Use of pink salmon as bait

Scott Kent: Presents the proposals



Gives department comments: Department doesn't support this proposal, the department supports on years of abundance.

Art Ivanoff: The department was neutral on this proposal

Michael Sookiyak: inquires about the effect on herring fisherman for bait.

Scott Kent: The data would say no.

Henry Oyoumick: Could you explain the Port Clarence Area

Scott Kent: Explains Norton Sound Port Clarence Area

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about whether if this proposal would affect the Southern Norton Sound

Wade: It sounds like basically people want to use this for crab. My only concern is overharvesting the pink salmon. I support this.

Scott Kent: Clarifies the necessity of modifying the proposal

Henry Oyoumick: I would be in favor if it only affects Northern Norton Sound

-I would to oppose this because I think we should use our herring bait fishery

Michael Sookiyak: I think we should support this proposal with the changes that the state recommends.

Art Ivanoff: I feel I agree with Henry, this could be impacting this region

Question

2 support

1 opposed

Motion carries with state modifications.

Scott Kent: I don't have any more proposals to cover

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about the sport fish record of Kings in Unalakleet, 534 king were caught. That is from the statewide harvest survey. 534 king that were caught and released.

Brendan Scanlon: That includes the 53 that were harvested.

Art Ivanoff: inquires about the mortality about catch and release for Chinook salmon.

Brendan Scanlon: There was a project conducted on the Kenai River. Over 5.5 and 8.8% death rate for hooked fish.



Art Ivanoff: on the 2011 harvest of 53 king inquires about the number of 53 of the salmon that were harvested how many of them were residents.

Brendan Scanlon: about half of the sport harvests is Alaska residents and half non-residents.

-All of the regulations are the same

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about Kenai resident versus non-resident preference.

Brendan Scanlon: says that there is only one in the marine waters.

Art Ivanoff: There is statutory language to give residents first stab. I am just trying to figure out what we need to do get our stocks to the historical level. Looking at the 534 number 8% up.

Brendan Scanlon: it is more like 10%. It looks like the data from Kenai, 15% of the salmon that didn't survive.

For king salmon it is 5.5% and 8%.

Art Ivanoff: There have been more reports that mortality rates are higher. I can't remember that the study by Susiski was higher if it was sockeye. I don't like the idea of the sports fishing up the river along the subsistence fish. I don't like that our people doing subsistence aren't able to catch.

Brendan Scanlon: Explains the AYK Resident Species is for Northern Norton Sound for the Nome River

Art Ivanoff: Defer to the Northern Norton Sound proposals

AYK Genetics:

Scott Kent: this years there were 3 collection trips for Norton Sound Port Clarence Chinook Stock for the Igallik and Shaktolik Rivers. We 53 samples on the Ingallik we are just shy of 100 total. We working towards getting more samples and putting new markers on the fish.

Michael Sookiyak: Inquire about if Fish and Game is working with the Northern Norton Sound Aquatic Association.

Scott Kent: Not really. They are not really involved. Genetics requires certain things that aqua culture does not. It is pretty much the department is one.

Henry Oyounick: I have always been interested in the genetic influence.

Scott Kent: The AYK Chinook salmon symposium and there is a research topic about (((SEND FLYER TO HIS NEW EMAIL ADDRESS)))

Art Ivanoff: Some of the people in Barrow are catching Chinook Salmon, and there has been a complete regime shift.



Scott Kent: It is not too far to suggest that salmon species are expanding their range. My trip to their was very eye opening. I thought that the Ingallik should have a lot of Chinook salmon. A lot of fish in the Ingallik were large. It is possible that things are change. Salmon are good at finding a new habitat.

Art Ivanoff: I am not sure if this is an anomaly, but it is interesting.

Merlin Henry: There used to be a lot of fish up there a long time ago.

Scott Kent: Your river is probably the healthiest in Norton Sound. There isn't any pollution.

Merlin Henry: Commercial fisherman had a low King Salmon return. In the Ingallik I only caught two king fish. I saw chums with sore heads (more than one). I don't know where they get their sores.

Jim Menard: Nothing from our end.

Art Ivanoff: Maybe it would be good to go through the proposals Southern Norton Sound Supported.

Michael Sookiyak: there are a lot of new faces sitting around the table.

Proposal #183 Jim Menard gives presentation

There has been a lot of discussion and changes throughout the years.

Art Ivanoff: the proposal was written because they currently stand down during the time period. We wanted to have some sort of regulation that prevent them from fishing during this time period, because of the mixed stock composition. We wanted to prevent them from fishing for fish that were our fish.

Michael Sookiyak: I just wanted to bring it up so that new people know what is going on .

Art Ivanoff: We submitted this proposal again to address our concern. Any question?

Proposal #180

Art Ivanoff: I think that window establishes a stand down and it gives our salmon time to. I think we want to be there at the Board of fish to present our proposal. Inquires about action taken a year ago.

Jim Menard: Area M is allowed to catch 8.3 % of the sockeye salmon. Explains the chum cap. One of the arguments presented about the 16 fishing day and how it didn't give them time to get out of the chum they are currently on 88 hours fishing with time off in between to allow them to move out of the chum.

Art Ivanoff: We need a motion to support 183 and I think it would be great to give a representative some flexibility.

Michael Sookiyak: I make a motion to support 183.

There is a motion 183.



Seconded:

Discussion:

Art Ivanoff: The proposal 180 is by Roy Ashenfelter, I think when you go to these meetings you pick up a lot more information when you change. The idea is to focus on conservation.

Is there support for the amended motion.

All in support for the amended motion

Gives the representative to have flexibility to make decisions based on the information given at the meeting.

Jim Menard: We don't have anything about the statewide salmon.

Art Ivanoff: Explains the minority report. The minority report was designed to push the envelope on providing resources to this region. We submitted it to higher ups the commissioner's office and senator's office to let them know there are some issue.

-covers disaster declaration

Explains that we didn't agree with the findings for the submission of declaration of the disaster from district 5 and 6. The letter was resubmitted to commerce for reconsideration. The Kenai River was classified as a disaster area. We are going through the motions.

Michael Sookiyak: Inquires about the letter submitted and the response to the letter.

St. Michael Public: Inquires about whitefish commercial fishing.

Jim Menard: you can apply for a permit

Scott Kent: there is a good basis for possibly developing the whitefish fishery. We need data we don't have any data.

Art Ivanoff: I will carry on that dialog with Wes Jones. That St. Michael will would like to develop a whitefish fishery.

Scott Kent: There is not likely a massive fishery here, but there is potential for development.

Art Ivanoff: Is there opportunity for tom cod for bait?

Jim Menard: People would need to get a permit for collecting tom cod for bait. You can get that permit from NSEDC. If there is somebody fishing for tom cod with their permit.

Art Ivanoff: We do have several people who are taking up targeting fishing of tom cod it is a really good opportunity.



Michael Sookiyak: Joint Board Modification

I would like to make a motion to support the Joint Board Proposal

Discussion:

Questions:

All support

None Opposed

Art Ivanoff: What was suggested was something. There needs to be some modifications and overhaul for the AC systems to fine tune this machine. You control 40%/44 million miles lands based on our hunting and fishing history. The tools need to be sharpened to get ACs involved in the decision making processes. The system is broken. The ACs should be involved in the deliberations. There needs to be more money put into these processes to make the ACs to support rural Alaska. It is difficult, but it needs to be overhauled. St Michael and Stebbins brought up some issues needs to be addressed. There is more that is required so that our people can harvest moose when they need it.

I would like to submit a motion for a letter SNAC to request additional resources from the Department of Fish and Game so that people can get the moose that they need.

Motion

Seconded:

Discussion: there are other areas that we could focus on. I know that Shaktoolik has been trying to get support for Chinook Salmon and the resources need to be covered across a greater area.

Michael Sookiyak: I agree that there needs to be more resource allocation to conduct more surveys in this region.

Amended motion to the board to include the Shaktoolik River resources

Motion carries for the amended

Art Ivanoff: two letters one for Senator Olson to allocate more resources to the Shaktoolik region Chinook salmon stocks with their own research and funding independent of Unalakleet

All support

None opposed

Motion Carries

Art Ivanoff: Returns back to Koyuk for antlerless moose hunt possibility. Is that the direction that Koyuk would like to do.



Merlin Henry: I have never been to this type of meeting before.

Art Ivanoff: We addressed the St. Michael and Stebbins about surveys.

Michael Sookiyak: Musk ox when I posed the question to the people at home. They wanted to leave it to the next annual meeting. Hopefully we will have an answer from

Wade Ryan: I would like a tier two hunt that gives more preference (local preference only) for local hunters, to reallocate the point system. All of those names at the top will be thrown into the hat to be drawn.

Art Ivanoff: inquires about further issues that Wade Ryan might have

Wade Ryan: I don't have any more questions and concerns

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about further issues that Henry Oyoumick might have.

Henry Oyoumick: Cisco data needs to be looked at for a whitefish fishery. Questions about the Western Arctic Herd, it was geared for the reindeer herders. It needs to be public use of public money. The real need of the Western Arctic Herd are the people who really need it.

Scott Kent: No further comments. You conducted a good meeting today.

Art Ivanoff: I know we have taken action on several proposal. I think there needs to be some flexibility to give some discretionary flexibility.

Michael Sookiyak: I would like to propose to send Art to the board meetings to represent us. If there is additional funding to have

Motion:

Discussion:

Art Ivanoff: I think the representative needs to have some flexibility.

I think there are other times it could have a greater impact a lot of communities.

Question:

All in favor

None Opposed to support the flexibility of representative.

Art Ivanoff: I think we need to choose an additional person assigned to go to these meetings.

Peter Martin: Motions to have Michael Sookiyak represent the advisory committee

Art Ivanoff: I would like to advocate to have Michael Sookiyak attend, based on his schedule.



Question: Motion carries

Art Ivanoff: Requests an alternate

Peter Martin: Wade Ryan as an alternate

Motion to have Wade Ryan to attend

Michael Sookyiak: Suggests Henry Oyoumick

Amended to have Henry and Wade serve as alternates

All in favor

Discussion

Question for the main motion

All Support

Motion Carries

Date and Time of Next Meeting

April Meeting in Unalakleet in conjunction with the pre-fishing season meeting.



Alaska Department of Fish and Game Northern Norton Sound Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

10/30/2012

Start time: 9:05 pm

Attendance: 26 people

Advertised: Nome Announce, Nome Nugget, KNOM, KICY, flyers posted in the post office, Sitnasuak, emailed Ads to all of the AC members

A quorum was present of AC Members, which had 11 of 15 members present: Vernon Rock, Stanley Tocktoo, Clifford Seetook, Tom Gray, Paul Kosto, Jack Fagerstrom, Daniel Stang, Nate Perkins, Adem Boeckman, Charlie Lean, and Roy Ashenfelter

Members not present: Chuck Okbaok, Sheldon Nagaruk, Charlie Saccheus

Fish and Game Staff: Subsistence-Nicole Braem, Assistant Wildlife Biologist: Letty Hughes, Area Biologist Wildlife: Tony Gorn, Area Game Manager: Peter Bente, Sport Fish: Brenden Scanlon, Commercial Fish: Jim Menard, Commercial Fish: Scott Kent, Commercial Fish: Justin Leon, Biometrics: Dan Reed

National Park Service; Ken Adkisson & Jeanette Pomrenke **KNOM** Margaret Demaiorbus

General Public; Kenny Hughes, Kevin Knowlton, Howard Farley-Commercial Fisherman, Michael Sloan-Nome Eskimo Community Biologist and Tom Sparks

NSEDC: Fisheries Biologist: Kevin Keith and Tiffaney Martinson

Alaska State Troopers: Jay Sears

Motion for approval of the agenda:

Additions to Agenda

Charlie: Stuff in the news about Bob Bell getting off the hook for not destroying his antlers of musk ox

Stanley Tocktoo: Musk Ox 22E discussion

Discussion for Elections, 3 AC seats are open they are; Mike Quinn, Bob Madden, Jr., & Dan Stang

Motion to Approve the Agenda: All in favor, No opposition, Motion carries Agenda Approved

Elections: Conducted by: Roy Ashenfelter, Identifies the parties that are running

Electorates: Dan Stang, Tom Gray, Kevin Knowlton, Kenny Hughes, Robert Madden Jr.

Elected Individuals: Kevin Knowlton, Tom Gray, Dan Stang,



Motion to approve the meeting minutes of October 12 and 13, 2011

All support, None opposed, Minutes Approved

Motion to consider Game Proposals

Proposal # 41&42 Antlerless Moose Reauthorization, motion to support, Unit 22(C) is the only unit with a cow hunt

Comments: The ADF&G gave an update on the moose population goals in Unit 22(C) which included bull to cow ration, recruitment of calves. There was a brief history about a moose biologist that reported on the amount of winter grazing area in Unit 22(C) would could sustain a limited moose population. A high moose population will eat more than is possible to re-grow during the summer season which could result in moose starvation. His report requested that the AC support an antlerless moose hunt which would be applied to Unit 22(C).

Tom Gray: Antlerless moose hunt I have voted against for years, I feel that the moose came from Fairbanks, Yukon River, the moose will move around they are not going to die in this area from over grazing. Fish and Game put out a paper that said you kill one cow moose you kill 200 moose throughout its life time. We have moose population problems in other Game Units here in Seward Peninsula and therefore will not support the antlerless moose hunt.

Majority of the AC members support antlerless moose hunt where needed to prevent over grazing winter habitat by moose. **Action on antlerless moose hunt reauthorization, 10 support, 2 opposed, Motion carries**

Brown Bear Tagging Fee Exemption: motion to support, ADF&G Game Biologist Tony Gorn: explains reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemption. We have reporting through the sealing of the fur, most people comply with the regulation.

Comments on Bear Tagging Fee: A AC member wanted to have a brown ear tag fee because it provides a report who is out hunting, plus the number of bears taken and the fee is nothing for people here. Kenny Hughes: License registration fee clarification, there are too many brown bears we need to have as many bears taken as possible so I support the brown bear tag fee exemption.

Tom Gray's point, there should be a brown bear tag fee so that the public understand who is hunting bears not requiring a brown bear tag fee omits this important information.

Stanley Tocktoo: Explains the bear issues. Explains brown bear attacks in Shishmaref, which had two brothers' get mauled. People are getting attacked when they are out or fishing hunting and he supports the brown bear tag exemption to make it easier for taking of brown bears.

Kevin Knowlton: explains having people to purchase a tag, buying a tag that everyone will buy a tag and the numbers will be skewed. It won't give a good indication of who is actually hunting because everyone is going to have one.



Tom Gray: a registration hunt, gives who are the cliental that are hunting the bears. In the long run this information is going to be needed. Ignoring it will not be a good thing.

Kenny Hughes: What affect will this having on the population? Do we want to reduce some effort or increase it? I have been interested in bears for a long time. We need to restrict bear hunting a little bit? Why does it make sense? The biggest predator of the bear population is male bears, but we are taking all of the bears out all of the bear and sows been destroyed. By reducing the amount of male bears, we reduce the predation on baby bears leading to an increase in male bears. I say allow the fee

Charlie Lean: I think we should waive the fee for brown bear. We are seeing a gradual increase over eight years. We are harvesting less than the population can stand.

Motion on Brown Bear tag fee exemption Proposal; 10 support, 2 do not support, Motion Carries

Tony Gorn: Gives Game Presentation

Caribou Report: 10-20,000 caribou currently the Death Valley area and around Granite Mountain

Musk Ox: Last year refers to the graphs in 2012, we did a range wide survey 13% annual decline between 2010 and 2012. We followed up by range wide composition surveys. Declining bull cow ratios, expanding range to the east. Far as musk ox are concerned they pretty disappointing. In 22A where there is no hunting, that is where the composition is the best. The Western Seward Peninsula ratio was what it reminded me of in 22A, good bull cow ratios. A product of the declining the musk ox population putting us back into tier II. We are trying to build bull cow ratios. Not that many musk oxen to harvest these days in comparison to five years ago. Hunting seasons open August 1st now that know we are going to be hunting tier II. Application period opens November 1st-December 17th, will go to villages to fill out applications for the tier II hunt. In 22E has its own unique ANS.

Letty Hughes: Explains application process.

Tony Gorn: there is a statewide application period. We are back into tier II we have to be available 29 animals available. A hundred musk ox were harvested last year. Two other things are, we got rid of helicopters it is easier on the animals and easier on staff; there are very high mortality rates for cows greater than three years of age. The last thing we need to get you guys to do. We are still basing the information on the musk ox management plan from 1998. The first draft we want available to the public. Before we can bring it to the public we need to get the agency on the same page. We spend an unbelievable amount of time on musk ox. We need a population objective for 22C. It is going to be a tough question to answer and you guys can help guide us through that. You guys we are asking you for how many musk ox you need.

Tony Gorn: explains selection of mature cows, darting a musk ox from a helicopter is an aerial rodeo. That is one of the nice things by looking at them from the ground; you can look at the horn bases better. I wondered when we were selecting the oldest cows to be selected for three year old cows. What is killing them it seems like a variety of things. Brown bears seem to be predated them. We need to find some balance between killing them all and sustaining them. Living with wildlife, if you live in Nome you



should not be surprised to see musk ox. We are in musk ox habitat. I am more concerned about airports with musk ox particularly in the morning and the evening. Animals hanging around city field and around the airport are more what I am concerned about where the chance for human casualty is possible. 29 animals available for harvest rate for musk ox 2% harvest rate. We cannot have a musk ox free zone around Nome.

Stanley Tocktoo: 22E there is a large increase in musk ox along the coastline and Serpentine, I take my family berry picking. I can't even get to the bathroom, it dangerous to see your family getting attacked by musk ox and brown bear. They are eating sour dock, black berries, some of our subsistence food. They are dangerous, I try to shoot above them and it just makes them madder. It is dangerous for subsistence hunting and berry picking. We see lots of antlerless cows. We hardly see any bulls they are up towards the hot springs.

Tony Gorn: We are collaring the caribou herd, we are in a transitional time and Peter Bente is going to talk about the Western Arctic caribou herd. Kenny Hughes: Explains that Nome is dealing things that the villages have been dealing with for a long time. Villagers are ok with musk ox herd declining. Villagers want to see the big black lawn mower decline in 22D Southwest.

Stanley Tocktoo: A few years back there was a study in a couple of regions Kotzebue area and Northern Seward Peninsula. Inquires about differences in tooth decay.

Peter Bente: on BOG proposal deadline is May 1st. If you want to act on the proposals. The books won't be consolidated until about July 1st.

Roy Ashenfelter: inquires about musk ox report.

Tony Gorn: We are not going to have that management plan available by May.

Tony Gorn: I will work with you guys as closely as you want to develop the proposals. I think it is most valuable when the department works with the ACs to submit proposals for comment. It is helpful to have a meeting date after the proposals have been submitted.

Charlie Lean: I am on the other side of the fence, I understand the conflicts. My wife picks Quivit it is better than gold mining. I am frustrated with the thumbing their nose at the information. I am frustrated with Bob Bell thumbing his nose at regulations at sitting member of the Board of Game. I thought we had a scientifically sound conclusion about the musk ox. What is happening at Bethel, there are many guys that are going to get cited and fined for not following regulations? There are many of us that are disappointed about how our testimonies are received by Fish and Game. We are here for window dressing for Fish and Game. I think local staff passed on the right information, a sitting member of the board of Game went out and shot a mature bull and went out and shot a trophy. All of my friends respect the regulation. It looks like an abuse of power to me. I hope you take this message to the superiors.



Jay Sears: I can't talk about the case, but there are serious loop holes in the trophy destruction. I would encourage you to file a complaint. There are always people that work loop holes. Do we want a trophy or not. We can do our investigation, but we need to have the eye cuts.

Nate Perkins: When we have a meeting and consider the proposals and then men Charlie Bell, what good a supposed support body. Have no regard, will the board of game going to do anything with it?

April meeting to discuss BOG proposals.

Roy Ashenfelter: A letter will be put together by Charlie Lean and Paul Kosto. There will be a letter sent around the AC for review and comment deadline will be set. Maybe we should also go to our legislators. (Discussion about where the letters should go).

Short Break from 10:30 am

Resume meeting 10:45 am

Peter Bente: Explains Western Arctic Caribou Herd report, explains jaw examination. 490,000 reduced 350,000 bull cow ratios have declined; the herd is in a steady decline. There are 15,000 animals taken for subsistence and 1000 animals from people coming into hunt. Herd is clean not as many diseases. We are just aware of population are in a steady decline. There is a good portion of the herd is further North. Herd migrating later in the fall. The caribou herd working group is taking place at the beginning of December 4,5,6th.

Adem Boeckman: Is it a healthy decline?

Peter Bente: Healthy in the sense of there isn't a major contributor, no outlier. Rain on snow problem for caribou for an order of a few hundred of the animals not the whole herd. We know that caribou population cycle; it gives a chance of the range to re grow. A steady slow decline is better and easier to respond to.

Adem Boeckman: Inquires about healthy cycle

Stanley Tocktoo: There are lots of white things in the meat; inquires about cysts in caribou. The cysts are inside the whole meat, the whole carcass.

Peter Bente: explains how the tapeworm parasite effects the animal and it won't make humans sick. The pellets will be in the meat or the whole carcass. The parasite does not affect humans.

Peter Bente: explains about range health. There is a standing crop of lichen, though it is in decline which could affect herd survival in the winter. Fire through the lichen takes 50 years to grow and cause herd problems.

Roy Ashenfelter: Fishery Reports

Action on Proposal #115 Norton Sound-Port of Clarence Customary Trade, Motion to support,



Public comments: Nicole Braem: Subsistence division supports this proposal. It is not like there has been a spike in customary trade. Increasing to \$500 versus \$200.00 does not seem like an unreasonable increase since inflation and other cost have increased considerably since 2007. The division of subsistence and commercial fish don't feel this is an unreasonable amount. This proposal is about raising the limit on the cash sales, the people who want to do it have to get a permit from Jim Menard and to report what they sold to Jim Menard and you need a permit.

The proposal would add or increase opportunity to catch pink or chum when there is increased number of either pink or chum during that season. ADF&G Fish Biologist, Jim Menard: Explains customary trade permit for selling dry fish. There has been little participation in it. The people who advertise things like dried fish are contacted to remind them they need a permit. There has been little participation reported. I don't know how much is going on under the table. There were several citations issued by the troopers during salmon season for selling subsistence caught salmon without a permit.

Action on Proposal #115, All in favor, motion carries

Proposal #116 Create a new commercial fishery for pink or chum salmon to be opened by emergency order (EO) in Subdistrict 1 of Norton Sound. Move to support

Comments: The intent is to allow for commercial fishing of chum or pink when there is a known significant number of either salmon present in subdistrict 1. A review of even year escapement of pink salmon in Norton Sound which includes subdistrict 1 shows a potential for a limited commercial fishery for pinks.

Action on Proposal #116. All in favor, Motion Carries

Proposals #92 Allow large hooks for fish other than salmon, Move to support

Comments: Charlie Lean: People who oppose this are going to be worried about snagging. It has to do with overlap of seasons so if you are out there with a monster hook; people can claim they are fishing for whitefish.

Stanley Tocktoo: explains the use of large hooks in Shismaref a lot people are fishing for grayling after freeze up. We use large single hooks and a lot of fish are caught for fish to be eaten with seal oil. Does this include ling cod hook? They are single bone hook. Our ancestors did this for hundreds of years.

Action on proposal #92 All in favor, motion carries

Proposal #95 Prohibit putting fish parts in the water, motion to support

Comments: This proposal was originally thought to be Statewide, upon further review it specific to Kusko and Goodnews area. The AC decided to act on it after a brief discussion.

Action on Proposal #95 All in favor, Motion Carries



Proposal #102 allow for subsistence take of grayling in the Nome River by use of jigging with hook-and-line gear thru the ice. Move to support

ADF&G staff comments were that there is limited amount of large grayling even with current regulation to release all grayling caught. Therefore the department is not in support of this proposal.

Charlie Lean: I think the reason the grayling disappeared on the Nome River is because chum and pink fry eat a lot of grayling even if they are the same size as the salmon. I am going to oppose this proposal

Action on Proposal #102 All opposed, Motion Fails

Proposal #103 Place holder for possible regulatory changes based on results from Western Alaska Salmon Stock Identification Project (WASSIP) Motion to support

Comments: Salmon Stock Identification Project

Charlie Lean: WASSIP due to come out later so we are not able to comment on proposal 103

Action on Proposal 103, motion to table, all supported the motion

Proposal #117 Allow commercial fishing in Subdistrict 1-West of longitude of Cape Nome for all species of salmon. Motion to support

Comments: ADF&G Jim Menard: There is a on a stock of concern for chum in Nome subdistrict. West of Cape Nome is closed by regulation for all salmon. The proposal was written to create a commercial fishery for salmon west of Cape Nome. Pink salmon fish is not closed. We can fish pinks and silvers east of Cape Nome. The commercial chum salmon fishery, however, is closed by regulation throughout the Nome Subdistrict.

Howard: Over the years that Nome has not had a commercial fishery for salmon. The salmon are coming back; just letting them go up the river and die it doesn't make sense. There could be a pink fishery. There are not many people out netting.

Charlie Lean: I think I am opposed to this; it is not that I don't like Howard. Explains differences between East of Cape Nome versus West of it by differences in Escapement goals. There is also a tagging study that has occurred. There is a big mixing zone a Cape Nome. Those that go east of Cape Nome go east those that go west end up in Western Streams. I think that sub district should be divided into two management zones and the west of management zone should be closed.

ADF&G Fish Biologist Jim Menard: Explains where the chum and pink salmon power is in the sub district. Over the past twenty years, we have an estimate 70% of the chum salmon production is east of Cape Nome. In contrast, 80% of the pink salmon production west of Cape Nome. If the western half of the subdistrict is open, we can designate specific areas within the subdistrict where commercial fishing can occur based on existing regulations. Right now west of Cape Nome is closed by regulation so we could not open commercial fishing. Menard explains possibilities of using areas within existing regulations to manage the fishery. Commercial Fisheries division is going to support this proposal.



Adem makes an amendment to add beach seining in Subdistrict 1 under 5 AAC 04.330

All in favor of amendment , None Opposed , amendment passes

Action on Proposal #117 as amended, 10 support, 1 oppose, motion passes

Proposal #118: Allow a commercial set net gillnet fishery in Golovin Bay once 4,800 Coho salmon have escaped into Niukluk river. Motion to support

Comments: Jack Fagerstrom: what is the current escapement level for Coho's?

ADF&G staff Scott: 2400-7200 escapement goals has been made consecutively since it was established. We got knocked out this year early because of high water but were projecting to easily reach the goal as of August 16. Refers to the escapement goals. There were a record runs in 2008 and 2010. We counted 2,408 last year; we barely made it last year.

Jack Fagerstrom: I walked around Golovin and the consensus was that at that level of escapement goal there isn't going to be a commercial fishery in Golovin. We have limited jobs and limited fishing opportunity, I am against this proposal

Tom Gray: This proposal it came from our cooperation. If you look at the fish runs in the Niukluk, it should be written slightly differently. Commercial fishing should be opened once you hit the middle of the escapement goal. We don't believe that the fish are actually meeting the escapement goal. If you pay attention for the escapement goals they are being lowered continually. These stocks need a break. We need to do something different. Fish and Game need 2400 fish and got 2405 fish. There is no reason to managing the fishery so closely. Our intention is not to punish the commercial fisherman we are trying to manage the stocks so everyone can have fish. Again our intent is we want to help that resource and put some safeguards

Tom Gray: would like to make a amendment to have 4,800 as a projected number.

The amendment was made and seconded, that we hit a projected number 4800 for commercial fishing for Coho ; vote on the amendment; _Support: 7, Opposed: 2

Action Proposal #118 as amended, Support 3, 8 opposed, motion fails

PROPOSAL #119: Allow for a commercial Coho fishery when there would be no impact to the chum salmon escapement goals in subdistricts 2 & 3, motion to support

Comments: The AC members recognize the intent of this proposal which to allow commercial fishing for Coho in Subdistricts 2 & 3, while avoiding subdistrict 1, which is the area that has stocks of concern for chum.

Department of Fish and Game supports this proposal

Action on Proposal #119, all in Support, motion passed



Proposal #122 Allows subsistence fishing in Norton Sound subdistrict 1 unless restricted by EO

ADF&G Comments: Jim Menard: Proposal 122 Requests subsistence gill net fishing 7 days a week in subdistrict 1. Explains harvests in Subdistrict 1 in tables 1 and 2 (see attached documents). Comm Fish, would support up to 5 days a week in marine waters during chum season. Also during a Tier II season reduce to 3 days a week in the marine waters for both chum and silver salmon season. In freshwaters the weekly schedule is 2 fishing periods at 48 hours each. Proposer is asking for 7 days a week for all salmon. Comm. fish feels more comfortable going up incrementally. Comm. Fish prefers the 2-48s in the river, and a doesn't have a problem going up to 5 days a week for chum season in marine waters. Based on table 122 (3), we didn't think that the net use would be too excessive so going up a couple of days is ok but not to 7 days a week.

Adem Boeckman: I would like to make an amendment to 122 to mirror the silver opener to be 1 pm-6pm.

No second on the amendment, amendment fails.

Jim Menard: In the even numbered years the majority of salmon caught are pink salmon and those are being taken by hook and line in Subdistrict 1. Seining is not allowed in the Nome River

Subsistence fishing should be open when there are quality days to subsistence fish. The days that are best to hang fish are warm sunny days which generally happen in early July. Subsistence fishing methods and practices should be accommodated when creating opportunity to seine in the Nome River. The 2 days-48 hrs is currently used by ADF&G staff to manage fresh water fishing.

Action on Proposal 122, All in support, Motion Carries

Proposal 123: Allow subsistence fishing with beach seine nets in Subdistrict one. Move to support

Comments: ADF&G Jim Menard: In 2010 and 2011 We would support on the front end during chum season but have concerns during the silver salmon run. Commercial Fish is ok until coho salmon season starts until July 26th being a problem. Give it a shot in chum and pink season. Commercial Fish can give it shot if the weather cooperates. Explains graphs with the number of permits that beach seine, rod and reel harvests, pink salmon, broke it down by location of fishing by subsistence users, chum net caught fish were dominantly in the marine waters.

Charlie Lean: Seining is used in mass production or to specialize the catch. There is a very short portion of the Sinuk River that is open for subsistence. Seining has an advantage over gill nets. You have a better chance of release fish alive. I think seining gear has a place.

Action on Proposal #123 All Support, Motion Carries

Proposal 124: Change boundaries for subsistence fishing on the Sinuk River for retention of sockeye by beach seine in the Sinuk River up to Boulder Creek. Motion to support



Comments: Generally the preferred fish to catch at Sinuk River is sockeye or silvers depending on what time season you are fishing. The current open area just above the mouth of Sinuk River is discouraging because a lot of other salmon are caught when just trying to catch either sockeye or silvers.

ADF&G Jim Menard: Comm fish supports the proposal 124, explains graphs and maps with the black flag marking with the proposed boundary and the present and lower river boundary.

Proposal 124 moves the boundary marker further up river where there is a better separation of salmon species. The additional distance up the river will have fishers catching the salmon they prefer at the same time prevent handling of other salmon.

Action on Proposal #124, All Support, Motion Carries

PROPOSAL #125 Proposal by Dan Reed The proposal is to allow a dip net for fishing for salmon NOT chum salmon in the Pilgrim River. It may be an effective economic way to catch salmon or be good for targeting a specific salmon. Motion to support

Comments: Jim Menard: gives department comments and data on the Pilgrim River. Department supports this proposal.

Charlie Lean: the King salmon are really going down on the Pilgrim. Makes suggestion for having Kings put back.

Dan Reed: I talked with people around town about dip netting and people were wondering why I didn't put cast nets on there too? People have expressed interest in using cast nets too. Said that he could not change the proposal but the AC can.

Amend to add cast nets to the proposal, All in favor of the amendment, none opposed

Action on Proposal #125 as amended, all support, Motion Carries

Proposal 126: Allow for extension to the commercial fishery for Coho salmon in the Norton Sound Subdistricts by EO, the intent is for a season with a high number of Coho's which have met escapement in Subdistricts 2-6

Comments: ADF&G Scott Kent: Wes Jones submitted this proposal to extend the salmon season by emergency order. The Department supports this proposal, it would not affect the management of the late fall season. The Department has extended the season by emergency order in 2006, 2008, 2009, and for one period in 2012. No harm in allowing increase in period of time when bulk of run is in river or there is late season surge in abundance of Coho salmon.

We believe that it technically requires a commissioner's order to extend the season. The proposal if approved would add flexibility to local fish managers to make in season changes when warranted.

Action on Proposal #126, All in support, Motion carries



Proposal #127 Gill net specifications and operations, allow for an increase in amount of commercial gillnet gear in the Norton Sound pink salmon fishery by EO, pink salmon mesh size would stay the same this proposal is to extend the net by 150 to 200 fathoms. Motion to support

Comments: ADF&G Scott Kent: department supports the proposal. Market interest in pink salmon has increased.

Charlie Lean (NSEDC employee): We tried to buy pink salmon commercially this year however there would have been a boom in market if people could have caught more. This is a cleaner easier way to increase the value of commercial fishery. This is a more workable solution.

Scott Kent: It would help increase pink salmon harvests during the non-peak fishing times and help mitigate losses from forgone harvest opportunities (i.e., weather, chum salmon conservation concerns).

Action on Proposal #127, All in support, Motion carries

Proposal 128 Use of pink salmon for bait in the Norton Sound Port Clarence Area

Comments: ADF&G Scott Kent: Allows pink fish commercial fish for personal use as bait and gives department comments and data. Permit holders would require permission from the department to exceed the 2 ton salmon amount.

Department opposes this proposal as written because this fishery should be opened by emergency order rather than at any time. Department may authorize other uses of salmon.

The department opposes the proposal as written because there may not be surplus available for this fishery in years of low pink salmon abundance. In years of low abundance, all surpluses will be needed to provide for subsistence uses. Additionally we are not comfortable with allowing this fishery to occur at any time, irrespective of abundance. This fishery should be opened by E.O. Supportive of the idea of utilizing pink salmon surpluses for bait in years of high abundance.

Paul Kosto: Requests an amendment to reflect the change in the proposal keep the proposal the same but include a clause about by Emergency Order Only.

Amendment seconded, All support the amend, amendment passes

Action on proposal # 128 as amended, all in support, motion carries

Proposal #129: re-open a sport fishery for chum in the Nome subdistrict with a bag limit of three chums, motion to support

Comments: this proposal aligns with hook and line as legal subsistence gear. Adoption of this proposal would allow people to fish outside the subsistence zone using rod and reel. Refers to figure (see attached). The Department is neutral on the allocation effects, but would be in support if given an EO for the Nome sub district. The sport harvest would go into effect when escapement of chum can be met.



Charlie Lean: West of Cape Nome is in different shape *than East of Cape Nome*. *I could probably support the E.O. to do that. If commercial is closed and so should sport fishing be closed. Subsistence should take first priority. The Nome and Snake River chum salmon still have concerns with meeting escapement.*

Charlie Lean: wants to make an amendment, I don't like the idea of a blanket opener. It should be open the sport fishery when adequate subsistence harvest is allowed. That would include meeting the escapement goals. My concern if the El Dorado fishing is good, but it is not true for the Snake and Nome that the E.O should account for that. Amendment seconded

Action on the amendment, All support the amendment, amendment passes

Action on proposal #129 as amended, all in support, motion carries.

Roy Ashenfelter: should act on 179, 180, 181, maybe 216.

Roy Ashenfelter: These proposals have been submitted to allow some measure of control in the June fishery at Area M fishery to reduce the by catch of chum either through time tables or through an actual cap.

What the BOF has supported in the past was the chum cap, there was one year that there was a window of fishing in the area M fishery. It is necessary to have some direction on the fishery other than the fisherman themselves. It is important to comment on these to have an AC direction, so that when I go before the BOF I can comment on what the AC would like to support.

All of the proposals are a variation are the same idea. In 1978 Area M fisherman really developed the fishery from a sleepy little fishery to one of the most lucrative fisheries in the state. They will catch a portion of fish bound to western Alaska each week with no question of whether the chum run is strong or weak. The chum cap when it was in place was from 350,000 to 700,000 on chum, it depended on the attitude of the board and it used to change a lot. If we support proposal #179, it aligns us with Bristol Bay who has a similar issue with red salmon. The June fishery needs to be regulated based on salmon abundance and not just how many days there are in the month.

I would to offer to the AC we just deal with 179 and forgo 180 and 181.

Proposal 179 has a 400,000 chum cap and 8.3% for sockeye allocation to be applied to the area M fishery.

Action on Proposal 179; All in Support, Motion carries

Proposal #180 and 181 defer to 179, All in support of motion, motion carries to defer to proposal #179

Proposal #216 Require statewide adherence to salmon fishery management plans as follows: motion to support

Comments: Roy Ashenfelter: inquires about his proposal being statewide.



Jim Menard: It seemed like to set some escapement goals outside the management plan, and it was made by Kenai sportsman fishing and they grabbed a bunch of different areas.

Action on Proposal#126; All opposed to proposal 216, Motion Fails

Proposal 218: Establish a sustained escapement threshold (SET) for stocks listed as yield or management concern as follows: motion to support

Charlie Lean: there should be a bottom line for escapement; it would include some streams in Norton Sound. This should occur, the downside to this it could be used as an endangered species act thing. The Nome River failed to meet the SET river threshold, it might close fishing for everything in the Nome sub district. It is something that the Bering Sea fisherman's association wanted me to bring to the AC. It is a double edged sword. This will tie Jim's hands, it would completely closed everything down. If were that low it would be below the escapement goal.

Jim Menard: Sub district 1 was listed as stock of management concern and Golovin and Elim were listed as stocks of yield concerns. We have never been that low again in sub district 1 as when the management concern was declared by the board in 2000. We did not establish an SET. We are (Nome) still a yield concern in sub districts 1, 2. and 3.

Action on Proposal 218, None Support, Motion fails

Motion Ajourned: 3:14 pm.



Juneau Douglas Fish and Game
Advisory Committee Meeting
12.11.12
UAS Glacier Room

Present: Greg Brown, Mike Peterson, Mike Bethers, Tina Brown, Henry Webb, Ed Buyarski, Chris Conder, Richard Yamada, Thatcher Brouwer, Atlin Daughearty, Jason Kohlhase, Ryan Scott (ADFG), Stephanie Sell (ADFG), Public: Jeff Felpausch, Mark Stopha, Jenny Purcell, Barry Brokken, Friends of Admiralty

Meeting called to order 6:32

Old business:

- Approval of Minutes from the Nov 21th meeting: *Unanimous approval*
- Clarification of fish proposals regarding proposals 218, 227 and 243
- Note 243 in a new addition and will be discussed even if we do not have BOF representation.

Henry: My concern with classifying herring as a forage fish- I'm afraid that it will open the door- I am hesitant to approve this. Fish and Game said that we don't need this to manage the fishery- I'm not comfortable with opening this up when everyone knows that this is a forage fish.

Chris C.: I think that this is just a name change to organize things.

Greg: We will put on hold the discussion of 243,227, and 243 until the next meeting.

Greg

: Tina taking non-consumptive personal use seat - unanimously elected

- Hunting Guide seat applicant: Altin Daugherty- He has been a hunting guide for 9 years and lived in Southeast his entire life- valid guiding licenses- no criminal wildlife violations in the last five years.

Mike P.: What level of guide are you?

Atlin: I am a registered guide- I can run an outfit in 3 units of the state. I guide bear, sheep, moose and goats in Southeast, Kodiak, Western Peninsula.... Etc. I don't currently have my own outfit.

Greg: All in favor of electing Atlin. Unanimously approved.

- Attending the BOG meeting in Sitka on Jan 11-15 Mike Peterson
- BOF meeting in Anchorage on March 19-24

New Business:



Juneau Douglas Fish and Game
Advisory Committee Meeting
12.11.12
UAS Glacier Room

Discussion of BOG

Proposals

1. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer

Chris: What are they asking?

Henry: Right now you get two bucks on the mainland. This says that you can have two more does during the season.

Ryan: The department had split their recommendation. Do not adopt a doe season and no recommendation on buck limit. Looking at the harvest data, on the mainland it took a hunter 28 days of hunting. On Douglas it takes 9 days and 330-400 are harvested in a given year. The differences are pretty great comparing mainland to islands. The does are important. We don't do deer pellet surveys on the mainland. You only need a buck to doe ratio at a certain level to assure stable population. In Alaska we don't know. Down south it is 5:1. In a localized area you might be able to drive the reproductive success down if you target bucks. We recommend that no more than 4 bucks be allowed on the mainland.

Atlin: Predators are also a factor on the mainland.

Henry: It is harder to hunt on the mainland. I think that the best argument IS the miles of road and access by public. I can't see how this would be a good thing to increase pressure on bucks.

Ed: There seems to be a lot of deer on the mainland, but I don't think there is a population to support this. Maybe a bow season could be implemented in a different proposal.

Mike B: I think the highway take a toll on the deer too: car accidents. I have observed less deer and more coyotes out the road.

For: 0 Against: 12 Abstain: 0

Proposal Fails

2. Hunting season and bag limits for deer: open a youth only deer hunt

Ryan: This is an allocation issue. We have no recommendation on this. The Board is required to look into youth hunting options in the state. In general I think it is a good idea. The season is one month long currently, it is a one buck bag limit. There is not a big conservation concern in the Yakutat area. This year, people are having a hard time finding deer due to the snow levels last year. We would recommend that they change youth to 10-17 and that there is a required hunting education requirement. The caveat is that everyone in Yakutat is a federally qualified user, so we



Juneau Douglas Fish and Game
Advisory Committee Meeting
12.11.12
UAS Glacier Room

would have to work this into the federal subsistence framework. While the intent of the proposal is to get new comers out into the sport, we don't want this to be used the wrong way.

Greg: Do these youth have adults with them?

Ryan: Most do.

Jason: Are the accompanying adults in the youth programs allowed to carry guns?

Ryan: I don't know.

Ed: As a hunter education instructor, I agree with requiring the class. In that location having an adult with them is certainly important in the first few years. I don't know that there would be an increase in harvest, but I am in favor of increasing youth involvement.

Tina: I understand the allocation issue, but there would be hunters hunting for two extra weeks. Does that put stress on the populations?

Ryan: I think it will be a lot harder to hunt during this time. I don't see it impacting the wildlife in a negative sense.

Ed: That two week earlier period will have tastier bucks.

Ed: I would ask that hunter education be required for the youth ages 10-17 for this proposal.

Chris: Second

Amendment unanimously passes

Vote on amended proposal.

For: 12 Against: 0 Abstain: 0

Unanimously passes

3/4. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear: extend the brown bear season and increase the bag limit for Berners Bay

Mr. Brokken: This proposal has been put before the board at least twice, yet it addresses the same concerns. This is a bear proposal, however moose would be a benefactor if this would pass. Berners Bay is incredibly difficult to access. Pressure on bears in the Bay is limited. The Board has said that on 2 bears out of the 63 are taken.

Greg: Have you done any financial analysis?



Juneau Douglas Fish and Game
Advisory Committee Meeting
12.11.12
UAS Glacier Room

Mr. Brokken: I know that this area is not open to guided tours. I don't know about bear viewing for this area.

Atlin: The guiding issue is a forest service issue. I believe that having a guide to go in with your proposal is a good idea.

Jason: It seems like you are looking to increase the moose population.

Mr. Brokken: Yes.

Jason: I think that going from 1 bear every 4 years to 1 bear every year is a bit excessive.

Mr. Brokken: The department has said that they are pretty sustainable in terms of harvest. I would like to see the harvest rate increase to 15% or so.

Jason: Would you be amenable to a lottery in there?

Mr. Brokken: I think if you look into the history of the moose hunt in this area- those that were drawn still had to contact the same people to get access to the Bay.

Henry: What is the wolf situation and other predators?

Mr. Brokken: Black bears shouldn't be overlooked. But that should be a question for Ryan.

Richard: This hunt is an open hunt?

Mr. Brokken: Yes, 1 bear every 4 years.

Richard: So, even with that scenario there isn't a lot of motivation for hunters to get into that area. Do you think demand would increase if you made it annual?

Mr. Brokken: I don't think that demand would increase, because there are other areas that are easier to hunt. I hope that it will encourage other people to get out there.

Ed: Are there any licensed transporters?

Mr. Brokken: No.

Mike: This seems like a gamble. To those few people that have those jet boats they will be able to get into the Bay more. Even with this proposal you are still looking at these 3-4 people getting up in there to harvest these bears.

Ryan: Department recommends to have an amendment. To maintain the current season date and harvest one bear a year. This is the first place in the region that would differ from one bear every four years. We can do it. We have EO authority and we can manage for an additional harvest. Another shift is that we have to make a decision to manage with 60 bears or with 50 bears or



Juneau Douglas Fish and Game
Advisory Committee Meeting
12.11.12
UAS Glacier Room

with 40 bears. The number of bears, 63 (the average of two population estimates) is a large number but you have to remember this is a small area. Small changes can have a huge effect. I agree with Mr. Brokken that we could sustain a little more harvest. However, small changes in the population will have dramatic effects with 63-67 bears. Some of the things that I will be watching: the female portion of the harvest (60/40 split) , the age structure of the harvest and other indicators that will trigger EO order (3 year rolling average). If we start managing bears at a lower number we have to figure out what that is going to be like. There are a lot of challenges in Berners Bay; however, bears are available down low. Beginning in May, bears start utilizing the beach head. The June time period is more vulnerable for all bears, but especially females. Weather to the area- snow levels can obstruct access.

There are three large predators: brown bears, black bears and wolves taking advantage of the moose population. The moose population is on its way up. It took a nose dive in 2006-2007 with around a 50% decrease. It is a slow comeback. This year we had two surveys to look at moose. There are 85 individual moose. That is a median number for numbers prior to 2006-2007. The bull:cow ratio is very strong. We have surplus bulls available. The number of calves is low, but consistent with what we have seen. There are 30 collared moose in Berners Bay since 2006. The first 6-8 weeks are the most dangerous times for moose calves. These collars also help us deduce population estimates. We know that moose numbers have clicked over 100 animals. The moose herd is coming around. There could be a moose hunt in Berners Bay in the 2014 season.

Berners Bay has a small population of bears. We don't really know about bear/cub mortality and recruitment up there. Those are parameters that we are trying to figure out to model population structure up there. We aren't ready to hang our hats on those models yet. We put in here amend and adopt; however, should this move forward you will see a shorter reporting period (5 days) and will be watching very closely in season and will use EO authority. A discussion that we will have is to change how manage brown bears in Berners Bay. It is a paradigm shift. Instead of trying to manage for both species (brown bear and moose) essentially we are managing for moose.

Mike B: Say you want a target harvest of a certain number are you going to try to manage female to male ratios? A point system?

Ryan: Not a point system, but we are certainly watching the ration (60:40).

Greg: What is the opportunity for viewing up there?

Chris: I'll play devil's advocate. I'm sure these visitors would also love to see moose too.

Atlin: Hunting a bear on Pac Creek, I think that bears are going to be in that area all around. As an example, if you were to hunt bears on pack creek those bears (those were not killed) would



Juneau Douglas Fish and Game
Advisory Committee Meeting
12.11.12
UAS Glacier Room

be there in June and July." Obviously there is no hunting in Pack creek..... However, in Berners Bay bear viewing is certainly more difficult.

Tina: The opportunity for residents to hike into these areas is an option that we should look at. I also want to point out that the chance of seeing a brown bear gets people out there. Ryan, it seems like things are ok up in Berners Bay. I don't see why we need to mess with anything right now.

Ryan: Even if we make this decision to manage bears at a lower level maybe we should

Atlin: Would that mean we are staying at a 4% harvest?

Ryan: No. It would be higher. There is a one bear difference when we start looking at the percentage.

Henry: You talk about a paradigm shift- is there anything else like that in Southeast?

Ryan: Managing for deer and wolves. I don't want to come off that we are selecting moose over bears, I just wanted to emphasize that we are managing at a different level.

Richard: Are there any population density issues?

Ryan: There is not a density dependence issue. Also, what we know is that bears move and go to other places outside of Berners Bay. We don't know what the proportion of the diet of brown bears is moose in Berners Bay, but we are looking at it. It is going to be a social driven thing.

Henry: Is this more in line with what they are doing on the Kenai?

Ryan: I don't think it is. I think that we don't want to try to draw a comparison to a predator control program. Part of the research that we didn't do is looking at moose kill and moose calves.

Jason: I would tend to be a little bit more conservation- I think that 1 every 4 years and 1 every 1 year leaves room for a lot of miscalculation. I think we should baby-step our way into it. Maybe 1 every 2 years.

Ryan: I want to make sure that all the information is out there.

Jason: My personal observation about EOs is that they don't always work as intended.

Tina: I think EOs are a great tool; however, we shouldn't plan to use them.

Richard: Can these 3-4 guys that have access to this area bring others with them?



Juneau Douglas Fish and Game
Advisory Committee Meeting
12.11.12
UAS Glacier Room

Ryan: Of course they can. We are looking at the Bay as a whole system and it is accessible to anyone with a boat. Getting up into these sloughs is a 'bugger' – there is some refuge to this area.

For: 3 Against: 8 Abstain: 1

Proposal Fails

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

Barry Brokken (Public): This has been before the board twice before. This is not fisher habitat. There has been half a dozen taken in the last 15 years. A concern I have is that there are fisher that are being captured that are not being surrendered to the department. When a fisher is captured it is dead- there is no releasing it from the trap. There is nothing to be gained by the trapper having to release it to the department. I think the department should request the carcass surrendered - I assume compliance would be 100%.

Mike P: Essentially, you just don't want to give the pelt over to fish and game. If you keep it then, do you tan it out and skin it?

Barry: the monetary gain of selling a fisher is miniscule- it would be more a personal accomplishment. I think it would be highly unlikely that they would sell it.

Mike P: What has changed since the last time this was put forth? (Holding questions for Ryan until after)

Mark Stopha: The proposals don't always have to serve a purpose or you don't have to be against it- a proposal like this is nice to see.

Ryan Scott (ADFG): Proposal 7 – The department did recommend and adopt this proposal. However, the department doesn't know anything about this species. So, we allocated effort to learn more about these animals. We were not successful in trapping these animals. We made an attempt to learn about the distribution. It is a no win situation. We weren't able to learn enough about the situation. I'm tired of taking the fishers away from the trappers and think this is a proposal that has some validity. I agree with Mr. Brokken that those rumors of trappers keeping the fishers might be true.

Jason K.: You have no information on population now?

Ryan: No.

Henry: If this goes through will you have a better idea of population?

Ryan: Yes. We will be able to get a lot of information.



Juneau Douglas Fish and Game
Advisory Committee Meeting
12.11.12
UAS Glacier Room

Mike P: I would like to make a motion to accept the amendment to this proposal (bag limit of 1 fisher and required sealing) as the department has. We should vote on that. Seconded

For: 11 Against: 0 Abstain: 1

Motion Passes/Proposal passes

Proposal #8: Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in Berners Bay
Proposal#9: Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in Gustavus.

Mike P: I make a motion that we pass proposals #8 and #9 by consensuses.

Unanimously passes

18/19. Furbearer trapping and intensive management plans: prohibit snaring bears in the Southeast Region.

Jenny Purcell (Public): I am a former AC member and am happy to see so many former ACs making comments on proposals. I would like to commend the author of 18, Greg Brown, for putting this proposal forward. I believe that this proposal is very relevant to Southeast Alaska, because the Board re-classified bears from 'game' to 'furbearers' and that this proposal is pre-emptive and proactive regarding the issue of snaring bears in Southeast. I also think that it would discourage the use of bear snaring as a method for predator control. The five reasons: 1) bear snaring has public safety issues 2) bear snaring is inhumane 3) bear snaring entails indiscriminate catch (young sows with cubs) 4) bear snaring is economically bad for ecotourism and wildlife viewing 5) snaring will be problematic for law enforcement.

Atlin: There is no current snaring at the moment, correct?

Jenny Purcell: I know that bear snaring is used in Alaska for predator control programs, but I am not aware of anything in Southeast right now.

Tina: To address the comment made by Atlin: Bear snaring is prohibited on a statewide basis-nevertheless it is still used. Many people have put their support in prohibiting bear snaring.

Ryan: The department has the recommendation to take no action. There aren't any proposals to allow snaring in Southeast and there aren't any seasons to go along with that. I appreciate it being written, but there is nothing going on with it right now. Our recommendations are focused on a general trapping season and at this time there is nothing going on.



Juneau Douglas Fish and Game
Advisory Committee Meeting
12.11.12
UAS Glacier Room

Mike P: I agree with you, Ryan, that there are no proposals, but I also believe that if this proposal were to pass, then in order for bear snaring to occur in Southeast they would first have to address these proposals and get rid of them. I'm going to support these proposals so that they are on the books.

Henry: I really don't like the bear baiting and snaring, but I don't know if we should be sending a message north to other regions that have bear snaring practices. I think we should have a little more discussion on it before the question is called.

Greg: This is a huge tourist issue.

Tina: Last cycle there were quite a few proposals from southern Southeast to conserve opportunities for wildlife tourism.

Ryan: We created a non-resident drawing program for black bears.

Jason: I like the idea of supporting this to send a message.

Ed: I hunt black bear and eat black bear with a rifle; however, snares are non-selective.

Atlin: With bears you have to be very careful. There is a 50% mortality with cubs and it is easy to over-harvest bears. I believe if there is an issue with bears in a certain area, we should just increase the hunting pressure.

Richard: I'm not quite sure if this venue is the right place for voicing this issue.

Chris: We talked about felt boots before felt boots were an issue. It is good to voice these things before it becomes an issue.

Richard: Well, felt shoes were already being used. It isn't an action where there was an issue. I think you are trying to get at fish and game using this in an experimental or control program. This proposal isn't trying to stop something that is in place. You classify bears as furbearing, is it legal for someone to go out and snare a bear?

Ryan: There is no trapping season for bears right now.

Mike B: I can't see the board taking too much time with this.

Mike P: Ryan, for snaring bears would a non-resident have to have a guide to do that?

Ryan: It is pretty convoluted when you talk about trapping and non-residents. Non-residents would have to have a fairly expensive license to snare bears if that passed.

For: 10 Against: 0 Abstain: 2



Juneau Douglas Fish and Game
Advisory Committee Meeting
12.11.12
UAS Glacier Room
Proposal Passes

20. Furbearer trapping- hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf-intensive management plans- prohibit the taking of wolves March through November in Southeast

Jenny Purcell (public): I support this proposal. Female wolves are apt to be pregnant and subsequent to March are pupping and teaching time periods- this process takes place during the summer months and early fall. Pelts at this time are not prime and have little economic value. Taking wolves in this time is not ecologically or economically sound management.

Ryan: We recommend to not adopt this proposal. A similar proposal has been through the AC every time. We don't have great data on wolves in this area. Harvest in Southeast is generally pretty low. You do run the risk of taking a pregnant female or with pups in a den. The current season dates at this point don't appear to have a significant effect on population as a whole.

Ed: There is a high reproductive rate. The opportunity for residents and non-residents to take a wolf is a good thing. I will oppose this.

Jason: Can you distinguish between a male and female?

Atlin: If you observe an animal long enough you can establish that.

Jason: I was just thinking you could cap the female harvest at a certain date if you are concerned about taking a female. But that would be a challenge.

Chris: From a moral stand point, I cannot see taking a pregnant female or a female with young.

For: 4 Against: 7 Abstain: 1

Proposal Fails

21. Align the trapping season dates in the SE region.

Mr. Brokken: *Passes out an abbreviated version of 3 different states and their opening/closing dates of trapping seasons.* Trapping involves a lot of effort. International markets have receiving dates for auction by early January. The best prices are paid in the first auction. In Southeast since we have later starting dates for trapping, we only have a 4 week trapping season to receive the most value for our items and we are competing with states that have longer trapping seasons. There is concern with catching different species when the trapping season isn't open due to the different season openers and these hides have to be surrendered and are not able to have any value. Other places in Alaska open up seasons in early November.

Tina: You said this would cut the wolf season by 10 days. Any other seasons?



Juneau Douglas Fish and Game
Advisory Committee Meeting
12.11.12

UAS Glacier Room

Barry: It would leave wolverine and beaver the same and extend the other fur bearers by two and half weeks. Beaver toward the end of the season still have value.

Jason K: Why would the wolf hunters be upset with this?

Mr. Brokken: It is not a big deal in terms of condition of the pelt. The weather is the issue here.

Greg Brown: What about closing dates?

Mr. Brokken: Typically, weather is a problem in February and it basically constrains the season already.

Mark Stopha: I agree with Barry in terms of lining up these dates.

Ryan: The department has no recommendation on this proposal. This has been brought up before. The concept is good. However, there are some conservation concerns for certain species. We want input from our local trappers, so we put together a survey. We are looking for that input and we are looking for the reasons. These season dates are based on a time that people agreed to go out and trap and they have been in place for a while. Barring specific conservation issues, we might be able to adjust some of this and we agree that enforcement would appreciate an alignment.

Greg: How many trappers in the Juneau area?

Ryan: About 11-15.

Richard: Was the concept trying to control harvest is that why these dates are set separately?

Ryan: Yes. We are only talking about 20 days, but there is still a possibility to hammer a spot.

Richard: Is there any level of removal for a species to be sustainable? A threshold?

Ryan: Sustainable on a population level, yes. But at a local level, no. There are places in Southeast Alaska (Kuiu) that are closed to certain species.

Richard: There obviously is not a lot of concern with conservation by the department.

Ryan: If we don't recognize a specific conservation concern with the issue, we went with no recommendation.

Mike: Reaching out to the trappers-SE or Alaska and when did it start?

Ryan: We started asking trappers this Monday morning. This is a Southeast effort.

Jason: Are there any other species besides Martin that have conservation concerns.



Juneau Douglas Fish and Game
Advisory Committee Meeting
12.11.12
UAS Glacier Room

Ryan: It is the primary one. It is one that we have focused research on. We have specific conservation concerns for species in certain areas. Example: otters.

Jason: Have you guys looked at sunseting this issue- giving it 3 years and look back at it again.

Ryan: Yes. This issue has been looked at by different regions in Alaska.

Thatcher: Does the trapper have the ability to go into a local area and close it during season?

Ryan: Yes, we have the ability to EO these areas.

Mike: Once a trapper has a marten, how long do they have to turn in the information?

Ryan: Within 30 days.

Mike: Because of the idea of waiting for information from trappers in southeast, I like the idea of tabling the proposal until the next cycle.

Tina: I would like to have the data before having to make a decision.

Ryan: I appreciate your approach to this. The Board is going to take this up. They may decide to hold off or not. Part of the reason in getting some information late in the game- we wanted to put these proposals right into the hands of the Board. We can tweak things as we go. The Board will certainly have some work ahead of them.

Chris: I think a sunset clause is the way to go. Don't put a date on this now, but just have a review process at some point.

Mike Bethers: It seems to me that with EO authority it makes more sense to get this thing passed with sunset or not. I think that staff will be working on it anyway.

Richard: I think that having a sunset this late in the game will detract from aligning the seasons. I think that the concept of the benefit to enforcement and trappers to conduct their business is on track.

Chris: I motion to amend the proposal to add on an open-ended sunset clause. Seconded.

For: 9 Against: 3 Abstain: 0

Proposal vote with amendment:

For: 11 Against: 1 Abstain: 0

22. Lengthen coyote trapping seasons in Units 1-5



Juneau Douglas Fish and Game
Advisory Committee Meeting
12.11.12
UAS Glacier Room

Ryan: We recommend to adopt this proposal. We don't have the data on coyote number, but anecdotally we see populations going up. We are seeing more coyotes caught in wolf traps. We are also going to put in a sealing requirement for both trapping and hunting. This is different than any other place in Alaska. We want to have this mimic the wolf season.

Chris: Because of what we just talked about this will have to go from November 10th per previous proposal.

Ryan: Observations have seen that this phenomenon is really only occurring in the Juneau area.

Mike P: I would like to make a motion that we amend this proposal to incorporate proposal 21 (November 10th start date).

Unanimously passes

Jason: Why no bag limit?

Ryan: We typically don't have bag limit on furbearers.

For: 10 Against: 2 Abstain: 0

32. Hunting season and bag limits for brown bear. Alternate spring and fall bear seasons for nonresidents in Unit 4.

Joel Bennett and KJ Metcalf (Friends of Admiralty): The committee that met to discuss the management of brown bears for unit 4 made lots of observations and constructed the guidelines. The key component that was laid out was the mortality guideline and the hunting pressure of residents and non-residents. This committee made a recommendation that the guide level be reduced by about 1/3 since 2000. Also, since there are no limitation in terms of where guides can go in geography the committee wanted to pay more attention to that. How many of these guidelines have been followed? Where should we go from now on in terms of management? When you look at proposal 32, that would be a major change for alternative spring/fall hunt and it would be serious departure from the guidelines. We don't believe that with the knowledge we have that it would produce an equitable situation for hunters. We think that hunters would target the year of the spring hunt and overload that year. We want to have a predictable harvest level with a brown bear drawing permit. We want the board to direct the department to look at a drawing permit for unit 4 and come back in 2015 with an analysis or a system that would have pros/cons and would be the core of what we could talk about in terms of being able to create something that is predictable and have areas that are not overhunted. The maximum harvest for females have been met and exceeded on 4 different occasions. We want you to support the board delegating and directing the department to analyze this system.



Juneau Douglas Fish and Game
Advisory Committee Meeting
12.11.12
UAS Glacier Room

What we are really dealing with is the biological red flags as well as economical. The forest service and the state of Alaska are involved with permitting the guides and I think this proposal would unite those two entities. The forest service made a huge mistake by allowing corporation guides. I lived in Angoon and was the first ranger on Admiralty after it became a monument. I have seen military guys come down from up North and practice non-quality and unethical hunts. and the State treats them as Residents.

A guided hunt is a better way to do it. We think that this is an opportunity to bring folks to the table and iron out problems. This is comment that our comments be followed rather than proposal 32.

Greg: Are you for or against 32?

Friends of Admiralty: We are against.

Atlin: I believe that the permit draws are in the brown bear management plan. For a three year average the guides will go to a draw.

Joel: I think that is just a recommendation.

Ryan: Proposals 32-35 the department has no recommendations on all of them and get the focus back on the Unit 4 management plan. The potential for implementing a draw permit, guide attrition and other recommendation will all come back to brown bear management actions that will come about at a later date. *Ryan gives a brief overview of the A and R for brown bear management in Unit 4.*

Henry: Are you saying that you can solve these problems with what you have?

Ryan: I don't want to go that far, but the management strategy has the tools.

Richard: Move to take no action on proposals 32-35

For: 11 Against: 0 Abstain: 1

Greg: I will try to get a letter to support what Ryan and Friends of Admiralty are talking about.

Ryan: The letter is looking at directing the department to look at how a drawing permit would work in Unit 4.

Motion to address a letter from the JDAC

For: 11 Against: 1 Abstain: 0

Next meeting: Greg will have a letter drafted to the board in regards to the Friends of Admiralty recommendation.



Juneau Douglas Fish and Game
Advisory Committee Meeting
12.11.12
UAS Glacier Room

Meeting adjourned: 9:57pm



December 20, 2012
Juneau, Douglas Fish and Game Advisory Committee

Alaska Board of Game Meeting, Sitka January 11-15, 2012

The Juneau, Douglas Fish and Game Advisory Committee (JDAC) supports by a vote of 11 for and 1 against the idea of the Department of Fish and game investigating options within the Brown Bear Management Strategy (BBMS) to address the issues that were outlined by the Friends of Admiralty with regard to Proposal 32 at the JDAC meeting on December 11, 2012.



Icy Strait Advisory Committee Meeting

Minutes 12/7/2012 Prepared by: Shawn McConnell(Chair)

Members in attendance:

Bill Miller, Shawn McConnell, Keith Skaflestad, Bob Barton, Dean Waguespack, Sean Neilson, Craig Murcoch, Donald Bolton.

Meeting Called to order at 5:45pm after Gustavus contingent logged in on the conference line.

Initial discussion of the agenda(see attached) resulted in agreement to look at Gustavus contingent issues and proposals first in case any of them had to leave and then discuss representation at the upcoming Board of Game meeting in Sitka as well as the division of the Icy Strait Advisory Committee into a north and south branch as requested by the Gustavus contingent.

Discussion of proposal #20 to shorten the wolf season in units 1-5 resulted in a consensus that we support the Do Not Adopt policy. Gustavus shared concerns from community discussion about snaring incidental moose but break away snare requirements addressed this issue.

Proposal #22 to extend coyote season resulted in a consensus to support adoption as either way there were going to be fewer coyote but the trappers could at least reap some monetary benefit for the effort.

Proposal #29 The committee agreed to continue our support for this proposal as it came from our committee even though the Department recommended a Do Not Adopt position.

Proposal #31- Impose a penalty for shooting a nanny in the goat seasons, we agreed to suggest a Do Not Adopt position on this proposal as the current management plan seems well equipped to account for the taking of nanny goats.

For proposals #34 through 36, regarding changing the lengths, and start/end dates of bear season and penalizing guides for taking under 20" skull size sows, we agreed to send forth a Do Not Adopt position on these proposals and let the Department's Management plan remain the deciding factor in managing our brown bear population.

For proposals relating to fur bearer season changes we will not rescind our proposal to move the start date for marten etc. season to November 1st but discussions resulted in a consensus that the current season structure had served the industry well for the recent past and should continue to do so going forward. The issue of loss of animals to bear, having happened several times locally this season even after the 1st of December, would only seem to be much more of an issue if seasons were moved to starting earlier in November when bears are still very active and hungry.

On the topic of our representative to the Sitka Board of Game meeting, Keith Skaflestad was the only member expressing an interest in representing our committee at the meeting so it was unanimously



agreed that he be sent as our representative. The arrangements will have to be made by Mr. Skaflestad in the coming week.

The Gustavus members of the committee have inquired recently about the possibility of dividing our committee into separate entities that would allow them a separate voice in issues more pertinent to their region and alleviate some of the difficulty in collecting such a large group of people from both sides of Icy Strait for a conference call style meeting structure. They suggested that if the committee were to continue in its current structure the participation from their community would likely wane and we would then have a difficult time establishing a quorum to conduct committee business. A motion was put forth to suggest to the joint board of game by Keith Skaflestad to divide the committee into two groups as Gustavus requested. Motion was seconded by Hank Lentfer in Gustavus. Discussion of the motion resulted in positions from Bill Miller, Bob Barton and Don Bolten that the strength of these committees came from the number of people participating and that division would only serve to weaken any influence we might have on the process. The Gustavus group commented that in cases of joint interest the separate committees could band together to present a united front of support for important issues. The vote was called and resulted in a 4-4 tie on the motion. It was decided that the motion be tabled and that we investigate the legal possible changes to the way the committee might be structured before proceeding with any further efforts.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00pm no schedule for another meeting was discussed.



SFGAC Minutes
November 29, 2012

Committee

Tad Fujioka-trapping-chair
Floyd Tomkins-conservation- vice chair
Jerry Barber-hand troll
Kim Elliot-subsistence
Randy Gluth-hunting
John Baird-processor
John Murray-power troll
Karen Johnson- at large
Mo Johnson-seine
Tory O'Connell -alternate-secretary
Aaron Bean-guide
Eric Jordan-alternate

Agencies

Phil Mooney ADFG
Carole Goularte USFS
Jeff Feldpauch, STA
Jessica Grill, STA

Public

Rep. Jonathon Kreiss-Tomkins
Kameron Perensovich

Begin 18:35, quorum

9: GST Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose regulation in Gustavus

Moved & seconded

Phil M gave an overview of the proposal. Food is a bit limited.

TF – Bear population has also increased there. Concerned that 100 permit could potentially be issued. Can't think of a scenario when that would be a good idea unless managers have been very inattentive. One hundred permits was only needed the very first year because of a several year delay in getting the antlerless hunt approved in the first place.

Phil: It would be a lot of trouble to adjust the maximum allowable number at this point.

6-0-3

Motion passes

17: Close hen grouse season in the spring after March 1.

KE – MTA

JB – 2nd

PM – no recommendation from the Dept – there are 3 species. Sooty grouse are well distributed. Rough grouse limited to transboundary issues. Spruce grouse is limited in distribution. Sooty grouse are usually hunted in the spring. The author intended this to be



limited to sooty grouse. In 2006 survey was conducted on numbers and sexes – 90 samples taken from Juneau road system. 76 males, 12 females, 2 unknown.

TF – I have hunted grouse in Juneau – you occasionally see a hen in the spring, but less than 10% of the time. Hens are a larger percentage of the harvest in the fall. Not sure if proposer intended the closure to remain in effect for the fall season. Regardless, I don't think this is necessary. Even in heavily hunted areas there seem to be plenty of birds. In low density areas few if any are hunted anyway.

JB – I have hunted on Kuiu – Contrary to Phil's commentary, I don't think that even the hooting males are easy to find.

PM – cold springs has been hard on grouse locally.

JM – we should take no action because its not our area, but I guess I can defer to the locals who have credit. I don't think we should look at out of area proposals.

KE – I haven't seen any grouse in a long time around here. I think this applies to here as well. I support this.

JB – I agree with Tad, I don't think this is necessary – human predation is so much smaller than spring kill or squirrels and marten.

Motion fails 1-8-2

Proposal 21 – align trapping seasons in SE reason.

TF – MTA

JB – 2nd

TF – opposed to this broad proposal – there are valid reasons for different animals having different season lengths. While this would lengthen the season for most furbearers, this would greatly reduce squirrel season. There may not be effort put into them for fur but they are trapped as nuisances. They make pests of themselves all year round, we ought to retain a year round squirrel season to be able to deal with them in a legal, straightforward and timely manner.

JB – I agree with TF

PM – up until 1988 there had been a number of proposals for different dates – Loyal Johnson got together with other game managers and they hammered out the December 1 general opening. The only two that open “early” are beaver, wolverine, and wolf. In unit 4 not much of an issue because we don't have wolves or wolverine here and the beaver population low except on Admiralty.

JB?

Motion fails 0-11-0

Proposal 23 – Open resident hunting season 7 to 10 days before nonresident seasons.

KE – MTA, JB -2nd

PM – proposals 23-25 have same rationale – allocation between residents and nonresidents. Personal use has precedence for residences over nonresidents. Most of the animals have draw hunts or season limits if there are conflicts.

RG-goat seasons are down, Why are guides are allowed to book goat hunts when there aren't enough to go around?

TO – I think it is fairly typical to have an early resident season in other states. I'm not sure the BOG will protect the resident access –they are about the guided hunts because of money.



PM- the guides in Sitka are very good about being careful. I think that the effort to discourage the taking of nannies is working but there is a proposal to make that even more of a discouragement.

TF – I will oppose this one as the inclusion of all hunts, all species, big game, small game and waterfowl is too broad, but will support proposal 26 which is focused on the hunts for which there is the most competition.

JM – is there an allocation issue here at all in the 7 to 10 days?

PM – no I don't see that. In Chichagof the feds wanted us to delay the deer hunt for a bit to allow subsistence harvest. This is similar to, but slightly different than the Prince of Wales Island deer season that opens in late July for Federal subsistence users.

JB – some of our season open so early that we aren't even thinking about hunting, so we don't participate in the opener.

JB ?

Motion fails 0-11-0

No action 24 based on 23

Proposal 25 – Open resident hunting 10 days before non resident and allocate 90% harvest to residents and increase fees.

RG – MTA

JB – 2nd

TF – this is very broad and is much more restrictive than 23

PM – This is very draconian towards nonresident big game hunts. Black bear hunts are restricted to draw permits. The Board of Game can not increase fees.

RG – removing guide requirements is very dangerous, I will oppose

TO ? JB 2nd

Motion fails 0-12-0

Proposal 26 Allocate 90% drawing permits to residents and eliminate nonresident participation in hunts with 10 or less permits for SE

TF – MTA JB 2nd

PM – 10 Black bear, 4 mt goat hunts, 3 elk hunts are managed using draw permits

The black bear hunts are exclusively for non-residents, as the same opportunity is open as a general hunt for residents.

JM – why do they have draw permits? For revenue?

TF – whereas drawing hunts are limited to the handful of hunts where the demand to go hunting most exceeds the resource, I think it is appropriate to reserve 90% for residents in these cases. Since whoever wrote the Dept comments seems to be hung up on the exclusively non-resident black bear hunts which I'm sure were outside of the proposer's intended scope, I'll offer an amendment to the motion to exclude hunts for which a resident is not required to draw a permit. I am in favor of this general principle of managing for resident needs first and in favor of this focused proposal.

Amendment accepted as friendly– to exclude draws that are exclusively for non-residents.

EJ ?

Motion as Amended passes 11-0-1



No action on 27, 28

Proposal 30 – Establish a 3-day doe season for NE chichagof

KE – MTA JB – 2nd

PM – conservation component – if the doe season is closed it would be for conservation reasons – so no hunting should be allowed regardless of area of residents. Outside of the allocation issue this is a different management scenario and we don't support it.

We had a traffic cam and doe counts this year – yearlings and fawns that stood on the road were killed. We don't want to see adult does being taken so we want to close the season before the rut.

JB?

Motion fails 0-12-0

Proposal 37 - extend otter trapping season – November 10 – April 30

JB – MTA

TO – 2nd

TF – I spoke with the proposer Uriah for about an hour. He is one of a handful of very serious trappers in SE. He lives in Tenekee.

In evaluating this proposal, I had two questions which I asked PM about. Firstly, what the condition of the fur would be in an extended season – and the other is what the population concerns would be for extra harvest. I'm not sure I'm in favor of such a long season but we could extend the season a bit. It is hard for an individual trapper to come to any conclusions about fur quality outside of the established seasons since we hopefully we don't catch enough out-of-season bycatch to have a large enough sample size. I was hoping that the dept staff might have a better idea about this. I found an old furbearer survey report with a section written by the Ketchikan management biologist Doug Larsen, and he indicated that he thought that otter fur would likely be ok through the end of February, but not for much beyond then.

I also was hoping that the dept might have some historic data on harvest and effort in the region. Many decades ago, fur was a much more important component of the local economy and there were a lot more trappers. If the fur bearer populations were able to sustain a high harvest back then, they can probably do so now too.

PM – spoke about both marten and otter. passed out the latest furbearer management report. Don't disagree that trapping effort is lower than a few decades ago but the trappers we have are more efficient. Second growth thinning is degrading habitat for these animals and providing more access to hunters. Marten young in the spring prefer blueberries. So thinning effects this too. They depend on vole prey base in the winter which is diminished by thinning. We seal marten here in SE because they are island populations and they are more sensitive to overharvest.

Otters – this proposal would extend the season by 13 weeks. There are 3 experts that I consulted on otters. Extending the season brings it into the mating season – they have delayed implantation so pups can be born from Jan to June – the first 6 weeks are most important for survival – if you kill the adult female during that period the pups don't survive. They can live to be 20 years old. They are more vulnerable to capture during the mating season.



KE – I haven't seen very many otter in the past 2 years

EJ – this is fascinating. The question I have is a bycatch issue – The proposer is catching otters while he's trapping beavers. What can we do about that?

PM – we don't have a big beaver population here although its getting larger– we have declining interest in beaver. I think this will result in less otter bycatch

TF – the paper that PM passed around showed a run up in otter harvest, followed by a sharp decline. While PM suggested that this was because the higher harvest was unsustainable, I think that price may be the explanation for rising and falling catch – the price before the peak year was \$200/each. Immediately after that, the price crashed. I know that I was stuck with otters that the auction house wouldn't sell at the low prices. The last thing that they wanted me to do was to send them some more.

FT – is the otter population a steady state or is it cyclical?

PM – we don't know – we look at population through sealing, not through any kind of field research. Otters have a different diet – they are omnivores.

JM – what about the condition of the fur.

PM – I haven't spoken to that yet. We don't have a lot of information on that. I don't have any records that fur have been sent back for lack of primeness but they are lotted. Marten have a subspecies on Admiralty, the Baranof martens are the same as Chichagof. They are indigenous to Admiralty.

JB?

0-11-1

Motion fails

Proposal 38 Lengthen trapping season for marten and mink in Unit 4

JB – MTA, JB 2nd

TF – Based on the lack of support for the previous proposal, I would like to **amend this proposal so that it is limited only to mink, and that the proposed mink season be December 1 – March 1.** I think the mink population is underutilized. Marten are more controversial. I choose March 1 based on the Doug Larsen's comment that he thought that otter pelts would remain prime though the end of February. March 1 is a better closure date than February 28, because you don't get confused every leap year. They have seasons that end at the end of February up north and it causes a bunch of questions every four years.

Amendment accepted as friendly.

JB – I don't see how increasing the season 2 weeks does any good.

TO – what about bycatch – do you catch things that need protecting.

TF – weasel or squirrels are the only thing that would be much of a worry The weasel season would extend along with the mink season by regulation. Squirrel is open anyway– you can avoid marten by using fish for bait and by staying on the beach since marten tend to go higher in elevation after the first couple of weeks of season.

JB? As amended

4-6-2

Motion fails

Done with SE Game proposals

Statewide FinFish Proposals to follow:



Proposal 227 – Department proposal establishing sport proxy fishing to be limited by EO.

JB – this one is a good idea because they should be able to restrict proxy limits.

EJ – they can just reduce the limit for all users.

FT – this way they can shut off the proxy fishing before limiting other fisheries.

EJ – I proxy fish for other elders – I can see where it can be a confusion issue.

KE – I know too many elders that need these fish.

TF – I have heard that in some situations the proxy process may be being abused. Juneau area king crab has a one crab limit. Proxy fishing permits a harvest big enough to be worthwhile. The catch may not be given to beneficiary as it is supposed to be. Hopefully these are isolated specific cases and this sort of tool will only be used where there is a specific issue.

RG – you can pile proxies on top of others – no restrictions?

EJ – I don't know if you can get multiple proxies

AB – I use a proxy for my folks – I can only fish one proxy for any sport fish.

KE – Motion to Table

JB 2nd

12-0-0

Motion passes

Proposal 228 – Limit high grading – any fish that isn't immediately released becomes part of the bag limit.

JM – MTA

AB 2nd

TO – I will support this

EJ -?

12 – 0- 0

Motion passes

Proposal 229 – Transfer of harvest record for annual bag limits

EJ – MTA

TF – 2nd

EJ – I hear that this is happening now with out of state residents that leave town and then come back and fish another limit.

RG – there are a lot of operations that cater to just this type of monkey business.

There is a lot of abuse.

JB ?

12-0-0

Motion passes.

No action 230

Proposal 231- Define compensation in regard to guided sport

KE – MTA

JB 2nd



FT – this proposal defines compensation as wages, dues, fees, employment benefits, does not include reimbursement for fuel, food and bait. Loop hole filler.

RG – this is too hard to regulate.

JB – the dept likely talked to their attorneys.

TO – I would support this because we have to start somewhere.

AB – I can see wanting to allow the pay back for gas, but I see that as a loophole open for abuse.

TO – I disagree with you.

EJ – I agree with you and Randy and I do this – I take out friends that are sport fishing on my boat. I refuse to let them pay me for anything but there is in kind compensation.

I think the exception for food, fuel, bait is a tough one.

JB – in the spirit of the law we are all trying to do the same thing – I would support this in moving in the right direction

EB – the Dept of Law comments on all of this – I think John is right.

RG – this seems like a Hail Mary attempt by the Dept to get a handle on nonresident sport fishing but it could turn around and bite us. Enforcement does not look at things other than black and white. I realize this is a huge problem but I don't want to give Enforcement carte blanche to use regs against anybody.

JB – I don't disagree but I do think it's a step in the right direction. Definitions are good.

TF – I concur with JB

JM ?

9-2-1

Motion passes

Proposal 232 – use of sport caught fish parts for bait.

TF MTA

KE 2nd

TF – this is of interest to me because there is a commercial fishery prohibition on using blackcod, lingcod and certain rockfish for bait in SE, and that regulation has identical language on the exempted parts of the fish. I agree with this proposal and I would like to offer a motion to request that the BOF also change the analogous SE commercial regulation in the same manner as this proposal seeks to change this sport fishing regulation.

KE – Use of sport caught fish as bait? For anything? For any kind of fishing.

JB?

10-0-2

Motion passes

TF – Move that the Sitka AC request that the BOF incorporate the language of proposal 232 into commercial fishing regulation 5 AAC 28.190 (1) prohibiting the use of sablefish, lingcod, and certain rockfish as bait.

EJ – 2nd

EJ – why do you feel like you need to specify the species.

TF – This is an existing regulation. The prohibited species are already listed in that regulation

KE?



12-0-0

Motion passes

243 – Modify the Forage Fish Management Plan to add Pacific herring

TO – I don't think we should take this up without advertising it specifically.

KE MTA

AB – 2nd

EJ – I move to table

JB 2nd

AB – I would like to mention that this is a Board generated proposal. They are adding it to the agenda.

EJ – we need to let the Department know.

JM – can we invite the staff to the next meeting

TO – the public needs to be noticed specifically about herring proposals.

8-4-0

Motion passes

Next meeting – December 13, 2012 – Election meeting. Proposal 243 will be on the agenda.

TF – will step down as chair but keep trapping seat

TO – stepping down.



Sitka Fish & Game Advisory Committee

Tad Fujioka, Chairman
214 Shotgun Alley, Sitka, AK 99835

Minutes of meeting :October 25, 2012

Attendance

Gluth	Randy	Hunting
Barber	Jerry	Hand Troll
Fujioka	Tad	Trapping
Johnson	Moe	Seine
Baird	John	Processor
Murray	John	Power Troll
Elliot	Kim	Subsistence
Jordan	Eric	Alternate
Oconnell	Victoria	Alternate

Quorum Established

ADFG

Phil Mooney

Public

Dale Adams -Guide

Brad Dennison- Guide

Carol Goularte USFS District Ranger

RG MTA Proposal 32 to alternate years for spring and fall brown bear hunts

JB 2nd

PM- The draft dept comments for most of these bear proposals will say "do not adopt". Our (ADF&G) approach is to ask the Board look at the Brown Bear Management Strategy before looking at smaller issues within management. There has been a brown bear strategy committee that has worked on the overarching strategy.

The previous fall, when the 3 year average was exceeded, the fall season was closed. This got hunter's attention- once they realized that we would follow through with this threat. The original Plan has been to treat Unit 4 as a single population, instead of by Island – in doing so we were getting harvest out of proportion on some of the islands, so we looked at 20 year average by Island and by sex. A lot of females were taken so we shut Baranof, then Admiralty, then Chichagof last fall. Up until now, the BBMS has not been fully implemented as intended for a variety of reasons. We think that the plan as the potential to work if implemented as designed.

We have not seen many bears in town this summer. Kind of surprising actually since it hasn't been a very good summer for them food-wise. Some of the DLP-killed



bears that we have had to shoot included sows that had run out of milk and very small-for-their-age cubs. Not enough fish for the bears and not many berries. The 4% harvest rate allowed by the BBMS is very conservative – It was a political compromise, not a strictly biological figure. At the time we had very little data- Admiralty VHF radio collars, but nothing on Baranof – we can use more data and we could use more time. If the plan was actually implemented then we might be ok (with regard to harvest). Right now there are problems in all sectors- guides, hunters, government that have prevented the plan from being implemented as designed.

Chichagof out produces Admiralty now. We've seen an increase in the numbers of marine mammals out on the ocean, and enough of them have washed ashore on beaches of Chichagof to increase that area's bear productivity.

Nowadays guides know their areas better and are much more efficient than in the past so their success rates are higher (~70% instead of 50% when BBMS was developed). This is just one of the reasons for increased harvest, but guides and their clients harvest the biggest share of the pie, so this is one of the biggest reasons for the increased harvest levels. Other categories have gone up too.

RG – Couple of points. First, we are still operating under really old population estimates – why can't we make an effort to improve population estimates? Secondly, there are a lot more DOLP kills now. I think that is because there are more bears around Sitka than in the past. Could the high sow mortality that you saw in some of your studies be because there are so many sows? We know that they will fight with one another if their territory is infringed upon.

PM- I don't disagree with the ideas that bear populations might be higher now than when we last did a population estimate.

Last Saturday a boar was killed in a DOLP situation and it was carrying another big bear in its mouth.

There is good bear habitat on the northern 2/3 of Baranof- better than the southern third. On the northern end of the island, our research of 18 collared bear found that they had dens above 3000' on north facing slopes– some of the dens were lined with twigs. With the dens up that high, those bears had to walk a long ways to gets sticks to line the dens with. Since it gets cold and stays cold where those dens were, these bears went into their dens early and came out late. Whereas the bears that we collared on South Baranof, they denned later and came out earlier (Dec 5th – Mar 3). They denned on low lands, grassy areas.

We need to do research on south Admiralty. Our last data was 1999-2003 on North Chichagof. That data is in the brown bear management plan.

I think there are more bears than there were 20 years ago but I think the population has peaked – we don't have as many older bears anymore. Most of bears killed by hunters are 4-9 year old bears.

ADF&G walked away from South Admiralty even though the BBMS instructed us to do research there because the mainland had no data at all – we are working at Berner's Bay now.



KP- don't understand what you mean by 2nd degree kin. Also, I spend a lot of time at Deep Inlet – there is a huge amount of bear sign there and a big sow that is productive. I am concerned about the local bear population being too high.

PM – 2nd degree kin– there is a provision in the hunting regs that allows a resident to guide a non resident if they are within 2 degrees of kindred, otherwise the non-resident is required to have a hired guide. Registered guides have to have forest service permits and are restricted by area, but non-residents who hunt with a resident 2nd degree of kin relative don't have these limitations. That's just one of the issues with these 2nd degree of kindred hunts. Sometimes this provision is abused- i.e. the resident relative who is supposed to be acting as the guide is not knowledgeable enough to do so. They might not even be a hunter at all. The resident just goes along to make it legal. Also, the registered guides in SE know the other guides that are operating in their area. They know the other guide's boats etc. so they don't hunt on top of one another. The non-residents who is hunting with a relative often doesn't know if another boat in the area is bear hunting, and doesn't necessarily avoid another hunting party even if they are aware of them.

RG – any idea on when boars break down physically – at what age?

PM - since 1960 the oldest bears aged in our area were 30 (male) and 32 (female) – oldest female with cub was 28. According to Jim Faro – if a boar is over 19 they have a bad attitude – look out. Their teeth are probably starting to hurt, they are getting cranky.

A lot of bears that are sealed have already been shot. They are tough animals and can heal and they are very smart, with personalities.

Most sows are older than 7 when they have their first set of cubs even though they are physically capable of doing so at 4; so this may be an indication that bear densities are high

Our research shows no exchange between Admiralty and Baranof – but there is significant movement between Chichagof and Baranof.

During the deer survey – we also count bear poops to look at potential numbers of bears. TO – can you use genetic analysis on the scat to figure out how many bears are in the area? PM – Yes but we have not had any dedicated research to try to do this.

JB – I was part of the group that developed the BBMS. One thing to keep in mind is that not only are the population estimates that we are using today old, but they never were very accurate to begin with. Well over half of the bears on these islands spend their whole lives too high and too far away from coastline to be available for hunting.

PM – Our bears have a high degree of home range fidelity. Sitka's bear issues are related to food. In 2009 we had 19 bears in town – all of them are dead or removed now. Despite this available niche having being opened, we didn't have many bears here this spring- but we have more in October than we have had in awhile.



DA – don't you think that people use to shoot nuisance bears 20 years ago but now they call you. I think that there is a shift in public perception. (I.e. the increase in DOLP kills is only due to an increase in reporting- not actually an increase in number of bears killed)

PM – in Yellowstone they use a one to one ratio – for every bear reported killed another is added for non-reporting.

PM – population is never static and the habitat is in flux –

EJ – we have taken out a big source of mortality when the logging camps were shut down. CG – You are right.

CG – how many bears were killed in unit 4? How many bears do you know of?
Is the replacement about the number we kill?

PM – no I think we have peaked so we aren't replacing our bears.

PM – 166 is the goal per the BBMS, we have a recently year when 205 were killed from human takes. But there is also mortality that is human induced but unreported.

EJ – you are looking at about 5% harvest rate, so there are 3000 bears standing?

PM – we think 4500. Human take is about 200 animals per year. Bear caused mortality is what?

PM - home range is 30 sq miles for a boar for females 11 -15; In Yellowstone it is 300 miles – the ranges are not round, and there is overlap...

In Yakutat they have big home range – they'll go from the city dump to across bay – breed at Manby and then go to Dry Bay....

PM – I want issues dealt with in the plan. If that doesn't work then there are options. BB management strategy is based on dead bears. Forest Service issues permits based on the number of hunts. The number of hunts hasn't declined as quickly as the success rate has increased.

TO – who isn't using the tools that are in place?

EJ – we can help sort out

BD – the brown bear strategy isn't broken and it doesn't need an overhaul
There is a healthy brown bear population, a healthy guide industry, an opportunity for residents. We don't want an increase in bear harvest. There is a delicate balance right now, we don't want 25% more quotas.

DA – there are a lot of bears but only so many male bears that are available to hunts and success and skull size will go down if the quota increases.

Size and success rate is the most important factors to our potential clients.



CG – We (USFS) manage the habitat, we depend on ADF&G to tell us how many bears can be taken. We don't decide new guiding. We want people to enjoy the forest and have a good time.

EJ – we don't usually go after resident or commercial. We usually go after the non resident non-guided2nd degree kin in this case.

JB – why does the USFS even care? There is a quota and guided requirements through ADFG. Why do you need a special use permit from FS?

DA – guides were not allowed to be regulated by the State because of a lawsuit, so the FS stepped in and saved us. They limited the number of guides / trips based on past performance in the area.

RG – I would like move that we table this proposal and there is no conclusion to come to here. It is a great discussion but we aren't going anywhere.

KE – 2nd

Motion to table passed anonymous.

EJ – I don't think we should take up the rest of these but we could make a comment to the Board of Game

Makes a motion to do that....

I move that the SFGAC is concerned with the conservation of Brown Bears in Unit 4 and believe that the existing Unit 4 Brown Bear Management Strategy should be fully implemented before additional regulations are adopted.

2nd KE

CG – in 1999 there were 35 registered guides on the list –we now have 28 but with assistant guides there are as many as 55 in the field. There are 13 brown bears that have not been allocated.

KE ?

Comment regarding support for BBMS Passes 8-0- 1

PM: The goat thing we have gone through before. This year we have 17 billies taken and only 1 nanny so better public peer pressure this year. I think there is some merit to this proposal that would target the problem hunters- that minority that has taken nannies year after year.

There was a 22% decline in goat population this year –we didn't lose any of our collared animals during winter – but fewer kids. Body weights of the adults are good – kid deaths are weather related, not disease or hunting. The Nakwasina sub-unit has been closed by EO because they exceeded billies but other areas remain open.

RG – what is percentage of goat harvest by guides?

CG – 17 hunts, 5 or 8 guides: PM – only 4 kills this year are from guided hunts. There was one problem guide with nannies, but public takes a lot of nannies – there has



been good education on this and the public is now taking care to look to see if they are males or females.

RG – if we are paring down the number of goats we can take, the guides are an issue

PM – USFS has the authority to penalize a guide for taking a nanny.

RG – why are we dependent on the federal government to regulate our wildlife???

We are doing too much of that.

PM they regulate hunts. ADFG regulates is dead animals. I rely on USFS for the habitat analysis. EJ – they are only regulating the guided hunts.

RG – If we allow the feds to do our footwork for us then they will take control sooner or later. I know it is a money issue...but it bothers me.

TF – I suggest that proposal 31 is one we should discuss.

PM – The 5 year prohibition is from the Kenai area. Don't know if that's the right length of time for here.

Feds have positive C&T on goats on Baranof. ADF&G does not. Genetics prove that this was a relic herd here – our goats are related to BC goats– Male DNA shows up in Haines from last ice age...some of our goats went south. When we planted goats here there were already goats here we just didn't know about them!

TO MTA Proposal 31 Impose 5-yr ban on hunting Mt Goat in Unit 4 following the taking of a nanny– JB 2nd

RG – at this point it might be a reasonable thing to restrict the hunting of nannies but when the population is higher I prefer nannies to billies. Maybe a sunset date would be an improvement, but I'm not all that comfortable with this whole proposal.

EJ - ?

5-2-2 Support for proposal 31 passes.

Next meeting in December with Phil...

KE – good of the order exchange of information – STA took forage fish up to BOF in Anchorage. They are going to write their own version of a forage fish designation for herring.

JM – Gov report on the AK Timber Job taskforce – the state wants to give 2 million acres to redevelop the timber industry. Could be significant

EJ – couple of things – Chinook salmon symposium – a lot of interesting information. Mostly westward areas. Thanks Carol for being here, it was helpful.

Motion to adjourn



Kotzebue Sound Advisory Committee Meeting
November 20th 2012 7-9 pm

Board of Game Proposals

Proposal # 42 Charlotte Westing: Gives presentation

Department: We think that our populations can support antlerless moose harvests that we have. People have gotten pretty good about reporting. The harvest is pretty small, normally we say that our population can support it. Doing the Noatak moose survey we are seeing lower numbers of moose in the Noatak River system than what we have seen in the past. We are going to do a spring population estimate, make sure we get a really solid count. We may need to make some changes in Unit 23 based on what we find. That may also be true in other areas of unit 23. The Lower Kobuk population was lower than what it was in 2006. People have been telling us that the moose population has been declining.

Cyrus Harris: Inquires about the spread of moose

Charlotte Westing: We see a range of distribution of groups of moose. We single moose up in the river drainages and sometimes there are groups lower in the drainage. All of the pilots were struck by how few moose we were seeing. I am just concerned because the antlerless moose is considered is a luxury item and it is possible it may need to be cut back. If you reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt we may have that option. We recognize that antlerless is a subsistence option, it may be better for the population to shoot a bull moose. We need to talk about the education message, that cows are a subsistence resource. Inquires about educational messages to encourage people to take a bull instead of cows to get the population back on track.

Alex Whiting: talks about bears and wolves eating moose instead of people eating moose. We haven't had to the discussion. The discussion has started when people are sick of feed bears and wolves and not feeding people.

Charlotte Westing: I can't spear head that conversation.

Karmen Monigold: Discusses using videography from the youth and elders to create educational tools. Amy Aiken does computer production, I don't know about being culturally sensitive. Maybe getting elders involved with those kids, because they can do some amazing things.

Atmuk Shiedt: Do you see what the sport hunters saw. Explains that caribou and moose are used interchangeably.

Charlotte Westing: The harvest data is somewhat preliminarily. North of Kelly River there was not many moose. I think the park service closure may have impacted the moose hunts. There is not a lot of pressure on the lower Noatak which includes the Squirrel and the Aggy. They may have a been a little influence. There were 5-6 moose were hunted by nonresidents in that region. I only talked with a few hunters about what they saw.

Atmuk Shiedt: I talked a few people in the Noatak region people just didn't see any. Maybe the caribou are just heading North.



Charlotte Westing: We have two data points one in the spring and this fall. We hope to get a clear picture at that time. We may need to emergency order the season closed.

Atmuk: Inquires about emergency order closure if the antlerless moose hunt isn't reauthorized and the control by the area biologist.

Alex Whiting: The caribou are going other places and the wolves and bears are eating moose instead of caribou and people are not able to take the moose and the caribou. Sport hunting also goes when people are having a hard time eating. The western arctic herd built up a large predator population and now they are looking other food. That is why I am saying there are a lot of predators, and they have to eat. They are sacrificing predators across the state. It is small take of the population the first thing to go is the antlerless moose hunt and the second thing to go is the sport hunting.

Charlotte Westing: The board has to see an incremental reductions antlerless moose, reduction in non-resident sport harvest, reduction in resident harvests.

Next fall we may have to shorten the antlerless moose season.

Alex: makes a motion to approve antlerless moose hunt
All support Antlerless moose authorization
None Opposed

Brown Bear Bag Fee Exemption #44

Charlotte Westing: Explains brown bear tag fees. In unit 23 we do not have tag fee. You have to have the head and the hide sealed. You don't have to fork out \$25 to shoot a bear Explains traditional uses and harvest of bears. It made it easier for the user.

Alex Whiting: I think we should give people free hunting licenses if they promise to kill a bear.

Charlotte Westing: Explains the meat salvage/hide depending on the hunts.

Alex Whiting: Makes a motion to keep the exemption of the fee
Seconded: Atmuk Shiedt
Discussion:
All Support
None Opposed



Noatak & Kivalina Department of Fish and Game
November 29th, 2012 10:30 am

Proposal #42 Antlerless Moose Hunt

Charlotte Westing: Explains Antlerless Moose Hunt Reauthorization

This year is a little different, because we have gotten some information because the moose population has decline according to the fall data. After the spring we will know what we need to do. If you reauthorize the antlerless moose option it gives you more options.

Enoch Mitchell: This is a good option for people in Noatak when the caribou populations have declined.

Charlotte Westing: We recognize that the female moose are important for subsistence, but the single best way to get the population to go back up is to not shoot female moose. The season would change to an antlered bull season.

Enoch Mitchell: Says that we need the meat.

Requests what Kotzebue AC said about Antlerless moose hunt

We go with Kotzebue on this decisions. They always go with us for our proposals. What do you guys think?

Motion to support proposal number 42.

All Support

None Opposed

Proposal #43 Brown Bear Tag Fee Exemption

Charlotte Westing: Explains the Brown Bear Tag Exemption Fee and you have to have the bear sealed.

AC Member: There goes my box of shells.

Enoch Mitchell: Inquires about the tag fee for brown bear. Too many bears anyways

All Support

None Opposed

Brown Bear Tag Fee



**NORTHERN SEWARD PENINSULA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Unit 23 Game Season update
Board of Fish Proposals
Buckland, Alaska
AGENDA December 10th, 2012
12:00 pm**

BOARD OF GAME PROPOSALS COMMENTS

- A. **Proposal #42 Antlerless moose hunt reauthorization**-Charlotte Westing presents the proposal and explains the antlerless moose hunt and the Kotzebue Department of Fish and Game's support for the Antlerless Moose Hunt to give you the most options for a valuable subsistence resource.

Marlene Moto Motions to reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt

Seconded:

Support-All support

Oppose-none opposed

Discussion-Explains the current concerns about moose population, Charlotte still recommends that antlerless moose reauthorization, it gives the most option.

Marlene Moto: Inquires about reducing sport hunting.

Charlotte Westing: The non-resident sport hunt is only for antlered bulls.

- B. **Proposal #44 Bear tagging fee reauthorization**

Motion to support the brown bear tagging exemption fee

Marlene Moto-Karl Seconded

Support-All supposed

Oppose

Discussion:

Marlene Moto: inquires about subsistence hunt for brown bears

Charlotte Westing: Explains subsistence hunt, you don't need to send in the hide or the skull you just have to salvage the meat.

Ron Moto: I like that idea it is good the way it is.

Marlene Karl-Moto: Inquires about the non-resident hunters to have a fee, but subsistence hunters would not have to pay the fee.

Charlotte Westing-explains the exemption fee



Petersburg Fish and Game Advisory Committee
November 17, 2012
9:00 AM
Petersburg Council Chambers

Attendance:

ADF&G Staff: Rich Lowell- Game, Doug Flemming-Sport Fish

Committee: Arnold Enge (Chairman), Stan Molcolm, Wes Malcom, Bob Martin, Yancey Nilsen, Max Warhatch, Andy Knight, Frank Neiderfer, Kirt Mart

Public: About 15, several left after the discussion of Crystal Lake hatchery fish transfer.

The Crystal Lake Fish transfer met with general approval from the public and the Committee.

The Advisory Committee recommended going ahead with the project.

The Committee discussed two items unrelated to the Board of Game agenda.

- 1) The ADF&G Game Biologist presented a plan to institute a predator control program for wolves in GMU-3. The committee recommended that he go to the Board of Game and investigate how to implement such a program.
- 2) Members of the public requested that we pursue implementing a fall brown bear unit on Mitkof Island in GMU-3. The Committee agreed to write a proposal to this issue for submission to the following Board of Game meeting.



ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

January 11-15, 2013

Southeast Region

DESIGNATED REPORTER: Shannon Stone

Juneau Area – Units 1C, 1D & 5

PROPOSAL 1

ACTION: N/A

DESCRIPTION: Increase the bag limit for deer in Unit 1C, mainland.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Out of area

PROPOSAL 2

ACTION: N/A

DESCRIPTION: Open a youth only deer hunt in Unit 5A.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Out of area

PROPOSAL 3

ACTION: N/A

DESCRIPTION: Extend the brown bear season and increase the bag limit for Berners Bay, Unit 1C.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Out of area

PROPOSAL 4

ACTION: N/A

DESCRIPTION: Extend the brown bear season and increase the bag limit for Berners Bay, Unit 1C.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Out of area

PROPOSAL 5

ACTION: N/A

DESCRIPTION: Allow the resident harvest of one brown bear every two years in Unit 5A

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Out of area

PROPOSAL 6

ACTION: N/A

DESCRIPTION: Shorten the black bear baiting season in Unit 1D.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Department already has discretionary authority to deal with bear baiting.

PROPOSAL 7

ACTION: Support 9-0

DESCRIPTION: Allow the incidental take of fisher in Unit 1C.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Currently no season or bag limit – anywhere. Recently there have been fishers taken, may be a good idea to establish a season & requirements so as to manage the species.



PROPOSAL 8 **ACTION: N/A**
DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in Berners Bay.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 9 **ACTION: N/A**
DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in the Gustavus area.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 10 **ACTION: N/A**
DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season at Nunatak Bench.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

Ketchikan Area – Unit 2

PROPOSAL 11 **ACTION: Failed 0-9**
DESCRIPTION: Change the black bear hunting regulations for Prince of Wales Island, Unit 2
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: Parts of the proposal are outside the Board's authority.

Petersburg Area – Units 1B & 3

PROPOSAL 12 **ACTION: Failed 0-9**
DESCRIPTION: Modify the definition of a legal moose antler for Units 1B and 3.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: Did not feel this would solve anything and since there is not a conservation concern, the AC did not see the need for it.

PROPOSAL 13 **ACTION: Fail 3-6**
DESCRIPTION: Modify elk drawing hunt area in Unit 3 to exclude Zarembo Island, and close season on Zarembo and associated islands.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: AC recognizes there is conservation concern and feel area should be closed to give the population a chance to rebound. There was concern with removing the hunt from the books altogether, as if/when the herd rebounds, it will be very difficult to re-open the hunt. There was feeling that the department could possibly modify the elk hunt to retain Zarembo Island drawing permits but keep it closed by EO. There was support to close the hunt on all the surrounding islands (Kashevaroff Islands).

PROPOSAL 14 **ACTION: Support 6-3**
DESCRIPTION: Decrease season length and bag limit for deer in Unit 3, Lindenberg Peninsula.
AMENDMENT:



DISCUSSION: Supporters understand the need to allow stock to rebuild. Herd has been hit hard by both predation and hard winters. Opponents did not want to lose opportunity, did not feel there was enough data to support such a drastic measure. Question was raised, why target just this one area?

PROPOSAL 15

ACTION: Failed 0-9

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the use of motorized vehicles by marten trappers on the Tonka Road System in Unit 3, the Lindenberg Peninsula.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Did not feel there was enough data to back up removal of motorized vehicles.

Regional and Multiple Units

PROPOSAL 16

ACTION: Failed 0-9

DESCRIPTION: Modify the bag limit for goat in Units 1 and 4.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Felt department already had measures in place to manage this area.

PROPOSAL 17

ACTION: Failed 0-9

DESCRIPTION: Close the taking of grouse hens in the spring for all Southeast Region Units.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Did not see a conservation concern here.

PROPOSAL 18

ACTION: N/A

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit snaring bears in the Southeast Region.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 19

ACTION: N/A

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit snaring bears in the Southeast Region.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 20

ACTION: Failed 0-9

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the taking of wolves March through November in the Southeast Region.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Went with department recommendation.

PROPOSAL 21

ACTION: Support 9-0

DESCRIPTION: Align the trapping season dates for the Southeast Region.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Could see the benefits and would increase access in some areas.

PROPOSAL 22

ACTION: N/A

DESCRIPTION: Lengthen coyote trapping seasons in Units 1-5.



AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Based on action taken on Proposal 21

PROPOSAL 23

ACTION: Failed 0-9

DESCRIPTION: Open resident hunting seasons seven to ten days before nonresident seasons for Southeast Region Units.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: This is an allocation issue, worried about effect on the guide industry in the area.

PROPOSAL 24

ACTION: N/A

DESCRIPTION: Open resident hunting seasons seven days before nonresident seasons for Southeast Region Units.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Based on action taken on Proposal 23.

PROPOSAL 25

ACTION: N/A

DESCRIPTION: Open resident hunting seasons ten days before nonresident seasons; allocate 90% harvest to residents, remove guide requirements and increase fees for Southeast Region Units.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Based on action taken on Proposal 23 and lack of Board authority.

PROPOSAL 26

ACTION: Failed 0-9

DESCRIPTION: Allocate 90% drawing permits to residents and eliminate nonresident participation in hunts with ten or less permits for Southeast Region Units.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Felt this referred back to Proposal 25 a bit and there was some concern about amount being taken by non-residents.

PROPOSAL 27

ACTION: N/A

DESCRIPTION: Limit drawing permits to 10% for nonresidents for Southeast Region Units.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Based on action taken on Proposal 26.

PROPOSAL 28

ACTION: N/A

DESCRIPTION: 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.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Based on action taken on Proposal 26.

Sitka Area- Unit 4

PROPOSAL 29

ACTION: N/A



DESCRIPTION: Allow hunters to harvest one antlerless deer on Pleasant Island, Unit 4.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 30

ACTION: N/A

DESCRIPTION: Establish a three-day doe season for Chichagof Island, Unit 4.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 31

ACTION: N/A

DESCRIPTION: Limit the harvest of nannies and prohibit the taking of nannies with kids in Unit 4.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 32

ACTION: Failed 0-9

DESCRIPTION: Alternate spring and fall bear seasons for nonresidents in Unit 4.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Did not see the need and felt it would be detrimental to the guides.

PROPOSAL 33

ACTION: Failed 0-9

DESCRIPTION: Shorten the season for brown bear in Unit 4.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 34

ACTION: Failed 4-5

DESCRIPTION: Restrict the bag limit for brown bear in Unit 4.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: There was concern regarding how one would be able to determine a 20inch skull from such a distance. Felt this was an allocative proposal.

PROPOSAL 35

ACTION: Failed 0-9

DESCRIPTION: Modify the brown bear harvest allocation for residents in Unit 4.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 36

ACTION: Failed 0-9

DESCRIPTION: Exclude wounding loss from the annual brown bear harvest for Unit 4t.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: How would this be enforced? Concerns communicated regarding accurate reporting due to not wanting to lose harvest (sows vs. boars points system).

PROPOSAL 37

ACTION: Failed 0-9

DESCRIPTION: Extend the otter trapping season in Unit 4.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Question was raised – is this species being underutilized?



Miscellaneous Items:

- Petersburg Advisory Committee met with department staff regarding the predator control program being suggested for Southeast Region. The Advisory Committee unanimously support the department's decision to pursue predator control in Unit 3.
- The Petersburg Advisory Committee discussed the Joint Board Proposal regarding removal for cause of Advisory Committee members.