

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

REVIEWER LETTER

Dear Reviewer,

August 2013

The Alaska Board of Game will consider the attached book of regulatory proposals at its meetings scheduled for **January through March 2014**. The proposals generally concern changes to the State's hunting and trapping regulations. Members of the public, organizations, advisory committees, and department staff submitted these proposals. The proposals are published essentially as they were received.

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

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

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

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

After reviewing the proposals, please send written comments to:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
2013/2014 PROPOSAL BOOK**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

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

ARCTIC AND WESTERN REGION (REGION V)

Proposal Index	1
Meeting Agenda.....	4
Bethel Area – Unit 18	5
Nome Area – Unit 22.....	18
Barrow Area – Unit 26A.....	26
Kotzebue Area – Unit 23	32
Regional and Multiple Units.....	39

INTERIOR REGION (REGION III)

Proposal Index	49
Meeting Agenda.....	55
Regional and Multiple Units.....	56
McGrath Area – Units 19, 21A and 21E.....	79
Galena Area – Units 21B, 21C, 21D & 24	97
Northeast Alaska – Units 25A, 25B, 25D, 26B & 26C	101
Tok Area – Units 12 & 20E.....	110

Delta Area – Unit 20D	124
Fairbanks Area – Units 20A, 20B, 20C, 20F & 25C	138
Antlerless Moose Hunts and Brown Bear Tag Fees for other Regions	177

STATEWIDE

Proposal Index	197
Meeting Agenda.....	200
Hunter Education	201
Harvest Tickets, Permits, Reports and Hunts	204
Permits for Possessing Live Game (Clean List)	220
Migratory Birds, Waterfowl.....	225
Sealing and Salvage Requirements	232
Intensive Management	238
Definitions.....	241
Falconry	248
Miscellaneous	254

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
TENTATIVE MEETING DATES & LOCATIONS
2013/2014 MEETING CYCLE**

Arctic/Western and Interior Regions and Statewide Regulations

Meeting Dates	Topics	Location	Comment Deadline
October 11, 2013 [1 day]	Work Session	Anchorage Hilton	Sept. 27, 2013
January 10-13, 2014 [4 days]	Arctic/Western Region	Kotzebue National Guard Armory	Dec. 27, 2013 [ACR Deadline: Nov. 11, 2013]
February 14-23, 2014 [10 days]	Interior Region	Fairbanks Alpine Lodge	Jan. 31, 2014 [ACR Deadline: Dec. 16, 2013]
March 14-18, 2014 [5 days]	Statewide Regulations Cycle A Schedule	Anchorage Dena'ina Center	Feb. 28, 2014 [ACR Deadline: Jan. 13, 2014]

Total Meeting Days: 20

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

Proposal deadline for 2014/2015 cycle is Thursday, May 1, 2014.

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

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME MEETING CYCLE

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

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

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

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

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

REGION: MEETING CYCLE:

Southeast Region (Region I) Game Management Units: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2014/2015	2016/2017	2018/2019
Southcentral Region (Region II) Game Management Units: 6, 7, 8, 14C, 15	2014/2015	2016/2017	2018/2019
Central / Southwest Region (Region IV) Game Management Units: 9, 10, 11, 13, 14A, 14B, 16, 17	2014/2015	2016/2017	2018/2019
Arctic /Western Region (Region V) Game Management Units: 18, 22, 23, 26A	2013/2014	2015/2016	2017/2018
Interior Region (Region III) Game Management Units: 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, 26C	2013/2014	2015/2016	2017/2018

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
STATEWIDE REGULATIONS SCHEDULE

CYCLE “A” 2014, 2018, 2022

5 AAC Chapter 92 Statewide Provisions:

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

CYCLE “B” 2016, 2020, 2024

5 AAC Chapter 92 Statewide Provisions:

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

- .260 Taking Cub Bears & Female Bears with Cubs Prohibited
- .400 Emergency Taking of Game
- .410 Taking of Game in Defense of Life or Property
- .420 Taking Nuisance Wildlife

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
MEMBER LIST**

NAME AND ADDRESS	TERM EXPIRES
Ted Spraker, Chairman 49230 Victoria Ave. Soldotna, AK 99669	6/30/2014
Nathan Turner, Vice-Chairman P.O. Box 646 Nenana, AK 99760	6/30/2016
Stosh (Stanley) Hoffman P.O. Box 2374 Bethel, AK 99559	6/30/2014
Teresa Sager Albaugh HC 72 Box 835 Tok, AK 99780	6/30/2015
Nick Yurko 9412 Long Run Drive Juneau, AK 99801	6/30/2014
Pete Probasco P.O. Box 861 Palmer, AK 99645	6/30/2016
Bob (Robert) Mumford 13391 Baywind Drive Anchorage, AK 99516	6/30/2015

Alaska Board of Game members may also be reached through:

ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

Boards Support Section

P.O. Box 115526

Juneau, AK 99811-5526

(907) 465-4110 PHONE

(907) 465-6094 FAX

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

Kristy Tibbles, Executive Director, Alaska Board of Game

e-mail: kristy.tibbles@alaska.gov

BOARDS SUPPORT SECTION STAFF LIST

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

HEADQUARTERS

Board of Fisheries

Monica Wellard, Exec. Director II, 465-6095

Frances Leach, Pub. Specialist II, 465-4046

Board of Game

Kristy Tibbles, Exec. Director I, 465-6098

Robert Pearson, Pub. Specialist II, 465-6097

Shaundy Petraborg, Administrative Officer I, 465-6096

Vacant, Administrative Assistant I, 465-4110

REGIONAL OFFICES

Southeast Region (North of Frederick Sound)

Frances Leach

PO Box 115526

Juneau, AK 99811-5526

Phone: 465-4046

Fax: 465-6094

Western Region

Alissa Joseph

P.O. Box 1467

Bethel, AK 99559

Phone: 543-2433

Fax: 543-2021

Southeast Region (South of Frederick Sound)

Robert Pearson

PO Box 115526

Juneau, AK 99811-5526

Phone: 465-6097

Fax: 465-6094

Arctic Region

Carmen Daggett

PO Box 689

Kotzebue, AK 99752

Phone: 442-1717

Fax: 442-2420

Southcentral Region

Sherry Wright

333 Raspberry Road

Anchorage, AK 99518-1599

Phone: 267-2354

Fax: 267-2489

Interior Region

Nissa Pilcher

1300 College Road

Fairbanks, AK 99701-1599

Phone: 459-7263

Fax: 459-7258

Southwest Region

Susie Jenkins-Brito

PO Box 1030

Dillingham, AK 99576

Phone: 842-5142

Fax: 842-5514

Arctic/Western Region

(Region V)

Proposal Index

(Note: Please review the “Regional and Multiple Units” section, which may include proposals that also affect the regulations for other units).

Bethel Area – Unit 18

- 1 Modify the Lower Yukon Area for moose hunting in Unit 18.
- 2 Modify the Lower Yukon Area for moose hunting in Unit 18, extend the resident season, and liberalize the bag limit.
- 3 Modify the season and bag limit for moose in Unit 18 Remainder and Lower Yukon Area.
- 4 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 18.
- 5 Open a subsistence musk ox hunt in Unit 18 and 19.
- 6 Remove the upper limit of Nelson Island musk ox registration permits issued for the winter season, and retain the requirement that permits are issued on a first-come, first-served basis.
- 7 Shift the wolverine hunting season dates in Unit 18.
- 8 Lengthen the lynx hunting season in Unit 18.
- 9 Extend the lynx hunting season in Unit 18.
- 10 Modify the game management unit boundaries for Units 18, 19, and 21.
- 11 Prohibit the use of .22 caliber ammunition for taking big game animals, excluding wolves and wolverines.
- 12 Change the salvage requirement for wildfowl in Unit 18.

Nome Area – Unit 22

- 13 Change the winter moose season in Unit 22E from January to March.
- 14 Establish an antlered bull season in Unit 22A Unalakleet River drainage.

- 15 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 22C and the Remainder of Unit 22D.
- 16 Modify the season and bag limit for brown bear in Unit 22.
- 17 Extend the brown bear season in Unit 22A.
- 18 Extend the wolf hunting season in Unit 22.
- 19 Extend the wolverine hunting season in Unit 22.

Barrow Area – Unit 26A

- 20 Extend the bull moose hunting season in Unit 26A.
- 21 Allow moose hunting in the Anaktuvuk Pass Controlled Use Area, modify the bag limit, and change the moose permit allocation for nonresidents.
- 22 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 26A.
- 23 Review the customary and traditional use worksheet for the Teshekpuk Lake caribou herd; establish amounts reasonably necessary for subsistence.
- 24 Change the hunting season and bag limit for coyote in Unit 26A to a no closed season and no bag limit.

Kotzebue Area – Unit 23

- 25 Change the Noatak River musk ox hunt area boundary to include the entire Noatak drainage and all areas north and west of the Kobuk River drainage.
- 26 Reauthorize antlerless moose seasons in Unit 23.
- 27 Modify brown bear harvest in Unit 23 on lands managed by the National Park Service.
- 28 Change the hunting season and bag limit for coyote in Unit 23 to a no closed season and no limit.
- 29 Allow the sale of caribou antlers harvested in Unit 23.

Regional and Multiple Units

- 30 Open resident sheep seasons ten days before nonresident seasons in Region V.
- 31 Open resident sheep seasons seven days before nonresident seasons in Region V.
- 32 Create a bowhunting only season for Dall sheep in Region V.
- 33 Change nonresident sheep hunts to drawing hunts and limit permit distribution to ten percent of the annual ten year average in Region V
- 34 Allocate a small percent of game harvest for nonresidents in Unit 26.
- 35 Prohibit the use of snares to take bears in Region V.
- 36 Allocate 90% of drawing permits to residents in Region V.
- 37 Allocate 90% of drawing permits to residents in Region V.
- 38 Reauthorize the current resident tag fee exemptions for brown bear in Units 18, 22, 23 and 26A.

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
Arctic/Western Region Meeting
(Game Management Units 18, 22, 23, 26A)
January 10-13, 2014
National Guard Armory
Kotzebue, Alaska

~TENTATIVE AGENDA~

NOTE: This Tentative Agenda is subject to change throughout the course of the meeting.

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

Friday, January 10, 8:30 AM

OPENING BUSINESS

- Call to Order
- Introductions of Board Members and Staff
- Board Member Ethics Disclosures
- Purpose of Meeting (overview)

STAFF AND OTHER REPORTS

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

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

Saturday, January 11, 8:30 AM

PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY Continued

BOARD DELIBERATIONS (Upon conclusion of public testimony)

Sunday, January 12 – Monday, January 13, 8:30 AM

BOARD DELIBERATIONS Continued

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, including petitions, findings and policies, letters, and other business

(Upon conclusion of deliberations)

ADJOURN

Special Notes

- A. This agenda is TENTATIVE and subject to change during the meeting. A list of staff reports and a roadmap will be available at the meeting. Scheduled updates will be available on the Board of Game website.
- B. Meeting materials are available at: www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=gameboard.meetinginfo or by contacting the ADF&G Boards Support Office in Juneau at 465-4110.
- C. A live audio stream for the meeting is intended to be available at: www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov
- D. The State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game complies with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). Individuals with disabilities who may need auxiliary aids, services, and/or special modifications to participate in this hearing and public meeting should contact 465-4110 no later than December 27, 2013 to make any necessary arrangements.

Bethel Area – Unit 18

PROPOSAL 1 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the Lower Yukon Area for moose hunting in Unit 18 as follows:

Unit 18 – that portion north and west of the Kashunak River continuing upriver along 1/2 mile south and east and paralleling a line along the southerly bank of the Kashunak River to the confluence of the south bank of Driftwood Slough, continuing upriver to the confluence of the Yukon River, across, ending the 1/2 mile buffer, then following the North Bank of the Yukon River to Pitka's Point and excluding all Yukon River drainages upriver from Pitka's Point; two moose, only one of which may be antlered. Antlered bulls may only be harvested from August 1-September 30.

ISSUE: Confusion on the boundary for the Lower Yukon Area of Unit 18 for moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The segment from Chakaktolik to Mountain Village will continue to be a confusing place to hunt due to the absence of good physical land marks to establish the border. A GPS is required to determine the eastern boundary for the Lower Yukon Area and not all hunters carry GPS units. Additionally, moose on the east bank of the Kashunak River are off limits for certain times of the year while moose on the west bank have more liberal open seasons. An unnecessary tempting situation for hunters when the Lower Yukon Area is open and the Unit 18 remainder is closed.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the managers' report that there is a substantial increase in the moose population during the last census in the Andreafsky portion of Unit 18 Remainder. Moving the boundary slightly upriver should have the effect of reducing the growth of that population and increasing the browse quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters on the Yukon River between Mountain Village and Pilot Station, and moose hunters on the Kashunak River.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo, but the lack of a good physical landmark for the establishment of a boundary for the Lower Yukon Area will continue to confuse hunters.

PROPOSED BY: Myron Naneng Sr., AVCP

EG043013838

PROPOSAL 2 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the Lower Yukon Area for moose hunting in Unit 18, extend the resident season, and liberalize the bag limit as follows:

Unit 18, that portion north and west of a line from Cape Romanzof to Kusilvak Mt. to Mountain Village and including Paimiut area and Andreafski all the way down to Kashunak River and excluding all Yukon River drainages upriver from Paimiut; however, portions of this area may be closed by emergency order.

Resident Hunt:
Unit 18

1 antlered bull; or moose August 10- February 28

Remainder of Unit 18

2 moose August 10- February 28

Nonresident Hunt: (Remains the same)

ISSUE: The Lower Yukon Advisory Committee would request the Board of Game:

1. Modify by adding the following locations to the Unit 18 hunt area by including Paimut area and Andreafski all the way down river to Kashunak River.
2. Modify the bag limit to bull and cow for the fall moose hunt and modify by adding all moose including calves to the regulatory year hunt.
3. Extend the date of the resident open season (subsistence and general hunts) from August 10- February 28.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The current population will continue to increase too rapidly in certain areas of the Lower Yukon. These congested areas of moose will decrease the non-toxic vegetative food at too rapid of a pace for sustaining a healthy level of moose within the area. We also don't want to see the moose population crash under pressure, due to something we as a working management team could have prevented.

Also, we do not want to see many years of patience with the moose moratorium be for nothing. We want to be capable of persevering as much as we can for generations to come. Especially while we are in the difficult times with our current salmon harvests being deducted and decreased by another 40% subsistence harvest this year.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, please review and take into consideration of all comments from all advisory committees, public comments and supporters of this proposal.

We do understand at the discretion of the Department of Fish and Game management biologist of Unit 18 to issue emergency orders to close the hunt if there is any biological emergency.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who lives in the Lower Yukon villages and relies on moose as a subsistence harvest in a regulatory year. We understand there will be other proposals that are going to be similar or reflect similar interest. We would like to see the Board of Game take into consideration to work with Unit 18 biologists, village representatives, users of the resources, and participating local organizations to develop appropriate language for the protection of the moose population. Also, to take into consideration and the mindfulness of the year-round-based residents of the Lower Yukon who rely heavily on subsistence hunting and fishing to feed their families.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Every human being that resides permanently throughout the year in one of the Lower Yukon villages and subsists a greater percent of their lives on harvesting on the resources and lesser percentage on store-bought goods.

Everybody who lives a conditioned life of managing to stay alive and subsist off the land's resources to sustain just enough food to get the source of nutrients, solid nourishment and the vitamins for mental stimulation and stability through a regulatory year.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We are open to compromise.

PROPOSED BY: Lower Yukon Advisory Committee

EG043013846

PROPOSAL 3 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the season and bag limit for moose in Unit 18 Remainder and Lower Yukon Area as follows:

In the Unit 18 Remainder and Lower Yukon Area, the season will open on August 1 and close on April 30. A limit of two moose, one of which may be an antlered bull from August 1 through September 30 only. Antlerless moose may be harvested from October 1 through April 30.

ISSUE: The most recent census appears to indicate that there are 10,000 moose or more in the Unit 18 Remainder and the Lower Yukon Area. In just driving a snow machine through the winter browse areas for moose indicate that there are many more moose than the habitat can support. Eventually, a combination of winter browse limitations or disease can easily cause a crash in moose populations that people worked so hard to build. We propose to make the Lower Yukon Area and the Unit 18 Remainder consistent in bag limit and seasons.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? As mentioned above, if the moose populations of the Lower Yukon Area and the Unit 18 Remainder area continue to grow, a population crash is inevitable.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Winter browse limitations are a major concern and the potential for diseases to occur in these populations are concerning as well. If the moose populations in these two areas are not effectively cropped, a population crash is inevitable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters will benefit including the moose populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo.

PROPOSED BY: Myron Naneng Sr., AVCP

EG042913828

PROPOSAL 4 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(16). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 18 as follows:

- Retain the resident antlerless hunt with no change in the Lower Yukon Area;
- Modify the resident antlerless hunt in Remainder of Unit 18:
 - Liberalize the resident bag limit to include antlerless moose in the fall hunt;
 - Lengthen the resident fall season to start on August 1; and
 - Retain the resident antlerless winter hunt with no change

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

(16)

...

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

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

2 moose of which only
1 may be an antlered bull; a
person may not take a calf or a
cow accompanied by a calf; or

Aug. 1 - Sept. 30

2 antlerless moose

Oct. 1 - Last Day of Feb.

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 antlered bull;

Sept. 1 - Sept. 30

Remainder of Unit 18

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

[1 ANTLERED BULL; OR]

[AUG. 10 - SEPT. 30]

[SEPT. 1 - SEPT. 30]

1 moose

Aug. 1 – Sept. 30

Dec. 20 – Last Day of Feb.

[NO OPEN SEASON]

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 antlered bull

Sept. 1 - Sept. 30

...

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

In November 2011, the Board of Game (board) authorized antlerless moose hunts in these hunt area through antlerless moose bag limits. This follows a trend of increased opportunity at board meetings in 2007 and 2009, where regulations were adopted to liberalize bag limits and lengthen seasons. Based on the recent trends of moose population productivity and growth, the department proposes continued antlerless moose hunts in Unit 18.

The Lower Yukon area is the most densely populated moose habitat in Unit 18. From 2002 to 2008, the population has doubled every three years and is now estimated at 3,320 moose in an area of about 1,100 square miles. The most recent data (Nov 2010) indicates calf:cow ratios of 69:100, twinning rates at 50%, and estimated minimum density of 2.8 moose/mi². Anecdotal evidence suggests that calf survival rates remain high.

Although the RY2012 harvest data in the Yukon River area has not been finalized due to the early proposal deadline, we expect harvests to be slightly higher than RY2011 due to the increased opportunity enacted by the Board in November 2011. In RY2011, there were 230 moose harvested. The winter harvest included 19 antlerless moose (cows). Continuing antlerless moose harvest opportunity will benefit hunters and also help slow the growth rate of the population.

The Remainder of Unit 18 has under-utilized moose habitat and a growing moose population. Based on counts in 2012 and 2013, the population is estimated at above 8,000 moose. The recent population data indicates calf:cow ratios of 37:100 and 36:100, in 2012 and 2013 respectively. The twinning rate in this area is estimated at 50% and anecdotal evidence suggests that calf survival rates remain high.

Although the RY2012 harvest data in the Remainder of Unit 18 has not been finalized due to the early proposal deadline, we expect harvests to be slightly higher than RY2011 due to the

increased opportunity enacted by the board in November 2011. In RY2011, there were 251 moose were harvested, including 115 moose in an emergency order extended winter season (December 20 - February 28). The winter harvest included 73 antlerless moose (cows). Expanding antlerless moose hunting through a longer resident fall season with any moose bag limit (as proposed) will benefit hunters through increased opportunity, and any increases in harvest may help slow the growth rate of the population in this portion of Unit 18.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity for antlerless moose in portions of Unit 18 will be needlessly lost.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who wish to harvest an antlerless moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613938

(This proposal will also be considered at the Interior Region meeting in February 2014; see proposal #66).

PROPOSAL 5 - 5 AAC 85.050. Hunting seasons and bag limits for musk oxen. Open a subsistence musk ox hunt in Unit 18 and 19 as follows:

Allow for a subsistence musk ox hunt to occur in the various populations of the Unit 18 and 19 mainland herd by close proximity communities.

ISSUE: The current musk ox population on the mainland is growing in various locations of Units 18 and 19. Increased sightings, encounters, and growing incidences of musk oxen taking refuge from predators near or in the villages suggests that the mainland musk oxen population is growing.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to not know what the mainland musk ox population is and the corresponding harvestable surplus. The State of Alaska and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service must determine the population and identify the harvestable surplus and allow for a hunt. The population cannot go unmonitored and harvest restriction cannot go on forever.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would force the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to do their job in effectively monitoring the mainland musk ox populations in Units 18 and 19.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence hunters in Unit 18 and 19 initially and perhaps other hunters at a later time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Additional hunting opportunity is always most beneficial.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Create a Unit 18 and 19 Musk ox Management Committee.

PROPOSED BY: Myron Naneng Sr., AVCP

EG042413785

PROPOSAL 6 - 5 AAC 85.050 (a)(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for musk ox.

Remove the upper limit of Nelson Island musk ox registration permits issued for the winter season. Retain the requirement that permits are issued on a first-come, first-served basis as follows:

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

(1)

...

Unit 18, Nelson Island

1 musk ox by registration permit only; [UP TO 42] permits will be issued on a first-come, first-served basis	Feb. 1 - Mar. 25 (General hunt only)	Feb. 1 - Mar. 25
--	---	------------------

ISSUE: The Nelson Island musk ox population currently has an increasing trend with high density on the island. For several years animals have not emigrated from the island, resulting in an increase in the island population. Recent counts show the island population is significantly above the island population objective of 250-350 muskox. To reduce the population, we need to increase hunting opportunity and harvest by removing the upper limit of 42 registration permits that is currently in place. By removing the upper limit of registration permits, the department would have the necessary flexibility to manage harvest by increasing the number of permits. Without reducing the total number of animals on Nelson Island, there is a risk of over grazing the range in the future.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Musk ox population will continue to be high and run the risk of over grazing the range on Nelson Island.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those desiring a stable, productive musk ox population on Nelson Island.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Set the permit limit as high as 125 permits. Reduce the population by relocating animals to other areas of the state.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613907

PROPOSAL 7 - 5 AAC 85.057. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolverine. Shift the wolverine hunting season dates in Unit 18 as follows:

Wolverine season: **September 15 - April 15** [SEPTEMBER 1 – MARCH 31]

ISSUE: Early season wolverine hunting is impractical in this unit. The fur quality is poor and it is completely incidental to hunting other species. I realize wolverines pup in the early winter, but there is no practical difference between the current end date and the proposed end date for the hunting season. I am also proposing to give up the early season in exchange for a later ending date.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters are unable to practically take advantage of the entire wolverine season.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, it just proposes to shift the dates. Total hunting days stay the same and so does the bag limit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who like a more prime pelt and enjoy hunting when it is warmer and the days are longer.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters in Unit 18 who harvest wolverine from September 1-15.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Keep season the same. This board should work for the benefit of hunters who are willing to compromise their early season in exchange for a marginally later season. I'm positive the sealing records will show little or no harvest during September 1-15.

PROPOSED BY: Aki Komulainen EG041713748

PROPOSAL 8 - 5 AAC 85.060. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals. Lengthen the lynx hunting season in Unit 18 as follows:

Lynx season: **November 1 - April 30** [NOVEMBER 10 – MARCH 31]

ISSUE: Hunters who enjoy eating lynx should be able to hunt lynx through the end of April. The bag limit is set for hunters, and whether they harvest in November or April, it should not affect the total lynx harvest by hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaskans who hunt lynx in Unit 18 will have an unnecessarily short season to harvest their bag for lynx, which is both a furbearer and food animal.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, just making it easier for hunters who enjoy eating lynx to get their bag when the weather is warmer and the days are longer.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Just hunters in Unit 18 who enjoy eating lynx. I don't anticipate that this would adversely affect anyone. People who trap lynx have a generous bag limit and if there is a biological reason to deny a longer season, this contradicts the liberal trapping season bag. I don't see they are exclusive though. I see this benefits both hunters and trappers, because not all hunters trap, but a lot of trappers are hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. The lynx population is intricately tied to the hare population. The bag is expected to stay the same, therefore not adversely affecting trappers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Leave the season the same. New federal regulations have taken effect, lengthening the lynx season on federal lands; these lands are a substantial distance from Alaskans who would want to take advantage of that season. This proposal if adopted would make it easier to harvest lynx closer to home.

PROPOSED BY: Aki Komulainen

EG041713747

PROPOSAL 9 - 5 AAC 85.06. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals. Extend the lynx hunting season in Unit 18 as follows:

I would like to see the hunting season for lynx extended to April 30 so it will match the federal hunting season.

ISSUE: I would like the Board of Game to look at the changing the hunting season for lynx.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to have two different sets of hunting regulations for lynx on state and federal land, with no easy way to tell where exactly those boundaries are.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters in Unit 18 will benefit by having more opportunity to harvest lynx on state land, and it would simply match the federal land season. This would help hunters who may not use a GPS to find exact land boundaries between federal and state land.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Jon Lavalle

EG050113853

(This proposal will also be considered at the Interior Region meeting in February 2014; see proposal # 67).

PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 92.450. Description of game management units. Modify the boundaries for Units 18, 19, and 21 as follows:

Create new boundary language for Unit 18 to read:

The area draining into the Yukon River downstream from a line starting at the down river boundary of Paimiut on the north bank of the Yukon River then across the river to the south bank to the northern terminus of the Paimiut Portage, proceed south through the Portage to the mouth of Hooking Creek on the northeast corner of Arhymot Lake, follow the northern and western bank of the lake to the head of Crooked Creek, follow the north bank of the creek downstream to the northern terminus of the Crooked Creek to Mud Creek Tramway, follow the tramway south to Mud Creek, follow its west bank downstream to First Slough, follow the west bank of the slough downstream to its confluence to the Kuskokwim River,

Create new language for Unit 19 to read:

The area draining into the Kuskokwim River upstream from the confluence of the First Slough and the Kuskokwim River; and the area draining into Crook Creek's south bank upstream from the northern terminus of the Mud Creek to Crook Creek Portage Tramway. (All are clearly visible land marks.)

Create new language for Unit 21 to read:

The area draining into the Yukon River upstream from the down river boundary of Paimiut on the north shore of the Yukon River and, directly across the river, the northern terminus of the Paimiut Portage on the south shore of the Yukon River. (Both clearly visible land marks.)

The area **east** of the boundary and **south** of the **High Portage Ridge** would be part of **Unit 19**, since this area drains into the Kuskokwim River. (Clear visible land marks.)

The area **east** of the boundary and **north** of the **High Portage Ridge** would be part of **Unit 21**, since this area drains into the Yukon River. (Clear visible land marks.)

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

WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Many hunters and enforcement personnel would still not know where the real boundaries are. There is no definite language explaining where the “straight line” begins or ends. Does the line start at the “downriver”, “center” or “upriver” boundary of Paimiut or Lower Kalskag?

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The boundaries would be clear, definite and visible. There would be no more confusion as to where the boundaries begin and end.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and enforcement personnel would know exactly what unit they are in. All hunters traveling up river on the Yukon and Kuskokwim rivers to Units 19 and 21.

All hunters from Lower Kalskag and Kalskag would benefit most by regaining their customary and traditional hunting lands in Units 18 and 21. These lands are presently included in Unit 18 and 21. This would also clarify the issue of “no man’s land” east of the boundary line and north of Kalskag and Lower Kalskag and south of High Portage Ridge. High Portage Ridge geographically separates the Yukon River and Kuskokwim River drainages. All drainages north of the ridge flowing into the Yukon would be in Unit 21 and all drainages south of the ridge flowing into the Kuskokwim would be in Unit 19.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one would suffer if this proposal is adopted. The Paimiut Portage is a well-established historical trail that connects the central Kuskokwim and Yukon rivers. It is repaired, remarked and maintained annually, after freeze up, by hunters and fishers from Kalskag and Lower Kalskag. The Paimiut Portage is used daily during the fall, winter and spring seasons by all hunters, fishers, trappers and visitors from the lower and central Kuskokwim River and from the central Yukon River villages.

The Mud Creek to Crooked Creek Tramway is a part of a historical personal/commercial route connecting travelers to/from the Kuskokwim River villages and the Yukon River villages.

Residents of Lower Kalskag and Kalskag were involved in the modification of this proposal. They endorse and support this proposal and urge the Board of Game to pass it as the best choice for redefining the presently unclear and confusing boundaries of Units 18, 19 and 21.

The residents of Lower Kalskag and Kalskag live, hunt, fish, trap and gather in this land, as have their ancestors. They do so with honor and respect to the land and its first inhabitants-the water, plants, berries, trees, fish and game. They do so following what the land and seasons offer of

their renewable food resources. They have always had customary and traditional seasonal use of this land and its resources.

Contrary to what you may hear from some residents of the lower Kuskokwim River area, they do have year-round customary and traditional use of this land and its resources, for this reason residents of Lower Kalskag and Kalskag urge the Board of Game to honor this proposal to modify the boundaries, move the Kuskokwim terminal out of Lower Kalskag downstream to a known visible location, and return their customary and traditional hunting, fishing, trapping and gathering lands. They ask this especially for the benefit of our youth and young adults, who would be made criminals if this change is not adopted and passed, because they will continue to hunt in lands now classified as part of Units 18 and 21, which are really in Unit 19.

We know this land and its resources. We know how, where and when to travel on this land, to hunt, fish, trap and gather. We do not hunt, fish, trap, gather and travel by paper. We hunt, fish, trap and gather using our natural land marks-rivers, sloughs, streams, lakes, hills and trails as guides and boundaries. We use what we can see, feel, hear and taste as our guides. We are part of the land and its resources-it feeds us, clothes us, shelters us, comforts us and connects us to our Creator. It is part of us, as we are part of it, because we live on it. We are one with the land.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Central Kuskokwim Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050613951

PROPOSAL 11 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.

Prohibit the use of .22 caliber ammunition for taking big game animals, excluding wolves and wolverines as follows:

The minimum caliber allowed for taking big game animals with the exception of wolves and wolverine should be a .243 caliber for Unit 18.

ISSUE: I would like the board to prohibit the use of .22 caliber center-fire ammunition for shooting big game animals, with the exception of wolves and wolverine in Unit 18. Many caribou, moose and bears shot with .223 and other .22 caliber center-fire calibers are wounded and walk away to die later.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Many big game animals may continue to be wounded and not recovered by hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, less wounding loss.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who utilizes the resources.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who like to shoot .22 caliber center-fires for big game.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Jon Lavalle

EG050113852

PROPOSAL 12 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. Change the salvage requirement for wildfowl in Unit 18 as follows:

In Game Management Unit 18, all edible portions of migratory and upland birds must be salvaged except the wingtip, feathers, and non-edible entrails.

ISSUE: In Unit 18, it is customary and traditional to salvage all edible portions of migratory and upland birds. In the fall of 2011, a Bethel resident threw away, in the dumpster, up to ten swans with only the breast meat salvaged. This drew the ire of the local people and created community uproar.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to waste precious and valuable edible portions of migratory and upland birds.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It would bring the salvage requirements up to local moral, ethical, customary, and traditional standards.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone is likely to benefit. If a sport hunter does not wish to retain other than the breast meat, the remainder shall be donated to local charities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who waste edible portions of migratory and upland birds.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There are no solutions to address the issue of waste.

PROPOSED BY: Myron Naneng Sr., AVCP

EG042413782

Nome Area – Unit 22

PROPOSAL 13 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change the winter moose season in Unit 22E from January to March as follows:

Winter moose season in Unit 22E: **March 1 - March 31** [JANUARY 1 – JANUARY 31] with a bag limit of one antlered bull.

ISSUE: Change the month a winter moose season in Unit 22E takes place. The change would give residents in Unit 22E safer access to hunting areas with longer daylight and better snow travel conditions.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Winter travel to the Unit 22E moose hunting areas is extremely difficult early in the winter (December and January) with frequent winter storms, very short daylight in which to safely hunt and travel. An example is this past early winter when the Unit 22E area did not receive adequate snow conditions for snow machine travel until mid-January.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? A March season for antlered bull moose will give residents of Unit 22E a better opportunity to put meat in their freezer. It will allow residents to obtain a food resource during the middle of the winter when their stored food resources are beginning to dwindle and their freezers are beginning to empty. This proposed season will not improve the quality of the resource harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This proposal will benefit the residents of Unit 22E including residents living in Wales and Shishmaref.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? We foresee that no person will likely suffer if the proposal is adopted.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Native Village of Wales

EG042213752

PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(20). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish an antlered bull season in Unit 22A Unalakleet River drainage (Unit 22A Central) to be announced by emergency order during the period December 1–December 31 as follows:

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

(20)

...

Unit 22(A) that portion in the Unalakleet River drainage and all drainages flowing into Norton Sound north of the Golsovia River drainage and south of the Tagoomenik and Shaktoolik River drainages

1 antlered bull by registration permit only; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 14

No open season.

1 antlered bull by registration permit only; during the period Dec. 1 - Dec. 31, a season may be announced by emergency order

Dec. 1–Dec. 31
(To be announced)

No open season.

...

ISSUE: Moose seasons in the central portion of Unit 22A were closed in Regulatory Year (RY) 2005 because of a declining trend in the area's moose populations since 1989. A stratified moose census completed in March 2008 estimated 339 moose in the area, and beginning the following regulatory year the Alaska Board of Game adopted a registration moose hunt regulation with harvest quotas to prevent over harvest. A stratified moose census completed of the area in February 2012 estimated 545 moose \pm 17.1% (452 to 639 moose at 90% C.I.), which is a 13% annual rate of increase since the 2008 population survey. Using a conservative harvest rate of 4% bulls, the population is expected to continue to grow.

The fall season dates of September 1–September 14 are used to help avoid warm weather at the beginning of the season to improve meat care, and to help minimize disturbance and harvest of adult bulls as they enter the breeding season. Protection of breeding bulls in September is considered a key step in the process to rebuild the population while allowing hunters the opportunity to harvest bulls earlier in the first half of September. Recent harvest quotas have been 14 antlered bulls in RY2011 and 22 antlered bulls in RY2012.

In each of the last two hunting seasons, harvest quotas were not reached in the fall hunt and season extensions were requested by the public. In these situations, the preferred solution to an extended season is through a winter hunt by emergency order for antlered bulls to fulfill the unmet portion of the annual quota. Extending the September season is less advisable because of the strategy to protect breeding bulls. To respond to public requests, this proposal establishes a 'to be announced' winter season which gives the department flexibility to announce additional hunting opportunity to reach harvest quota. Based on the emergency order season extension

completed in RY2012, the preferred winter hunt management is by registration permit RM844 for antlered bulls during December. The registration permit requires harvest reporting within 1 day allowing the hunt to be monitored closely to ensure that over-harvest does not occur.

Antler drop of mature bulls commences in November and a season in December is not expected to impact or harvest the breeding bulls in the population. Younger bulls retain their antlers into January and early February making them available for harvest during a season announced in December.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The public may continue to request season extension if harvest quota is not met.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Possibly, young bulls retain their antlers and would be taken if a December hunt is announced.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters wishing to harvest an antlered bull moose, expanded opportunity in the winter.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those preferring, or only able, to hunt in the fall season.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? January 1–January 31 period for announced season, but not preferred by the local community. Extending the season to September 20, rejected to protect breeding bulls.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613949

PROPOSAL 15 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(20). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 22C and the Remainder of Unit 22D as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(20)		
Unit 22(C)		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull by registration permit only, or	Sept. 1-Sept. 14	
1 antlerless moose by	Sept. 15-Sept. 30	

registration permit only; or

1 antlered bull by registration permit only; during the period Jan. 1 – Jan. 31, a season may be announced by emergency order

Jan. 1 – Jan. 31
(to be announced)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1-Sept. 14

...

Remainder of Unit 22(D)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Aug. 10 - Sept. 14
Oct. 1 - Jan. 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1 - Sept. 14

...

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

In October 1999, the Board of Game authorized a registration hunt for antlerless moose in Unit 22C and the department has managed this hunt with a quota of up to 33 permits annually. During the period from RY2001 through RY2012, the Unit 22C population was above its management objective of 450-525 moose and believed to be at or near winter range carrying capacity with populations of 620 and 660 moose, respectively in RY2007 and RY2011. Lowering the population through additional bull harvest was ill-advised due to low bull:cow ratios, ranging from 10-20 bulls:100 cows. Instead, issuing antlerless permits was used to yield harvests of 8-24 antlerless moose per year over the period since RY2001 to achieve population reduction and stabilization. This approach successfully reduced the population to the current estimate of 429

moose in February 2013. Although the department has the latitude of issuing antlerless permits, no permits are planned to be issued in RY2013 because the population has been lowered to management guidelines. We will consider antlerless hunts when factors suggest the population is increasing above carrying capacity. Retaining the antlerless authorization gives flexibility to the department in future hunt management.

In most other parts of Unit 22, low recruitment rates are believed to be causing low moose populations and declines. However, in the Remainder of Unit 22D we recommend continued authorization of antlerless moose hunting where moose populations are increasing and hunting pressure is low. This portion of Unit 22D is relatively remote with difficult access and these factors contribute to limited hunting pressure in the area.

In the Remainder of Unit 22D, the moose population has grown 1% annually during the period 1997-2011 and the estimated number of moose has increased from 578 in 1997 to 700 in 2011. This area typically shows higher calf:cow and calf:adult ratios than other parts of Unit 22, annually ranging from 14-35ca:100ad with an average of 23ca:100ad since 1988. The reported cow harvest in this area has been low, averaging one cow moose per year since 2000. Village harvest survey data (collected only in 2000-2001) shows five cow moose were harvested from Unit 22D Remainder, which is a more realistic estimate of annual cow harvest compared to harvest ticket reports. Low harvest rates of antlerless moose support our recommendation to reauthorize antlerless moose seasons in the Remainder of Unit 22D.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity for antlerless moose in portions of Unit 22 will be needlessly lost.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who wish to harvest an antlerless moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613942

PROPOSAL 16 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Modify the season and bag limit for brown bear in Unit 22 as follows:

Priority 1: One brown/grizzly bear every regulatory year.

Priority 2: Open season from April 1-May 31 or later date by emergency order from the Department of Fish and Game, August 1- October 31.

ISSUE: Over population of brown/grizzly bears in Nome, Unit 22C, reports of sows with four to five cubs. Bears are over-competing with themselves for other potential food sources; bears

are breaking into cabins and taking food from meat drying racks. There are bear sightings in town.

The above date for the spring hunt is to accommodate for the seasonal climate change, spring in Unit 22 does not happen on the exact calendar date every year. This would allow for hunters the most optimum time to hunt brown/grizzly bears in the spring from a very healthy bear population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bear population will continue to populate and grow out of control. Bear sightings in town will increase; potential for harm to people and pets as bears encroach into town and camp sites. The moose population is declining and will continue to decline.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by having a more liberal spring season it would allow bear hunters to take advantage of the optimum time to harvest the hide on brown bears; spring in Unit 22 does not happen on an exact calendar date every year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bear hunting guides, bear hunters, migratory bird hunters, bird watchers, subsistence harvesters, sport fishermen, salmon fishery, moose hunters, moose population, musk ox hunters, caribou hunters, reindeer herders, campers and the general public.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Excessive amount of brown/grizzly bears showing up in town, and subsistence use areas.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Considered two bears every year to help control an overabundant bear population. Try the above proposal first.

PROPOSED BY: Sitnasuak Native Corp., Kawerak, Inc., King Island Native Corp., and Nome Eskimo Community
EG043013837

PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Extend the brown bear season in Unit 22A as follows:

All of Unit 22A: brown/grizzly bear, August 1- **June 15** [MAY 31]

ISSUE: Unit 22A south of the Golsovia River drainage has been iced in until after May 31 in 2005-2010, 2011 and 2012.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? No one can hunt grizzly bear in May by boat. All of Unit 22 should have the same season ending date.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Grizzly bear hunters, moose and the reindeer near St. Michael.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Virgil Umphenour

EG050313890

PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC 85.060. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals. Extend the wolf hunting season in Unit 22 as follows:

Unit 22: wolf, August 1- **May 31** [APRIL 30]

ISSUE: Ending of wolf season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wolves cannot be taken by bear and seal hunters in May.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Virgil Umphenour

EG050313891

PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 85.060. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals. Extend the wolverine hunting season in Unit 22 as follows:

Unit 22: wolverine, September 1- **April 30** [MARCH 31]

ISSUE: The end of wolverine season for hunting should be the same as for trapping.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People may get the hunting and trapping seasons mixed up.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Virgil Umphenour

EG050313892

Barrow Area – Unit 26A

PROPOSAL 20 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Extend the bull moose hunting season in Unit 26A as follows:

The open season for the general hunt for bull moose in the Colville River drainage above and including the Anaktuvuk River drainage and in the area classified as “Remainder” will be August 1 - **September 30** [SEPTEMBER 14].

ISSUE: Extend the season for the general hunt for bull moose from August 1 - September 14 to August 1 – September 30 in the Colville River drainage above and including the Anaktuvuk River drainage and in the area classified as "Remainder".

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters' opportunity to harvest moose will be unnecessarily restricted.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? With a warming climate it is sometimes difficult to prevent harvested meat from spoiling in early September. If hunters could hunt later, when it is cooler, it would be easier for hunters to take better care of their meat resulting in a better product. In addition, due to the warmer temperatures, moose are moving into the river bottoms later, so it would provide hunters a better hunting opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who are trying to provide food for their families and community.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who simply want to view and photograph wildlife.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered not changing the season because the moose population is fairly low and we want it to grow. This was rejected because there are other factors in place that will prevent overharvest such as 1) a ban on using aircraft to fly in and harvest moose during the general season hunt and 2) the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation owns most of the land where moose are hunted and they only allow residents of North Slope villages to hunt there.

PROPOSED BY: North Slope Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG121412727

PROPOSAL 21- 5 AAC 95.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Allow moose hunting in the Anaktuvuk Pass Controlled Use Area, modify the bag limit, and change the nonresident moose permit allocation for nonresidents as follows:

ISSUE: Change the number of nonresident moose permits to two for DM980 and two for DM981, and allow moose hunting in the Anaktuvuk Pass Controlled Use Area.

There would be two nonresident moose permits for DM980 and two permits for DM981. Moose must be 50 inches or have three brow tines.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nonresidents will not have an opportunity to hunt moose in Unit 26A. The population of moose in Unit 26A is growing and there are a large percentage of old bulls that will die of old age.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, The bull to cow ration is high and the harvest of the bulls would help.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nonresident moose hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, as there are already resident moose permits for residents.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: David Byrd

EG042212543

PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(24). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

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

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
<u>(24)</u>		
Unit 26(A), that portion in the Colville River drainage upstream from and including the Anaktuvuk River drainage		
1 bull; or	Aug. 1 – Sept. 14	No open season.
1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 40 permits may be issued; up to 20 percent of the permits may be issued to nonresident hunters; or	Sept 1 – Sept. 14	Sept 1 – Sept. 14
1 moose; a person may	Feb. 15 – Apr. 15	No open season.

not take a calf or a cow
accompanied by a calf.

Unit 26(A), that portion west
of 156° 00' W. longitude ex-
cluding the Colville River
drainage

1 moose; a person may
not take a calf or a cow
accompanied by a calf.

July 1 – Sept 14

No open season.

...

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Two areas in Unit 26A are considered by this proposal: 1) the Colville River drainage upstream from and including the Anaktuvuk River drainage; and 2) the portion of Unit 26A west of 156 00' W longitude and north of the Colville drainage.

Within the 'upstream' portion of the Colville River drainage, a winter hunt was established by the Board of Game in November 2005 and opened in RY2005 to provide more hunting opportunity in an area where the moose population was, at that time, increasing in Unit 26A. Since most bull moose shed their antlers before the established season opening of February 15, the bag limit for this hunt is one moose, except a calf or cow accompanied by a calf may not be taken. This area is remote and inaccessible and has a moose population that is at low numbers but is slowly increasing. In the past winter seasons, there has been a low harvest of cows during antlerless hunts: two cows in 2006, three cows in 2007, one cow in 2008, one in 2009, and no cows in 2010-2012. A similar low harvest is anticipated for the RY2013. The low rate of antlerless moose harvest (zero-three per year) in the Colville River drainage should not prevent the population from recovering and we recommend reauthorization of the antlerless moose season in this area.

The portion of Unit 26A west of 156° 00' W longitude and north of the Colville drainage has a sparse distribution of moose. Each year a small percentage of moose (primarily bulls and cows without calves) disperse away from the major river drainages and across the coastal plain. These moose provide the only opportunities for harvest in the northwestern portion of Unit 26A. Overall, the Unit 26A moose population is low, but the small number of dispersing cow moose that could be harvested under this reauthorization proposal will have very little impact on the size of the population. To date, after several years of hunting, few antlerless moose have been harvested in this portion of the unit. One cow was harvested in 2006, none in 2007, one in 2008, and none in 2009 -2012 during this hunt. We recommend reauthorization of the antlerless moose season in this portion of Unit 26A.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity will be needlessly lost.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters who need to harvest an antlerless moose when caribou or other game is unavailable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613944

PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC 99.025. Customary and traditional uses of game populations.

Review the customary and traditional use worksheet for the Teshekpuk Lake caribou herd and determine whether there are customary and traditional uses; if so, establish amounts reasonably necessary for subsistence (ANS), as follows:

5 AAC 99.025(a)(4)

SPECIES & UNIT	FINDING	AMOUNT REASONABLY NECESSARY FOR SUBSISTENCE USES
(4) Caribou		
<u>Units 22, 23, 24, 26(A), 26(B)</u> <u>(Teshekpuk Lake herd)</u>	<u>XXXXX</u>	<u>XXX – XXX</u>

ISSUE: The Alaska Board of Game (board) was first presented a customary and traditional use (C&T) worksheet for consideration of the customary and traditional uses of the Teshekpuk Lake caribou herd in 1990. The administrative record does not capture if a C&T determination was made at the 1990 board meeting. This same C&T worksheet was revised for the 1993 board meeting and stated:

“[B]ecause the Teshekpuk Caribou Herd is not specifically identified in current hunting regulations, there is no specific harvest ticket for this herd, and because so little is actually known about its seasonal movements over time, little information on any hunting of this herd is actually available. Based on caribou harvest ticket returns from GMU 26A, it appears that there is little hunting of the herd by non-North Slope residents (within its central range around the Teshekpuk Lake) because of difficult access.

It remains unclear whether the board made a C&T determination at the 1993 board meeting, so the Department of Fish and Game will provide an updated C&T worksheet for this herd, in addition to a written report with ANS options for the board’s consideration.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The requirements of AS 16.05.258 will go unaddressed to determine whether there are customary and traditional uses of the Teshekpuk Lake caribou herd and if so, there will be no ANS to ensure that reasonable opportunities for customary and traditional uses are provided to Alaska residents.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users of the Teshekpuk Lake caribou resource will benefit from decisions based upon the best available information, which provides the board with an unambiguous metric for assessing reasonable opportunities for subsistence uses of this caribou herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No action. However, this proposal provides the board with the opportunity to fulfill its statutory mandate to identify game populations that are customarily and traditionally taken or used for subsistence. If a harvestable surplus exists, the board “shall determine the amount of the harvestable portion that is reasonably necessary for subsistence uses” (AS 16.05.258(b)) and promulgate regulations that ensure reasonable opportunities for this herd are provided.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613909

PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC 85.060. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals. Change the hunting season and bag limit for coyote in Unit 26A to a no closed season and no bag limit as follows:

No bag limit and no closed season in Unit 26A for coyotes.

ISSUE: Currently, there is a two coyote bag limit in Unit 26A and a season from September 1 to April 30. This regulation is unnecessary since there is no conservation concern with this species in northwest Alaska as they are not native to northwest Alaska. Very few, if any, are seen or harvested in Unit 23 during any particular year since at least the 1940's when the first occasional appearances west and north of the Brooks Range were recorded. Already there is no limit and no closed season in Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B and 26C. This proposal was been submitted for Unit 26A.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Coyotes may become established in the area as their range expands. It is considered to have an occasional presence in Units 23 and 26A only since the mid-twentieth century and is not native to northwest Alaska. If populations were to become established there would be negative impacts to native species such as Dall sheep, hoary marmots, wolverines, red and white fox, waterfowl and other small mammals and birds. In

particular, coyotes could seriously impact sheep populations that are already very vulnerable to dramatic fluctuations related to weather and range conditions.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Preventing the establishment of coyote populations in northwest Alaska will protect sheep and other valuable native species.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those that are interested in protecting sheep populations and other native fauna from the establishment of a new predator species in northwest Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Kotzebue Sound Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG040113743

Kotzebue Area – Unit 23

PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC 85.050 (a)(2). Hunting seasons and bag limits for musk ox. Based on the distribution of the Cape Thompson musk ox population in northwestern Unit 23, change the Noatak River hunt area boundary to include the entire Noatak drainage and all areas north and west of the Kobuk River drainage as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(2)		
...		
Unit 23, that portion north and west of the <u>Kobuk River drainage</u> [NOATAK RIVER]		
1 bull by Tier II subsistence hunting permit only; up to 15 bulls may be taken	Aug. 1 - Mar. 15 (Subsistence hunt only)	No open season.
Remainder of Unit 23	No open season.	No open season.

ISSUE: Musk ox were introduced into northwest Unit 23 at Cape Thompson in 1970 as transplants from the Nunivak Island population. Initially, population growth was slow and somewhat localized, creating a skewed distribution in relation to available habitat. At the time the hunt first opened, animals were primarily distributed north and west of the Noatak River so this geographic feature was used as the hunt boundary. Through time, their range has expanded into a larger portion of northwestern Unit 23 and the Cape Thompson population now occupies the area north and west of the Kobuk River drainage. Since harvest rates and hunt quotas are based on the total musk ox population in this area, we propose changing the regulation to better match the geographic footprint of this herd to allow hunting of this population in areas that are currently closed to hunting.

The Noatak River drainage borders the Kobuk River drainage in the central portion of Unit 23. By using the Kobuk River drainage as a boundary for the musk ox hunt area in northwestern Unit 23, the portion of Unit 23 north and west of the Kobuk River drainage will include the entire Cape Thompson musk ox population as well as other portions of northwestern Unit 23. The proposed boundary encompasses the complete Noatak River drainage and solves the hunting

issue described above. It also becomes a drainage-based hunt area that is more easily recognized by hunters in the field.

Changing the hunt boundary is not anticipated to change the Tier II subsistence status in this hunt area due to population trend and available harvest compared to the amount reasonably necessary for subsistence (ANS). The number of animals occupying the area considered in this proposal has declined steadily from a peak of 369 in 2005 to an estimated 220 musk oxen in 2012. Although some of this decline may be attributable to emigration to areas outside the count area, the proposed boundary change contains the entire Cape Thompson population and does not change the way the population, or available harvest, is estimated. Using a conservative harvest rate of less than 3%, the harvestable surplus is calculated at 6 bulls per regulatory year. Since the available harvest is less than the ANS finding of 18-22 musk ox for this population, the harvest strategy should remain a Tier II subsistence hunt (TX107) in the future.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A hunt boundary based on the channel of the Noatak River, with little basis in biology or distribution of musk ox, will continue to exist and remain confusing or restrictive to hunters.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunt areas based on drainages in northwestern Unit 23 will make the full population available to hunter harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613908

PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(21). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. This is a placeholder proposal for reauthorized antlerless moose seasons in Unit 23. At this time, analysis of March/April 2013 population data that may affect antlerless hunts is not complete and will be provided as an amended proposal as follows:

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. This proposal serves as a placeholder for antlerless hunts in Unit 23 and will be amended through the analysis and recommendations submitted by the department prior to the public comment period for the Arctic/Western Region board meeting. As described below, recent population data needs to be analyzed to determine the potential impact on antlerless moose hunts in Unit 23, and whether that opportunity should be retained.

In general, moose density has been low in large portions of Unit 23 for an extended period and this situation prompted the development and use of registration hunt RM880 for resident hunters, beginning in RY2004. The resident registration hunt was implemented as a way to retain

antlerless opportunity through substantially shortened seasons limiting antlerless harvest to the months of November and December. The seasons and bag limits in Unit 23 have not changed since RY2004 and the reported harvest of antlerless moose has been low throughout this period.

Preliminary analysis of the March 2013 moose abundance surveys on the lower Noatak River show further declines in the moose population in this portion of Unit 23. Additional assessment of the population and analysis of data is planned by the department to determine the amount of decline and geographic extent of lowered moose populations. These factors may affect the hunt areas where antlerless hunting has been authorized in previous years, and any proposed antlerless areas for the future. An update to the regulation section referenced in this proposal [5 AAC 85.045 (a)(21)] will be provided through department comments submitted prior to the public comment period.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity will be needlessly lost. If antlerless hunts in Unit 23 are not reauthorized the board will need to determine whether the remaining hunts provide a reasonable opportunity for success in obtaining moose for subsistence uses.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters who need to harvest an antlerless moose when caribou or other game is unavailable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613943

PROPOSAL 27 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Modify brown bear harvest in Unit 23 on lands managed by the National Park Service as follows:

For lands in Unit 23 managed by the National Park Service (NPS), amend brown bear harvest regulations as follows:

1. Establish a three year mean, annual total human caused brown bear mortality limit of <8% for adult bears (i.e. > 2 years of age) based on NPS brown bear population estimates;
2. Reinstate resident brown bear tag fees;
3. Limit brown bear sport (general) harvest to one bear every four years.

ISSUE: Excessive sport (general) hunting brown bear harvest opportunity on lands managed by the NPS in Unit 23, in particular within the Noatak and Kobuk river drainages.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Excessive brown bear harvest opportunity is negatively impacting the conservation of brown bears in Unit 23.

Multiple liberalizations of brown bear harvest opportunity have occurred since 1998 for lands managed by the NPS in Unit 23. Season dates have been liberalized (1998 & 2002), draw hunt permit allocations have doubled (2010), resident brown bear tag fees have been revoked (2004), and restrictions on harvest have been liberalized from one bear every four years to one bear every year (2000 for residents, 2002 for nonresidents). The purpose behind these changes can easily be linked to the State's intensive management strategy and its desire to lessen the population of predators like brown bears in an effort to increase moose and caribou populations. While this may be accepted wildlife management for lands owned by the State of Alaska, it is contrary to the purposes for which Congress established national preserves which we readily admit provides for sport hunting, but NOT for the manipulation of one wildlife population to benefit another.

The liberalization of brown bear harvest regulations has not been justified on recognized scientific management principles. With little to no management data on brown bear populations the Board of Game has instead liberalized the regulations to benefit the opportunistic harvest of brown bears for the purpose of reducing the natural brown bear populations in Unit 23 by both guided and non-guided hunters.

Promoting theoretical maximum harvest rates without reliable biological data including current brown bear density estimates with an estimate of precision is a short sighted experiment that is not appropriate for lands managed by the NPS. Alaska Department of Fish and Game (department) has long acknowledged the significant limitations of managing high harvest rates using only harvest parameters to evaluate the impact to a brown bear population.

The impacts of significant liberalizations since 2008 cannot be effectively evaluated since the department has not published the *biannual* brown bear management report since 2009. Historically the state has published these reports in a timely fashion, but it appears, with the dramatic shift in state brown bear management policy that significant delays in publishing harvest data for public use is also occurring. Enhancing the difficulty in evaluating the negative impacts of the long term trend in significant liberalizations to brown bear harvest regulations is the fact that the state does not publish harvest data specific to lands managed by the NPS.

This is the second cycle of the Arctic/Northwest Regional Board of Game meeting in which no current brown bear management report has been available by the proposal submission deadline.

As stated by the National Parks Conservation Association at the previous Arctic/Northwest board meeting, approximately 80% of the total brown bear harvest in Unit 23 has occurred in the Noatak and Kobuk river drainages between 2001 and 2006. Significant portions of these two rivers are managed by NPS. In addition, department staff stated to the Board of Game in 2009 that for Regulatory Year 2008 median skull size for all harvested brown bears, and the median age of male brown bears, had fallen to the lowest level since 1989. With virtually no other data published by the state, the National Parks Conservation Association is handicapped in documenting the negative trends occurring during the last five years.

The NPS has stated “Unacceptable impacts are those that are inconsistent with park purposes and values; diminish opportunities for current or future generations to enjoy, learn about, or be inspired by park resources or values; or those that unreasonably interfere with other appropriate uses.”

The federal government has defined the conservation of healthy populations of wildlife as follows:

Conservation of healthy populations of wildlife – means the maintenance of wildlife resources and their habitats in a condition that assures stable and continuing *natural populations* and species mix of plants and animals in relation to their ecosystem...”

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, managing the natural brown bear population based on recognized scientific principles will promote the long term stability and availability of brown bears for harvest by local subsistence hunters and sport hunters who prize the trophy status of the population while simultaneously recognizing the management objectives, purposes, and values of the NPS.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents of the United States who value the long term integrity of the ecosystems managed by the NPS for future generations.

Sport hunters who value the brown bear as a world class trophy hunt.

Maintaining a natural cohort density reduces potential human conflicts on lands managed by NPS due to unnaturally high densities of young bears due to a low density of mature bears.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who prefer an artificially low brown bear population.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Managing brown bears based on recognized scientific principles is the only option for lands managed by NPS.

PROPOSED BY: National Parks Conservation Association EG050313903

PROPOSAL 28 - 5 AAC 85.060. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals. Change the hunting seasons and bag limits for coyote in Unit 23 to no closed season and no limits.

No bag limit and no closed season in Unit 23 for coyotes.

ISSUE: Currently, there is a two coyote bag limit in Units 23 and 26A. This regulation is unnecessary since there is no conservation concern with this species in northwest Alaska as they are not native to northwest Alaska. Very few, if any, are seen or harvested in Units 23-26A during any particular year since at least the 1940’s when the first occasional appearances West and North of the Brooks Range were recorded. Already there is no limit and no closed season in Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B and 26C.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Coyotes may become established in the area as their range expands. It is considered to have an occasional presence in Units 23-26A only since the mid-twentieth century and is not native to northwest Alaska. If populations were to become established there would be negative impacts to native species such as Dall sheep, hoary marmots, wolverines, red and white fox, waterfowl and other small mammals and birds. In particular, coyotes could seriously impact sheep populations that are already very vulnerable to dramatic fluctuations related to weather and range conditions.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Preventing the establishment of coyote populations in northwest Alaska will protect sheep and other valuable native species.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those that are interested in protecting sheep populations and other native fauna from the establishment of a new predator species in northwest Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Kotzebue Sound Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG04011823

PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 92.200. Purchase and sale of game. Allow the sale of caribou antlers harvested in Unit 23 as follows:

Remove the restrictions on selling caribou antlers in Unit 23 once they have been removed from the skull.

ISSUE: The Board of Game should remove the restrictions on buying, selling or bartering caribou antlers from Unit 23 once they have been removed from any part of the skull. This regulation is no longer needed because the main caribou migration has shifted to a much later time, late October, when the rivers are freezing up or have frozen. People have much less access to them then in the past. This regulation has been in place for over twenty years without being reviewed. Under the current migration pattern there is little chance that people would shoot them just for their antlers. Removing this regulation will allow hunters to sell their antlers to recover a portion of the cost of fuel to get in the field and return.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Antlers will go to waste when they could have been sold to cover fuel costs and utilized for crafts or the natural dog chew market.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It allows better utilization of caribou antlers that might otherwise be wasted.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All people who hunt caribou in Unit 23 will benefit by being able to recoup some of the money they spend on boat fuel.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody would suffer by removing this regulation.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Daniel Montgomery

EG042513788

Regional and Multiple Units

PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Open resident sheep seasons ten days before nonresident seasons in the Arctic/Western Region as follows:

Change the dates for sheep hunting to:

Alaska residents:	August 1 to September 20
Nonresidents:	August 10 to September 20

ISSUE: The quality, safety and crowded conditions of sheep hunting at the start of the season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The overall quality and safety of sheep hunting in Alaska will continue to deteriorate due to the large number of people trying to get into the field at the start of the season. This will put a big strain on all of the resources and parties involved.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would increase the overall quality and safety of sheep hunting for both residents and nonresidents by eliminating overcrowding and the competition for available resources.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both residents and nonresidents would benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, although the guides and some nonresidents may disagree.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There is no other solution to this problem. I think that the guiding industry is doing a good job for their customers using a public resource to make a very good living. I welcome nonresidents to come to Alaska and hunt but a quality hunt is very important for everyone and unless something is done this will not be the case.

PROPOSED BY: Leonard Jewkes EG043013842

PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 85.055 Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Open resident sheep hunting seasons seven days before nonresident seasons in the Arctic/Western Region as follows:

Sheep season dates:

Alaska residents:	August 5 – September 20
Nonresidents:	August 12 – September 20

Alaska residents may only hunt sheep in regions with similar start dates. This will keep hunters from trying to get an early start in one region (which would cause overcrowding) and then shift

to another area. If a resident hunter picks Regions III or V, those are the only regions they may hunt sheep for that season. If the Board of Game would have passed the early start dates at the last statewide meeting we wouldn't have to make more rules. We need to start this region by region so Alaskans will have this statewide preference by 2016. A different colored sheep tag for Region III & V would make it easy to see if the resident hunter is in the appropriate area and legal (*This proposal was also submitted for Region III*).

ISSUE: Overcrowding, lack of quality experiences, and low allocations of sheep for Alaska residents. Nonresidents harvest over 40% of Alaska's sheep and that number keeps increasing.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The quality of the hunt has been diminished by overcrowding and this is the best way to separate the number of hunters in the field. This is not a new idea and resident sheep hunters have supported this concept in the past. The resident has had to compete against the infrastructure of the guiding industry and everyone is trying to enter the mountains at the same time. Air services could spread out their charters and many residents would be returning when the nonresident hunters would be heading out to hunt with their chosen guide. Getting a legal ram is a difficult task and this would give our young Alaska resident hunters a much better opportunity to be successful. This should be a statewide proposal but the Board of Game failed to pass any of the 23 proposals presented to them requesting some preferences for Alaska residents. This statewide issue won't come up again until 2016 so now we need to adjust the dates in different regions.

The only other solution is to put all nonresidents on permits. The number of permits given to nonresidents would be 15% of the total sheep harvest of the previous year. Example: 1000 sheep harvested = 150 permits for nonresidents.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This will make it much easier to get hunters in and out of the field – both resident and nonresident. Both groups will have a better experience due to less crowded conditions. Guides want people to think that nonresidents will quit coming to Alaska to hunt if any preference is given to Alaska residents and this is not the case. Nonresidents can come to Alaska and buy over the counter tags for most species cheaper than a deer tag can be purchased in many of the western states. The nonresident tag fees are a big boost to the Department of Fish and Game but the Board of Game and the Alaska Legislature needs to keep resident Alaskans as their number one priority.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska resident sheep hunters and nonresident sheep hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Commercial operators (guides) will complain but they are making money off a public resource we (all Alaskans) own and many of these guides are nonresidents who can't legally harvest sheep, goats, or brown bears but they can guide other nonresidents. The price of the tag is cheap but the cost of a guided hunt is expensive.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Tom Lamal

EG042913829

PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Open a bowhunting only season for Dall sheep in the Arctic/Western Region as follows:

Add a new bowhunting only sheep season in all northern and northcentral units where there is a current general sheep season. Dates would be August 1 - 9. The bag limit would be one full curl ram. Only open to International Bowhunter Education Program (IBEP) certified bowhunters.

ISSUE: Overcrowding of hunters seeking Dall sheep is reducing the quality of the sheep hunting experience.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The problem will continue to increase and eventually all sheep hunting will need to be by drawing permit.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It would improve the quality of the outdoor experience which qualifies as a resource. It would not improve the quality of the products produced.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bowhunters by being given a chance to hunt sheep with less direct competition from rifle hunters. Firearm sheep hunters by not seeing quite as many hunters in the field when they were actually hunting because the bowhunters who wanted to hunt sheep would probably utilize the bow season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one really. Bowhunters for Dall sheep have a very low success rate even when they are allowed to take any sheep. This hunt would be much more difficult because it would be for full curl rams only. This proposal would serve to spread out utilization with very little effect on the sheep population. Multiple parties on the mountain at the same time significantly reduces the quality and enjoyment of the hunting experience for all involved.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Have the new archery season be after the regular sheep season, September 21-30. This is the model which has been in effect for over 30 years in Unit 14C. However the northern units (especially the Brooks Range) have very short cold days in late September and weather could be a safety issue. Long warm days are important to bowhunters who must be patient waiting for an opportunity to get close to sheep.

PROPOSED BY: Alaskan Bowhunters Association

EG050113876

PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Change nonresident sheep hunts to drawing hunts and limit the permit distribution to ten percent of the annual ten year average for the Arctic/Western Region as follows:

Nonresidents wanting to participate in sheep hunting in Alaska will have to enter by drawing permit. The drawing permit will be limited to a maximum of 10% of the annual ten year historical average sheep harvest in Region V.

ISSUE: Because of our decreasing resident hunter success and falling sheep populations, I would like the Board of Game to limit, by drawing permit, all nonresident hunters of Alaska's Dall sheep to a maximum of 10% of the preceding ten year average historical harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaskans limited natural resources will continue to be taken by increasing number of nonresidents. Ignoring this fact, and the fact of our shrinking sheep population, will soon force drawing permits on Alaska residents.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this proposal not only protects our natural resources from the ever increasing pressure of the guide industry, but also places Alaska on EQUAL footing with ALL western states who have long ago, limited the nonresident hunters to a maximum of 10% of the sheep permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaska residents, and the natural resources we are entrusted with.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some nonresident hunters and some in the guide industry.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Trying, yet again, to express to the Board of Game that we have a statewide problem with our Dall sheep populations. I am not blaming the guide industry for the decreasing sheep populations, I am saying that the increased percentage nonresident harvest, shows an increased pressure on our sheep.

The first step in restricting access of our limited game resources, should be to place our nonresident hunters on EQUAL footing with the nonresident hunters in other states.

PROPOSED BY: Vern Fiehler

EG042813810

PROPOSAL 34 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Hunting seasons and bag limits. Allocate a small percent of game harvest for nonresidents in Unit 26 as follows:

Only allow a small or token percent of the most abundant game for nonresidents in Unit 26.

ISSUE: In my 50 years in Alaska the number of nonresident hunters and big game guides has increased dramatically which has diminished a resident's opportunities, mainly on sheep but certainly includes all big game, now we even have nonresident guides. Opening sheep hunting

for residents early is the only way I see to give residents a fair opportunity at success, especially older residents. I have observed guides putting their camps in and locating sheep and other big game weeks before the season and manning these camps to discourage and chase away hunters that might compete. Other states give priority to residents but here nonresidents have equal footing and now the most sought after hunt of Delta bison nonresidents are increasing every year. This hunt should be residents only. I have spoken at Board of Game meetings about these very issues in the past and members that are big game guides have laughed me out of the room. It's time to man up and do the right thing, reduce nonresident hunting and let them have only a small percent of what is available. Thank you.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Less opportunities for residents and more opportunities for nonresidents.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Will definitely improve the quality, more and bigger sheep, in the 1960s and 1970s I harvested 9 rams over 41" that cannot happen anymore.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents of Alaska will benefit, our constitution says that the big game should be managed for sustained yield for all Alaskans, to my knowledge it says nothing about nonresidents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I don't think nonresidents will suffer, just less opportunities, it will reduce the number of big game guides which will help all residents and therefore the State of Alaska.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo is not an option.

PROPOSED BY: Norman Pickus

EG042113751

PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 92.095 Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.

Prohibit the use of snares to take bears in the Arctic/Western Region as follows:

The new regulation would forbid the use of snares to take bears in the Region V Units.

5AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions

1. The following methods and means of taking furbearers under a trapping license are prohibited, in addition to the prohibitions in 5AAC 92.080:

(20) The taking of a bear by trap or snare

ISSUE: The 2010 decision to list black bears as a furbearer paved the way to allow bear snaring for the first time since statehood.

In Unit 16B, an experimental bear snaring program is in place allowing the snaring of both black and brown bears. Bear snaring is indiscriminate, allowing the capture and death of brown and black bears, cubs and sows with cubs.

The Department of Fish and Game is quoted as saying “The effectiveness of reducing both bear species through harvest methods to increase moose calf survival has not been demonstrated.” This conclusion was confirmed by ADF&G in a report to the Board of Game at the Central/Southwest Region Meeting February 8-15, 2012 showing no correlation between high harvest levels of bears and moose calf survivability in Unit 16B.

The McGrath predator control poster child that the Board of Game references time and time again resulted in higher moose calf survivability only after killing 97% of the black bears in the area, 75% of the wolves and 50% of the brown bears. This program has cost the state untold hundreds of thousands of dollars (more likely millions), and still only 50% of the moose calves survived to weaning-not even to adult recruitment. At least one member of the board has offered the suggestion that the Board of Game needs to ramp up their efforts in 16B to achieve the results they are looking for.

The McGrath model is not a program to emulate elsewhere. The consequences of ridding the landscape of predators to enhance moose numbers is an expensive experiment that disregards the impacts of disturbing the natural balance of functioning ecosystems.

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the Board of Game have significantly liberalized regulations for the killing of predators in recent years. State regulations and policies now allow snaring of brown and black bears, baiting of brown bears, killing sows with cubs and cubs, year-round seasons, unlimited bag limits, and killing animals in their dens and from aircraft. In conjunction with these changes, the Board of Game has also reauthorized land and shoot hunting, and has vastly expanded predator control areas. All of this has been done with little scientific or social justification.

The bottom line is bear snaring is indiscriminate, wasteful, and cruel and poses a danger to the public. With unlimited numbers of snares and long open seasons, snaring may kill more bears than is sustainable. Snaring and killing of bears regardless of age, species, and gender is incompatible with the scientific principles and the ethics of modern wildlife management.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A scientific article published in 2011 in documents the Alaska Board of Game’s liberalization of hunting regulations for grizzly bears. The four highly-respected scientists concluded in their report that “*Current attitudes, policies and absence of science-based management of grizzly bears in Alaska are increasingly similar to those that resulted in near extirpation of grizzly bears south of Canada in the 19th and 20th centuries. If current trends continue, they increase risk to portions of the most intact population of grizzly bears in North America*”.

Additionally, as bear populations diminish, the viewing public will have fewer opportunities to see bears in the wild which could have significant economic impacts for the wildlife viewing businesses around the state.

More bears will become food-conditioned causing a danger to people, families and communities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Bear snaring is wasteful and requires no salvage of meat, only the hide and skull. Trappers will still be allowed to harvest a bear under trapping licenses by using a firearm and bait stations. Under this method, a trapper can be selective in harvesting a bear and avoid taking non target species and cubs or females with cubs.

Managing bear populations using modern wildlife management practices will result in healthier ecosystems including the tendency for ungulates to over browse areas if predators are absent.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans and visitors who value wildlife and sound biological management of our wildlife resources and who want to view wildlife will benefit. Tourism-related businesses will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer as a result of this proposal being adopted. The practice of bear snaring only promotes waste and disrespect for wildlife.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There are no other solutions. The snaring of bears must be halted.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Alliance

EG042913826

PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Hunting seasons and bag limits. Allocate 90% drawing permits to residents for the Arctic/Western Region and distribute remaining permits as follows:

Alaska residents will receive a minimum of 90% of all drawing permits and nonresidents will receive a maximum of 10% of permits, but 10% is not guaranteed. If Alaskans don't apply for particular permits, the extra or leftover permits may be issued to nonresidents (higher tag fees), sold over the counter to residents and nonresidents on a first come first serve basis, or do another drawing. Any hunt with less than 10 permits for an area is not open for nonresident drawings but if there are permits leftover, nonresidents may purchase the permits over the counter.

ISSUE: Allocation of permits for Alaska residents.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? All of the western states have a high allocation of their drawing permits reserved for their residents. Most of the drawing permits in Alaska don't have any preference for the Alaska resident. A resident can put in for a drawing for 20 years and next year he is on equal footing with a nonresident putting in for the first time. Since Alaska doesn't have preference points (has to be funded by the legislature) the Board of Game needs to give a high allocation of the permits to resident hunters. The commercial operators (guides) don't want either because it is in their best interests not to give Alaska residents any advantage. We're not too far away from having many of our sheep hunts go on permits and moose and caribou are a possibility in certain areas. In many of the western states it is a 90/10 split with 90%+ going to the resident and a maximum of 10% going to the nonresident, but 10% is not guaranteed.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Alaskans will receive the same respect other states give their residents and the majority of permit hunted game will go in the freezers of Alaska residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides and their nonresident clients.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Tom Lamal

EG042913830

PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Hunting seasons and bag limits. Allocate 90% of drawing permits to residents for the Arctic/Western Region and distribute remaining permits on a first come basis as follows:

Alaska residents should receive 90% of all drawing permits and nonresidents should receive 10%. If any permits are left over then they could be sold over the counter on a first come basis.

ISSUE: The way that Alaska allocates hunting permits for residents and nonresidents.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Currently Alaskan residents and nonresidents are on an equal footing when it comes to most permit drawings. If the current system continues a nonresident applying for a permit will have the same chance as a resident. That means that even though you live here year round and support your state you have the same chance as a nonresident. This hardly seems fair. Many states give their residents an advantage. With many hunts going to a permit draw I think it is high time Alaska does the same.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. A system will be put in place to help the Alaskan resident harvest more of the resource. This system is in place in many other states and it rewards their residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskan residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresidents.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solution is acceptable unless a point system is established favoring residents.

PROPOSED BY: Leonard Jewkes

EG043013841

PROPOSAL 38 – 5 AAC 92.015(a)(4), (8), (9) & (13) and 92.015(b)(4), (7), (8) & (10).

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

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

...

(4) Units... 26;

...

(8) Unit 22;

(9) Unit 23;

...

(13) Unit 18;

...

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

...

(4) Unit 18;

...

(7) Unit 22;

(8) Unit 23;

...

(10) Unit 26(A).

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

General Season Hunts: Reauthorizations are needed for: Unit 18, where the tag fee has been exempted for two years; Unit 22, where the tag fee has been exempted for twelve years; Unit 23, where the tag fee has been exempted for seven years; and Unit 26A, where the tag fee has been exempted for two years. Tag fee exemptions are desired to allow: 1) incremental increase in annual harvest, 2) opportunistic harvest by resident hunters, and 3) harvest by a wide range of users. Increased harvest is allowable because portions of these units have high bear populations.

General season brown bear harvest rates are within sustained yield limits and previous exemptions of the resident tag fee have not caused dramatic or unexpected increases in overall harvest. In Units 18 and 26A, tag exemptions were authorized for RY2012 and harvest has remained within sustained yield and continues to be similar to the preceding 10-year period. In Unit 22, the 12-year tag-free period for residents has had an average annual harvest of 50 brown bears (range 41-63 bears). In Unit 23, general harvests have been increasing slowly since 1961 primarily in response to increases in human population rather than regulatory changes, although harvests are annually quite variable due to effects of weather on hunting conditions. Harvest data for Unit 23 show no trend in the sex ratio, age or size of bears harvested under all types of hunts.

Subsistence Season Hunts: Reauthorizations are needed for Units 18, 22, 23, and 26A where brown bear subsistence hunt requirements include: 1) a registration permit; 2) a tag fee exemption; 3) salvaging meat for human consumption; 4) no use of aircraft in Units 22, 23 and 26A; 5) no sealing requirement unless hide and skull are removed from subsistence hunt area; and 6) if sealing is required, the skin of the head and the front claws must be removed and retained by the department at the time of sealing. Continuing the tag fee exemption helps facilitate participation in the associated brown bear harvest programs maintained by the department for subsistence hunts.

In all Units, subsistence brown bear harvest rates are low and well within sustained yield limits and exempting the resident tag fee has not caused an increase in subsistence harvest. In Unit 18, we estimate one to three bears are taken annually in subsistence hunts. In Unit 22, subsistence harvest by permit is quite low, averaging less than one bear per year (less than 1 % of the total brown bear harvest). In Unit 23, subsistence permit harvest is less than five bears annually since 1992 (less than 10 % of the total brown bear harvest). In Unit 26A, between one and five bears are taken annually by subsistence hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The tag fee exemption will lapse and hunters will be required to purchase \$25 tags for general season and subsistence hunts. The brown bear harvest by residents will probably decline.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents who are reluctant or unable to purchase the \$25 tag before hunting will be able to opportunistically and legally harvest a brown bear.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613947

Interior Region

(Region III)

Proposal Index

(Note: Please review the “Regional and Multiple Units” section, which may include proposals that also affect the regulations for other units).

Regional & Multiple Units

- 39 Allocate 90 percent of drawing permits to residents in Region III.
- 40 Allocate a small percent of game harvest for nonresidents in Units 24, 25 and 26B
- 41 Modify the season dates for Dall sheep in Region III.
- 42 Open resident sheep hunting seasons seven days before nonresident seasons in Region III.
- 43 Open resident sheep seasons ten days before nonresident seasons in Region III.
- 44 Change the nonresident general sheep hunts to draw hunts and cap the number of permits in Region III.
- 45 Allocate 90 percent of drawing permits to residents for big game hunts and distribute remaining permits in Region III.
- 46 Change nonresident sheep hunts to drawing permit hunts and limit permit distribution to ten percent of the annual ten-year average for Region III.
- 47 Create a bowhunting-only season for Dall sheep in Region III.
- 48 Change all nonresident general season Dall sheep hunts in Unit 20 to drawing permit hunts.
- 49 Open resident sheep seasons one week prior to nonresidents in Units 25 and 26.
- 50 Review the customary and traditional use worksheet for the Teshekpuk Lake caribou herd and determine whether there are customary and traditional uses; if so, establish amounts reasonably necessary for subsistence.
- 51 Lengthen the wolf season in Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, and 25.
- 52 Reauthorize resident grizzly bear tag fee exemptions throughout Interior and Eastern Arctic Alaska.

- 53 Change the bag limit for black bear in Units 25C and 25D
- 54 Allow the Department of Fish and Game to offer permits for trapping bears under their discretionary authority in Region III.
- 55 Prohibit the use of snares to take bears in Region III.
- 56 Remove salvage requirements for brown bear meat when taken over a bait station in Region III.
- 57 Remove the salvage requirements for brown bears taken at bait stations in Units 12, 20C, 20E, and 22D.
- 58 Remove salvage requirements for brown bear meat when taken over a bait station in Units 12, 20C, 20E, and 21D.

McGrath Area – Units 19, 21A & 21E

- 59 Lengthen the nonresident moose season in Unit 21A.
- 60 Modify moose hunt requirements in 21E.
- 61 Reallocate moose drawing permits in Unit 21E.
- 62 Reauthorize the Unit 19A predation control program.
- 63 Reauthorize the Unit 19D-East predation control program.
- 64 Extend the lynx trapping season in Unit 19.
- 65 Establish a registration sheep hunt for residents in Unit 19C.
- 66 Create a musk oxen hunt in Units 18 & 19.
- 67 Modify the game management unit boundaries for Units 18, 19, and 21.

Galena Area – Units 21 B, 21C, 21D & 24

- 68 Change the Unit 21D moose permit hunt, DM818, to a general season hunt.
- 69 Allow moose hunting guides in Units 21D and 24 to select a replacement client.
- 70 Reauthorize the winter moose registration hunt in Unit 24B, RM833.

- 71 Reinststate the previous dimensions of the Kanuti Controlled Use Area.
- 72 Allow the taking of brown bears at black bear bait stations in Units 24C and 24D.
- 73 Extend lynx trapping season in Unit 21.

Northeast Alaska – Units 25A, 25B, 25D, 26B & 26C

- 74 Increase resident-only hunting in the Dalton Highway Management Corridor Area caribou season and create a youth hunt.
- 75 Change the resident-only hunting periods in the Dalton Highway Management Corridor Area caribou season and create a youth hunt.
- 76 Allow sidelock muzzleloading rifles using round ball only in Dalton Highway Management Corridor Area.
- 77 Clarify the subunit boundary between Unit 26B and 26C.
- 78 Modify antler restriction bag limit for moose in Unit 25.
- 79 Create a new hunt area for moose in Unit 25A and establish season dates and bag limits.
- 80 Allow harvest of brown bears over black bear bait in Unit 25D

Tok Area – Units 12 & 20E

- 81 Establish a nonresident Dall sheep drawing permit hunt for the Tok Management Area in Units 12, 13C and 20D, with conditions.
- 82 Limit Glacier Valley Mountain Controlled Use Area to walk-in only for sheep hunting.
- 83 Limit guides to two black bear bait stands in Units 12 and 20E.
- 84 Allow permits to use inedible game meat for bear bait.
- 85 Establish a registration hunt for Nelchina caribou in Unit 12.
- 86 Modify resident bag limit for moose in portions of Units 12 and 20D.
- 87 Reauthorize the Upper Yukon/Tanana Predation Control Program.

- 88 Modify the Upper Yukon/Tanana Predation Control Program.
- 89 Establish a wolf control program in Unit 12.

Delta Area – Unit 20D

- 90 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20D.
- 91 Modify the season and bag limits for DM795 in Unit 20D and change the qualification for disabled hunters.
- 92 Modify the bag limit for bison in Unit 20D to one per lifetime; limit one permit per household.
- 93 Correct a discrepancy in bag limits for the Macomb caribou herd in Unit 12.
- 94 Modify the season and bag limits for the Macomb caribou herd registration hunt in Unit 20D.
- 95 Modify the Macomb caribou registration hunt season and bag limits in Units 12 and 20D, and require locking tags.
- 96 Include Johnson Slough Island Unit in a portion of Unit 20D moose hunt boundary.

Fairbanks Area – Units 20A, 20B, 20C, 20F & 25C

- 97 Reauthorize antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20A.
- 98 Change bag limit for moose in Unit 20A to any bull.
- 99 Eliminate the Wood River Controlled Use Area.
- 100 Modify the boundaries of the Wood River Controlled Use Area.
- 101 Create targeted moose hunts in Units 20A and 20B.
- 102 Allow the taking of any bull by utilizing two harvest tickets in Unit 20A and portions of Unit 20B
- 103 Allow a hunter to proxy hunt only once per year for moose in Units 20A and 20B.
- 104 Allow incidental brown bear harvest over black bear bait in Units 20A and 20B.

- 105 Allow brown bear harvest over black bear bait in Units 20A and 20B.
- 106 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20B.
- 107 Create a nonresident moose season in Unit 20B within the Minto Flats Management Area.
- 108 Allow the use of air boats for moose hunting in the Minto Flats Management Area.
- 109 Create a muzzleloader registration hunt in DM 782, Unit 20B and modify season dates and hunt area.
- 110 Eliminate the muzzleloader hunt for bull moose in the Middle Fork of the Chena River and upper Salcha River in Unit 20B.
- 111 Lengthen the moose season in Salcha River Drainage upstream from and including Goose Creek in Unit 20B.
- 112 Create a youth hunt drawing permit for antlerless moose in Unit 20B and a create a Unit 20B Youth Hunt Management Area.
- 113 Create a drawing youth sheep hunt in Unit 20B Remainder.
- 114 Repeal the requirement for leaving evidence of sex (gender) on black bear until sealing has taken place in Unit 20B.
- 115 Change bag limit and season for moose in Unit 20C.
- 116 Establish a Controlled Use Area for the Nenana-Totchaket Resource Development Corridor.
- 117 Reinstate the Nenana Controlled Use Area.
- 118 Change season dates for fall moose in Unit 20F Yukon River and Tanana River Drainages.
- 119 Change season dates for winter moose in Unit 20F Yukon River and Tanana River Drainages.
- 120 Require trophy value of moose to be destroyed in Unit 20F Yukon River and Tanana River Drainages.
- 121 Create a Controlled Use Area along the Manley to Tanana road.

Antlerless Moose and Brown Bear Tags Outside of Regions III & V

- 122 Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemptions for Region IV.
- 123 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Berners Bay and Gustavus in Unit 1C.
- 124 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 5A.
- 125 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6C.
- 126 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Twentymile/Portage/Placer hunt area in Units 7 and 14C.
- 127 Reauthorize the drawing permit hunts for antlerless moose in Unit 13.
- 128 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 14C.
- 129 Reauthorize the drawing permit hunt for antlerless moose in Unit 14A and the targeted winter hunt for antlerless moose in Units 14A and 14B.
- 130 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Unit 15C.
- 131 Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt on Kalgin Island in Unit 16B.
- 132 Reauthorize the winter antlerless moose hunt in Unit 17A.

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
Interior Region Meeting
(Game Management Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, and 26C)
February 14-23, 2014
Alpine Lodge
Fairbanks, Alaska

~TENTATIVE AGENDA~

NOTE: This Tentative Agenda is subject to change throughout the course of the meeting.

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

Friday, February 14, 8:30 AM

OPENING BUSINESS

Call to Order

Introductions of Board Members and Staff

Board Member Ethics Disclosures

Purpose of Meeting (overview)

STAFF AND OTHER REPORTS

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

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

Saturday, February 15, 8:30 AM

PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY Continued

Sunday, February 16, 8:30 AM

BOARD DELIBERATIONS (Upon conclusion of public testimony)

Monday, February 17 – Sunday, February 23, 8:30 AM

BOARD DELIBERATIONS Continued

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

ADJOURN

Special Notes

- A. This agenda is TENTATIVE and subject to change during the meeting. A list of staff reports and a roadmap will be available at the meeting. Scheduled updates will be available on the Board of Game website.
- B. Meeting materials are available at: www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=gameboard.meetinginfo or by contacting the ADF&G Boards Support Office in Juneau at 465-4110.
- C. A live audio stream for the meeting is intended to be available at: www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov
- D. The State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game complies with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). Individuals with disabilities who may need auxiliary aids, services, and/or special modifications to participate in this hearing and public meeting should contact 465-4110 no later than January 31, 2014 to make any necessary arrangements.

Regional and Multiple Units

PROPOSAL 39 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Hunting seasons and bag limits. Allocate 90% drawing permits to residents for the Interior Region and distribute remaining permits on a first come basis as follows:

Alaska residents should receive 90% of all drawing permits and nonresidents should receive 10%. If any permits are left over then they could be sold over the counter on a first come basis.

ISSUE: The way that Alaska allocates hunting permits for residents and nonresidents.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Currently Alaskan residents and nonresidents are on an equal footing when it comes to most permit drawings. If the current system continues, a nonresident applying for a permit will have the same chance as a resident. That means that even though you live here year round and support your state you have the same chance as a nonresident. This hardly seems fair. Many states give their residents an advantage. With many hunts going to a permit draw I think it is high time Alaska does the same.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. A system will be put in place to help the Alaskan resident harvest more of the resource. This system is in place in many other states and it rewards their residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskan residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresidents.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solution is acceptable unless a point system is established favoring residents.

PROPOSED BY: Leonard Jewkes

EG043013841

PROPOSAL 40 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Hunting seasons and bag limits. Allocate a small percent of game harvest for nonresidents in Units 24, 25 and 26B as follows:

Only allow a small or token percent of the most abundant game for nonresidents in Units 24, 25 and 26B.

ISSUE: In my 50 years in Alaska the number of nonresident hunters and big game guides has increased dramatically which has diminished a resident's opportunities, mainly on sheep but certainly includes all big game, now we even have nonresident guides. Opening sheep hunting for residents early is the only way I see to give residents a fair opportunity at success, especially older residents. I have observed guides putting their camps in and locating sheep and other big game weeks before the season and manning these camps to discourage and chase away hunters

that might compete. Other states give priority to residents but here nonresidents have equal footing and now the most sought after hunt of Delta bison nonresidents are increasing every year, this hunt should be residents only. I have spoken at Board of Game meetings about these very issues in the past and members that are big game guides have laughed me out of the room. It's time to man up and do the right thing, reduce nonresident hunting and let them have only a small percent of what is available. Thank you.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Less opportunities for residents and more opportunities for nonresidents.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Will definitely improve the quality, more and bigger sheep, in the 1960s and 1970s I harvested nine rams over 41" that cannot happen anymore.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents of Alaska will benefit, our constitution says that the big game should be managed for sustained yield for all ALASKANS, to my knowledge it says nothing about nonresidents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I don't think nonresidents will suffer, just less opportunities, it will reduce the number of big game guides which will help all residents and therefore the State of Alaska.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo is not an option.

PROPOSED BY: Norman Pickus

EG042113751

PROPOSAL 41 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Modify season dates for Dall sheep in the Interior Region as follows:

Resident hunting season for Dall sheep shall be August 3rd to September 20th. Nonresident hunting season shall be from August 10th to September 20th. Drawing permit areas will start seven days earlier for Alaska residents and if there is a split season, the second half will be shortened by seven days for non-residents such that residents can start the second half seven days prior to non-residents.

ISSUE: The Board of Game (board) needs to address the lack of full curl legal rams available to Alaska residents. While sheep populations have been stable to slightly declining, the availability of legal rams, much less trophy rams, has been significantly reduced and is in serious decline. Success rates for resident sheep hunters will never be on par with nonresidents if not allowed an earlier jump from the efficiency of their guides.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaskan resident hunters will continue to suffer from the mismanagement of this species by the Board of Game. Alaskan youth will never have the opportunity afforded to their parents and grandparents to successfully hunt healthy populations of Dall sheep with ample populations of large rams. Alaska wildlife belongs to all Alaskans and these resources should be managed as such.

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

Yes. Resident hunters will have an improved quality of hunt and avoid conflicts with guides and their clients. Nonresident hunters will have an improved quality of hunt by avoiding conflicts with resident hunters. Transport services associated with sheep hunting will improve as this will lessen the bottleneck on transporters seen at the beginning of each season, especially during poor weather. This may also increase the safety of hunters and transporters by spreading out the season and users more. Current Alaska residents and future Alaskans may be more interested in hunting Dall sheep, its management, and the future of Dall sheep hunting if they had greater opportunity to locate and harvest a legal ram, much less quality rams.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska residents, Alaska youth, and future Alaskans. Dall sheep populations may also improve as more people may feel like they have a chance at successfully harvesting a quality ram and will be more interested in the management of the resource. This benefits Alaska, all of Alaska's game resources, and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, though some will say nonresident hunters, non-resident guides, and resident guides may suffer. Harvest records, however, show that resident sheep hunters are much less successful than nonresidents because of their guides. This is largely due to time guides can give to pre-season scouting, which is done mostly by fixed wing aircraft. While success rates for resident hunters will hopefully increase, there is little reason to think that nonresident success rates will decline significantly. Pre-season scouting will still be available to guides. Sheep populations will not suffer directly, again because resident hunter success rates are consistently low. Future sheep populations, however, may suffer and receive little support or interest, if today's youth and future generations cannot hunt healthy populations of sheep, as is currently the case. You will be hard pressed to find any Alaska resident who is not a guide or associated with a guiding business who does not favor this proposal. If not sure whether to favor Alaska residents over nonresidents, please look at any other state and how they manage their resources for the benefit of their residents and not for the financial benefit of a few.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close non-resident hunting of Dall sheep for five years or until healthy populations of sheep with sufficient populations of legal rams is re-established. Charge resident hunters nonresident harvest fees during this interim to offset any loss of funding from loss of nonresident tags. This would be the best management practice the board could do, as it would best serve current and future Alaska residents, and most of all best serve the Dall sheep population as a whole. I rejected this solution based on past performance of the board where political and financial interests of a few, trumped the best interests of Alaska residents, Alaska game resources, and Alaska itself.

PROPOSED BY: Jake Sprankle

EG042913813

PROPOSAL 42 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Open resident sheep hunting seasons seven days before nonresident seasons in the Interior Region as follows:

Sheep season dates in Region III:

Alaska residents:	August 5 – September 20
Nonresidents:	August 12 – September 20

Alaska residents may only hunt sheep in regions with similar start dates. This will keep hunters from trying to get an early start in one region (which would cause overcrowding) and then shift to another area. If a resident hunter picks Region III or V those are the only regions they may hunt sheep for that season. If the Board of Game would have passed the early start dates at the last statewide meeting we wouldn't have to make more rules. We need to start this region by region so Alaskans will have this statewide preference by 2016. A different colored sheep tag for Region III & V would make it easy to see if the resident hunter is in the appropriate area and legal. *(Note: This proposal was also submitted for the Arctic/Western Region).*

ISSUE: Overcrowding, lack of quality experiences, and low allocations of sheep for Alaska residents. Nonresidents harvest over 40% of Alaska's sheep and that number keeps increasing.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The quality of the hunt has been diminished by overcrowding and this is the best way to separate the number of hunters in the field. This is not a new idea and resident sheep hunters have supported this concept in the past. The resident has had to compete against the infrastructure of the guiding industry and everyone is trying to enter the mountains at the same time. Air services could spread out their charters and many residents would be returning when the nonresident hunters would be heading out to hunt with their chosen guide. Getting a legal ram is a difficult task and this would give our young Alaska resident hunters a much better opportunity to be successful. This should be a statewide proposal but the Board of Game failed to pass any of the 23 proposals presented to them requesting some preferences for Alaska residents. This statewide issue won't come up again until 2016 so now we need to adjust the dates in different regions.

The only other solution is to put all nonresidents on permits. The number of permits given to nonresidents would be 15% of the total sheep harvest of the previous year. Example: 1000 sheep harvested = 150 permits for nonresidents.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This will make it much easier to get hunters in and out of the field – both resident and nonresident. Both groups will have a better experience due to less crowded conditions. Guides want people to think that nonresidents will quite coming to Alaska to hunt if any preference is given to Alaska residents and this is not the case. Nonresidents can come to Alaska and buy over the counter tags for most species cheaper than a deer tag can be purchased in many of the western states. The nonresident tag fees are a big boost to the Department of Fish and Game but the Board of Game and the Alaska Legislature needs to keep resident Alaskans as their number one priority.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska resident sheep hunters and nonresident sheep hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Commercial operators (guides) will complain but they are making money off a public resource we (all Alaskans) own and many of these guides are nonresidents who can't legally harvest sheep, goats, or brown bears but they can guide other nonresidents. The price of the tag is cheap but the cost of a guided hunt is expensive.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Tom Lamal

EG042913829

PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Open resident sheep seasons ten days before nonresident seasons in the Interior Region as follows:

In Region III (Interior Region), change the dates for sheep hunting to:

Alaska residents: August 1 to September 20

Nonresidents: August 10 to September 20

ISSUE: The quality, safety and crowded conditions of sheep hunting at the start of the season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The overall quality and safety of sheep hunting in Alaska will continue to deteriorate due to the large number of people trying to get into the field at the start of the season. This will put a big strain on all of the resources and parties involved.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would increase the overall quality and safety of sheep hunting for both the residents and nonresidents by eliminating overcrowding and the competition for available resources.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both the residents and nonresidents would benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, although the guides and some nonresidents may disagree.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There is no other solution to this problem. I think that the guiding industry is doing a good job for their customers using a public resource to make a very good living. I welcome nonresident to come to Alaska and hunt but a quality hunt is very important for everyone and unless something is done this will not be the case.

PROPOSED BY: Leonard Jewkes

EG043013842

PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep and 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep drawing permit hunts. Change the nonresident general sheep hunts to draw hunts for the Interior Region, and cap the number of permits based on sheep density as follows:

All nonresident sheep hunts in Region III (Interior Region), where we have general open season hunts for nonresidents (excluding subunits within U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Park Service (NPS) lands) become draw only, and the total number of permits is capped based on sheep density and population estimates and/or recent historical sheep harvest data for each subunit, to try to achieve a balance whereby nonresident guided sheep hunter harvest rates are lowered, more full curl rams are left on the mountain, and the conflicts afield greatly reduced.

(If the Board of Game (board) prefers, this regulation if passed could have a sunset clause added should the proposed Department of Natural Resources (DNR) guide concession program ever be implemented.)

We recognize that not all areas in Region III are experiencing the problems outlined in this proposal. However, if the board only works to “fix” the problem areas, that presents the real possibility that some guides will shift to areas still open to general season nonresident sheep hunting where the same type of problems will occur.

There are various ways the board could decide permit allocation levels. One way would be to look at the sheep harvest statistics for federal lands where the federal guide concession program is in place. It has been widely promoted that the proposed DNR guide concession program the board favors as a solution to these issues was supposed to mirror or be similar to the federal concession program. Just using the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as an example, nonresident sheep harvest rates have tended to average between 25-30%. Below are the statistics from 2011 for subunits 26B and 26C within the Refuge:

**Interim Reports GS000 Sheep - Year 2011 Unit 26B, 26C
Current File Statistics (110)**

	Successful		Unsuccessful		Did Not Hunt		Total Hunters	
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct
Residents	95	36.8% <i>36.8% of all overlays</i>	163	63.2% <i>63.2% of all overlays</i>	0	0%	258	100%
Non Res	37	72.5% <i>72.5% of all overlays</i>	14	27.5% <i>27.5% of all overlays</i>	0	0%	51	100%
Unspecified	7	41.2% <i>41.2% of all overlays</i>	10	58.8% <i>58.8% of all overlays</i>	0	0%	17	100%

No Overlay	0	0% <i>0% of all tickets</i>	1	100% <i>100% of all tickets</i>	0	0%	1	100%
Total	139	42.5%	188	57.5%	0	0%	327	100%

Nonresident guided hunters took 37 of 139 total sheep for a 27% harvest rate. Nonresident guided hunters comprised 15% of the total hunters.

ISSUE: Unlimited nonresident sheep hunting opportunities and unlimited guide numbers in parts of Region III.

In many parts of Region III (excluding USFWS and NPS lands) where we have open general season sheep hunts, there are no limits on the number of nonresident hunters or the guides they are required to hire to hunt sheep. Because nonresident guided hunters have such a higher success rate than resident hunters, this has led to concerns of localized diminished populations and future restrictions on resident general open season sheep hunting opportunities. Some areas are also experiencing crowding, conflicts between guides and resident hunters and conflicts between guides licensed for the same area.

Our primary concerns are sheep conservation and continued resident general season sheep hunting opportunities. We firmly believe that we can't allow any areas to have nearly every full-curl ram harvested each season, which is what we fear may happen in some areas if we continue to allow unlimited guiding and nonresident sheep hunting opportunities. We also believe, just on a matter of fairness to Alaskan resident sheep hunters, that nonresident sheep harvest rates of 40% across much of Region III, and 50-80% in some subunits, is unacceptable.

For example, below are the 2011 statistics for two subunits (2012 data not yet available):

Interim Reports Sheep - Year 2011 Unit 19C
Current File Statistics (110)

	Successful		Unsuccessful		Did Not Hunt		Total Hunters	
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct
Residents	10	16.7% <i>16.7% of all overlays</i>	50	83.3% <i>83.3% of all overlays</i>	0	0%	60	100%
Non Res	66	82.5% <i>82.5% of all overlays</i>	14	17.5% <i>17.5% of all overlays</i>	0	0%	80	100%
Unspecified	2	100% <i>100% of all overlays</i>	0	0% <i>0% of all overlays</i>	0	0%	2	100%
No Overlay	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%

		<i>100% of all tickets</i>		<i>0% of all tickets</i>				
Total	81	55.9%	64	44.1%	0	0%	145	100%

For subunit 19C, there were 80 confirmed nonresident guided hunters and 60 resident hunters who hunted Dall sheep in 2011. Guided nonresident hunters took 66 of 81 total sheep, resulting in 81% of the total overall harvest.

Interim Reports GS000 Sheep - Year 2011 Unit 20A
Current File Statistics (110)

	Successful		Unsuccessful		Did Not Hunt		Total Hunters	
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct
Residents	40	25.2% <i>25.2% of all overlays</i>	119	74.8% <i>74.8% of all overlays</i>	0	0%	159	100%
Non Res	62	72.1% <i>72.1% of all overlays</i>	24	27.9% <i>27.9% of all overlays</i>	0	0%	86	100%
Unspecified	1	16.7% <i>16.7% of all overlays</i>	5	83.3% <i>83.3% of all overlays</i>	0	0%	6	100%
No Overlay	1	100% <i>100% of all tickets</i>	0	0% <i>0% of all tickets</i>	0	0%	1	100%
Total	104	41.3%	148	58.7%	0	0%	252	100%

For Unit 20A, a subunit known to have the type of crowding and conflicts described in this proposal, in 2011 there were 86 confirmed nonresident guided sheep hunters and 159 resident hunters. Guided nonresident sheep hunters took 62 of 104 total sheep, resulting in 60% of the total harvest. (Note that even though resident sheep hunters were nearly double the nonresidents, guided nonresident hunters still took 60% of the sheep)

While we certainly support and respect the guiding profession and encourage nonresident hunting and want to share our wildlife resources with our nonresident hunting brethren, we believe there needs to be new limits applied to nonresident sheep hunting opportunity.

This proposal is similar to the one we put before the board in 2012, and at that time the board expressed great displeasure when the Department of Fish and Game presented data on the high nonresident sheep harvest rates in some subunits, like those above. The board is well aware of these ongoing problems, but has put off acting on them using the rationale that the proposed DNR Guide Concession Program that would limit guides (and thus their nonresident clients)

would be implemented on state and Bureau of Land Management lands. But as of this writing, the proposed DNR guide concession program has not been funded and has been declared “dead” by DNR sources. Even if it were to be revived and be implemented, the earliest implementation keeps getting pushed farther and farther ahead on the calendar.

With all due respect to the board, we feel strongly it is well past time to act now in ways that will better conserve our sheep populations, prevent the loss of resident general open season sheep hunting opportunities, and curb the ongoing conflicts that surround nonresident guided sheep hunting in much of Region III.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued localized diminished populations of full-curl rams that threaten population sustainability and resident general open season sheep hunting opportunities, continued user conflicts and crowding, and continued inequitable nonresident sheep harvest rates of 40% annually in much of Region III, and 50-80% in some subunits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. By limiting nonresident sheep hunting opportunities in much of Region III we thus limit the number of guides they must hire, thereby reducing total sheep harvests, better conserving sheep populations, as well as improving the quality of sheep hunts for both guided and unguided hunters by reducing crowding and conflicts afield.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All those who put the resource first and wish to see our Region III sheep populations conserved and sustained. All resident hunters who want to see their general open season sheep hunting opportunities retained, and their success rates go up. All guided nonresident hunters who don’t want to compete with so many other guided hunters and who favor a more quality sheep hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some guides would suffer monetarily because of the lower number of nonresident clients. Division of Wildlife Conservation funding would decrease because of a decrease in nonresident sheep tags being sold, and some local economies could see a decrease in nonresident hunting-related tourism, but it’s important to emphasize that these same things would happen if the DNR proposed guide concession program, which the board supports, was implemented.

Nonresident sheep hunters would lose the guarantee to be able to hunt Dall sheep in parts of Region III, and would have to take their chances with a draw-only hunt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Waiting for the DNR proposed guide concession program to be implemented. Rejected because we have already waited too long for this proposed concession program to be implemented, and it now appears it will never come about. 2) Only trying to “fix” the known problem areas in Region III, not making all of Region III draw-only for nonresident sheep hunters. Rejected because it has the potential to spread the problems to the areas still open to general season nonresident sheep hunting. 3) Including Region III registration sheep hunts for residents in all general (non-draw) open season areas, mandatory harvest reporting period, Alaska Department of Fish and Games discretionary authority to close some

sheep hunts based on harvest reports, in conjunction with our proposed solution. Rejected because we don't believe we need that at this time, but our concern is to conserve sheep so that sheep hunting by all can continue, and we do believe it is important that resident sheep hunters are fully cognizant this may be necessary down the line and preferable to a draw-only hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Chapter Backcountry Hunters & Anglers EG050113878

PROPOSAL 45 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Hunting seasons and bag limits. Allocate 90% drawing permits to residents for the Interior Region big game hunts, and distribute remaining permits as follows:

Alaska residents will receive a minimum of 90% of all drawing permits and nonresidents will receive a maximum of 10% of permits, but 10% is not guaranteed. If Alaskans don't apply for particular permits, the extra or leftover permits may be issued to nonresidents (higher tag fees), sold over the counter to residents and nonresidents on a first come first serve basis, or do another drawing. Any hunt with less than ten permits for an area is not open for nonresident drawings but if there are permits leftover, nonresidents may purchase the permits over the counter.

ISSUE: Allocation of permits for Alaska residents.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? All of the western states have a high allocation of their drawing permits reserved for their residents. Most of the drawing permits in Alaska don't have any preference for the Alaska resident. A resident can put in for a drawing for 20 years and next year he is on equal footing with a nonresident putting in for the first time. Since Alaska doesn't have preference points (has to be funded by the legislature) the Board of Game needs to give a high allocation of the permits to resident hunters. The commercial operators (guides) don't want either because it is in their best interests not to give Alaska residents any advantage. We're not too far away from having many of our sheep hunts go on permits and moose and caribou are a possibility in certain areas. In many of the western states it is a 90/10 split with 90%+ going to residents and a maximum of 10% going to nonresidents, but 10% is not guaranteed.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Alaskans will receive the same respect other states give their residents and the majority of permit hunted game will go in the freezers of Alaska residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides and their nonresident clients.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Tom Lamal

EG042913830

PROPOSAL 46 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Change nonresident sheep hunts to drawing permit hunts and limit the permit distribution to ten percent of the annual ten year average for the Interior Region as follows:

Nonresidents wanting to participate in sheep hunting in Alaska will have to enter by drawing permit. The drawing permit will be limited to a maximum of 10% of the annual ten year historical average sheep harvest.

ISSUE: Because of our decreasing resident hunter success and falling sheep populations, I would like the Board of Game to limit, by drawing permit, all nonresident hunters of Alaska's Dall sheep to a maximum of 10% of the preceding ten year average historical harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaskans limited natural resources will continue to be taken by increasing number of nonresidents. Ignoring this fact, and the fact of our shrinking sheep population, will soon force drawing permits on Alaska residents.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this proposal not only protects our natural resources from the ever increasing pressure of the guide industry, but also places Alaska on EQUAL footing with ALL western states who have long ago, limited the nonresident hunters to a maximum of 10% of the sheep permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaska residents, and the natural resources we are entrusted with.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some nonresident hunters and some in the guide industry.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Trying, yet again, to express to the Board of Game that we have a statewide problem with our Dall sheep populations. I am not blaming the guide industry for the decreasing sheep populations, I am saying that the increased percentage nonresident harvest, shows an increased pressure on our sheep.

The first step in restricting access of our limited game resources, should be to place our nonresident hunters on EQUAL footing with the nonresident hunters in other states.

PROPOSED BY: Vern Fiehler

EG042813810

PROPOSAL 47 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Open a bowhunting only season for Dall sheep in Interior Region as follows:

Add a new bowhunting only sheep season in all northern and northcentral units where there is a current general sheep season. Dates would be August 1-9; the bag limit would be one full curl ram. Open only to International Bowhunter Education Program (IBEP) certified bowhunters.

ISSUE: Overcrowding of hunters seeking Dall sheep is reducing the quality of the sheep hunting experience.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The problem will continue to increase and eventually all sheep hunting will need to be by drawing permit.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It would improve the quality of the outdoor experience which qualifies as a resource. It would not improve the quality of the products produced.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bowhunters by being given a chance to hunt sheep with less direct competition from rifle hunters. Firearm sheep hunters by not seeing quite as many hunters in the field when they were actually hunting because the bowhunters who wanted to hunt sheep would probably utilize the bow season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one really. Bowhunters for Dall sheep have a very low success rate even when they are allowed to take any sheep. This hunt would be much more difficult because it would be for full curl rams only. This proposal would serve to spread out utilization with very little effect on the sheep population. Multiple parties on the mountain at the same time significantly reduces the quality and enjoyment of the hunting experience for all involved.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Have the new archery season be after the regular sheep season, September 21-30. This is the model which has been in effect for over 30 years in Unit 14C. However the northern units (especially the Brooks Range) have very short cold days in late September and weather could be a safety issue. Long warm days are important to bowhunters who must be patient waiting for an opportunity to get close to sheep.

PROPOSED BY: Alaskan Bowhunters Association

EG050113876

PROPOSAL 48 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep and 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep drawing permit hunts. Change all nonresident sheep hunts to drawing permit hunts in Unit 20 with a 75% distribution of nonresident permits as follows:

Turn all nonresident Dall sheep tags in Unit 20 to drawing only and limit the number to 75% of the number of nonresident tags based on historic average.

ISSUE: The overcrowding/overlapping of guides in Unit 20, conflicts between guides, their clients and residents and also an overharvest of rams that have not yet reached their full potential trophy value.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If this issue is not addressed, a conflict will continue to exist and potentially increase between guides who are currently overcrowding one another during the current Dall sheep season. This overcrowding during Dall sheep season has also lead to reports to the Big Game Commercial Services Board of registered guides violating Alaska Statute 08.54.720 as well as more disturbing conflicts between guides and resident hunters.

The overcrowding of guides in Unit 20 has also led to an overharvest of rams in a means that does not allow them to reach their full potential trophy value. This is a major issue especially in Unit 20 where recent genetics have shown many rams take over eight years to reach the full curl requirement. If this issue is not addressed, we as a committee fear resident and nonresident hunters will never again have the opportunity to harvest a true trophy ram, which Unit 20 has been historically known to hold. As of 2011, over 70% of the Dall sheep harvested in Unit 20 have been by nonresidents, who are all required to have a registered guide accompany them. By simply reducing this number by a small fraction, harvest will in turn drop and many more rams will have the opportunity to reach older age. Nonresident hunters will still have the opportunity to hunt in other less pressured portions of Alaska, which is the only state in the United States to not require all nonresidents to apply for a drawing tag for wild sheep.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. By reducing the number of hunters in the field, the overall harvest numbers would decrease while at the same time give hunters the opportunity to disperse. This would in turn lessen the impact of harvest on individual herds and allow for rams to reach greater trophy value. The smaller harvest would also allow these higher trophy value rams to breed more ewes, spreading their genes while also increasing the overall Dall sheep population in Unit 20.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both resident and nonresident hunters alike as well as law-abiding guides.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A small percentage of nonresident hunters as well as a portion of the guiding industry.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Turn all nonresident sheep tags in Unit 20 to drawing only tags and reduce the number of tags to 80% of average. We believe as an Advisory Committee that this is not a sufficient enough percentage to reduce the overall harvest and guide conflicts in the unit.

PROPOSED BY: Middle Nenana Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050113877

PROPOSAL 49 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Open resident sheep seasons one week prior to nonresidents in Units 25 and 26 as follows:

Residents have the first week of sheep season without the presence of guides and their hunters.

ISSUE: Open sheep season one week for residents only in Units 25 and 26.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Guides think that they own the areas I know of one in particular in Unit 25 that comes over with his whole crew to try to scare off a resident hunter.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This helps separate the competition that guides have with hunters. The guides charge such a high price these days that it puts a lot of pressure on them to give there hunters a quality hunt. It would be better for all hunters because a lot of resident sheep hunters would be done hunting by the time the guides arrive.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? I think everybody would.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one would because the experience is what counts less competition is a better experience.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Chris Gossen

EG042813811

PROPOSAL 50 - 5 AAC 99.025. Customary and traditional uses of game populations.

Review the customary and traditional use worksheet for the Teshekpuk Lake caribou herd and determine whether there are customary and traditional uses; if so, establish amounts reasonably necessary for subsistence (ANS), as follows:

5 AAC 99.025(a)(4)

SPECIES & UNIT	FINDING	AMOUNT REASONABLY NECESSARY FOR SUBSISTENCE USES
(4) Caribou		
<u>Units 22, 23, 24, 26(A), 26(B)</u> <u>(Teshekpuk Lake herd)</u>	<u>XXXXXX</u>	<u>XXX – XXX</u>

ISSUE: The Alaska Board of Game (board) was first presented a customary and traditional use (C&T) worksheet for consideration of the customary and traditional uses of the Teshekpuk Lake caribou herd in 1990. The administrative record does not capture if a C&T determination was made at the 1990 board meeting. This same C&T worksheet was revised for the 1993 board meeting and stated:

“[B]ecause the Teshekpuk Caribou Herd is not specifically identified in current hunting regulations, there is no specific harvest ticket for this herd, and because so little is actually known about its seasonal movements over time, little information on any hunting of this herd is actually available. Based on caribou harvest ticket returns from GMU 26A, it appears that there is little hunting of the herd by non-North Slope residents (within its central range around the Teshekpuk Lake) because of difficult access.

It remains unclear whether the board made a C&T determination at the 1993 board meeting, so the Department of Fish and Game will provide an updated C&T worksheet for this herd, in addition to a written report with ANS options for the board's consideration.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The requirements of AS 16.05.258 will go unaddressed to determine whether there are customary and traditional uses of the Teshekpuk Lake caribou herd and if so, there will be no ANS to ensure that reasonable opportunities for customary and traditional uses are provided to Alaska residents.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users of the Teshekpuk Lake caribou resource will benefit from decisions based upon the best available information, which provides the board with an unambiguous metric for assessing reasonable opportunities for subsistence uses of this caribou herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No action. However, this proposal provides the board with the opportunity to fulfill its statutory mandate to identify game populations that are customarily and traditionally taken or used for subsistence. If a harvestable surplus exists, the board "shall determine the amount of the harvestable portion that is reasonably necessary for subsistence uses" (AS 16.05.258(b)) and promulgate regulations that ensure reasonable opportunities for this herd are provided.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613909

PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 85.060. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals. Lengthen the wolf season in Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, and 25 as follows:

Wolf season: August 5 - June 15.

ISSUE: Start wolf hunting season August 5 and increase wolf season to June 15. There are many hunters out and about hunting and baiting black bears in June. These hunters are in the field during moose calving times and during the critical first month of a moose calf's life. This is an excellent time to hunt wolves opportunistically by predator calling or hunting over a fresh moose kill site. In the fall many hunters arrive to set up camp and prepare to hunt before August 10, which is opening day for sheep and caribou in some areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to be restricted to a wolf closing date of May 31 and opening date of August 10.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wolf hunters will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered a closing date of June 10. I rejected because many bear hunters are still in the field.

PROPOSED BY: Smokey Don Duncan

EG050113873

PROPOSAL 52 – 5 AAC 92.015(a)(4). Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize resident grizzly bear tag fee exemptions throughout Interior and Eastern Arctic Alaska as follows:

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

...

(4) Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26(B), and 26(C)

...

ISSUE: Resident brown bear tag fees were put in place statewide during the mid-1970s to discourage incidental harvest, elevate the status of brown and grizzly bears to trophies, and to provide revenue. Today, Region III populations are healthy, grizzly bears are highly regarded as trophies, and revenue can be generated from non-tag fee sources. The Board of Game (board) must annually reauthorize all resident tag fee exemptions.

Eliminating resident grizzly bear tag fees throughout Interior and Eastern Arctic Alaska (Region III) simplifies regulations, increases resident hunter opportunity, and is not likely to cause declines in these grizzly bear populations. This reauthorization would assist with our objective of managing Region III grizzly bear populations for hunter opportunity and would continue to allow hunters to take grizzlies opportunistically. During regulatory years 2006–2009, 35% of grizzlies harvested by resident hunters in Region III were taken incidentally to other activities (compared to 4% incidental take in regions I and II and 17% statewide).

We estimate that a kill rate of at least 6%, composed primarily of males, is sustainable. Human-caused mortality in most of Region III has been consistently less than 6% of the population. Where harvests are elevated (i.e. Units 20D, 20B, 20A, and portions of 26B), grizzly populations are managed through changes in seasons and bag limits. Resident tag fees that were in place prior to 2010 appeared to have no effect on harvest in these areas.

As part of this request to reauthorize exemption of grizzly tag fee throughout Region III, we recommend that the board, at a minimum, continue to reauthorize the tag fee exemptions for subsistence registration permit hunts in Units 19A and 19B (downstream of and including the Aniak River drainage), 21D, and 24.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Harvest opportunity will be lost and hunters will be required to obtain the \$25 resident tag. Subsistence users in areas where tag fees are currently exempt will be required to purchase a tag to harvest grizzly bears for food.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents who are unable to purchase the \$25 tag before hunting, due to lack of vendors or economic reasons, will be able to opportunistically and legally harvest grizzly bears.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who believe the \$25 resident tag fee is useful in managing grizzly bear populations and those who believe grizzly bears should not be harvested to provide food for subsistence hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Decrease the Region III grizzly tag fee to \$10. This would require legislative action.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613946

PROPOSAL 53 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear. Change the bag limit for black bear in Units 25C and 25D as follows:

Set the harvest limit of black bear to five black bear per year.

ISSUE: Increase the bag limit of black bear in Units 25C and 25D to five black bear per hunter per year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There are a limited number of hunters willing to expend the resources to harvest this species, and we believe we should allow maximum harvest opportunity to offset the high economy of effort required to target this species in this area. The Yukon Flats have some of the highest bear densities and lowest moose densities in the state, yet we have not been successful in implementing any regulation aimed at correcting this issue. Locals have objected to allowing foot snaring of bears in these game units because it is not in keeping with the methods and means they have used to control the nuisance bears around their fish camps in years past (the preferred method is to target bears at the head and neck with a snare, causing death versus keeping them alive until the trapper comes to check the snare). So for safety reasons they have opposed all attempts to exploit this population.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The common belief is that we may reduce the black bear population to a level where the moose population may escape predation and flourish, but reality is we likely will not harvest enough bears with this bag limit to even stabilize the black bear population let alone cause growth in the moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The sportsmen and subsistence users of the area who are willing to target black bear in the game units.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer, this population can be exploited even higher levels than recommended here with no chance of harming the resource.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee

EG042613797

PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 92.051. Discretionary trapping permit conditions and procedures.

Allow the Department of Fish and Game to issue permits in the Interior Region for trapping bears under their discretionary authority as follows:

No change in the regulation. The Board of Game (board) has already approved, and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (department) has discretionary authority to issue permits for trapping furbearers per conditions outlined in 5 AAC92.051.

We are only asking the board to approve, that department could issue permits for the trapping (foot hold snares) of bears at their discretion and in compliance of 5 AAC 92.051.

ISSUE: Allow the department to issue discretionary trapping permits in Region III for the taking of black bears with foot hold snares.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Loss of opportunity (both in a subsistence harvest opportunity and in a general resident season opportunity) to harvest black bears using foot hold snares as another method and means through the issuance of discretionary permits by the department in Region III.

We also believe there are areas in Region III where ADF&G could issue such discretionary permits. Region III has remote areas of high bear densities where these trapping activities will not produce social issues, but are sufficiently accessible to provide a reasonable opportunity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. We have confidence that the department will and has managed bears in Region III on a sustained yield bases (as mandated). This proposal would provide additional opportunity for both the subsistence user and also the resident nonsubsistence users. We also believe Region III managers have a proven track record of providing for high yields of harvest and opportunity for residents of the region and for other Alaskans traveling to Region III for an opportunity to harvest their wild food needs.

The region still has a harvestable surplus of black bears even with a no closed hunting season, a three black bear limit, plus a 45 day black bear baiting season though out the region. We believe Region III is a good place to test a new “method and means” under a controlled permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both subsistence users and the resident nonsubsistence users. Both could have additional opportunity through other methods and means for take. Having this additional permitted opportunity will provide a very controlled harvest, accountability, and opportunity. Currently the department has any of 13 conditions they can apply to the permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, as the board is mandated through the constitution and statutes to manage wildlife resources on sustain yield harvest. We would also state that the conditions specified on the permit would avoid areas where social issues could be confrontational.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1. Add a new line under 5 AAC 92.044 using bait to take black bears. (A) To allow the use of foot hold snares. But this is more of a statewide issue, and we like this region to be a test area, because we have remote areas that other users don't recreate, but are accessible. 2. Create a new section 5 AAC 92.XXX permit for taking bears with the use of foot hold snares. At this time we believe that the current regulation that allows ADF&G to issue discretionary permits for taking furbearers is already codified. Maybe after we see the success in this new opportunity, we could address a new section in the future.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks and Delta Fish and Game Advisory Committees EG042913827

PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.
Prohibit the use of snares to take bears in the Interior Region as follows:

The new regulation would forbid the use of snares to take bears in the Interior Region.

5AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions

2. The following methods and means of taking furbearers under a trapping license are prohibited, in addition to the prohibitions in 5AAC 92.080:

(20) The taking of a bear by trap or snare

ISSUE: The 2010 decision to list black bears as a furbearer paved the way to allow bear snaring for the first time since statehood.

In Unit 16B, an experimental bear snaring program is in place allowing the snaring of both black and brown bears. Bear snaring is indiscriminate, allowing the capture and death of brown and black bears, cubs and sows with cubs.

The Department of Fish and Game (department) is quoted as saying "The effectiveness of reducing both bear species through harvest methods to increase moose calf survival has not been demonstrated." This conclusion was confirmed by the department in a report to the Board of Game (board) at the Central/Southwest Region Meeting February 8-15, 2012 showing no correlation between high harvest levels of bears and moose calf survivability in Unit 16B.

The McGrath predator control poster child that the board references time and time again resulted in higher moose calf survivability only after killing 97% of the black bears in the area, 75% of the wolves and 50% of the brown bears. This program has cost the state untold hundreds of thousands of dollars (more likely millions), and still only 50% of the moose calves survived to weaning-not even to adult recruitment. At least one member of the board has offered the suggestion that the board needs to ramp up their efforts in Unit 16B to achieve the results they are looking for.

The McGrath model is not a program to emulate elsewhere. The consequences of ridding the landscape of predators to enhance moose numbers is an expensive experiment that disregards the impacts of disturbing the natural balance of functioning ecosystems.

The department and the board have significantly liberalized regulations for the killing of predators in recent years. State regulations and policies now allow snaring of brown and black bears, baiting of brown bears, killing sows with cubs and cubs, year-round seasons, unlimited bag limits, and killing animals in their dens and from aircraft. In conjunction with these changes, the board has also reauthorized land and shoot hunting, and has vastly expanded predator control areas. All of this has been done with little scientific or social justification.

The bottom line is bear snaring is indiscriminate, wasteful, and cruel and poses a danger to the public. With unlimited numbers of snares and long open seasons, snaring may kill more bears than is sustainable. Snaring and killing of bears regardless of age, species, and gender is incompatible with the scientific principles and the ethics of modern wildlife management.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A scientific article published in 2011 in The Journal of Wildlife Management, (Trends in Intensive Management of Alaska's Grizzly Bears, 1980–2010), documents the board's liberalization of hunting regulations for grizzly bears. The four highly-respected scientists concluded in their report that *“Current attitudes, policies and absence of science-based management of grizzly bears in Alaska are increasingly similar to those that resulted in near extirpation of grizzly bears south of Canada in the 19th and 20th centuries. If current trends continue, they increase risk to portions of the most intact population of grizzly bears in North America”*.

Additionally, as bear populations diminish, the viewing public will have fewer opportunities to see bears in the wild which could have significant economic impacts for the wildlife viewing businesses around the state.

More bears will become food-conditioned causing a danger to people, families and communities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Bear snaring is wasteful and requires no salvage of meat, only the hide and skull. Trappers will still be allowed to harvest a bear under trapping licenses by using a firearm and bait stations. Under this method, a trapper can be selective in harvesting a bear and avoid taking non target species and cubs or females with cubs.

Managing bear populations using modern wildlife management practices will result in healthier ecosystems including the tendency for ungulates to over browse areas if predators are absent.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans and visitors who value wildlife and sound biological management of our wildlife resources and who want to view wildlife will benefit. Tourism-related businesses will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer as a result of this proposal being adopted. The practice of bear snaring only promotes waste and disrespect for wildlife.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There are no other solutions. The snaring of bears must be halted.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Alliance

EG042913826

PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. Remove the salvage requirements for brown bear meat taken at bait stations in the Interior Region as follows:

Repeal the meat salvage requirement for brown bear over bait in the Interior Region.

ISSUE: Brown bear salvage requirements that force hunters to salvage meat that may be inedible. Also it is confusing to hunters because salvage requirements are different for brown bears and black bears.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unreasonable salvage requirement for meat that may be inedible.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Keeps hunters from being required to salvage poor quality meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those hunters who harvest brown bears over bait who do not wish or are unable to eat the meat that has been harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None. Meat may still be salvaged if it is determined to be of good quality.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Require same salvage criteria as black bear. Rejected because brown bear are more likely to be consuming rotten meat prior to harvest, rendering their meat inedible.

PROPOSED BY: Joel Doner

EG042313754

PROPOSAL 57 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. Remove the salvage requirement for brown bear meat taken at bait stations in Units 12, 20C, 20E, and 22D as follows:

For brown bears taken over bait in Units 12, 20C, 20E, and 22D the edible meat **does not need to be salvaged.**

ISSUE: Salvage for brown/grizzly bears taken in Units 12, 20C, 20E, and 21D. All of the meat must be salvaged. There is no exemption for brown or grizzly bears in the definitions of edible meat like there is for black bear. Also black bears have a time line for meat salvage requirements which says the meat must be salvaged between January 1 and May 31. There is currently no timeline for grizzly/brown bear meat salvage like there is for black bear. Establishing a similar timeline for brown/grizzly bear meat salvage is the minimum action needed. However, I propose to eliminate the requirement to salvage meat from brown/grizzly bears taken over bait. When the Board of Game discussed the issue of baiting grizzlies in Unit 20C the vast majority of the discussion was on whether to allow it or not. The meat salvage requirement was more of an afterthought that was not discussed. Eliminating any salvage requirements for brown/grizzly bear whether taken over bait or not on a sport hunt (nonsubsistence hunt) will align all areas of the state and make the salvage requirements uniform.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Confusion will remain when brown/grizzly bear meat must be salvaged and how much must be salvaged.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Brown/grizzly bear hunters who are in remote locations where meat salvage requirements will affect whether they choose to shoot a grizzly. The Board of Game has been liberalizing the brown/grizzly seasons and the methods and means restrictions but then places a salvage requirement that has the opposite effect.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Placing a separate definition for grizzly salvage that listed only the hind quarters as edible meat. I rejected it because I would like to see the salvage requirement eliminated entirely because I do not know anyone to give the meat to.

PROPOSED BY: Smokey Don Duncan

EG050113869

PROPOSAL 58 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. Remove the salvage requirement for brown bear taken over bait stations in Units 12, 20C, 20E, and 21D as follows:

5AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides.

(5) all edible meat of a brown bear taken under a subsistence registration permit in Unit 9(B), all drainages in Unit 9(E) that drain into the Pacific Ocean between Cape Kumliun and the border of

Unit 9(D) and 9(E), Unit 17, Unit 18, that portion of Units 19(A) and 19(B) downstream and including the Aniak River drainage, Unit 21(D), Unit 22, Unit 23, Unit 24, and Unit 26(A) shall be salvaged for human consumption; salvage of the hide or skull are optional; [ALL EDIBLE MEAT OF A BROWN BEAR TAKEN UNDER A PERMIT ISSUED UNDER 5AAC 92.044 IN UNITS 12, 20(C), 20(E), AND 21(D) SHALL BE SALVAGED;]

ISSUE: The requirement to salvage all edible meat from a brown bear if the bear is taken at a black bear bait site in Region III. Note: This regulation change should be applied to units in Regions II and IV if adopted.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Salvage of brown bear meat is only required when bears are taken in a brown bear subsistence area under a special permit. Applying this condition to brown bears taken at a black bear bait site is unnecessary and confusing to hunters since meat salvage in all other general season hunts is not required.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quality of the resource harvested will be improved by allowing those hunters that harvest brown bears for the meat to salvage as much of the animal as they desire, while hunters that do not consider brown bear meat edible will not be unnecessarily obligated to retrieve all the edible meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters that do not consider brown bear meat edible. Additionally, by repealing this regulation enforcement will benefit by less confusing regulations imposed on hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one should be impacted by repealing this regulation. Individuals wanting brown bear meat could make arrangements to salvage the meat from a harvested bear.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Changing the meat salvage requirements for brown bear, all edible meat, to match the regulation for black bear, meat from the four quarters and backstrap. This was rejected because most hunters do not consider brown bear meat edible compared to other big game animals such as moose or caribou. It would also still be confusing to hunters since black bear meat salvage is only required from January 1 to May 31 but brown bear meat salvage is required any time a black bear baiting season is open.

PROPOSED BY: Bob Ermold

EG042213753

McGrath Area – Units 19, 21A & 21E

PROPOSAL 59 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Lengthen the nonresident moose season in Unit 21A as follows:

Moose season for Unit 21A would be September 5-25 for both residents and nonresidents, with residents being able to take any bull and nonresidents restricted to moose with 50-inch antlers or four brow tines on at least one side.

ISSUE: I would like the nonresident moose season in Unit 21A changed from September 5-20 to September 5-25. I have been hunting in Unit 21A since 1990 and I saw the moose population slowly decline, which is why the season was shortened several years ago. However, in the past five years, or so, while flying over the unit during the month of September, I have seen a steady increase in moose numbers. There are a lot of bulls and I am seeing a lot of young bulls and many cows with calves. I think the moose have turned a corner and are on the increase. The bull-to-cow ratio seems to be very good also. The only thing this proposal would do is give the nonresidents an additional 5 days to hunt when the rut was on. Nonresidents are limited to 50-inch plus bulls so that is the only moose that would be affected and that would not affect the overall moose population at all. Residents are now able to hunt to September 25 and they can harvest any bull, where nonresidents are restricted to 50-in bulls. I think the overall harvest would increase by approximately five bulls if this regulation was changed and they would be big mature bulls, which do not affect the overall population. It might even save some of the smaller bulls that are killed by residents hunting with nonresident partners and are forced to end their hunt on September 20 and harvest a small bull instead of hunting until September 25 and holding out for a big, mature bull. There was a moose count done this spring but the data has not been studied yet. By the time this proposal is looked at this data will be in and can be considered when making a decision on this proposal.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Potentially, more conflicts between local residents from Shageluk and Grayling and nonresident hunters who continue to push down into Unit 21E since the season there is September 5-25 for both residents and nonresidents.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Nonresidents would be able to pass up some smaller 50-inch bulls when it is hot there is little opportunity to harvest mature bulls much before September 20. I think there would be less chance of nonresidents shooting sub-legal bulls if they were able to hunt until September 25. Many resident hunters have friends come up from the lower 48 and hunt with them and they are also forced to end their hunt on September 20. These resident hunters often harvest young bulls under 50 inches since residents are allowed any bull some of these residents are after trophy mature bulls and if they were allowed to hunt till September 25 with their nonresident friends they might be able to hold out for a trophy mature bull.

The quality of guided hunts would also increase since nonresident guided hunters would have the opportunity to hunt later and have a much better chance at a mature bull instead of going home without a bull or settling for a barely legal 50-inch bull.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? I think not only will nonresidents hunters and resident hunters hunting with nonresident partners benefit, but the local hunters out of Shageluk and Grayling will have better hunting in Unit 21E. Many nonresident hunters are now hunting in Unit 21E since it has a longer season ending September 25. There are more conflicts between the local hunters and the hunters that are from outside the area than ever before. Some of these conflicts are residents that have a nonresident with them and they are hunting Unit 21E because of the later season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer as Unit 21A is far up river from any towns and very few hunters in 21A are local. Almost all hunters in Unit 21A are flying in.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered moving the nonresident season from September 5-20 to September 10-25, so it would be later but the same number of days. I think this would not be much different than September 5-25 since most hunters do not harvest bulls early and would have little or no effect on total harvest in Unit 21A.

PROPOSED BY: Steve White

EG043013840

PROPOSAL 60 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify hunt requirements in Unit 21E as follows:

Unit 21E: Resident Hunters: 1 antlered bull **by registration permit only** September 5-25. We prefer a 7 day reporting period for successful hunters and a 15 day reporting period after September 25 for unsuccessful hunters.

ISSUE: The Grayling Shageluk Anvik and Holy Cross Advisory Committee (GASH AC) believes there is a significant number of unreported moose being harvested in Unit 21E. Hunters will get the green harvest ticket and harvest a moose, and not validate their harvest ticket. They do not send in the report, but instead return to the field and harvest another moose using the same harvest ticket, then another and another. Not only is that practice illegal, but the reported harvest is not accurate. It is also problematic to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (department) in assessing anything involving moose and documenting the subsistence requirements for the people of Unit 21E.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The GASH AC has been a very proactive advisory committee and has worked hard with the department over the last couple of decades to develop the *Yukon-Innoko Moose Management Plan* designed to ensure the long term stability of the moose in Unit 21E and still provide for the needs of the people who hunt them. There will continue to be many more unreported moose harvested. The department will not have correct data to help assess the amount of moose the people of Unit 21E require for subsistence needs. Furthermore the *Yukon-Innoko Moose Management Plan* that both our advisory committee and the department have worked so hard on to create and maintain will be in jeopardy.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. By requiring a registration permit, there will be a definite reporting period for both successful and unsuccessful hunters. We believe that accurate harvest data are necessary to successfully manage the moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users of this resource will benefit. When an accurate count of the number of moose that is needed for the people of Unit 21E, all local and nonlocal hunters will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who chose to hunt illegally by harvesting more than one moose on a harvest ticket. Some people might believe that they are suffering by having to fill out and turn in the registration permit, but actually they should have been doing that with a harvest ticket already. Reporting requirements are a bit more stringent, thus inconvenient.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There was discussion of making a requirement to display the notched harvest ticket on the animal while transporting it out of the field like they do in other states, but this idea was rejected since we did not believe that it would help as much as the registration hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Grayling Anvik Shageluk Holy Cross Fish and Game Advisory Committee
EG042613803

PROPOSAL 61 - 5 AAC 92.069. Special provisions for moose drawing permit hunts.
Reallocate moose drawing permits in Unit 21E as follows:

Move five DM837 transport permits over to DM839 guided permits. The new regulation would read: 15 DM839 guided moose permits (30% guided) and 35 DM837 transport moose permits (70% transport).

ISSUE: I would like the Board of Game to address the following: At this point there are 50 total permits for Unit 21E, ten DM839 guided permits and 40 DM837 transport permits. There are far more hunters wanting a guided hunt instead of a transport hunt. The number in the DM837 transport hunts have never been filled since put in place. It is desired to move five DM837 transport permits to the DM839 guided permits slot. This would make available 15 DM839 guided permits and 35 DM837 transport permits.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The DM839 guided hunting permits will suffer from numbers of lost guided hunts while the DM837 transport hunt permits will remain unfilled like in the past 10 years.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would improve the quality of the resource harvested by balancing out the permits between guided and transport hunts. The demands for guided hunts are steadily increasing versus the transport hunts. This proposal would make available more hunts in the field instead of lost hunts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? We will have more hunters in the field and put an end to lost hunts. A regulated balance of guided permits and transport permits will happen as the types of hunts are changing more than ever.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one is likely to suffer with this new solution.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Considered making all 50 permits, if drawn, as either guided or transported hunts. There will be no conflict on how the permit(s) may be used. This would cause an impact of more guides in an area and local people may not want this.

PROPOSED BY: Bruce Werba

EG042913815

PROPOSAL 62 – 5 AAC 92.123(a)(1). Intensive Management Plans VII. Reauthorize the Unit 19A predation control program as follows:

5AAC 92.123. Intensive Management Plans VII.

(a) **Plans established.** Intensive management plans for the following areas are established in this section:

(1) Unit 19(A) Predation Control Area;

...

(b) Unit 19(A) Predation Control Area: the Unit 19(A) Predation Control Area is established and consists of those portions of the Kuskokwim River drainage within Unit 19(A), encompassing approximately 10,048 square miles; this predator control program does not apply within National Park Service or National Wildlife Refuge lands unless approved by the federal agencies; notwithstanding any other provision in this title, and based on the following information contained in this section, the commissioner or the commissioner's designee may conduct a wolf and black bear and brown bear population reduction or a wolf and black bear and brown bear population regulation program in Unit 19(A) to benefit moose:

(1) the following Wolf and Bear Predation Control Focus Areas are established in the Unit 19(A) Predation Control Area; the areas do not delineate a moose, wolf, or bear population and are not intended to distinguish animals within the areas from populations in Unit 19(A); the purpose is to focus wolf and bear control in a relatively small area where moose numbers can be better estimated, where moose are accessible to hunters, and where harvest can be closely monitored;

(A) the Wolf Predation Control Focus Area (WCFA) encompasses approximately 3,905 square miles within all Unit 19(A) drainages of the Kuskokwim River upstream from and including the Holitna River Drainage; wolf control will be conducted only within the WCFA; the department has

the discretion to adjust the area's size and shape to include up to approximately 4,000 square miles of Unit 19(A);

(B) the Black Bear and Brown Bear Predation Control Focus Area (BCFA) encompasses approximately 534 square miles consisting of those portions of the Kuskokwim River drainage within the area starting at Sleetmute at 61° 42.00' N. lat., 157° 10.00' W. long., then east to 61° 42.00' N. lat., 157° 00.00' W. long., then north to 61° 44.00' N. lat., 157° 00.00' W. long., then east to 61° 44.00' N. lat., 156° 55.00' W. long., then north to 61° 46.00' N. lat., 156° 55.00' W. long., then east to 61° 46.00' N. lat., 156° 50.00' W. long., then north to 61° 48.00' N. lat., 156° 50.00' W. long., then east to 61° 48.00' N. lat., 156° 45.00' W. long., then north to 61° 50.00' N. lat., 156° 45.00' W. long., then east to 61° 50.00' N. lat., 156° 30.00' W. long., then south to 61° 40.00' N. lat., 156° 30.00' W. long., then west to 61° 40.00' N. lat., 156° 45.00' W. long., then south to 61° 18.00' N. lat., 156° 45.00' W. long., then west to 61° 18.00' N. lat., 157° 15.00' W. long., then north to 61° 24.00' N. lat., 157° 15.00' W. long., then east to 61° 24.00' N. lat., 157° 10.00' W. long., then north to 61° 42.00' N. lat., 157° 10.00' W. long.; bear control will be conducted only within the BCFA; the department has the discretion to adjust the area's size and shape up to approximately 800 square miles of Unit 19(A); the BCFA is mostly within the WCFA;

(2) this is a continuing control program that was first authorized by the board in 2004 for wolf control, with bear control added by the board in 2012; it is currently designed to increase moose numbers and harvest in the WCFA and BCFA by reducing predation on moose and is expected to make a contribution to achieving the intensive management (IM) objectives in Unit 19(A);

(3) moose, wolf, black bear, and brown bear objectives are as follows:

(A) the IM population objective established by the board for Units 19(A) and 19(B) is 13,500–16,500 moose; based on the relative sizes of the two units, the proportional population objective for Unit 19(A) alone is 7,600–9,300 moose; the IM moose harvest objective for Units 19(A) and 19(B) is 750–950 moose annually; the proportional harvest objective for Unit 19(A) alone is 400–550 moose annually;

(B) the density objective for moose in the BCFA is 2.0 per square mile (corrected for sightability) during late winter surveys; the annual moose harvest objective for the BCFA is 4 percent of the estimated total number present in late winter surveys;

(C) the post-control wolf population objective for Unit 19(A) is 25–30; the pre-control wolf population in Unit 19(A) was estimated in winter 2006–2007 at 125–150; the minimum of 25 wolves is approximately an 80 percent

reduction from the pre-control population and will ensure that wolves persist in the plan area;

(D) the wolf control objective in the WCFA is to reduce wolf numbers to the lowest level possible; the pre-control estimate within the WCFA in winter 2006–2007 was 75–100;

(E) the black bear control objective in the BCFA is to reduce black bear numbers to the lowest level possible; the pre-control black bear population in Unit 19(A) was estimated at 2,500–3,000; the pre-control estimate within the BCFA was 135–160; because the BCFA is a relatively small geographic area, removing black bears from within it will have only a minor effect on the black bear population in Unit 19(A);

(F) the brown bear control objective in the BCFA is to reduce brown bear numbers to the lowest level possible; the pre-control brown bear population in Unit 19(A) was estimated at 180–210; the pre-control estimate within the BCFA in was 10–15; because the BCFA is a relatively small geographic area, removing brown bears from within it will have only a minor effect on the brown bear population in Unit 19(A);

(4) board findings concerning populations and human use are as follows:

(A) the Unit 19(A) moose population and harvest IM objectives have not been achieved;

(B) the BCFA objectives for moose density and moose harvest have not been achieved;

(C) predation by wolves and bears is an important cause of the failure to achieve population and harvest objectives;

(D) a reduction of wolf and bear predation within the WCFA and BCFA can reasonably be expected to make progress towards achieving the Unit 19(A) IM objectives;

(E) reducing predation is likely to be effective and feasible using recognized and prudent active management techniques and based on scientific information;

(F) reducing predation is likely to be effective given land ownership patterns;

(5) authorized methods and means are as follows:

(A) hunting and trapping of wolves and hunting of black bears and brown bears by the public in Unit 19(A) during the term of this program may occur

as provided in the hunting and trapping regulations set out elsewhere in this title, including use of motorized vehicles;

(B) notwithstanding any other provisions in this title, the commissioner may allow department employees to conduct aerial, land and shoot, or ground based lethal removal of wolves and black bears and brown bears using state owned, privately owned, or chartered equipment, including helicopters, under AS 16.05.783;

(C) notwithstanding any other provisions in this title, the commissioner may issue public aerial shooting permits or public land and shoot permits using fixed-wing aircraft as a method of wolf removal under AS 16.05.783;

(6) time frame is as follows:

(A) through June 30, 2020, the commissioner may authorize removal of wolves and black bears and brown bears in Unit 19(A);

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

(7) the commissioner will review, modify or suspend program activities as follows:

(A) when wolf surveys or accumulated information from department personnel, hunters, trappers, and permittees indicate the need to avoid reducing wolf numbers in Unit 19(A) below the control objective of 25–30 wolves specified in this subsection;

(B) when the moose density and harvest objectives within the BCFA specified in this subsection are achieved.

ISSUE: The Unit 19A Intensive Management Plan will expire on June 30, 2014. The program was first authorized by the Board of Game (board) in 2004 for wolf control only; bear control was added in 2012. The department recommends reauthorization of the plan to increase the moose population and make progress towards achieving the intensive management (IM) objectives for moose.

This placeholder proposal will reauthorize the program for a six year period from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2020 and will simplify codified language. It includes options for aerial wolf control conducted by public permittees and the Department of Fish and Game (department), and aerial black and brown bear control conducted by the department only. Changes to this proposal will be included in the department's analyses and recommendations of proposals that will be

made available for public review prior to the board meeting. Additional details will also be made available for public review in a separate IM operational plan prior to the board meeting.

IM objectives for Unit 19A have not been achieved. Only wolf control was conducted between December 2004 and April 2013. Progress towards achieving unit-wide IM objectives was monitored in a 3,853 mi² Wolf Control Focus Area (WCFA). Public permittees using fixed-wing aircraft reduced wolves in the WCFA by at least 60% below the pre-control level during most years since control started in 2004. However, no measurable increase in moose numbers has been detected within the WCFA, and the moose hunting season has been closed in the area (except in the Lime Village Management Area) since fall 2006. Research conducted in nearby Unit 19D-East indicates that control of both wolves and bears will be required to achieve an increase in the number of moose. The department plans to conduct black and brown bear control within a 534 mi² Bear Control Focus Area (BCFA) in May 2013. The objective is to reduce bear numbers to the lowest level possible.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The existing predation control programs will expire and predation control will stop in Unit 19A.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The number of moose available for harvest should increase with reauthorization.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and others interested in higher moose numbers will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those philosophically opposed to predator control are the most vocal group likely to oppose this proposal.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The department considered allowing this control program to expire due to lack of any detectable increase in number of moose. This was rejected because we expect an increase in moose numbers if bear control is implemented and control of both wolves and bears continues during the proposed life of this program.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613914

PROPOSAL 63 – 5 AAC 92.123(a)(2). Intensive Management Plans VII. Reauthorize the Unit 19D-East predation control program as follows:

5 AAC 92.123. Intensive Management Plans VII. (c) is entirely deleted and replaced by the following:

...

(2) Unit 19(D)-East Predation Control Area:

...

(c) Unit 19(D)-East Predation Control Area: the Unit 19(D) East Predation Control Area is established and consists of those portions of the Kuskokwim River drainage within Unit

19(D) upstream from the Selatna River drainage and the Black River drainage, encompassing approximately 8,513 square miles; this predation control program does not apply to any National Park Service or National Wildlife Refuge lands unless approved by the federal agencies; notwithstanding any other provisions in this title, and based on the following information contained in this section, the commissioner or the commissioner's designee may conduct a wolf and a black bear and a brown bear population reduction or a wolf and black bear and brown bear population regulation program in Unit 19(D)-East to benefit moose:

(1) the following Wolf and Bear Predation Control Focus Areas are established in the Unit 19(D)-East Predation Control Area; the areas do not delineate a moose, wolf, or bear population and are not intended to distinguish animals within the zones from populations in Unit 19(D)-East; the purpose is to focus wolf and bear control in a relatively small area where moose numbers can be better estimated, where moose are accessible to hunters, and where harvest can be closely monitored;

(A) the Wolf Predation Control Focus Area (WCFA) encompasses approximately 4,500 square miles within that portion of Unit 19(D) upstream of, but not including, the Black River drainage and upstream of and including the Little Selatna River drainage and downstream of, but not including, Fourth of July Creek, Soda Creek, Slow Fork, and Tonzona River drainages, surrounding the villages of McGrath, Takotna, Medfra and Nikolai; wolf control will be conducted only within the WCFA; the department will have the discretion to adjust its size and shape to include up to approximately 5,100 square miles of Unit 19(D)-East;

(B) the Black Bear and Brown Bear Predation Control Focus Area (BCFA) encompasses approximately 528 square miles consisting of those portions of the Kuskokwim River drainage starting northwest of McGrath at 63° 04.00' N. lat., 155° 50.00' W. long., then east to 63° 04.00' N. lat., 154° 50.00' W. long., then south to 62° 54.00' N. lat., 154° 50.00' W. long., then west to 62° 54.00' N. lat., 155° 25.00' W. long., then south to 62° 50.00' N. lat., 155° 25.00' W. long., then west to 62° 50.00' N. lat., 155° 30.00' W. long., then south to 62° 48.00' N. lat., 155° 30.00' W. long., then west to 62° 48.00' N. lat., 155° 35.00' W. long., then south to 62° 42.00' N. lat., 155° 35.00' W. long., then west to 62° 42.00' N. lat., 155° 55.00' W. long., then north to 62° 50.00' N. lat., 155° 55.00' W. long., then east to 62° 50.00' N. lat., 155° 50.00' W. long., then north to the point of beginning at 63° 04.00' N. lat., 155° 50.00' W. long., surrounding the village of McGrath; bear control will be conducted only within the BCFA; the department will have the discretion to adjust its size and shape up to approximately 680 square miles of Unit 19(D)-East; the BCFA is within the WCFA;

(2) this is a continuing control program that was first authorized by the board in 1995; wolf control began in winter 2003–2004 and bear control began with nonlethal removal of bears in the BCFA during May 2003 and 2004; the control program is currently designed to increase moose numbers and harvest in the WCFA and BCFA

by reducing predation on moose and is expected to make a contribution to achieving the intensive management (IM) objectives in Unit 19(D)-East;

(3) moose, wolf, black bear, and brown bear objectives are as follows:

(A) moose IM objectives established by the board for Unit 19(D)-East are for a population of 6,000–8,000 and an annual harvest of 400–600 ;

(B) the moose density objective for the BCFA is 2.0 per square mile (corrected for sightability) in fall surveys; the moose harvest objective for the BCFA is 4 percent of the estimated total number present in fall surveys;

(C) the post-control wolf population control objective for Unit 19(D)-East is 40 wolves remaining; the pre-control wolf population in Unit 19(D)-East was estimated in February 2001 at 198 wolves; a minimum population of 40 wolves is approximately an 80 percent reduction for the pre-control population and will ensure that wolves persist in the plan area;

(D) the wolf control objective in the WCFA is to reduce wolf numbers to the lowest level possible; the pre-control estimate within the WCFA in 2001 was 68;

(E) the black bear control objective in the BCFA is to reduce black bear numbers to the lowest level possible; the pre-control black bear population in Unit 19(D)-East was estimated at 1,700; the pre-control estimate within the BCFA was approximately 130; because the BCFA is a relatively small geographic area, removing black bears from within it will have only a minor effect on the black bear population in Unit 19(D)-East;

(F) the brown bear control objective in the BCFA is to reduce brown bear numbers to the lowest level possible; the pre-control brown bear population in Unit 19(D)-East was 128; the pre-control estimate within the BCFA was 9; because the BCFA is a relatively small geographic area, removing brown bears from within it will have only a minor effect on the brown bear population in Unit 19(D)-East;

(4) board findings concerning populations and human use are as follows:

(A) the Unit 19(D)-East moose population and harvest objectives have not been achieved;

(B) the BCFA objectives for moose density and moose harvest have not been achieved;

(C) predation by wolves and bears is an important cause of the failure to achieve population and harvest objectives;

(D) a reduction of wolf and bear predation within the WCFA and BCFA can reasonably be expected to make progress towards achieving the Unit 19(D)-East intensive management objectives;

(E) reducing predation is likely to be effective and feasible using recognized and prudent active management techniques and based on scientific information;

(F) reducing predation is likely to be effective given land ownership patterns;

(5) authorized methods and means are as follows:

(A) hunting and trapping of wolves and hunting of black bears and brown bears by the public in Unit 19(D)-East during the term of this program may occur as provided in the hunting and trapping regulations set out elsewhere in this title, including use of motorized vehicles;

(B) notwithstanding any other provisions in this title, the commissioner may allow department employees to conduct aerial, land and shoot, or ground based lethal removal of wolves and black bears and brown bears using state owned, privately owned, or chartered equipment, including helicopters, under AS 16.05.783;

(C) notwithstanding any other provisions in this title, the commissioner may issue public aerial shooting permits or public land and shoot permits using fixed-wing aircraft as a method of wolf removal under AS 16.05.783;

(6) time frame is as follows:

(A) through June 30, 2020, the commissioner may authorize removal of wolves and black and brown bears in Unit 19(D)-East;

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

and bear populations, and recommendations for changes, if necessary to achieve the objectives of the plan;

(7) the commissioner will review, modify or suspend program activities as follows:

(A) when the wolf surveys or accumulated information from department personnel, hunters, trappers, and permittees indicate the need to avoid reducing wolf numbers in Unit 19(D)-East below the control objective of 40 wolves specified in this subsection;

(B) when the moose density and harvest objectives within the BCFA specified in this subsection are achieved.

ISSUE: The Unit 19D-East Intensive Management Plan will expire on June 30, 2014. The program was first authorized by the Board of Game (board) in 1995. Wolf control began in 2003. Bear control began with nonlethal removal of bears by the Department of Fish and Game (department) during May 2003 and 2004, and continued with lethal, public removal starting in 2010. The department recommends reauthorization of the plan to increase the moose population and continue progress towards achieving intensive management (IM) objectives established for this area.

This placeholder proposal will reauthorize the program for a six year period from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2020 and will simplify codified language. It includes options for aerial wolf control conducted by public permittees and the department, and aerial black and brown bear control conducted by the department only. Changes to this proposal will be included in the department's analyses and recommendations of proposals that will be made available for public review prior to the board meeting. Additional details will also be made available for public review in a separate IM operational plan prior to the board meeting.

Unit-wide IM objectives for Unit 19D-East have not been achieved, but progress has been made. Within the 1,118 mi² Upper Kuskokwim Villages Moose Management Area (MMA) where wolf and bear control have been conducted, the number of moose increased from 868 in fall 2001 to 1,820 in fall 2009. However, numbers declined to 1,337 by 2012. The decline may be due to combination of deep snow winters and increased bear predation. Harvest of moose increased in the MMA from 29 in 2001 to 69 in 2012. However, the present harvest will not be sustainable if moose numbers continue to decline.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The existing predation control programs will expire.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The number of moose available for harvest should increase with reauthorization.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and others interested in higher moose numbers will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those philosophically opposed to predator control are the most likely to oppose this proposal.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered allowing this control program to expire. This was rejected because ongoing predator control will likely be necessary to achieve prey objectives.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613915

PROPOSAL 64 - 5 AAC 84.270. Fur bearer trapping. Extend the lynx trapping season in Unit 19 as follows:

Extend the lynx trapping season in Unit 19 to run concurrently with the open season on wolverine in Unit 19; November 1-March 31.

ISSUE: Currently in Unit 19, lynx trapping ends after February 28. The proposal is to extend the season through March creating easier and more practical enforcement by the troopers; no waste of lynx from incidental catches and more accurate sealing data.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Enforcement by troopers is very difficult because lynx and wolverine sets are very similar. There is bound to be incidental catches resulting in the potential waste of the animal, more work for the state, and some trappers may not turn in their March catches making sealing data inaccurate.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Potentially increased harvest of lynx may reduce pressure on hare population resulting in a greater prey base over a longer period of time. This could benefit all predator populations by smoothing out some of the peaks and crashes on population numbers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Department of Fish and Game, troopers and trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered the idea of making sets that would only target wolverine but it would not be a viable solution because any set that a wolverine is susceptible to a lynx is also susceptible to.

PROPOSED BY: Rhone Baumgartner EG050113880

PROPOSAL 65 - 5 AAC 85.055 Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Establish a registration sheep hunt for residents in Unit 19C as follows:

Establish a residents-only registration hunt for sheep in 19C with a limit of one sheep with $\frac{3}{4}$ -curl or less, excluding lambs and ewes accompanied by lambs, and excluding rams with broomed horns, from October 1-April 30. Prohibit use of aircraft for access to hunt sheep except into and out of the McGrath, Nikolai, and Telida airports. Hunters are required to call-in to the area management biologist within three days of the beginning and the end of each hunt, and hunters must report any sheep harvested after each hunt. The number of hunters in the field may be limited at the discretion of the area management biologist in order to prevent overharvest. Hunt will be closed by emergency order when the total harvest reaches ten sheep, or prior to this at the discretion of area management biologist. Standard horn sealing requirements do not apply for this hunt: horns must be sealed within 30 days of the close of season rather than 30 days after kill. This hunt is eligible for proxy hunting for elders over 65 years old.

ISSUE: Current regulations for harvesting Dall sheep in Unit 19 do not provide Alaska residents living in the communities of McGrath, Nikolai, Takotna, and Telida a reasonable opportunity to practice their recognized customary and traditional subsistence use of Dall sheep. Regulations currently provide for nonresident trophy hunters' needs, but are inadequate to provide for the needs of Alaska residents, especially those living in Unit 19.

For example, in 2011 79 nonresident hunters harvested 66 full-curl Dall sheep rams from Unit 19C and had an 84% success rate. 59 Alaska resident hunters from all areas harvested only ten full-curl rams and had only a 17% success rate. Four sheep hunters living in Unit 19 harvested zero sheep and had a 0% success rate.

Local residents of Unit 19 have a long term pattern of sheep hunting, recognized as customary and traditional by the Alaska Board of Game in 2010 (5 AAC 99.025(a)(10)), but most residents who wish to hunt sheep have not had a reasonable opportunity to do so for many years. Access during the current fall season is only possible via small aircraft or specialized shallow-draft boats and motors that are cost prohibitive to the majority of Alaskans, and especially to residents of Unit 19 where opportunities for cash income are very limited. In addition to the problems related to the timing of the current fall season, the full curl ram regulations in Unit 19C prevent most non-guided resident hunters from harvesting sheep, as full curl rams are scarce in the area due to regular high harvests by guided nonresident hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Residents of Unit 19 will continue to suffer from the lack of a reasonable opportunity to harvest Dall sheep, a formerly important source of food and clothing in the area. In particular, elderly community members will continue to suffer from the lack of Dall sheep, an important and desired part of their diet that some have not had access to for decades. Younger generations will not be able to learn the knowledge and skills related to traditional patterns of sheep hunting, use, and respect that have long been an important part of the culture in Unit 19. Communities in the region will continue to suffer from a lack of Dall sheep meat during important community gatherings such as funeral potlatches and holiday gatherings. Skills and knowledge related to sheep hunting that have been developed over many generations will likely be lost within the next 20 years.

There will be a greater risk of food shortage in the future, as residents of Unit 19 currently depend almost completely on moose and black bear for meat. In the past, the ability to harvest other big game animals such as caribou and Dall sheep provided security against changes in the local moose population.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This season will likely reduce competition between trophy hunters and subsistence hunters, as sheep harvested under this hunt will not be full-curl rams. Subsistence hunters will no longer need to attempt to harvest full-curl rams to meet their Dall sheep subsistence needs as is required under current regulations, and it is possible that slightly more full-curl rams will be available to trophy hunters as a result. Sheep with less than $\frac{3}{4}$ curl often provide a higher quality meat than full-curl rams, and sheep harvested in this season would have a higher quality skin with thicker wool, which is more desirable for use as clothing or sleeping mats than sheep harvested in the current season.

This season would not cause harm to the Dall sheep populations in Unit 19C, as area biologists have stated that an additional harvest of ten sheep would be sustainable in the region.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska residents would benefit, especially residents of Unit 19 who would be able to access Dall sheep via snow machines in winter. This would benefit the majority of residents of Unit 19 who do not have access to small aircraft or specially equipped shallow water boats and motors for hunting during the current fall season. Also, trophy hunters may benefit due to less competition from subsistence hunters for full-curl rams as stated previously.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1. Leaving the current Dall sheep hunting season as it currently stands. This was rejected because it does not provide an opportunity for Alaska residents living in the communities of McGrath, Nikolai, Takotna, and Telida a reasonable opportunity to follow for their recognized customary and traditional subsistence use of Dall sheep as described under (2).

2. Extending the Dall sheep season for Alaska residents beyond the current September 20 close of season. This would provide Alaska residents more of an opportunity to harvest Dall sheep than guided nonresidents, but would not address the problem of too few full-curl rams due to high harvests by trophy hunters during the current season. This would also possibly increase competition between sport and subsistence hunters in Unit 19.

PROPOSED BY: Nikolai Edzeno' Village Council

EG042913819

(This proposal will also be considered at the Arctic/Western Region meeting in January 2014; see proposal #5).

PROPOSAL 66 - 5 AAC 85.050. Hunting seasons and bag limits for musk oxen. Create a musk oxen hunt in Unit 18 and 19 as follows:

Allow for a subsistence musk ox hunt to occur in the various populations of the Unit 18 and 19 mainland herd by close proximity communities.

ISSUE: The current musk oxen population on the mainland is growing in various location of Units 18 and 19. Increased sightings, encounters, and growing incidences of musk oxen taking refuge from predators near or in the villages suggests that the mainland musk oxen population is growing.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to not know what the mainland musk ox population is and the corresponding harvestable surplus. The State of Alaska and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service must determine the population and identify the harvestable surplus and allow for a hunt. The population cannot go unmonitored and harvest restriction cannot go on forever.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would force the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to do their job in effectively monitoring the mainland musk ox populations in Units 18 and 19.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence hunters in Unit 18 and 19 initially and perhaps other hunters at a later time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Additional hunting opportunity is always most beneficial.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Create a Unit 18 and 19 Musk Ox Management Committee.

PROPOSED BY: Myron Naneng Sr., AVCP

EG042413785

(This proposal will also be considered at the Interior Region meeting in February 2014; see proposal # 10).

PROPOSAL 67 - 5 AAC 92.450. Description of game management units. Modify the boundaries for Units 18, 19, and 21 as follows:

Create new boundary language for Unit 18 to read:

The area draining into the Yukon River downstream from a line starting at the downriver boundary of Paimiut on the north bank of the Yukon River then across the river to the south bank to the northern terminus of the Paimiut Portage, proceed south through the Portage to the mouth of Hooking Creek on the northeast corner of Arhymot Lake, follow the northern and western bank of the lake to the head of Crooked Creek, follow the north bank of the creek downstream to the northern terminus of the Crooked Creek to Mud Creek Tramway, follow the tramway south to Mud Creek, follow its west bank downstream to First Slough, follow the west bank of the slough downstream to its confluence to the Kuskokwim River,

Create new language for Unit 19 to read: The area draining into the Kuskokwim River upstream from the confluence of the First Slough and the Kuskokwim River; and the area draining into Crook Creek's south bank upstream from the northern terminus of the Mud Creek to Crook Creek Portage Tramway. (All are clearly visible land marks.)

Create new language for Unit 21 to read: The area draining into the Yukon River upstream from the down river boundary of Paimiut on the north shore of the Yukon River and, directly across the river, the northern terminus of the Paimiut Portage on the south shore of the Yukon River. (Both clearly visible land marks.)

The area **east** of the boundary and **south** of the **High Portage Ridge** would be part of **Unit 19**, since this area drains into the Kuskokwim River. (Clear visible land marks.)

The area **east** of the boundary and **north** of the **High Portage Ridge** would be part of **Unit 21**, since this area drains into the Yukon River. (Clear visible land marks.)

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

WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Many hunters and enforcement personnel would still not know where the real boundaries are. There is no definite language explaining where the “straight line” begins or ends. Does the line start at the “downriver”, “center” or “upriver” boundary of Paimiut or Lower Kalskag?

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The boundaries would be clear, definite and visible. There would be no more confusion as to where the boundaries begin and end.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and enforcement personnel would know exactly what unit they are in. All hunters traveling up river on the Yukon and Kuskokwim rivers to Units 19 and 21. All hunters from Lower Kalskag and Kalskag would benefit most by regaining their customary and traditional hunting lands in Units 18 and 21. These lands are presently included in Units 18 and 21. This would also clarify the issue of “no man’s land” east of the boundary line and north of Kalskag and Lower Kalskag and south of High Portage Ridge. High Portage Ridge geographically separates the Yukon River and Kuskokwim River drainages. All drainages north of the ridge flowing into the Yukon would be in Unit 21 and all drainages south of the Ridge flowing into the Kuskokwim would be in Unit 19.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one would suffer if this proposal is adopted. The Paimiut Portage is a well-established historical trail that connects the central Kuskokwim and Yukon rivers. It is repaired, remarked and maintained annually, after freeze up, by hunters and fishers from Kalskag and Lower Kalskag. The Paimiut Portage is used daily during the fall, winter and spring seasons by all hunters, fishers, trappers and visitors from the lower and central Kuskokwim River and from the central Yukon River villages.

The Mud Creek to Crooked Creek Tramway is a part of a historical personal/commercial route connecting travelers to/from the Kuskokwim River villages and the Yukon River villages.

Residents of Lower Kalskag and Kalskag were involved in the modification of this proposal. They endorse and support this proposal and urge the Board of Game to pass it as the best choice for redefining the presently unclear and confusing boundaries of Units 18, 19 and 21.

The residents of Lower Kalskag and Kalskag live, hunt, fish, trap and gather in this land, as have their ancestors. They do so with honor and respect to the land and its first inhabitants-the water, plants, berries, trees, fish and game. They do so following what the land and seasons offer of their renewable food resources. They have always had customary and traditional seasonal use of this land and its resources.

Contrary to what you may hear from some residents of the lower Kuskokwim River area, they do not have year-round customary and traditional use of this land and its resources, for this reason residents of Lower Kalskag and Kalskag urge the Board of Game to honor this proposal to modify the boundaries, move the Kuskokwim terminal out of Lower Kalskag downstream to a known visible location, and return their customary and traditional hunting, fishing, trapping and gathering lands. They ask this especially for the benefit of our youth and young adults, who would be made criminals if this change is not adopted and passed, because they will continue to hunt in lands now classified as part of Units 18 and 21, which are really in Unit 19.

We know this land and its resources. We know how, where and when to travel on this land, to hunt, fish, trap and gather. We do not hunt, fish, trap, gather and travel by paper. We hunt, fish, trap and gather using our natural land marks-rivers, sloughs, streams, lakes, hills and trails as guides and boundaries. We use what we can see, feel, hear and taste as our guides. We are part of the land and its resources-it feeds us, clothes us, shelters us, comforts us and connects us to our Creator. It is part of us, as we are part of it, because we live on it. We are one with the land.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Central Kuskokwim Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050613951

Galena Area – Units 21B, 21C, 21D & 24

PROPOSAL 68 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change the Unit 21D moose permit hunt, DM818, to a general hunt as follows:

Remove moose hunt DM818 for the Papa Willie Creek area from the drawing permit process and return it to just a general hunt with a harvest card.

ISSUE: The drawing permit hunt, DM818, for the Papa Willie Creek area in Unit 21D is not needed. There are 25 permits available for issue and for 2013 there were only two applicants and 23 leftover permits. Every year there are a high number of leftover permits not filled. I hunted this area in 2012 and never saw another hunter or another boat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Current rules don't allow hunters who want to hunt this under-subscribed area to get a permit for the same hunt every year.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who like to hunt this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one because very few people apply for this hunt and/or hunt this area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow leftover drawing permits to be issued to hunters who drew the permit the year before. This should be a statewide proposal.

PROPOSED BY: Mel Erickson

EG041013745

PROPOSAL 69 - 5 AAC 92.069. Special provisions for moose drawing permit hunts.

Allow moose hunting guides in Units 21D and 24 to select another client if original applicant is unable to hunt as follows:

If a successful applicant dies or is seriously injured, contracts a serious illness or is the victim of a disaster such as a tornado, flood, hurricane, fire, etc., which prevents the successful applicant from participating in the hunt, the department shall allow the contracting guide who the successful applicant was contracted to hunt with, to select another client to replace the client who cannot participate in the hunt.

ISSUE: Guides losing clients due to death, serious injury or illness,,or acts of nature such as tornadoes, hurricanes and fires, etc.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Guides will lose clients due to no fault of the client, or guide. The department will lose Pittman-Robertson funds.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The guide who will take the person hunting and the people who get the meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Virgil Umphenour

EG050313888

PROPOSAL 70 - 5 AAC 85.045(22). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Retain the winter registration moose hunt in Unit 24B (RM833) as follows:

Moose:

Unit 24B Remainder:

Residents: one bull, harvest ticket, September 1- September 25

Residents: one antlered bull by permit, available online at <http://hunt.alaska.gov> or in person in Hughes, Allakaket, or Fairbanks beginning December 14; December 15-April 15.

Nonresidents: one bull with 50-inch antlers, or antlers with four or more brow tines on at least one side, harvest ticket, September 5- September 25

ISSUE: The winter bull moose hunt (RM833) is due to sunset in regulatory year 2014. The Koyukuk River Advisory Committee feels this hunt should continue to provide winter bull moose hunting opportunity in a portion of Unit 24B.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The regulation will sunset in 2014, and winter moose harvest opportunity will be lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The opportunity for winter moose hunting spreads use of bull moose harvest into areas that cannot be hunted in the fall.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who did not harvest a bull moose in the fall hunt would have additional opportunity to take an antlered bull moose while trapping or wood cutting. This is a remote area that entails expensive travel, and a low density moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There is no user group adversely affected by the current regulation that is due to sunset.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Hunting antlerless moose with this season, but the current moose population in Unit 24B cannot support cow harvest at this time.

PROPOSED BY: Koyukuk River Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG022513736

PROPOSAL 71 - 5 AAC 92.540(8)(b). Controlled use areas. Modify the Kanuti Controlled Use Area boundaries as follows:

Reinstate the original dimensions of the Kanuti Controlled Use Area to circa 2009, when the Board of Game moved to reduce the size of the Controlled Use Area.

ISSUE: The reduction of the size of the Kanuti Controlled Use Area. The Koyukuk River Advisory Committee believes that the original boundary of the Kanuti Controlled Use Area should be reinstated. The Department of Fish and Game is actively conducting predator control in the surrounding area to attempt to bolster the moose population for the people of the Koyukuk River area. Reinstating the original size of the Kanuti Controlled Use Area would help preserve the intention of the original Kanuti Controlled Use Area, which is still needed today.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The proximity of the Kanuti Flats to Bettles air taxi operations would allow too much hunting pressure for this limited moose resource. Without the entire controlled use area there is potential loss of harvestable moose by the residents of the Koyukuk River drainage, failure to meet our subsistence needs.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All people who hunt this area who are seeking quality hunting that also provides for a healthy moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who hunt exclusively with aircraft.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Koyukuk River Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG042613804

PROPOSAL 72 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Allow the taking of brown bears at black bear bait stations in Units 24C and 24D as follows:

Allow grizzly bears to be taken at black bear bait stations in Units 24C and 24D.

ISSUE: Grizzly bears at black bear stations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be high predation on moose by grizzly bear, and black bear bait stations will become useless once grizzly bears start coming to them.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All moose hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Virgil Umphenour

EG050313889

PROPOSAL 73 - 5 AAC 84.270(5). Fur bearer trapping. Extend the lynx season in Unit 21 as follows:

Lynx, Unit 21, November 1- **March 31** [LAST DAY OF FEBUARY]

ISSUE: Inconsistent trapping regulations. The season for trapping wolverine in Unit 21 ends March 31. The season for trapping lynx in Unit 21 ends February 28. That leaves a month in which one can incidentally catch lynx in a wolverine set. Lynx sets and wolverine sets are nearly identical and incidentally caught lynx must be forfeited to the state. In most years, the incidentally caught lynx pelts from Unit 21 in March are still prime, sellable pelts. This results in lost opportunity for those who wish to trap wolverine in March who catch a lynx in their set.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued loss of opportunity for the trappers in Unit 21 who wish to trap lynx in March. Continued loss of opportunity for the trapper who does not wish to target lynx in March, but catches them incidentally to setting traps for wolverine.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All trappers who are targeting wolverine in March in Unit 21.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Middle Yukon River Fish and Game Advisory Committee

EG050113859

Northeast Alaska –

Units 25A, 25B, 25D, 26B & 26C

PROPOSAL 74 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Change resident season for caribou within the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area and create a youth hunt as follows:

Resident only caribou season from August 1 thru August 25 with a youth hunt only for a week in that mix.

ISSUE: Increase the number of days for resident only hunts in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area so residents can hunt for a longer period of time.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We need affordable access to hunting areas such as these not only to access the resource but to teach our young people about hunting. We need to teach young people to become hunting advocates and this proposal will help to provide that opportunity which is so important to the future of hunting in this state. Residents only should be offered more time to access the resource than they are now with an August school start date in mind. Many of us cannot afford expensive fly-ins and this is a road accessible area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It will improve the quality of the hunt by keeping down the crowds from outside.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresidents because they will have a bit of a narrower window. The constitutional statement that the resources shall be allocated for maximum benefit of the state residents should be considered and adhered to as well.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Residents only but that is too harsh as the people of the state do benefit from nonresidents utilizing the resource as well.

PROPOSED BY: Jeff Alling

EG043013848

PROPOSAL 75 - 5 AAC 85.025(22). Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Change the resident caribou season and create a youth hunt in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area as follows:

Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area

Residents Only: August 13 – August 20.

Hunting in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area (DHCMA) is restricted to residents only from August 13 - August 20, north of the north bank of the Kanuti River.

August 13-16 is a youth hunt for Alaska residents, 17 and younger, (four days)
August 17-20 is for all Alaska residents, any legal age, (four days).

Possible Bonus: The first week in September that encompasses the entire Labor Day weekend would be a nice addition to the resident only hunting period from August 13-August 20. This would give residents an eight day period in August and a seven day period in September to enjoy a less crowded hunting environment and kids would have better opportunities.

The focus of this proposal is for caribou hunting but sheep season opens on August 10 and moose on September 1 so the Board of Game has the opportunity to include other big game species to create even more opportunity if they choose.

ISSUE: Overcrowding in the DHCMA. This caribou hunt has been featured in several outdoor articles and it has become very popular with nonresident hunters. This hunt has a generous bag limit and is open for ten months. The most popular months of hunting are August and September and eight days of resident only hunting in August before school starts is not an unreasonable request.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The board needs to start creating some opportunities for young Alaskans and their parents. With all the attacks on hunting and firearm ownership, the board has an excellent opportunity to create a positive situation for our youth. We can't lose the kids if we want our hunting traditions to continue.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This will result in a less crowded hunt for Alaskans and give our youth a reasonable opportunity for success. This will improve the quality or experience of hunting in the DHCMA for both residents and nonresidents. No one enjoys crowded conditions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska residents and nonresidents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Maybe a nonresident who wants to hunt between August 13-20. The nonresidents have 40 plus weeks to hunt the DHCMA so there is ample opportunity to plan a trip.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Tom Lamal

EG042913833

PROPOSAL 76 - 5 AAC 92.530. Management areas. Allow sidelock muzzleloading rifles to be used within the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area as follows:

I would allow the use of sidelock muzzleloading rifles shooting lead round balls in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area (DHCMA), Units 24 and 25. The use of these weapons would be further restricted to no optical sights, muzzleloader safety course, and no shooting within 500 yards of the pipeline.

ISSUE: I would like to be able to use muzzleloading rifles in the DHCMA.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Only bowhunters will be able to hunt in the area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This would allow more people to be able to hunt in the pipeline corridor who may not be able to use a bow and arrow.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those people who either physically can not use a bow or have difficulty shooting a bow would be able to participate in hunting in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Bowhunters who do not wish to share the resource with firearm users.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered in-line muzzleloaders and conical and/or sabot rounds. I rejected these because the effective range using conicals and sabot rounds is much further than round balls and stand a much higher chance of damaging the pipeline. Lead round balls are ballistically inefficient and firing them from 500 yards or more from the pipeline would cause any shot to hit the ground before getting to the pipeline. By not allowing optical sights or in-line firearms hunters are less likely to attempt any long range shots. Shots with round balls and open sights are generally under 100 yards as that is about the maximum effective range of lead round balls.

PROPOSED BY: James Fitzpatrick

EG042813812

PROPOSAL 77 – 5 AAC 92.450(26)(B). **Description of game management units.** Clarify the subunit boundary between Unit 26B and Unit 26C. Add additional language in subunits to clarify that the area described is not stand alone language, but within the larger unit boundaries as follows:

5 AAC 92.450(26)(B) Unit 26(B) consists of that portion of Unit 26 east of Unit 26(A), **and** west of **a line following** the west banks of **the Staines River branch of the Canning River,** the Canning River and [WEST OF THE WEST BANK OF] the Marsh Fork of the Canning River.

As a housekeeping measure, several subunits will have language added to clarify that the description applies only to the unit defined.

Example:(5)(A) Unit 5 (A) consists of all drainages **of Unit 5** east of Yakutat Bay, Disenchantment Bay, etc.

ISSUE: The current boundary between Units 26B and 26C is unclear due to multiple river branches near the mouth of the Canning River. The boundary line should follow the western-most branch, which is actually the Staines River branch. This proposal would clarify that line. In addition, some subunit descriptions in regulation do not clearly state that they apply only in that specific unit. For instance, if the subunit description references the area upriver, that may

actually cover areas in another unit. Adding the clarification should help focus the actual subunit description.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters may be confused by actual area boundaries and associated seasons and bag limits.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and the public.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anyone who was using the wrong boundary description.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo, but maps would not delineate the actual written description.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613927

PROPOSAL 78 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change the bag limit for moose in Unit 25 as follows:

Unit 25: One bull moose with 50-inch antlers or three or more brow tines on at least one side.

ISSUE: Change the brow tine requirement for bull moose from four brow tines to three or more brow tines on at least one side. Bull moose in Unit 25 generally do not produce huge antler spreads and therefore have to be judged by antler size. Many older bulls grow antlers in the 45 - 54 -inch class. Even a 54 inch bull is a hard judgment call, by providing an opportunity of counting only three brow tines it would provide a greater chance of harvesting a few more mature bulls. In discussions with Department of Fish and Game biologists, there is no reason it cannot be changed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Less opportunities for moose hunters to harvest legal moose in this area. Moose in this area are nutritionally stressed and generally don't produce huge antler spreads with big brow tines.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This would provide more opportunities for nonresident hunters to harvest a bull moose and possibly a few more nonresident licenses and tags would be sold. There would be more revenue for the Department of Fish And Game.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This would provide more opportunities for a few nonresident hunters and guides and revenue for the Department of Fish and Game.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I don't believe anyone would suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1). Changing the regulation to any bull; rejected because most nonresidents are looking for a larger bull anyway. 2). Changing the regulation to certain Unit 25 subunits but all of Unit 25 bull moose are nutritionally stressed and don't produce huge antler spreads. 3). Doing nothing but want to provide a little more of a chance for a nonresident hunters that is spending a lot of money to hunt in Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: Jim Kedrowski

EG042413781

PROPOSAL 79 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Create new hunt area for moose in Unit 25A as follows:

The existing regulation is:

Remainder of Unit 25(A)

Resident hunters: 1 bull, September 5 - September 25.

Nonresident hunters: 1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side, September 5 – September 25.

The Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council (Council) requests the Board of Game to create another hunt area out of Unit 25A Remainder as follows:

Unit 25A, the portion consisting of Sheenjek River, upstream but not including Koness River and the drainages of the Coleen River and Old Crow Rivers

Resident hunters: 1 bull with 50-inch antlers or four or more brow tines on at least one side September 5 - September 25

Nonresident nonguided hunters: 1 bull with 50-inch antlers or four or more brow tines on at least one side by draw permit September 5 - September. 25

Nonresident guided hunters: 1 bull with 50-inch antlers or four or more brow tines on at least one side by harvest tag September 5 - September 25

Concerning permit requirements, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge manager already limits the number of clients a guide can take to hunt in the area, and therefore, a draw permit is not necessary to further limit participation by guided hunters. Additionally, if a draw permit is required for guided hunters, a guide will have to compete for a permit and the odds are he will not get one. Otherwise, he can apply for more clients than he is allowed to take and possibly receive too many permits. By not requiring a guided hunter to get a draw permit, guiding businesses are protected from the uncertainty of obtaining a permit.

Many of the non-guided hunters dropped off by transporters hunt while floating rivers and their harvests are prone to spoiling because they are not picked up for up to ten days after harvesting a moose. Requiring a draw permit will reduce their participation in the hunting.

ISSUE: To describe the problem that this proposal addresses, the Council referenced the testimony on February 21, 2013, by Fran Mauer:

“...The picture here is that the Kongakut and Firth are the areas that are currently closed, have been closed to hunting since 1996 and it looks like they have either recovered or are in the process of recovering, whereas the moose farther west, the Coleen and Sheenjek, have been open to hunting all these years, were never closed, and we haven't seen a real strong improvement over the last -- well, from 2000. So we're talking 12 years and numbers have remained low.

The concern that I bring forward with this closure that you're reviewing for 26C is that if 26C areas on the Firth and the Kongakut are opened, moose that are headed for the Coleen and for the Firth are going to now -- would be exposed to additional harvest pressure where currently they're not. I think that's a concern...”

(Transcript of Eastern Interior Alaska Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council meeting in Fairbanks, February 21, 2013, Pages 65–66).

The Council also notes that there have not been consistent moose population surveys conducted in this area in recent years and stress that the slight increase in restrictions will slow the harvest rate until a more comprehensive aerial moose survey can be completed and the population deemed sustainable with the hunting regulations in place. A report by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game notes that although few surveys have been conducted in recent years in Unit 25A, moose populations in this area are considered to be some of the lowest some of the lowest in Interior Alaska (Harper, 2010).

A report by retired Arctic National Wildlife Refuge Biologist Fran Mauer, indicates that moose occurring in the upper portion of the Sheenjek River (upstream of Kones River) and most of the Coleen and Old Crow rivers in Unit 25A are a migratory population that moves across the border to Old Crow Flats in spring where they give birth to calves and remain through the summer (Mauer 1998). These moose migrate back to Alaska during late August and September where they rut and stay for the winter (Mauer 1998). Council members also cite the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and Arctic National Wildlife Refuge moose survey reports below and are concerned that during the period between 1990 and 2000, the number of moose counted in fall survey areas declined sharply from previous years. For the Sheenjek area, moose declined from a previous average of about 135 to as low as 21 in 2000, a drop of 81%. In the Coleen survey area moose numbers declined from an average of 229 prior to 2000, to 116 during 2000 to 2002, a decline of 66%. The 2012 fall moose count was 26 moose and 79 moose for the Sheenjek and Coleen survey areas respectively. Moose numbers have remained low in the Sheenjek and Coleen areas for the past 12 years.

Total moose counted by fall aerial surveys during 1977 to 2012, eastern Brooks Range, Alaska.

Year	Coleen	Sheenjek
1977(1)	219	104
1978(2)	No Survey	125
1979(3)	245	151
1987(4)	No Survey	149

1989(5)	220	147
1991(6)	233	81
2000(7)	129	21
2002(8)	103	2
2008(9)	No Survey	22
2012(10,11)	79(15)	26(16)

-
- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| (1) Haggstrom, 1977 (ADF&G) | (6) Mauer and Akaran, 1991 (Arctic Refuge) |
| (2) Spindler, 1978 (Arctic Refuge) | (7) Mauer, 2000 (Arctic Refuge) |
| (3) Spindler, 1980 (Arctic Refuge) | (8) Bucholtz, 2002 (Arctic Refuge) |
| (4) Nowlin, 1987 (ADF&G) | (9) Wertz, 2008 (Arctic Refuge) |
| (5) Mauer, 1989 (Arctic Refuge) | (10) Caikoski, 2012 (ADF&G) |
| | (11) Wald, 2012 (Arctic Refuge) |

Furthermore, Council members have seen indications of increased hunting pressure occurring on both the upper Sheenjek and Coleen rivers during the past ten years. Thus there is a need to reduce the over-all harvest of moose in the upper Sheenjek and Coleen river areas to prevent further decline, and to enhance recovery of this depressed population.

LITERATURE CITED

***Most data cited in the table is in-house, unpublished reports of harvest surveys conducted by Alaska Department of Fish and Game and Arctic National Wildlife Refuge biologists that some Council members had acquired for review or through discussion with the listed biologists.**

Buchholtz, C. 2002. Arctic National Wildlife Refuge Eastern Brooks Range Moose Trend Survey 2002 Trip Report. Memorandum, 6pp. Fairbanks, AK.

Caikoski, J. R. 2011. Moose survey of the Firth, Mancha, and Upper Kongakut Drainages, Unit 26C. Unpublished report. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Fairbanks, AK. 3 pp.

Harper, P. 2010. Moose management report of survey – inventory activities 1 July 2007 – 30 June 2009. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Juneau, AK.

Mauer, F. J. 1998. Moose migration: northeastern Alaska to northwestern Yukon Territory, Canada. *Alces* 34:75-81.

Wald, E. 2011. North Slope Moose Survey, April 2011. Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Fairbanks, AK.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose populations in the proposal area will continue to be depressed, reducing opportunity for all moose hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? By adding the antler restriction, only large mature bulls would be harvested allowing the smaller bulls to mature into large trophy size moose. This proposal will also assist in maintaining the moose population in the upper Sheenjek and Coleen which are of specific concern due to low and declining numbers. Because of the open tundra and shrub communities of the eastern Brooks Range valleys where migrating moose are funneled, these moose are very susceptible to rising hunting pressure. With numbers as low as they are currently, the migratory population could be extirpated entirely. This would represent a significant loss to the region. It is imperative that harvest pressure on this predominately migratory moose population be reduced so that it can recover and grow to its former levels of abundance. Recovery of this population of moose would result in increased opportunity for sustained use of this resource not only by local subsistence hunters but greater opportunity for all hunters in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? In the long run, the population of moose in the area will increase benefiting everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Residents of Alaska who are non-federally qualified subsistence users will have additional antler restrictions while hunting in the proposal area. Non-guided hunters will have to participate in a new drawing for permits.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? More severe restrictions were considered but taking too much harvest opportunity and displacing the present population of moose hunters that use this area may negatively affect another location through increased hunting pressure and harvest.

PROPOSED BY: Eastern Interior Alaska Regional Advisory Council EG050113866

PROPOSAL 80 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Allow brown bears to be taken at black bear stations in Unit 25D as follows:

5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting bear with the use of bait or scent lures.

(1) a person may establish a black bear bait station, or a black and brown bear bait station in Units 12, 20(C), 20(E), and 21(D), **and 25(D)** only if that person obtains a permit under this section;

The Eastern Interior Alaska Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council (Council) concurs this regulation would apply to both resident and guided nonresident hunters.

This has been done in the area for generations. Both the Yukon Flats National Wildlife Refuge manager and the biologist described the high density of black and brown bears in the area. The proposal will increase the opportunity to harvest brown bear.

ISSUE: In Unit 25D, when brown bears appear at black bear baiting stations, it is illegal to harvest them. Hunters should be allowed to harvest brown bear that show up at their bait stations. The harvest limit for brown bear is two per year. Both the Yukon Flats National Wildlife Refuge manager and the biologist described the high density of black and brown bears in the area. The proposal will increase the opportunity to harvest brown bear. Subsistence users have harvested brown bear over their moose gut piles. The brown bear season is year round. A Council member explained that this has been done in the area for generations. He went on to explain:

"...In the springtime you'll find the bears just coming out of their dens and the trappers that would have their carcasses from the winter trapping would use that as bait or something along that line, whatever didn't get eaten by the dogs, they would use that for bait in the springtime to get the spring bears and you'd use whatever was left from your moose kill in the fall for bait to get a fall bear and whatever else. Generally not taken in the summer due to the weather and, of course, they're busy fishing in the summer. But those were the two times of year that they're normally taken, which the state season reflects on, but I'd just like to see it in the federal reg. book as well so I don't have to play that lawyer GPS "where am I game" to go from state and federal land and bounce around, and I could leave my bait stations where they are and not have to move camp 30 miles to get back onto federal land or back onto state land as we have a checkerboard of land ownership in the Yukon Flats..."

(Eastern Interior Council meeting transcripts, February 21, 2013, in Fairbanks, pages 255–256).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to be frustrated when brown bears appear at their baiting stations that cannot be harvested legally.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Eastern Interior Alaska Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council

EG043013847

Tok Area – Units 12 & 20E

PROPOSAL 81 - 5 AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep drawing permit hunts and 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Establish a nonresident Dall sheep drawing permit hunt for the Tok Management Area in Units 12, 13C and 20D as follows:

- Establish a separate Tok Management Area (TMA) draw permit for nonresidents for each hunt period (DS102 and DS103).
- Allocate a fixed 10% of TMA permits to nonresidents.
- Allow up to [no more than] 50% of nonresident permits to be issued to nonresidents hunting with a second-degree of kin relative.
- All nonresident applications for TMA permit hunts must include the following information: For the guide, supply name of guide or a number assigned by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (department) by the hunt number, or for second degree of kindred, list name of relative and relationship to the hunter. The permit drawing hunt application form will have to be revised to accommodate this requirement.
- Nonresident hunters that choose to hunt with a registered guide will be required to have their application completed and submitted by the same registered guide that will be contracting the hunt.
- Nonresident hunters that choose to hunt with a registered guide will also be required to have a guide-client agreement that is completed and signed by both the nonresident hunter and the registered guide they will be contracting the hunt with, prior to the drawing application deadline. A copy of this guide-client agreement must be provided to the Tok department office by the contracting guide prior to the draw application deadline.
- The guide must be registered for at least one Guide Use Area (GUA) within the TMA hunt area both during the year the application is submitted and the year the permit will be valid by the draw application deadline. For example, if a hunter applied for a permit for the application period of 2014, for a hunt that will be valid for the 2015 season, the registered guide would be required to be registered for at least one GUA within the TMA during the application period of 2014 and by January 1 of 2015. Any client who draws a permit with a guide registered in only one GUA of the TMA would only be allowed to hunt that GUA of the TMA and no other.
- Both the name of the nonresident hunter and the registered guide or a number provided by the department to the guide that will be contracting the hunt must be listed on the drawing application.
- Nonresident hunters must carry the guide-client agreement (dated prior to the drawing application deadline) in the field.

ISSUE: Clarify guide-client agreement requirements and nonresident drawing permit allocations for DS102 and DS103 (Tok Management Area Dall sheep permit).

There has been significant confusion about the current TMA guide-client agreement requirements and nonresident drawing permit allocations for DS102 and DS103 by the department.

While the Board of Game (board) finding (2007-173-BOG, dated March 12, 2007) was intended to provide direction to ADF&G about nonresident drawing allocation policy, and guide-client agreements, the intent of the finding has not been implemented consistently by the department, in particular, for the TMA drawings DS102 and DS103.

This has resulted in TMA draw hunt regulations and board findings not being implemented as originally intended by the board and allocation of TMA permits to recipients who have not completed a guide-client agreement with a guide who has a current GUA registration on file prior to the drawing.

Putting this proposed language into regulation will provide direction to the department, from the board, to properly implement the TMA guide-client agreement requirements and nonresident drawing permit allocations for DS102 and DS103 as originally intended by the board.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Confusion will continue, TMA draw hunt regulations and board findings will not be implemented as originally intended and permits will continue to be issued to unqualified recipients.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It will clarify the guide-client agreement requirements and nonresident drawing permit allocations for DS102 and DS103; therefore, reducing confusion by the department, hunters, and guides about the application process and reduce the potential for allocation of permits to unqualified recipients.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those applicants to the draw permit trying to follow the intent of the board regulations and findings for the draw permit areas including the TMA. Protection officers would benefit by being able to track those trying to circumvent the regulatory process.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides who prefer not to have current GUAs registered on file prior to the drawing.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Not requiring the guide-client agreement to go to the local ADF&G office in Tok. We rejected it because it helps department staff and wildlife protection officers to know the guides are following regulation and not circumventing the system. Department staff has already received complaints after the drawing which resulted in lengthy research. This would be better done before the drawing than after.

PROPOSAL 82 - 5 AAC 92.540(3)(E). Controlled use areas. Limit Glacier Mountain Controlled Use Area to a walk in only area as follows:

In this day and age where sheep areas are going to draw hunts and pressure is continually mounting, the Glacier Mountain Controlled Use Area (GMCUA) needs to revert back to the original intent when created, that makes sheep hunting in the GMCUA by walk-in only. This will put all hunters on the same playing field and result in a more limited harvest, within sustainable levels, without having to go to a permit hunt.

ISSUE: The use of pack animals in the GMCUA for sheep hunting. The original intent and creation of the GMCUA was to create a walk-in area to protect the very small population of sheep that inhabit this area.

Although the GMCUA was originally created/established as a walk in area for sheep hunting, it was later modified to allow pack animals for moose and caribou, but somehow it was left to include the sheep. This is a very unique area that was created to protect the small population of sheep, is road accessible and is very susceptible to overharvest. Use of horses to hunt these sheep has increased in recent years and in fall of 2012 there were three sheep harvested by horseback hunters and two by walk in hunters.

Hunters have traditionally walked into this area until recent years, with the use of pack animals a rarity in the past. This included mostly resident hunters but also includes a few guided nonresidents walking into this area in the past. Because hunters have traditionally walked into the GMCUA to hunt sheep, sheep harvest has been maintained at sustainable levels simply due to the challenging nature of this hunt area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unsustainable harvest levels could occur, the area may need to be converted to a permit hunt, and the original intent to have this as a walk-in area for sheep will not be met.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It reverts the sheep hunt part of the GMCUA back to walk-in only, which follows the “original” intent and creation of the GMCUA. It puts everyone on the same playing field and protects the small sheep population from potentially being overharvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The sheep population in the GMCUA and all walk in sheep hunters that are willing to put the time in to hunt this incredibly unique area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The very few people who use pack animals, who should not be allowed to use pack animals to hunt this area according to the original intent and creation of the GMCUA.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None, as we feel it was a mistake that led to the use of pack animals for sheep and we would like to see it revert back to the original intent and creation of the GMCUA.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050113885

PROPOSAL 83 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Limit guides to two black bear bait stands in Units 12 and 20E as follows.

In Units 12 and 20E, guides may only register up to two bait stands per guide.

ISSUE: We would like the board to change the current regulation of allowing a guide to be able to register up to ten bait stands changed to: a guide can only register two bait stands in Units 12 and 20E. We believe that the regulation that allows guides to register up to ten stands was put in place for units such as 16B that had very limited access where guides had vast amounts of country that did not compete with local bear baiters. We do not believe it was meant for Units such as 12 and 20E, that has primarily only road access, is heavily baited by locals and nonlocals, and has limited area to bait due to vast amounts of private land. Units 12 and 20E are already heavily baited by many local and nonlocal users and having a guide register ten stands and bait on top of others is simply not something that is needed nor should it be allowed. Also, it makes no sense that a guide is allowed to register ten stands when the regular baiter is only allowed to register two.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Guides will be baiting on top of local users/regular bear baiters. Units 12 and 20E have relatively small areas of state land to bait, therefore it creates situations where there are many baits all squeezed into these areas. There will be conflicts between guide/local baiters. Bear quality will be significantly reduced and many local people that depend on this source of fresh meat in the spring will suffer. Many baiters “farm” their baits by only selecting the biggest bears for harvest and also selectively passing on female bears. It will create unsafe baiting conditions for all involved by having bait sites in relative close proximity to each other. It will also create unsafe conditions for the many local people who do spring activities in the area that already know where bait sites are. We have had grizzly bears charge baiters here and this creates a serious safety issue for all baiters. Allowing a guide to register up to ten stands will create conflict that is simply not needed or wanted and should not be allowed by the Board of Game. The safety issue alone should be a viable reason to change this regulation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it still allows a guide to hunt but they may not flood the relatively small areas of state land that are open to baiting. It reduces the conflict between guides and local hunters. It will allow local users who depend on this source of fresh meat in the spring the opportunity to get it without having added competition from a guide putting bait stands all over the place. It allows baiters to be able to continue to “farm” their baits and be selective in the take of the size of bear, sex of the bear, and to see if there are cubs present. It keeps areas from being inundated with baiters which ultimately not only hurt the resource, but will cause

guide/hunter conflict, and unsafe baiting conditions for all involved. It will give baiters who like to take their families out (wife/kids) the best chance at having a safe hunt knowing there aren't many other bait stands in close proximity of one another.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All bear baiters who are selective on size and sex of bears that they harvest. All bear baiters who have had their bait stand locations for a long time, who like to take their kids out baiting and not have to worry about being "right" next to another baiter. All bear baiters who are thinking safety first when they are hunting with their families and not having to worry about other bait stands in close proximities to theirs. All baiters who depend on and need this source of fresh meat in the spring after a long winter. All baiters who simply don't want to conflict with a guide on the relatively small areas of land available to bait in Units 12 and 20E. All local people who use this land for other activities and whom know already where bait stands are.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides that don't care about other baiters who are already baiting areas, who want to inundate some very small areas of state land that they can bait on, therefore creating guide/user conflict, resource issues, and unsafe hunting conditions for all involved.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Having guides register stands in remote areas like in Unit 16B, which is what we believe this regulation was really meant to be, not along the road system where they would conflict with the baiters that already bait there. Identify areas in these units that aren't already heavily baited and allow them to bait in these areas where there would be no conflict.

PROPOSED BY: Mike Cronk

EG050313905

PROPOSAL 84 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Allow the use game meat at bait stations in Units 12 and 20E as follows:

Allow the Department of Fish and Game (department) to issue permits to take bears at bait stations with the use of game, furnished by the state, as bait in Units 12 and 20E. This is the same wording used under 5 AAC 92.040 for issuing permits for use of game for trapping.

ISSUE: The inability of the department to issue permits to allow the use of inedible game meat for bear baiting (example: road-killed moose and caribou determined by ADF&G to be unfit for human consumption). The department can already issue permits to allow the use of these game animals as trapping bait by trappers, so it makes no sense that they can't be used for bear baiting. Currently, many of these road-killed game animals end up in landfills every spring that could be used for bear bait instead.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A continued waste of a bait source that could be used by bear baiters.

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

It would allow the use of game animals that have been incidentally killed, such as by highway collisions, and are determined by the department to no longer be edible, to be used as a source of bear bait by bear baiters rather than wasting the meat by dumping it in landfills.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bear baiters who would like to use this sort of bait at their bait sites.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, as the incidentally killed resource is “wasted” if not used for bear baiting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None, as there are no other solutions for this issue.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050213886

PROPOSAL 85 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Establish a Tier I registration permit for Nelchina caribou in Unit 12 as follows:

Establish a registration hunt for Nelchina caribou similar to the Tier 1 caribou registration hunt (RC566) in Unit 13. Permits would be issued through the annual subsistence permit supplement.

Hunt Area: Unit 12 excluding that portion within the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve.

Season: October 21 – March 31; season should be open for Alaska residents only

Bag Limit: One caribou.

Hunt Conditions: Hunters will be restricted to taking caribou in Unit 12 only, unless the hunt is cancelled.

Harvest Quota: The harvest quota for Unit 12 should be managed within the annual Nelchina Herd quota.

ISSUE: Unit 12 has a customary and traditional finding for Nelchina Caribou but currently there is no state season for Nelchina caribou in Unit 12. The Nelchina caribou herd could support additional harvest on state and private lands in Unit 12. This proposal will allow an additional caribou hunting opportunity currently unavailable in Unit 12.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity for Nelchina caribou in Unit 12 will be lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This proposal will provide an opportunity to harvest caribou that is currently being lost.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This change will benefit all Alaska resident caribou hunters by allowing additional opportunity to harvest caribou in Unit 12.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who oppose opening additional caribou hunting seasons on state and private lands in Unit 12.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Opening a drawing hunt for caribou on state and private lands in Unit 12 is unnecessarily restrictive. Limit numbers of permits at one time rejected because of difficulty with hunt administration. Registration permits available in Tok only.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050213884

PROPOSAL 86 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the bag limit for resident moose hunters in a portion of Units 12 and 20D as follows:

South of the confluence of the west fork and the mainstem of the Robertson River change the resident bag limit to one bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers, or antlers with four or more brow tines on at least one side.

ISSUE: Moose seasons in the Robertson River drainage south of the confluence of the west fork and the mainstem are too liberal for this population to support. Due to liberal moose hunting regulations this area has attracted increasing numbers of moose hunters in recent years. This has resulted in low bull/cow ratios in the upper Robertson River drainage.

Note: This proposal is contingent on fall 2013 Department of Fish and Game moose survey results in the Robertson River drainage.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This moose population will continue to be overharvested and bull/cow ratios may continue to decline and potentially result in productivity issues.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It will protect younger bull moose from harvest, which will increase the bull cow ratio.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This change will benefit all moose hunters by allowing the number of bull moose in the area to increase and by allowing more opportunity to harvest mature bull moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who prefer hunting moose in areas with no antler restrictions.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050213882

PROPOSAL 87 - 5AAC 92.113(a)(1). Intensive Management Plans III. Reauthorize the Upper Yukon/Tanana Predation Control Program as follows:

5AAC 92.113. Intensive Management Plans III. (b) is entirely deleted and replaced by the following:

(a) **Plans established.** Intensive management plans for the following areas are established in this section:

(1) Upper Yukon/Tanana Predation Control Area in Units 12, 20(B), 20(D), 20(E), and 25(C);

...

(b) Upper Yukon/Tanana Predation Control Area in Units 12, 20(B), 20(D), 20(E), and 25(C): the Upper Yukon/Tanana Predation Control Area (UYTPCA) is established to increase the Fortymile Caribou Herd (FCH) throughout its range to aid in achieving intensive management objectives; the control area includes that portion of Unit 12 north of the Alaska Highway, that portion of Unit 20(D) within the Goodpaster River drainage upstream from and including the South Fork Goodpaster River drainage, and within the Healy River, Billy Creek, and Sand Creek drainages, that portion of Unit 20(B) within the Salcha River drainage upstream from and including the Goose Creek drainage, and within the Middle Fork of the Chena River drainage, all of Unit 20(E), and that portion of Unit 25(C) within the Birch Creek drainage upstream from the Steese Highway Bridge, and within the area draining into the south and west bank of the Yukon River upstream from the community of Circle, encompassing approximately 18,750 square miles; this predation control program does not apply to any National Park Service or National Wildlife Refuge lands unless approved by the federal agencies; notwithstanding any other provisions in this title, and based on the following information contained in this section, the commissioner or the commissioner's designee may conduct a wolf population reduction or wolf population regulation program in the UYTPCA in Units 12, 20(B), 20(D), 20(E), and 25(C):

(1) this is a continuing control program that was first authorized by the Board of Game in 2004 for wolf and brown bear control to increase the moose population and harvest in northern Unit 12 and in Unit 20(E); in 2006 wolf control was expanded by the board to increase the FCH population and harvest in its entire range; in 2009 bear control was deleted from the program because control methods available at the time were ineffective;

(2) caribou and wolf objectives are as follows:

(A) the Fortymile herd IM population objectives established by the board are for a population of 50,000–100,000 and an annual harvest of 1,000–15,000;

(B) the wolf population control objective for the wolf control area is 88–103; the pre-control wolf population in the wolf control area was estimated in fall of 2004 at 350–410; a minimum population of 88 wolves is approximately a

75 percent reduction from the pre-control population and will assure that wolves persist in the plan area;

(3) the board's findings concerning FCH populations and human use are as follows:

(A) the FCH population and harvest are within the lower end of the range of IM objectives;

(B) continued recovery of the FCH to a higher population and harvest within the range of the IM objectives is needed to provide for high levels of human consumptive use of the herd;

(D) predation by wolves is an important cause of the failure to achieve higher caribou population and harvest levels;

(E) a reduction of predation by wolves can reasonably be expected to aid in achieving higher prey population levels;

(F) reducing predation is likely to be effective and feasible utilizing recognized and prudent active management techniques and based on scientific information;

(G) reducing predation is likely to be effective given land ownership patterns;

(4) authorized methods and means are as follows:

(A) hunting and trapping of wolves by the public in the UYTPCA during the term of this program may occur as provided in the hunting and trapping regulations set out elsewhere in this title;

(B) notwithstanding any other provisions in this title, the commissioner may:

(i) allow department employees to conduct aerial, land and shoot, or ground-based lethal removal of wolves, using state-owned, privately-owned, or chartered equipment, including helicopters, under AS 16.05.783;

(ii) issue public aerial shooting permits or public land and shoot permits using fixed-wing aircraft as a method of wolf removal under AS 16.05.783;

(5) time frame is as follows:

(A) through June 30, 2020 the commissioner may authorize removal of wolves in the UYTPCA;

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

(6) the commissioner will review, modify or suspend wolf control activities when wolf surveys or accumulated information from department personnel, hunters, trappers, and permittees indicate the need to avoid reducing wolf numbers in the UYTPCA below the control objective of 88–103 wolves specified in this subsection.

ISSUE: The Upper Yukon/Tanana Intensive Management Plan will expire on June 30, 2014. We recommend reauthorization of the program for a six year period from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2020 to continue recovery of the Fortymile Caribou Herd (FCH).

This placeholder proposal includes options for aerial wolf control conducted by public permittees and the Department of Fish and Game (department). Any changes will be included in the department's analyses and recommendations of proposals that will be made available for public review prior to the Board of Game meeting. Additional details will also be made available for public review in a separate intensive management (IM) operational plan prior to the board meeting.

The program was first authorized by the Board of Game in 2004 to benefit moose in southern Unit 20E. Wolf and bear control began in 2005. The wolf control portion of the program was expanded to include the FCH in 2006. The bear control portion of the program was deleted in 2009 because it was determined to be ineffective at removing bears from the control area due to ineffective control methods. Moose are not included in this proposal because no focused predation control efforts specifically intended to benefit moose have been conducted or are planned. However, moose will likely continue to benefit to some degree from wolf control conducted to increase the FCH.

The estimated population of the FCH in June 2010 was 51,675 and the annual FCH harvest during regulatory years 2009–2010 to 2011–2012 was 725–1,083. Public wolf control has been conducted in the majority of the FCH range since 2006, and department wolf control, focused on the FCH calving area, was conducted during the winters of 2008–2009, 2009–2010, 2011–2012 and 2012–2013. The FCH population and harvest are within the lower end of the range of IM objectives; however, continued recovery of the FCH to a higher population and harvest within the range of the IM objectives is needed to provide for high levels of human consumptive use of the herd.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The existing predation control programs will expire and predation control to benefit the FCH will stop.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The number of caribou available for harvest should increase with reauthorization.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and others interested in higher caribou numbers will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to predation control will likely suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered allowing this control program to expire because FCH population and harvest are within the lower end of IM objectives. This was rejected because of high consumptive use of this herd.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613916

PROPOSAL 88 - 5 AAC 92.113. Intensive management pans III. Change the Upper Yukon/Tanana Predation Control Area as follows:

Upper Tanana/Fortymile Fish and Game Advisory Committee recommends:

1. Re-implement the grizzly bear control portion of the Upper Yukon/Tanana Predator Control Program (UYTPCP) in southern Unit 20E.
2. Reduce the size of the original grizzly bear control area to an 870 square mile area in the Boundary/Liberty Creek area in southeast Unit 20E where there is an extensive trail system that will provide access for bear removal and moose harvest.
3. Allow snaring using snares in buckets (similar to those approved for the Unit 16B program) and ground foot snares.
4. Allow the use of VHF trap monitoring devices to check traps to reduce the amount of time and expenses associated with daily trap checks.
5. Allow the take of grizzly and black bears, including sows and cubs.
6. Allow use of airplanes and helicopters to set and check snare sets the same day permittees fly as long as they are 300 feet from the aircraft.
7. Allow the sale of raw or tanned hides, claws (attached or removed from hide) and skulls as an incentive for permittees to participate and as a way for permittees to recoup a portion of their expenses.
8. Require Alaska Department of Fish and Game (department) training prior to participation on the program.
9. Restrict the number of permittees to a limited number of trained bear trappers.
10. Allow trapping during April 1 – June 30 and September 1 – November 30.
11. Allow the department to issue permits to use moose and caribou meat that is not fit for human consumption for bait.
12. Allow an incentive payment to be given for each bear killed in this area and each wolf from packs whose territories overlap with this area.

Bears and wolves should be reduced to the lowest level possible in this area. Because the area is kept so small, reducing the bears to very low levels should not have a significant impact on the overall Unit 20E bear populations.

ISSUE: The grizzly bear control program in southern Unit 20E under the UYTPCP was originally adopted by the Board of Game (board) in fall of 2004 and implemented in spring of

2005. The grizzly bear control program was implemented in an attempt to reduce grizzly numbers in key moose calving areas in southern Unit 20E to reduce predation on moose calves to benefit the moose population. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game (department) research has shown that grizzly bear predation on moose calves was the primary limiting factor to the moose population in southern Unit 20E.

Under the grizzly bear control portion of the UYTPCP, the board originally allowed baiting of grizzly bears, but did not approve the Upper Tanana Fortymile Advisory Committees' proposed snaring of grizzly bears. The grizzly bear baiting portion of the UYTPCP was suspended in Regulatory Year 2009 because grizzly bear baiting alone was deemed ineffective at achieving bear control objectives. We have submitted several proposals to the board since 2004 to allow snaring of grizzly bears in the UYTPCP, which have all been rejected by the board due to political and social concerns about the method of snaring grizzly bears.

However, with the board's recent approvals since 2011 of brown bear snaring under predator control programs in several other areas of the state, we feel it is now appropriate for the board to approve a similar grizzly bear snaring program under the UYTPCP in southern Unit 20E. During the 2012 Interior Board of Game meeting, the department asked the board to delay reauthorizing bear control under the UYTPCP so that the department could work with the Upper Tanana Fortymile Advisory Committee to develop recommendations for the board's consideration at their 2014 Interior Region meeting. This proposal is the culmination of that cooperative effort.

To ensure the grizzly bear control program is as effective as possible, we developed this proposal with the following in mind:

1. Scaling back the size of the original UYTPCP grizzly bear control area to focus efforts in a smaller area to reduce the total number of bears that would need to be removed and maximize the likelihood of successfully reducing bear numbers to desired objectives.
2. Have the area encompass the Taylor Highway corridor and trail networks used by hunters to allow for access for bear removal and harvest of moose.
3. Establish the area on state land to reduce conflict with federal and private land owners and ensure access by the public to remove bears and harvest moose.
4. Allow snaring as a means to remove bears to improve success of control permittees.
5. Allow the use of VHF trap monitoring devices to check traps to reduce the amount of time and expenses associated with daily trap checks.
6. Allow shooting bears same day airborne at trap sites.
7. Allow use of helicopters same day airborne (by the public) to check trap sites.
8. Allow the sale of hides as an incentive for permittees to participate and as a way for permittees to recoup a portion of their expenses.

While the southern Unit 20E moose population is increasing with wolf control alone, it is a slow increase and not occurring over all of southern Unit 20E. We feel grizzly bear snaring would enhance the current program tremendously and greatly improve moose calf survival and result in much more rapid increases in the moose population toward intensive management (IM) objectives. In addition, there are some areas in southern Unit 20E, like the Boundary/Liberty

Creek area, where aerial wolf control has been nearly impossible in most years due to large numbers of wintering Fortymile and Nelchina caribou and thick tree cover making aerial wolf tracking almost impossible. In areas like the Boundary/Liberty Creek area, grizzly bear snaring is the only reasonable predator control option available. Without bear snaring, this area may never achieve IM moose objectives, especially if an administration change results in elimination of aerial wolf control in the near future.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It will take substantially longer to meet IM moose population and harvest objectives in Unit 20E and IM objectives may not be feasible in some areas like the Boundary/Liberty Creek area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It will result in more moose and ultimately more bears in the proposed area when the program ends.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People in support of IM.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to IM.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050313887

PROPOSAL 89 - 5 AAC 92.111. Intensive management plans I. Establish a wolf control program in Unit 12 as follows:

Establish an aerial or land and shoot wolf control program in Unit 12 on state lands so the moose population will increase in Unit 12.

ISSUE: Establish an aerial or land and shoot wolf control program in Unit 12 on state lands so the moose population will increase in Unit 12.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Moose population may be at a stable population right now, but it may fall below population objectives, if there is a severe and hard winter.

The moose population should be kept at a healthy, viable and productive population. Instituting a wolf control program will aide in building up the moose herd in Unit 12 on state lands, and subsistence use needs for moose will be met.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the moose population will increase, everyone will benefit by having more moose in the area to hunt for and provide for their families.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone will benefit with the moose population being increased and kept at a sustainable, healthy population. Subsistence uses will be met. Hunters

will be able to hunt in Unit 12 and alleviate the impact in Unit 13, somewhat, if there are more moose to hunt for in Unit 12.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer. Some organizations and groups of people who oppose predator control may oppose this proposal, but they will not suffer because of it.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solution to consider.

PROPOSED BY: Ahtna Tene Nene' Customary & Traditional Use Committee EG050313904

Delta Area – Unit 20D

PROPOSAL 90 – 5 AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20D as follows:

Units and Bag Limits (18)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
Unit 20(D), that portion lying west of the west bank of the Johnson River and south of the north bank of the Tanana River, except the Delta Junction Management Area and the Bison Range Youth Hunt Management Area		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 15 (General hunt only)	
1 bull by drawing permit; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 15 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 1,000 permits may be issued in combination with that portion in the Delta Junction	Oct. 10–Nov. 25 (General hunt only)	No open season.

Management Area; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf; or

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf

Oct. 10–Nov. 25
(General hunt only)

No open season.

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side

Sept. 5–Sept. 15

Unit 20(D), that portion within the Bison Range Youth Hunt Management Area

1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or 1 antlerless moose, per lifetime of a hunter, by drawing permit only; up to 10 permits may be issued; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf

Sept. 1–Sept. 30
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1–Sept. 30

Unit 20(D), that portion within the Delta Junction Management Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers

Sept. 1–Sept. 15
(General hunt only)

with 4 or more brow
tines on one side
by drawing permit
only; up to 30
permits may be
issued; or

1 antlerless moose by
drawing permit only;
up to 1,000 permits
may be issued in
combination with
that portion lying
west of the west
bank of the Johnson
River and south of
the north bank of
the Tanana River; a
person may not take
a calf or a cow
accompanied by a
calf; or

Oct. 10–Nov. 25
(General hunt only)

No open season.

1 antlerless moose by
registration permit only;
a person may not take
a calf or a cow
accompanied by a calf

Oct. 10–Nov. 25
(General hunt only)

No open season.

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers
with 4 or more brow
tines on one side
by drawing permit
only; up to 30
permits may be
issued

Sept. 5–Sept. 15

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. Our goal is to provide for a wide range of public uses and benefits, and to protect the health and habitat of moose populations. Antlerless hunts are important for improving or maintaining the ability of

moose habitat to support current populations. They also help regulate moose population growth, and help to meet intensive management (IM) objectives for high levels of harvest.

The population of moose in Unit 20D reached the IM objective of 8,000–10,000 moose in 2006. The highest density of moose in the Unit was in southwest 20D at 5.6 moose/mi². The moose population in this area was exhibiting the effects of increased competition for food, with a moderately low two-year average twinning rate of 14%. Antlerless moose hunts during 2006–2009 contributed to reducing the moose density in southwest Unit 20D to 3.9 moose/mi². The goals of the antlerless moose hunts were to stabilize population growth in the unit and to address concerns about range degradation, reduced nutritional conditions, and reduced reproductive success of moose. Future antlerless hunts are likely needed to maintain the population at the optimal density and will contribute toward meeting the IM harvest objective of 500–700 moose. Registration permits will be issued only if additional harvest is needed in specific areas to maintain optimal moose densities.

The antlerless moose hunts and their effect on moose density and population growth will continue to be evaluated. Three indices of density-dependent moose nutritional conditions—biomass removal of current annual growth on winter browse, proportion of females with twin calves, and late-winter calf weights—will be evaluated in relation to changes in moose density. Future antlerless moose hunts for Unit 20D will be implemented as needed based on this evaluation. There are currently no plans to issue permits for antlerless moose hunting in Unit 20D during the 2013 season, with the exception of that an antlerless moose (except a cow accompanied by a calf or a calf) is part of the legal bag limit in the Bison Range Youth Hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population may increase to unacceptable levels or may need reduction when new data is available and analyzed. Opportunity to hunt a harvestable surplus of cow moose will be lost, and our ability to meet IM harvest objectives will be compromised.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This reauthorization of antlerless moose hunts will likely improve or maintain the ability of moose habitat to support the current moose population. Hunting opportunity and harvest will increase and allow the department to manage these moose populations at optimum levels. The additional harvest will help in meeting IM harvest objectives. It will also allow hunters to harvest moose toward meeting the IM harvest objective without reducing bull-to-cow ratios to low levels.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Meat hunters will benefit from the opportunity to harvest cow moose. Moose populations will benefit by having moose densities compatible with their habitat. Delta Junction residents may benefit from reduced moose–vehicle collisions and moose–human conflicts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to harvest of antlerless moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSAL 91- 5 AAC 92.530. Management areas and 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Simplify the moose hunting regulations for DM795 in Unit 20D and change the qualification for disabled hunters applying for permits as follows:

Change DM795 as follows:

5 AAC 85.045 Hunting seasons and bag limits:

Unit 20(D), that
portion within
the Delta Junction
Management Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with spike-fork or 50 -
inch antlers or antlers
with 4 or more brow
tines on one side
by drawing permit
only; up to 30
permits may be
issued; or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 15
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose
by drawing permit
only; up to 1,000 permits
may be issued in
combination with
that portion lying
west of the west
bank of the Johnson
River and south of
the north bank of
the Tanana River;
A person may not take
a calf or a cow
accompanied by a
calf; or

Oct. 10 - Nov. 25
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by
registration permit only;
a person may not
take a calf or a

Oct. 10 - Nov. 25
(General hunt only)

cow accompanied by
a calf;

or

**1 moose, every four
regulatory years, by drawing
permit only, no one may take a
calf or a cow accompanied by a
calf.**

Sept 1 – Sept 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch
antlers or antlers
with 4 or more brow
tines on one side
by drawing permit
only; up to 30
permits may be
issued; **or**

Sept. 5 - Sept. 15

**1 moose, every
four regulatory years, by
drawing permit only, no one
may take a calf or a cow
accompanied by a calf;**

Sept 1 – Sept 15

5 AAC 92.530 MANAGEMENT AREAS

(19) the Delta Junction Management Area:

(A) the area consists of that portion of Unit 20(D) bounded by a line beginning at the confluence of Donnelly Creek and the Delta River, then up Donnelly Creek to the Richardson Highway (Mile 238), then north along the east side of the highway to the "12 Mile Crossing Trail" (Mile 252.4), then east along the south side of the "12 Mile Crossing Trail" and across Jarvis Creek to the 33-Mile Loop Road, then northeast along the 33-Mile Loop Road to the intersection with the Alaska Highway (Mile 1414), then southeast along the north side of the Alaska Highway to the bridge at Sawmill Creek (Mile 1403.9), then down the west bank of Sawmill Creek to its confluence with Clearwater Creek and down the south bank of Clearwater Creek to its confluence with the Tanana River, then down the Tanana River to its confluence with the Delta River, and upstream along the east bank of the Delta River to the point of beginning at Donnelly Creek;

(B) the area is open to moose hunting by permit only;

(C) up to 25 percent of the drawing permits will be issued to applicants who are qualified disabled veterans and qualified disabled active-duty military personnel; an applicant under this subparagraph must [EITHER]

(i) [POSSESS A UNITED STATES MILITARY PHYSICIAN’S AFFIDAVIT STATING THAT THE APPLICANT HAS A 50 PERCENT OR GREATER SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY; OR] **be certified by the United States Department of Veterans Affairs as a recipient of the Purple Heart Medal; and**

(ii) be certified by the United States Department of Veterans Affairs as having incurred a [50] **100** percent service-connected disability;

ISSUE: This proposal addresses three issues: 1.) Provide a greater opportunity for Purple Heart recipients to hunt moose. Alaska has been classified as a “Purple Heart State” by recent legislation. Changing the qualifications for the disabled hunters to recipients of the Purple Heart will recognize and honor those that have sacrificed so much for all of us. This will also provide a simpler definition/qualification for participation in the drawing permit hunt. The current qualification of 50% disabled is too often arbitrarily awarded and opposed by many of our veterans familiar with the process. 2.) Provide a small, sustainable harvest of antlerless moose as a means of population management. This proposal provides for a small, but consistent antlerless moose hunt in Unit 20D that will aid in managing the moose population and help prevent the need for much larger, periodic antlerless hunts. This change in bag limit will also increase the chance for success of our Purple Heart recipient hunters. 3.) Simplify the hunting regulations for the DM 795 hunt. It will standardize the moose hunting season in the Delta Junction Management Area for resident and nonresident hunters thereby simplifying the hunting regulations. There is no biological reason to shorten the nonresident moose hunting season. Nonresidents comprise approximately 10% of the hunters in Alaska, harvest approximately 10% of the game while contributing 70-75% of the funding for game management through their purchase of licenses and tags.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? 1) We will miss the opportunity to recognize and honor those military veterans and active duty personnel that have made significant sacrifices for freedom that we all cherish. 2) The antlerless moose population will continue to expand and we will miss the opportunity to establish a small continuing harvest of antlerless moose by our deserving Purple Heart recipients. 3) We will continue our discrimination (shorter season and thus reduced opportunity) against nonresident hunters without biological reason. The current regulation will continue to be complicated by having two different hunting seasons for residents and nonresident hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This will simplify the regulations, eliminate discrimination against nonresidents, and provide an opportunity for deserving individuals to hunt moose with a high probability of success, while also contributing to the management of the expanding moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Military veterans and active duty personnel who have received the Purple Heart medal for their sacrifice to America. Those Purple Heart recipient hunters, with 100% disability, that would like to hunt with the opportunity to take any bull or antlerless moose with the exception of a calf or cow accompanied by a calf. Residents of the state and local area by implementing a gradual population control hunt that will help offset a larger, more intense, short term antlerless hunt as we've experienced in the past.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those individuals who have suffered less severe, service-connected disabilities for which they have not received the Purple Heart Medal.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The creation of a special hunt for Purple Heart recipients on Fort Greely military land. This was rejected because it increases the complexity of regulations, is subject to total control by the military and occupies a very small hunt area. It was also rejected because it could set precedence for other land owners wishing to have special hunts created on their private lands.

PROPOSED BY: Delta Fish and Game Advisory Committee & Fort Greely Garrison

EG042613800

PROPOSAL 92- 5 AAC 85.010. Hunting seasons and bag limits for bison. Modify the bag limit for bison in Unit 20D to one per lifetime; limit one permit per household awarded under a party drawing permit as follows:

Bison, Unit 20D: One bison **per lifetime of hunter by permit, one permit per household during a regulatory year** [EVERY TEN REGULATORY YEARS BY PERMIT], DI403-404, October 1-March 31

ISSUE: With over 19,000 applicants for 75 bison permits (based on 2012 applicants/permits) most will never draw a tag in their lifetime, while some will draw the hunt two, three, or four times. Also, households drawn on a party application get more meat than they can eat, while most others never receive an opportunity to taste bison. Under new restrictions like this, it would still take over 250 years for everyone to draw a permit. Sounds unreasonable, but under current ten year limitation, the drawing could continue for all eternity and many still would not draw, while others receive multiple permits.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A select few will continue to draw multiple permits over the years while the vast majority are never able to draw the hunt.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It spreads the precious few permits among more families/applicants.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? A few of the 19,000 applicants previously not drawn will have slightly better odds of drawing a permit in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those lucky applicants who would draw multiple permits over their lifetime.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A solution with the same result is creation of preference points system for drawing permits like many other states enjoy. To date, efforts to create a fair preference point system have failed. Or leave the hunt drawing as it is where hunters apply for decades and are never drawn, while others make the hunt multiple times. This existing system is unfair to the vast majority of applicants.

PROPOSED BY: Dave Machacek

EG032913739

PROPOSAL 93 - 5AAC 85.025(a)(7). Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Correct a discrepancy in the bag limit for the Macomb caribou herd in Unit 12 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
(7)		
...		
Unit 12, that portion west of the Glenn Highway (Tok Cutoff) and south of the Alaska Highway excluding the Tok River drainage		
1 bull by registration permit only; up to 100 [50] bulls may be taken in combination with Unit 20(D), in that portion south of the Tanana River	Aug. 10–Sept. 30	No open season.

...

ISSUE: The Macomb caribou herd is harvested in portions of Units 12 and 20D. In 2008 the Board of Game (board) increased the harvest quota from 50 to 100 caribou for the Unit 20D portion of the hunt, as requested by the Department of Fish and Game (department). However, the department overlooked requesting the same quota increase for Unit 12. If adopted, this proposal would allow a take of up to 100 bulls in Unit 12, correcting the discrepancy in the

regulations. Annual Macomb caribou harvest ranged between 48–73 bulls during 2008–2012, and is within sustainable harvest limits of this herd of 1,373 caribou.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A discrepancy will exist in the hunting regulations for the Macomb caribou herd that can confuse the public and the Alaska Wildlife Troopers.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the accuracy of regulations will be improved. The public and the Alaska Wildlife Troopers will have a better understanding of the department’s management of the Macomb caribou herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will benefit from regulations that are not conflicting. Hunters and non-hunters will benefit from knowing harvest management regulations are accurate and reliable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Reduce the Unit 20D portion of the Macomb harvest quota to correspond with the Unit 12 quota. However, this is would unnecessarily restrict harvest.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613910

PROPOSAL 94 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Modify the season and bag limit for caribou in Unit 20D as follows:

Season dates and bag limits for caribou in Unit 20D (southern portion) - Macomb caribou herd:

Unit and Bag Limits	Residents-	Nonresidents
Unit 20D-south of the Tanana River, west of the Johnson River, and east of Jarvis Creek One bull by registration permit	August 5 – 25	No open season
Unit 20D-south of the Tanana River and east of the Johnson River One bull by registration permit	August 26-September 20	No open season

ISSUE: Since the Alaska Department of Fish and Game moved the caribou hunt from September to August “to better control the hunt, prevent overharvest and avoid emergency

closures” caribou hunting on the Macomb Plateau in in eastern Unit 20D has been poor. The caribou generally hang back in the Alaska Range and are inaccessible until the first part of September, when they begin to move down to lower ground. A September season in this area would give hunters a better opportunity to harvest a bull.

In southwestern Unit 20D (the Granite Mountains), opening the area to motorized hunting after the motorized restrictions are no longer in effect (August 26-28) has resulted in overharvest and an unpleasant hunting experience for many.

The weather in mid-August can also be hot, making it difficult to keep meat cool on an extended hunt. While the August season has provided hunting days for eastern 20D hunters, the caribou have just not shown up for the hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Caribou hunters in eastern Unit 20D will continue to be frustrated by their lack of success. Large bull caribou will die of old age or be eaten by wolves and bears, rather than be harvested to feed hunters and their families. Skilled hunters will continue to go year after year without harvesting a caribou.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? I believe that the cooler temperatures in September would be more conducive to caring for a hunter’s caribou meat, and would reduce the risk of spoilage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and their families would benefit from the harvest of caribou. The season dates designated in this proposal would make overharvest and emergency closures unlikely.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one would suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Becoming a vegetarian.

PROPOSED BY: Tom Geyer

EG042613805

PROPOSAL 95 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Modify the season and bag limit of the Macomb caribou herd hunt in Units 12 and 20D , and require locking tags, as follows:

To address law enforcement challenges, we consulted the Alaska Wildlife Troopers and collectively suggest the Board of Game require a locking tag for this drawing hunt; as there is a concurrent moose hunt in this same area.

In addition, we propose the following changes to the Macomb caribou hunting season and bag limit.

Units and Bag Limits

Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)

Nonresident Open Season

(7)

...

Unit 12, that portion west of the Glenn Highway (Tok Cutoff) and south of the Alaska Highway, excluding the Tok River drainage

1 bull by registration permit only; up to 50 bulls may be taken in combination with Unit 20(D), in that portion south of the Tanana River; or

Aug. 10–**Aug. 25**[SEPT. 30] No open season

1 bull every four regulatory years by drawing permit only; up to 25 permits may be issued

Aug. 26–Sept. 10

No open season

...

(15)

...

Unit 20(D), that portion south of the Tanana River

RESIDENT HUNTERS

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

Aug. 10– **Aug. 25**[SEPT. 30] No open season

1 bull every four regulatory years by drawing permit only; up to 25 permits may be issued

Aug. 26–Sept. 10

No open season

ISSUE: The Macomb caribou hunt, RC835, late season August 26 - 27.

Reduce the potential for over harvest of the Macomb herd by better controlling the numbers of motorized hunters.

Reduce harassment of the Macomb herd from the increasing number of motorized hunters attempting to intercept the herd and the potential to manipulate (drive) the caribou to certain advantageous areas.

Improve the quality of the hunt by reducing the number of motorized hunters aggressively pursuing caribou in a short two-day hunt. The late season motorized hunt has had an increasing number of hunters, resulting in increased difficulty in managing the hunt and increased potential to exceed the harvest quota.

Reduce the impact of the motorized vehicles on the fragile habitat and ensuing environmental degradation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This two-day motorized hunt has been increasingly popular among hunters. As a result, the problems listed above are more significant each year as the number of hunters increases. Larger numbers of hunters result in more intense hunter competition, thereby reducing the quality of the hunt; more harassment of the caribou by motorized hunters attempting to intercept animals; and more destruction of the habitat. The current situation of increasing numbers of motorized hunters and fluctuating numbers of Macomb caribou presents a significant management challenge to the Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G). This proposal will offer a solution ADF&G can use for future management of the Macomb herd hunt.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will reduce stress on the caribou, improve the quality of the hunt, improve the ability of ADF&G to manage the herd by reducing the possibility of over-harvest, and extend the amount of time this caribou herd can be hunted. Hunter success will also improve with the longer season and reduced competition.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters would benefit in the long term with ongoing hunting opportunity for the Macomb caribou hunt. Hunters looking for a quality hunt that lasts longer than two days.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Short term hunters that prefer weekend hunts (two day), hunters opposed to drawing permit hunts, unethical and aggressive hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered eliminating the last two days (the motorized hunt) altogether, with no additional hunting opportunity. We opted not to do this and instead, propose this drawing hunt to allow additional opportunity during a late season Macomb caribou hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Delta Fish and Game Advisory Committee

EG042613801

PROPOSAL 96- 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the hunt area for moose in a portion of Unit 20D to include Johnson Slough Island as follows:

Seasons and bag limits for moose in Unit 20D

North of the north bank of the Tanana River and draining into the Volkmar River east to include the Billy Creek drainage **and Johnson Slough Island**, excluding the Healy River drainage

Residents and Nonresidents - bag limit of one bull September 1-September 20

ISSUE: Johnson Slough Island is accessible only by boat. There's no reason it shouldn't be open to moose hunting until after September 20.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Someone may lose an opportunity to call in a bull late in the season.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Late season hunters may be able to call in a bull on the island.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Extending moose hunting on Johnson Slough Island until September 20, but making it for Alaska residents only.

PROPOSED BY: Tom Geyer

EG042613806

Fairbanks Area – Units 20A, 20B, 20C, 20F & 25C

PROPOSAL 97 – 5 AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20A as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(18)		
Unit 20(A), the Ferry Trail Management Area, Wood River Controlled Use Area, and the Yanert Controlled Use Area		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 25 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 2,000 permits may be issued in combination with the remainder of Unit 20(A); a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Aug. 15–Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied	Oct. 1–Feb. 28 (General hunt only)	

by a calf; or

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 1,000 permits may be issued in combination with the remainder of Unit 20(A); or

Sept. 1–Sept. 25
(General hunt only)

1 bull by drawing permit only; by muzzleloader only; up to 75 permits may be issued in combination with nonresidents in Unit 20(A)

Nov. 1–Nov. 30
(general hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 25

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only; by muzzleloader only; up to 75 permits may be issued in combination with residents in Unit 20(A)

Nov. 1–Nov. 30

Remainder of Unit 20(A)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 25

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 2,000 permits may be issued in combination with Unit 20(A), the Ferry Trail Management Area, Wood River Controlled Use Area, and the Yanert Controlled Use Area; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or

Aug. 15–Nov. 15
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or

Aug. 25–Feb. 28

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 1,000 permits may be issued in combination with Unit 20(A), the Ferry Trail Management Area, Wood River Controlled Use Area, and the Yanert Controlled Use Area;

Sept. 1–Sept. 25

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side

Sept. 1–Sept. 25

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. Our goal is to provide for a wide range of public uses and benefits, and to protect the health and habitat of moose populations. Antlerless hunts are important for improving or maintaining the ability of

moose habitat to support current populations. They also help regulate moose population growth, help to meet intensive management (IM) objectives for high levels of harvest, and provide subsistence hunters with a reasonable opportunity for success in obtaining moose for subsistence uses without reducing bull-to-cow ratios.

The purpose of antlerless moose hunts in Unit 20A is to regulate population growth, to meet the IM mandate for high levels of harvest, and to provide subsistence hunters with a reasonable opportunity for success in obtaining moose for subsistence uses in Unit 20A outside the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence Area (part of the western Tanana Flats). Our goal is to protect the health and habitat of the moose population and to provide for a wide range of public uses and benefits. The number of moose in Unit 20A was estimated at 17,768 in 2003. Research indicated this high-density moose population was experiencing density-dependent effects, including low productivity, relatively light calf weights, and high removal rates of winter forage.

Our objective beginning in regulatory year 2004 (Regulatory Year begins 1 July and ends 30 June, e.g., RY04 = 1 July 2004 through 30 June 2005) was to reduce moose numbers to the population objective of 10,000–12,000 moose (2.0–2.5 moose/mi²) unless indicators of moose condition showed signs of improvement at higher densities. The Unit 20A population was estimated at 12,193 moose in 2012. Based on harvest rates and population trends observed during RY96–RY11, continuation of these antlerless hunts is necessary to regulate the population at stable levels near the population objective.

The Unit 20A antlerless moose hunt provides additional harvest opportunity, which helps to meet human consumption interests and IM harvest objectives. In addition, this hunt has been successful in reversing moose population growth and in increasing moose harvest and hunter participation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population may increase to unacceptable levels or may need reduction when new data is available and analyzed. Opportunity to hunt a harvestable surplus of cow moose will be lost, and our ability to meet IM harvest objectives will be compromised. Subsistence hunters in the portion of Unit 20A outside the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence Area (part of the western Tanana Flats) may not have a reasonable opportunity for success in obtaining moose for subsistence uses.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This reauthorization of antlerless moose hunts will likely improve or maintain the ability of moose habitat to support the current moose population. Hunting opportunity and harvest will increase and allow the department to manage these moose populations at optimum levels. The additional harvest will help in meeting IM harvest objectives. It will also allow hunters to harvest moose toward meeting the IM harvest objective without reducing bull-to-cow ratios to low levels.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will benefit from the opportunity to harvest cow moose. Moose populations will benefit by having moose densities compatible with their habitat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to harvest of antlerless moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613939

PROPOSAL 98 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change the bag limit of moose in Unit 20A to any bull as follows:

All Unit 20A, any bull, no restrictions. The Department of Fish and Game can regulate close to road or certain areas length due to harvest if too many bulls are taken.

ISSUE: Antler restrictions, wanton waste in Unit 20A.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose being wasted which deny other hunters meat because hunters can't always tell if 50-inch or 48-inch.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Stops wanton waste and stress out of hunt, did I shoot legal or pass up shot and meat for freezer?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Takes pressure off big bulls for anyone who can hunt Unit 20A any bull.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Jeff Barney

EG050113849

PROPOSAL 99 - 5 AAC 92.540(3)(F). Controlled use areas. Remove the Wood River Controlled Use Area as follows:

ISSUE: Eliminate the Wood River Controlled Use Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People will not be able to access the moose population for hunting. Every person you see on the Rex Trail tells you to call the governor to stop the cow moose hunts, because there are no moose left. Therefore, there needs to be more access to allow people to get to where all the moose are.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, more access allows for less congestion in the hunting areas and improves everyone's chances of being successful hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everybody that uses moose meat as their primary food source.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A few guides that using community resources to profit from.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Get rid of all controlled use areas, but this would be a statewide issue.

PROPOSED BY: Robert Caywood

EG050113851

PROPOSAL 100 - 5 AAC 92.540(3)(F). Controlled use areas. Modify the boundaries of the Wood River Controlled Use Area as follows:

Move the boundary for the Wood River Controlled Use Area (WRCUA) back to the west bank as it previously was.

ISSUE: I would prefer eliminating the WRCUA, but the guides have too much power. But at least by moving the boundary back to the west bank, it would open up huge areas that people can access to feed their families.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The trails on the east side of the WRCUA would not be accessible to hunters. It does no good to manage for abundance if you cannot get to the animals. We need to manage game not people.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, if you cannot get a moose there is no quality of resources.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who depend on moose meat to feed their families. Game management will be getting the hunters to the moose (they will never kill enough cows in that area).

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody. No access to the area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close cow hunts to force the moose back down to where the people are able to access them. Thousands of people have testified to close cow hunts, but no one listens.

PROPOSED BY: Robert Caywood

EG050113850

PROPOSAL 101 - 5AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Create targeted moose hunts in Units 20A and 20B as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(18)		
Unit 20(A), the Ferry Trail Management Area, the Wood River Controlled Use Area, and the Yanert Controlled Use Area		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 25 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 2,000 permits may be issued in combination with the Remainder of Unit 20(A); a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Aug. 15–Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Oct. 1–Feb. 28 (General hunt only)	
1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 1,000 permits may be issued in combi- nation with the Remainder	Sept. 1–Sept. 25 (General hunt only)	

of Unit 20(A); or

1 bull by drawing
permit only; by
muzzleloader only;
up to 75 permits
may be issued in
combination with
nonresidents in
Unit 20(A); **or**

Nov. 1–Nov. 30
(General hunt only)

**1 moose by targeted-hunt
permit only; by shotgun or
bow and arrow only; up
to 100 permits may be issued**

**Season to be announced
by emergency order
(General hunt only)**

No open Season

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch
antlers or antlers
with 4 or more brow
tines on one side;
or

Sept. 1–Sept. 25

1 bull with 50-inch
antlers or antlers
with 4 or more brow
tines on one side
by drawing permit
only; by muzzleloader
only; up to 75 permits
may be issued in
combination with
residents in
Unit 20(A);

Nov. 1–Nov. 30

Remainder of Unit 20(A)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with spike-fork
antlers or 50-inch
antlers or antlers
with 3 or more brow
tines on one side; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 25

1 antlerless moose by
drawing permit only; up

Aug. 15–Nov. 15
(General hunt only)

to 2,000 permits may be issued in combination with Unit 20(A), the Ferry Trail Management Area, Wood River Controlled Use Area, and the Yanert Controlled Use Area; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or

Aug. 25–Feb. 28

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 1,000 permits may be issued in combination with Unit 20(A), the Ferry Trail Management Area, Wood River Controlled Use Area, and the Yanert Controlled Use Area; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 25

1 moose by targeted-hunt permit only; by shotgun or bow and arrow only; up to 100 permits may be issued

Season to be announced by emergency order (General hunt only)

No open Season

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side;

Sept. 1–Sept. 25

Unit 20(B), that portion within Creamer's Refuge

1 bull with spike-fork

Sept. 1–Sept. 30

Sept. 1–Sept. 30

or greater antlers, by bow and arrow only; or	(General hunt only) Nov. 21–Nov. 27 (General hunt only)	Nov. 21–Nov. 27
1 antlerless moose by bow and arrow only, by drawing permit only; up to 150 bow and arrow permits may be issued in the Fairbanks Management Area; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area; or	Sept. 1–Nov. 27 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1–Nov. 27
1 antlerless moose by muzzleloader by drawing permit only; up to 10 permits may be issued; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area	Dec. 1–Jan. 31 (General hunt only)	Dec. 1–Jan. 31
Unit 20(B), remainder of the Fairbanks Management Area		
1 bull with spike-fork or greater antlers, by bow and arrow only; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 30 (General hunt only) Nov. 21–Nov. 27 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1–Sept. 30 Nov. 21–Nov. 27
1 antlerless moose by bow and arrow only, by drawing permit only; up to 150 bow and arrow permits may be issued in the Fairbanks Management Area;	Sept. 1–Nov. 27 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1–Nov. 27

a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area; or

1 moose by targeted-hunt permit only; by shotgun or bow and arrow only; up to 100 permits may be issued

Season to be announced by emergency order (General hunt only)

No open season.

Unit 20(B), that portion within the Minto Flats Management Area

1 bull; or

Aug. 21–Aug. 27
(Subsistence hunt only)

No open season.

1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or

Sept. 8–Sept. 25

No open season.

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only

Oct. 15–Feb. 28
(Subsistence hunt only)

No open season.

Unit 20(B), the drainage of the Middle Fork of the Chena River

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 300 permits may be issued; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or

Aug. 15–Nov. 15
(General hunt only)

No open season.

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only;

Oct. 1–Feb. 28
(General hunt only)

a person may not take
a cow accompanied
by a calf; or

1 bull; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 20	Sept. 1–Sept. 20
1 bull, by bow and arrow only; or	Sept. 21–Sept. 30	Sept. 21–Sept. 30
1 bull by drawing permit only; by muzzleloader only; up to 60 permits may be issued in combination with the hunt in the Salcha River drainage upstream from and including Goose Creek Unit 20(B), that portion of the Salcha River drainage upstream from and including Goose Creek	Nov. 1–Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season.
1 bull; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 20	Sept. 1–Sept. 20
1 bull, by bow and arrow only;	Sept. 21–Sept. 30	Sept. 21–Sept. 30
1 bull by drawing permit only; by muzzleloader only; up to 60 permits may be issued in combination with the hunt in the Middle Fork of the Chena River; Unit 20(B), that portion southeast of the Moose Creek dike within one-half mile of	Nov. 1–Nov. 30	No open season.

each side of the
Richardson highway

1 bull; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 20

Sept. 5–Sept. 20

1 moose by drawing
permit only; by
bow and arrow or
muzzleloader only;
up to 100 permits
may be issued; **or**

Sept. 16–Feb. 28
(General hunt only)

No open season.

**1 moose by targeted-hunt
permit only; by shotgun or
bow and arrow only; up
to 100 permits may be
issued**

**Season to be announced
by emergency order
(General hunt only)**

No open season.

Remainder of Unit 20(B)

1 bull; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 20

Sept. 5–Sept. 20

1 antlerless moose by
drawing permit only;
up to 1,500 permits
may be issued in the
Remainder of Unit 20(B);
a person may not take
a cow accompanied
by a calf; or

Aug. 15–Nov. 15
(General hunt only)

No open season.

1 antlerless moose by
registration permit only;
a person may not
take a cow
accompanied by a calf; **or**

Oct. 1–Feb. 28
(General hunt only)

**1 moose by targeted-hunt
permit only; by shotgun or
bow and arrow only; up
to 100 permits may be
issued**

**Season to be announced
by emergency order
(General hunt only)**

No open Season

...

ISSUE: Targeted permit hunts have been an effective management tool in Unit 14A to address public safety and nuisance moose concerns in very small areas. We recommend the board allow these hunts in Units 20A and 20B to address similar concerns. With moose populations of 11,000–12,000 in Unit 20A and 18,000–20,000 in Unit 20B, human–moose conflicts commonly arise, including many calls each year related to injured moose along roadways and in residential areas, and aggressive moose (particularly in Fairbanks residential areas). The high moose populations could sustain harvest of these moose, benefitting both the moose populations and humans. Targeted hunts would provide meat to hunters and alleviate some of the human–moose problems now occurring. Targeted hunts would also allow the use of bow and arrow to harvest moose in areas where local ordinances or Fish and Game regulations (i.e., Fairbanks Management Area) prohibit the use of firearms.

Our intent is to use targeted hunts primarily to reduce moose-vehicle collisions by harvesting moose that habitually spend time along roadways and have a high likelihood of being injured by highway vehicles or have already been injured. Sixty to eighty moose are hit annually in the Fairbanks Management Area portion of Unit 20B. Over 150 are hit annually outside the Fairbanks Management Area in the remainder of Unit 20B and in Unit 20A. We would also like to use targeted hunts as an option for resolving nuisance situations. In the Fairbanks area we have approximately 70 of these annually.

Targeted hunts would be implemented by selecting hunters at random from an applicant pool. They will be required to respond quickly to harvest moose from specifically defined “targeted” moose–vehicle collision or nuisance areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Large numbers of moose will continue to be hit and killed unnecessarily along Interior roads.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, moose harvested under this regulation will generally have better quality meat than that provided through the state’s road salvage program.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents in Units 20A and 20B will likely benefit from reduced moose–vehicle collisions and moose–human conflicts while providing additional moose for human consumption. Hunters who obtain a targeted hunt permits will also benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who disagree with the harvest of moose, particularly in more populated areas.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Drawing permit moose hunts were considered, however it would be harder to harvest specific animals with drawing permits.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613911

PROPOSAL 102 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Allow in the taking of any bull in Unit 20A and portions of Unit 20B by utilizing two harvest tickets as follows:

In Unit 20A and the antler restricted portions of Unit 20B, allow the taking of any bull by utilizing two valid harvest tickets. Both holders of the tickets must be present in the field and the harvest tickets would have to accompany the animal to the point of processing. Harvest reports would be required to list both ticket numbers for the single animal taken.

ISSUE: Increase opportunity for hunters who have not received a permit or are opposed to the taking of antlerless moose to harvest one bull with two valid harvest tickets. This would be only applicable in antler restricted areas of these units.

This also may help curb the waste of game that is already down and found to not meet antler requirements. In this case a party could validate two tags and go home legally.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Department of Fish and Game would continue to issue permits trying to increase regular season harvest with a reasonable success rate. This could also be used as an early season regulation and save on issuing specific permits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? I think it would improve the chances of using the resource without impacting the harvest numbers a great deal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who hunt with at least one other person and those opposed to taking of antlerless animals would get an increased chance for a successful hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one I can think of.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I thought of a draw permit similar to a party with one animal per two individuals. Disregarded this because of more permits to issue and the fact that the permit holders have to be able to participate. I have known persons that were unable to hunt during their permit period. This would be more flexible for people that are available to fill the freezer.

PROPOSED BY: Mark Albert

EG031913738

PROPOSAL 103- 5 AAC 92.011. Taking of game by proxy. Limit proxy hunting for moose in Units 20A and 20B as follows:

...

(d) A person may not be a proxy

- (1) for more than one beneficiary at a time;
- (2) more than once per season per species in Unit 13;
- (3) for Tier II Caribou in Unit 13, unless the proxy is a Tier II permittee.

(4) more than once per regulatory year for moose in Units 20A and 20B

ISSUE: Some individuals are harvesting multiple moose during antlerless moose registration hunts. This may lead to localized overharvest of female moose in some areas. Also at issue is allocation of the resource and fair and equitable distribution of the meat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fairness issue will continue to divide hunters resulting in deterioration of public support for antlerless hunts. Localized overharvest may also contribute to user conflicts and loss of support for antlerless hunts.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The distribution of the harvest will be viewed as more fair and equitable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those that participate in the antlerless hunts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Prohibit taking of moose by proxy; limit one proxy per household.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050113860

PROPOSAL 104 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Allow harvest of brown bear over black bear bait sites in Units 20A and 20B as follows:

We would like the Board of Game to allow the incidental harvest of grizzly bear over black bear bait in subunits 20A and 20B to allow for a reasonable opportunity to harvest grizzly bear.

ISSUE: Brown bear populations have begun taking over habitat of Units 20A and 20B which historically have been populated by black bear.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We believe these bear will begin to create problems with cabin owners and other recreational users of the area. Black bear harvest will decline because black bear baiters in the area have a hard time with grizzlies destroying baits and there have even been reports of grizzlies taking black bear after they were shot over bait.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will provide for an incidental harvest of grizzly bears in units that enjoy stable grizzly populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Black bear baiters will benefit from being able to incidentally harvest brown bear that come to their black bear baits. Moose hunters will benefit by the byproduct of healthier moose populations, and recreational users in the area will be kept safer as the habituated grizzlies in the area will be removed before they can become a problem.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? We cannot think of anyone who will suffer from an incidental harvest of grizzly bear over black bear baits in Units 20A and 20B. In fact this would dispose of nuisance bear that are inadvertently habituated to human feeding when visiting baits sites intended to feed black bear.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Bear trapping proposals; rejected because there has not been support for this methods and means in the past and there is no reason to believe that the Board of Game has changed their position now.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG042613798

PROPOSAL 105 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Allow harvest of brown bear over black bear bait sites in Units 20A and 20B as follows:

In Units 20A and 20B: One grizzly per year; female may be taken without cubs, meat must be salvaged.

ISSUE: The overabundance of grizzlies in these two units, I would like the Board of Game to allow baiting grizzlies on a black bear bait.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The lack of interest in bear baiting because of feeding grizzly bears and not being able of taking them on black bear bait.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Hunter will feel better going to their bear baits knowing that they have a chance of taking a grizzly if it comes to their bait.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The hunter who has been baiting his bear baits and wasting fuel and time and bait feeding grizzlies on their bear bait.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one but the grizzlies that have been feeding on the baits.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Snaring bear but being able to look at a bear from a stand and target the one that needs to be reduced with a rifle or bow.

PROPOSAL 106 – 5 AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20B as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(18)		
...		
Unit 20(B), that portion within Creamer's Refuge 1 bull with spike-fork or greater antlers, by bow and arrow only; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 30 (General hunt only) Nov. 21–Nov. 27 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1–Sept. 30 Nov. 21–Nov. 27
1 antlerless moose by bow and arrow only, by drawing permit only; up to 150 bow and arrow permits may be issued in the Fairbanks Management Area; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area; or	Sept. 1–Nov. 27 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1–Nov. 27
1 antlerless moose by muzzleloader by drawing permit only; up to 10 permits may be issued; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered	Dec. 1–Jan. 31 (General hunt only)	Dec. 1–Jan. 31

bull moose in the
Fairbanks
Management Area

Unit 20(B), remainder
of the Fairbanks
Management Area

1 bull with spike-fork
or greater antlers, by
bow and arrow only; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 30
(General hunt only)
Nov. 21–Nov. 27
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1–Sept. 30
Nov. 21–Nov. 27

1 antlerless moose by
bow and arrow only,
by drawing permit
only; up to 150 bow and
arrow permits may be
issued in the Fairbanks
Management Area; a
recipient of a drawing
permit is prohibited
from taking an
antlered bull moose
in the Fairbanks
Management Area

Sept. 1–Nov. 27
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1–Nov. 27

Unit 20(B), that portion
within the Minto Flats
Management Area

1 bull; or

Aug. 21–Aug. 27
(Subsistence hunt
only)

No open season.

1 bull with spike-fork or
50-inch antlers or antlers
with 4 or more brow tines
on one side; or

Sept. 8–Sept. 25

No open season.

1 antlerless moose by
registration permit only;

Oct. 15–Feb. 28
(Subsistence hunt
only)

No open season.

Unit 20(B), the drainage
of the Middle Fork
of the Chena River

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 300 permits may be issued; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Aug. 15–Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	No open season.
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Oct. 1–Feb. 28 (General hunt only)	No open season.
1 bull; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 20	Sept. 1–Sept. 20
1 bull, by bow and arrow only; or	Sept. 21–Sept. 30	Sept. 21–Sept. 30
1 bull by drawing permit only; by muzzleloader only; up to 60 permits may be issued in combination with the hunt in the Salcha River drainage upstream from and including Goose Creek;	Nov. 1–Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season.
Unit 20(B), that portion of the Salcha River drainage upstream from and including Goose Creek		
1 bull; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 20	Sept. 1–Sept. 20
1 bull, by bow and arrow only; or	Sept. 21–Sept. 30	Sept. 21–Sept. 30
1 bull by drawing permit only; by muzzleloader	Nov. 1–Nov. 30	No open season.

only; up to 60 permits
may be issued in
combination with the
hunt in the Middle
Fork of the Chena River;

Unit 20(B), that
portion southeast
of the Moose
Creek dike within
one-half mile of
each side of the
Richardson highway

1 bull; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 20	Sept. 5–Sept. 20
------------	------------------	------------------

1 moose by drawing permit only; by bow and arrow or muzzleloader only; up to 100 permits may be issued	Sept. 16–Feb. 28 (General hunt only)	No open season.
---	---	-----------------

Remainder of Unit 20(B)

1 bull; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 20	Sept. 5–Sept. 20
------------	------------------	------------------

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 1,500 permits may be issued in the Remainder of Unit 20(B); a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Aug. 15–Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	No open season.
---	--	-----------------

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf;	Oct. 1–Feb. 28 (General hunt only)	
--	---------------------------------------	--

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. Our goal is to provide for a wide range of public uses and benefits, and to protect the health and habitat of moose

populations. Antlerless hunts are important for improving or maintaining the ability of moose habitat to support current populations. They also help regulate moose population growth, help to meet intensive management (IM) objectives for high levels of harvest, and provide subsistence hunters with a reasonable opportunity for success in obtaining moose for subsistence uses without reducing bull-to-cow ratios.

Fairbanks Management Area (FMA) — The purpose of this antlerless hunt is to provide opportunity to harvest a surplus of antlerless moose in the FMA and potentially reduce moose–vehicle collisions and nuisance moose problems.

The number of moose–vehicle collisions in the FMA is high and poses significant safety risks to motorists. In addition, moose nuisance issues continue to place significant demands on property owners. To increase hunting opportunity and harvest and reduce moose–vehicle collisions, the department incrementally increased the number of drawing permits for antlerless moose in the FMA during RY99–RY10. Moose–vehicle collisions and moose nuisance problems have declined during RY06–RY12, presumably, in part due to the higher antlerless moose harvests of 35–55 during RY09–RY12.

Minto Flats Management Area (MFMA) — The primary purpose of this antlerless hunt is to provide a reasonable opportunity for subsistence uses and to stop growth of a high density population.

Population estimation surveys indicate the MFMA moose density is high (>4 moose/mi²). The annual reported harvest of antlerless moose taken during RY96–RY12 was approximately 1% to 2% of the MFMA moose population and is likely sustainable.

Unit 20), drainage of the Middle Fork of the Chena River and the Remainder of Unit 20B — The antlerless moose harvest in this area is designed to curb growth of this population that has surpassed the upper limit of the IM population objective of 12,000–15,000 moose and helps to meet IM harvest objectives for Unit 20B. Increasing population estimates (from 12,313 in 2001 to 20,173 in 2009) and high calf:cow ratios (37–43:100 during 2003–2009) indicate numbers are increasing. Moreover, moose densities are relatively high (2.2 moose/mi²) in central Unit 20B surrounding Fairbanks.

The drawing permit hunts for antlerless moose were approved by the board in 2006 to take advantage of relatively high and increasing moose numbers in central Unit 20B. The goal is to increase the cow harvest until the growth is stopped to prevent over-use of the habitat. The harvest from drawing permits has ranged from 258 and 265 cow moose in 2009 and 2010, respectively, to 294 and 271 cow moose in 2011 and 2012. In combination with the registration antlerless permits in the MFMA, we estimate the current antlerless harvest at approximately 2% of the total Unit 20B population of approximately 20,000 moose.

To mitigate hunter conflicts, we spread hunters out over space and time. Each of 16 hunt areas has permits in three time periods: one before the general hunt, one during, and one after. This way we maintain few hunters at a time in each permit area, yet expect to achieve a harvest of 400–500 cows.

Mortality from vehicle and train collisions has been high, averaging 149 moose killed annually by motor vehicles in Unit 20B. Road kill may be reduced by focusing harvest in the central Unit 20B where road density is highest.

Finally, extensive burns in northcentral Unit 20B will provide excellent habitat in the future. With improving habitat, continued high predator harvest, and relatively mild winters, we can expect continued high productivity and survival of moose, along with increased yield.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population may increase to unacceptable levels or may need reduction when new data is available and analyzed. Opportunity to hunt a harvestable surplus of cow moose will be lost, and our ability to meet IM harvest objectives will be compromised. Subsistence hunters outside the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence Area may not have a reasonable opportunity for success in obtaining moose for subsistence uses. Fairbanks residents may benefit from reduced moose–vehicle collisions and moose–human conflicts.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This reauthorization of antlerless moose hunts will likely improve or maintain the ability of moose habitat to support the current moose population. Hunting opportunity and harvest will increase and allow the department to manage these moose populations at optimum levels. The additional harvest will help in meeting IM harvest objectives. It will also allow hunters to harvest moose toward meeting the IM harvest objective without reducing bull-to-cow ratios to low levels.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will benefit from the opportunity to harvest cow moose. Moose populations will benefit by having moose densities compatible with their habitat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to harvest of antlerless moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613940

PROPOSAL 107 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Open a nonresident season in Unit 20B within the Minto Flats Management Area as follows:

Moose hunting in Unit 20B within the Minto Flats Management Area:

Nonresidents: eight drawing permits of which half are issued to guided hunters who have a signed contract with a registered guide licensed for the area (20-01).

Season Dates: September 8- 25 one bull with 50-inch antlers or four brow tines on at least one side.

ISSUE: There is no nonresident moose season within the Minto Flats Management Area in 20B. The overabundance of moose and the very liberal harvest that exists for residents indicate that the area could now support some nonresident opportunity.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nonresidents will continue to be excluded.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; the current management plan calls for reducing the moose population in this area and other surrounding areas in Unit 20B. Allowing nonresidents some opportunity could help.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? A very limited number of nonresident hunters and the guide/s operating in the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I don't know about suffer but some resident hunters may see a nonresident hunter.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered asking for a 10% nonresident allocation based on 10 % of the past resident harvest. I figured that would be politically unacceptable. I considered restricting the nonresidents to an area south of Swan Neck Slough (between Swan Neck and the Tanana River and the mouth of the Tolovana River. I rejected it because there is now two lower mouths to Swan Neck Slough a considerable distance apart. It could be confusing. It would also eliminate areas to the west off the river and lakes system that receive little hunting pressure.

PROPOSED BY: Ken Lamb

EG050113881

PROPOSAL 108 - 5 AAC 92.530(8). Management areas. Eliminate the Minto Flats Management Area restrictions on airboats as follows:

Delete the controlled use area in Minto Flats and allow the use of airboats for the harvest of moose.

ISSUE: Controlled use area Minto Flats; closed to the use of airboats.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? With the overabundance of moose in the area and the lack of getting to areas in the Minto Flats area with regular boats, and spreading the harvest throughout the area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes it would spread the harvest throughout the area where regular boat traffic can't go and reduce crowding on the river corridors.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The hunters with airboats who can hunt bears and ducks there and who can fish there, but are restricted from moose hunting there, when there is an abundance of moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close it to everyone or open it to everyone to be fair.

PROPOSED BY: Lee Olsen

EG042613792

PROPOSAL 109 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change the muzzleloader moose drawing hunt in Unit 20B to a registration hunt and modify the season dates and hunt area as follows:

Moose, Unit 20B, Salcha River drainage upstream from and including **Butte Creek** [GOOSE CREEK]; one Bull by muzzleloader only [BY PERMIT], **registration permit** [DM782], **November 10-December 10** [NOVEMBER 1—NOVEMBER 30]

ISSUE: Muzzleloader moose hunt (DM782) is located in an extremely difficult and remote area to access. Most years there is insufficient snow on 1 November to successfully make this hunt. Starting later and ending later will allow more time for rivers to freeze and more snow to fall. December Bull only moose hunts have been successful under a general harvest ticket for decades in Unit 20F, with a low impact harvest. I believe this portion of 20B is more difficult to access than the portion of 20F open in December. Hunter success has been zero to one on DM782. Permit holders learning the area must wait 2 years to reapply for a drawing permit despite the fact there are extra unissued drawing permits. A registration hunt would eliminate this waiting period and still allow active Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) oversight of hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunter success will continue to be near zero and ADF&G will likely cancel this muzzleloader opportunity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, going from no harvest to a few animals taken.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Any hunter desiring an extremely challenging late season hunt. Also, moose hunters not getting a September moose and muzzleloaders drawn in prior year wouldn't be restricted from hunting the same area the following year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Staying with current drawing with very few hunters attempting to access the area has not worked over past two seasons, we need to expand the group to find access. The department can carefully monitor a registration type hunt. We considered lengthening the season, but trappers would be more impacted with a longer season. This proposed season is the same number of days, so the impacts of hunters opening trails for trappers would stay at the same level.

PROPOSAL 110 – 5AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Eliminate the muzzleloader hunt for bull moose in the Middle Fork of the Chena River and Upper Salcha River in Unit 20B as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(18)		
...		
Unit 20(B), the drainage of the Middle Fork of the Chena River		
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 300 permits may be issued; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Aug. 15–Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	No open season.
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Oct. 1–Feb. 28 (General hunt only)	No open season.
1 bull; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 20	Sept. 1–Sept. 20
1 bull, by bow and arrow only; or	Sept. 21–Sept. 30	Sept. 21–Sept. 30
[1 BULL BY DRAWING PERMIT ONLY; BY MUZZLELOADER ONLY; UP TO 60 PERMITS MAY BE ISSUED IN COMBINATION WITH THE HUNT IN THE	[NOV. 1–NOV. 30] [(GENERAL HUNT ONLY)]	[NO OPEN SEASON.]

SALCHA RIVER
DRAINAGE UPSTREAM
FROM AND INCLUDING
GOOSE CREEK]

Unit 20(B) that portion of
the Salcha River drainage
upstream from and
including Goose Creek

1 bull; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 20	Sept. 1–Sept. 20
1 bull, by bow and arrow only; or	Sept. 21–Sept. 30	Sept. 21–Sept. 30
[1 BULL BY DRAWING PERMIT ONLY; BY MUZZLELOADER ONLY: UP TO 60 PERMITS MAY BE ISSUED IN COMBI- NATION WITH THE HUNT IN THE MIDDLE FORK OF THE CHENA RIVER]	[NOV. 1–NOV. 30]	[NO OPEN SEASON.]

...

ISSUE: The Department of Fish and Game (department) recommends eliminating the November muzzleloader drawing permit hunt (DM782) for bull moose in the Middle Fork of the Chena River and upper Salcha River because interest and harvest have been very low. This hunt was adopted by the Board of Game in 2010 as a replacement for a popular November muzzleloader moose hunt in Unit 20A that had been modified. The DM782 hunt in Unit 20B began in 2011 when 60 “any moose” permits were issued. Of the 60 permits issued, 28 people hunted and 1 cow moose was harvested. In 2012, in response to several public proposals, the board changed this hunt to “bull only”. Only 32 of the 60 permits were issued in 2012, 7 permit-holders hunted, and no moose were harvested. For the 2013 season, 60 permits were offered in the drawing and 15 people applied. Access into the hunt area is extremely difficult, especially during November when travel conditions are poor and hunters have difficulty getting into the good moose habitat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will continue to invest time and effort into administration of a hunt that has little hunter interest or success.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This does not apply.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The department will benefit by not administering a hunt that has minimal hunter interest and harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who are looking for muzzleloader hunting opportunities.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Changing the hunt to a registration hunt was considered, although due to the difficult access, harvest rates may still be minimal. Another solution to consider would be to just add more opportunity to the fall general season.

PROPOSED BY: The Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613912

PROPOSAL 111 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Lengthen the moose season in a portion of Unit 20B as follows:

Salcha River drainage upstream from and including Goose Creek:
One bull September 1 - September 25 [20], or
One bull by bow and arrow only, September 26 - September 30

ISSUE: To lengthen the general moose season in Unit 20B in the Salcha River drainage upstream from and including Goose Creek from September 1- September 20 to September 1- September 25.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity will be lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Cooler weather will improve quality of meat. Distribute hunters over a longer period of time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Rifle hunters who don't get a moose September 1 - September 20.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Likely no one; very few hunters hunt this late season and they would still have the last five days all to themselves.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: John Giuchici EG042613793

PROPOSAL 112 – 5AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose and 92.530. Management Areas. Create a youth drawing permit hunt for antlerless moose in Unit 20B, and create a Unit 20B Youth Hunt Management Area that specifies hunt conditions as follows:

5AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(18) ...		
Remainder of Unit 20(B)		
1 bull; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 20	Sept. 5–Sept. 20
<u>1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 200 permits may be issued within the Unit 20(B) Youth Hunt Management Area; or</u>	<u>Aug. 5–Aug. 14</u>	<u>No open season</u>
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 1,500 permits may be issued in the Remainder of Unit 20(B); a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Aug. 15–Nov. 15	No open season.
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf	Oct. 1–Feb. 28 (General hunt only)	
...		

5 AAC 92.530. Management Areas.

(XX) Unit 20(B) Youth Hunt Management Area;

(A) the area consists of the Remainder of Unit 20(B);

(B) in addition to other legal seasons, the area is open to moose hunting by a drawing permit issued to a child; the department may issue a permit to a child, as follows:

(i) a permit may be issued to a child aged 10 to 17 who will be accompanied in the field by an adult 21 years of age or older, with the child being the permittee;

(ii) a moose harvested under a permit issued under this section will count against the bag limits of both the child and accompanying adult;

(iii) only the child may shoot a moose, except that the accompanying adult may shoot the animal only to prevent the animal from escaping after having been wounded by the child;

(iv) in addition to the permit specified in this section, the child and accompanying adult must have the licenses, harvest tickets, hunter education certification, and tags required under this title and AS 16 in possession while in the field.

ISSUE: At their Interior/Eastern Arctic meeting in 2012, the Board of Game encouraged the Department of Fish and Game (department) to identify hunting opportunities for youth in the Interior. Unit 20B has approximately 18,000–20,000 moose and the department issues about 1,000 antlerless moose permits in the central and western portions of the unit outside the Fairbanks Management Area. This provides ample opportunity to allocate a portion of the drawing permits to youth hunters. We recommend that the unit-wide number of antlerless moose permits not increase, but that a percentage (about 20%) of the available permits be allocated to an early season, youth drawing hunt for hunters that are ages 10 to 17. Creating this hunt would give young people a greater chance to harvest a moose before school starts, and it could easily be integrated into the department's Unit 20B moose harvest strategy.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Youth hunters will have to continue applying and competing for regular drawing permits in which they receive no advantage in obtaining a permit.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Youth hunters and their families will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Adult hunters would suffer because fewer antlerless drawing permits would be available to them.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613913

PROPOSAL 113 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Create a youth Dall sheep hunt in 20B remainder as follows:

Sheep, remainder of Unit 20

One sheep, drawing: July 20 – August 5

Qualified youth hunters, one drawing permit per lifetime of hunter.

Youth hunters must have successfully completed a Alaska Department of Fish and Game approved Hunter Education Course and must be accompanied by a licensed resident adult that is at least 21 years of age or older. Proxy hunting is not allowed during this hunt. Biologists to determine the appropriate amount of permits to be offered.

ISSUE: Create an interior of Alaska youth sheep hunt. Currently youths can participate in regular season sheep hunts, but often are unable to compete in the field with older more seasoned adults.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Our hunting tradition will decline over time as our youths interest moves to other activities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, only provides a quality hunting experience without heavy competition from adults for our resident youth.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Youths ages 10 to 17, who draw a permit and are given this opportunity to hunt with an adult, often a parent, for several days above tree line.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Youths turning 18 or older would not eligible for drawing or the hunt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Considered asking for a ram only hunt, but creation of a ram or ewe only hunt has the potential to make their ultimate youth hunt into a horrible experience should they accidentally take ram on a ewe hunt or if ram is one inch short. We can avoid the possibility of that happening with an any sheep hunt. Also considered starting the season later, but Yukon Territory starts their sheep hunt July 15, why not in Alaska?

PROPOSED BY: Dave Machacek

EG032913741

PROPOSAL 114 - 5 AAC 92.150. Evidence of sex and identity. Repeal the requirement to leave evidence of sex on black bears in Unit 20B as follows:

5 AAC 92.150(d) In those areas where sealing is required, until the hide has been sealed by a representative of the department, no person may possess or transport the hide of a bear that does

not have the penis sheath or vaginal orifice naturally attached to indicate conclusively the [sex]**gender** of the bear.

(i) except in Unit 20B

ISSUE: Repeal the leaving of evidence of gender on black bears, until sealing has taken place in 20B.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? In Region III, 20B is the only sub-unit that still requires that evidence of gender must stay attached to the hide until sealed. This is not really necessary. An individual reports what gender of black bear they have taken on their black bear harvest report. It is also reported on the black bear sealing form which is signed and dated and is a certified statement, per AS 11.58.210(a). There is no statistical loss of data pertaining to gender of bears harvested.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? I cannot see the correlation between having a mandatory requirement of leaving evidence of gender on black bears. Whereas regulations do not require the same on wolves (otters, wolverine, and martin also). Wolves are most likely even managed at higher levels of maximum sustained yield than black bears. Furthermore, evidence of gender is usually associated with a bag limit of a certain gender of species being taking. Unit 20B has a three black bear bag limit, no closed season, and all black bears can be harvested except sows with new born cubs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those harvesting black bears. The entire region would be unified on evidence of gender. The Division of Wildlife Conservation (DWC) still has to seal black bears taken in subunit 20B, if there is any question about gender at that time. Our well educated personnel at DWC Fairbanks can, with high confidence, distinguish between a male or female black bear. Any bear that is too difficult to determine gender would not affect the complied data, as this would be rare.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Al Barrette

EG050113863

PROPOSAL 115 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change the season dates and bag limit for moose in Unit 20C as follows:

Unit 20C:

Resident moose season, spike fork or 50-inch antlers or three brow tines, September 1-25.

Nonresident moose season, September 1-25 one bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with four brow tines, on at least one side.

ISSUE: Moose season in Unit 20C for residents and nonresidents. Currently, Unit 20C has six moose/square mile while across the rivers in Unit 20A and 20B densities are as high as 4.4 moose / square mile. Unit 20C has had some recent burns in the area and the Board of Game has allowed grizzly baiting. This should allow the moose population to grow to what it should be. However the long any bull season for residents targets all age groups and is more in line with a management plan that stabilizes or reduces the population. I believe a better strategy for this area at this time would be the spike fork, 50-inch strategy. The spike fork, 50-inch strategy is supposed to grow the moose population while increasing hunting opportunity for both meat and trophy hunters. Prior to the last Board of Game cycle, the nonresident moose season ended September 15 but was for any bull. If the board wants to stay with the 50-inch nonresident requirement, the season date should be changed to September 25.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Targeting all age classes of bulls for the new longer hunting season may not have the desired effect of growing the population.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposed change is supposed to provide more moose and opportunity for meat and trophy hunters and increase the moose population in the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who want more moose whether they are trophy or meat hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who want to shoot any bull without worrying about antler size.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered leaving the nonresident season at closing September on 20. I rejected this because the later season will allow them to hunt when chances are better for taking that size bull. I did not feel it would infringe on the resident priority because the residents can take smaller meat moose or moose with only three brow tines. And Unit 20C has always been (before the last cycle) an area where the local nonresidents could hunt for any bull without antler restrictions and the board has taken that away so a longer season should be in place for compensation.

PROPOSED BY: Smokey Don Duncan

EG050113872

PROPOSAL 116 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Create the Nenana-Totchaket Resource Development Corridor Controlled Use Area in Unit 20C as follows:

In the following areas, access for hunting is controlled as specified:

Unit 20C Nenana-Totchaket Resource Development Corridor Controlled Use Area:

(i) consists of the portion of Unit 20C along the Nenana-Totchaket Resource Development Corridor, and any extensions to this corridor made accessible by new road completion, and within two miles of the road.

(ii) the area is closed to the use of highway and ATV/ORV for moose hunting, including the transportation of moose hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of moose, from September 1 through September 25, except on private property.

ISSUE: The development of the Nenana-Totchaket Resource Development Corridor threatens to allow hunter access to a large area of interior Alaska (Unit 20C) that has been, until now, difficult to access. The continued expansion of this road and the possibility of a bridge, across the Nenana River, from the 10th Street boat launch area to the land on the opposite bank make it very likely that hunting pressure will increase dramatically. This area already has low moose densities that cannot support an increased number of hunters. Units 20C and 20F have a combined annual amounts necessary for subsistence of 100 – 130 moose and a total harvest objective of 150-400. With the development of the new road corridor, it is likely that a higher success rates will be enjoyed in the vicinity of the road way causing the population objective to fall to an unhealthy level. This is also likely to result in greatly skewed sex ratios due to this being an any bull area. Additionally, it is likely that without regulation highway vehicles, ATVs and large track rigs will create new trail systems through the area that will damage or destroy key habitat and lowlands. The area already contains a large number of recreational property and cabins that will have their remoteness infringed upon by new users. I would like the board to adopt a controlled use area along the new road corridor that limits all highway and off highway vehicle traffic originating from the new road corridor for moose hunting, including the transportation of moose hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of moose, from September 1 through September 25, until an impact study can be completed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose densities in Unit 20C will remain low, population objectives will decline, sex ratios will decline, habitat will be destroyed, subsistence users of the area will not have reasonable opportunity to harvest moose, and recreational property owners will be disenfranchised as they purchased “remote recreational property” not road accessible property.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this proposal protects moose populations in the area from over harvest potential created by new access opportunities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence and recreational users of the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? In writing this proposal, I considered reinstating the Nenana Controlled Use Area with a change to include ORV and ATV, restricting the area to residents only, placing antler restrictions, and shortening the season but decided that each of these options may reduce opportunity to an unacceptable level.

PROPOSED BY: Adam Lammers

EG042913817

PROPOSAL 117 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Reinstate the Nenana Controlled Use Area as follows:

5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas.

In the following areas, access for hunting is controlled as specified:

(3) Units 13 and 20

(J) the Nenana Controlled Use Area:

(i) the area consists of those portions of Units 20A and 20C bounded by a line beginning at the confluence of the Wood and Tanana Rivers, then southerly along the west bank of the Wood River to the Rex Trail, then west along the Rex Trail to the Parks Highway, then west along the Bear Paw Trail to the Kantishna River, then northerly along the east bank of the Kantishna River to the Tanana River, then easterly along the south bank of the Tanana River to the point of beginning;

(ii) the area is closed to the use of airboats for moose hunting, including the transportation of moose hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of moose, from September 1 through September 25, except within the main channels of the Taklanika, Toklat, and Nenana Rivers and at the public boat launch in Nenana;

ISSUE: We would like the board to reinstate the Nenana Controlled Use Area (NCUA) to protect our traditional subsistence hunting areas. Areas of comparable habitat, size and accessibility remain available to airboat hunters in adjacent areas of Unit 20A and Unit 20C. This adjacent area has traditionally been less important for subsistence hunters and more frequently used by airboat hunters than has the NCUA. This area is a low density moose area and the additional pressure from these types of vehicles will make it very difficult to maintain a healthy moose population, and provide the reasonable opportunity required to meet the amounts necessary for subsistence (ANS) for the area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Totchaket Nenana Resource Corridor will provide new access to this area, and will allow airboaters to haul their boats across the river and drop them right into swamps and wet lands they previously had no access to. This will allow exploitation of this area in a manner which will prove to be inconsistent with sustained yield practices. We are concerned that this over exploitation will result in future shortening of seasons, antler restrictions, and other limitations that would reduce the reasonable opportunity of subsistence users to harvest moose.

The board previously concluded that a conflict existed between moose hunters using airboats and moose hunters using the more traditional spot and stalk and still hunting methods, and that this conflict detrimentally affected the subsistence use of moose from the area, although game levels remain stable.

The Alaska Supreme Court has examined such means and methods restrictions and found them to be time-honored management tools accepted as legitimate by the framers of the Alaska Constitution. See *Fish Spotters Ass'n v. State*, 838 P.2d 798 (Alaska 1992).

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will ensure that a low density moose population is not over utilized to the point where the ANS cannot be met.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users of the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The airboat community.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Requesting a road corridor like on the north slope; requesting antler restrictions in the area to protect sex composition; requesting shorter seasons to protect the moose population.

PROPOSED BY: Minto Nenana Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050313893

PROPOSAL 118 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change the season dates for moose hunting in Unit 20F as follows:

Unit 20F, Yukon River drainage and Tanana River drainage, moose hunting season: September 10-30.

ISSUE: With the change in temperature caused by global warming, it is becoming more difficult to shoot a moose because moose are not rutting during the hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The hunters who hunt in Unit 20F, Yukon River drainage, Tanana River drainage will continue to have a hard time bagging a moose because the moose aren't rutting because it is too warm.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If we were able to hunt during September 10-20 there would be more moose taken by subsistence hunters because the moose would be in rut and mating calls would lure them out.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Most people who hunt in Unit 20F Yukon River drainage, Tanana River drainage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The hunters who like to go out hunting during the Labor Day weekend.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We thought of changing the season from September 5-25, but the first week of September is just too warm to keep meat hanging without it getting spoiled.

PROPOSED BY: Tanana Native Council

EG042413783

PROPOSAL 119 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change the season dates for winter moose season in Unit 20F as follows:

The winter moose hunting season in Unit 20F: December 1-15.

ISSUE: The winter hunt in Unit 20F needs to be extended. The weather at this time of year is unpredictable; it could be 40, 50 below zero for weeks at a time. That is too cold to have to go out and butcher a moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the dates are not extended then people who didn't get meat during the fall hunt may not be able to get moose meat during the winter hunt either.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If the dates are extended it gives the residents more time to get the moose meat that they need for their winter food.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The people who hunt during the winter moose hunt in Unit 20F will all benefit from the regulation change.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There would be no negative effect caused by the regulation change.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We wanted to extend the hunting season ten more days but it is not likely a hunting season would be doubled.

PROPOSED BY: Tanana Native Council

EG042913818

PROPOSAL 120 - 5 AAC 92.151. Destruction of trophy value required in specific areas.

Require trophy destruction for all moose taken in Unit 20F as follows:

The trophy value is to be destroyed from all moose taken in Unit 20F, Yukon River drainage and Tanana River drainage.

ISSUE: There has been an increase in trophy hunters in Unit 20F since other game units passed the regulation to destroy trophy value. There are a lot of people who live in this game unit who rely on moose meat to subsist on for the winter, who have not been able to get their yearly meat supply. There is a lot more competition with hunters who are traveling great distances to trophy hunt in Unit 20F.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The subsistence hunters will continue having a difficult time shooting their moose because of the competition with trophy hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If the trophy value of the antlers were destroyed then there

would be no competition with trophy hunters, in turn there would be more moose for the subsistence hunters of Unit 20F Yukon River and Tanana River drainages.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All subsistence hunters in Unit 20F would benefit from this proposed change.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The trophy hunters will have to hunt somewhere else.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We thought about having a subsistence hunt for rural residents but that is not allowed by the State of Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: Tanana Native Council

EG042513787

PROPOSAL 121 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Create a controlled use area around the Road to Tanana in Unit 20F as follows:

Create a controlled use area with a two-mile corridor on both sides of the new Manley to Tanana road wherein no hunters in motorized vehicles are allowed to hunt that have originated from the Manley to Tanana Road.

ISSUE: Strong potential for biologically unsustainable harvest and population declines in the Unit 20F moose herd due to improved access and increased hunting effort and success rate as a result of construction of a new road between Manley Hot Springs and the Yukon River.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Increased public access by a new road to inland portions of Unit 20F poses a potential to result in greater unit harvest than can be sustained under current regulations. This could result in a reduction in the overall population size and significantly reduce subsistence harvest by residents of Tanana and Yukon river communities that access this area almost exclusively by boat along the Yukon and Tanana rivers.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The Unit 20F moose population will be maintained or improved by protection from over-harvest during a general season developed in the absence of public road access to the Yukon River near Tanana. Further, the potential for a decline in the quality of the resource harvested will be avoided.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This proposal is designed to allow for sustained hunting by those hunters that have hunted this area for many years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one is likely to suffer, as this will simply be protecting an area that was not hunted by road traffic in the past. Hunting within the two-mile corridor on either side of the road would not be available to motorized vehicles hunting by local and nonlocal hunters that originate from the Manley to Tanana road.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We thought of a proposal with a five-mile corridor, like the Dalton Highway has but we thought that it was too large on an area to have as a corridor.

PROPOSED BY: Tanana Native Council

EG043013845

Antlerless Moose Hunts and Brown Bear Tag Fees for other Regions

PROPOSAL 122 - 5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemption. Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemptions for Region IV (Central/Southwest) as follows:

5AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemption

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

- (1) Unit 11;
- (2) Units 13 and 16(A);
- (3) Unit 16(B) and 17;

(11) Unit 9, within the following areas, unless a smaller area is defined by the department in an applicable permit:

(A) Unit 9(B), within five miles of the communities of Port Alsworth, Nondalton, Iliamna, Newhalen, Pile Bay, Pedro Bay, Pope Vanoy Landing, Kakhonak, Igiugig, and Levelock;

(B) Unit 9(C), within five miles of the communities of King Salmon, Naknek, and South Naknek;

(C) Unit 9(D), within five miles of the communities of Cold Bay, King Cove, Sand Point, and Nelson Lagoon;

(D) Unit 9(E), within five miles of the communities of Egegik, Pilot Point, Ugashik, Port Heiden, Port Moller, Chignik Lake, Chignik Lagoon, Chignik Bay, Perryville, and Ivanof Bay;

(12) Unit 10, within three miles of the community of False Pass, unless a smaller area is defined by the department in an applicable permit.

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

- (1) Unit 9(B);
- (2) Unit 9(E), that portion including all drainages that drain into the Pacific Ocean between Cape Kumliun and the border of Unit 9(D) and Unit 9(E);
- (3) Unit 17;

...

ISSUE: Brown bear tag fee exemptions must be reauthorized annually or the fee will be automatically reinstated.

General Season Hunts: The Board of Game (board) liberalized brown bear hunting regulations including the tag fee exemption to increase the harvest of brown bears in Units 11, 13, and 16 during the March 2003 board meeting and in Unit 17 during the March 2011 board meeting. The tag fee exemption in these Units provides greater opportunity to harvest of brown bears by allowing opportunistic.

The board also exempted brown bear tag fees for bear hunts near communities in Unit 9 to

address public safety concerns in communities during the board meeting in March 2011. Brown bears are abundant in Unit 9 and are managed as a trophy species. Brown bears are frequently observed communities where they destroy property in search of food or garbage and occasionally kill pets. The liberalized bear seasons and bag limits adopted along with the elimination of the tag fee were intended to allow people to take bears before they destroy property, to promote a greater acceptance of the unit's bear population, and to resolve some of the compliance issues associated with the take of defense of life or property bears.

Subsistence Brown Bear Hunts: The board waived the brown bear tag fee requirement for subsistence brown bear hunts in Unit 17 and portions of Unit 9. Subsistence brown bear harvest rates are low and well within sustainable limits. Exempting the resident tag fee has not caused an increase in subsistence harvest in these units. Continuation of the exemption accommodates cultural and traditional uses of brown bears in these units and provides an alternative for hunters who take brown bears primarily for their meat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the board does not reauthorize the tag fee exemption the fee will be reinstated and hunters will not be able to legally harvest a bear unless they purchase a \$25 brown bear tag.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? In Unit 9 the exemption is intended to increase local acceptance of the high-density brown bear population and preserve a management strategy designed to maintain a high quality of bears being harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who are reluctant to purchase the \$25 brown bear tag, opportunistic hunters who encounter a brown bear while hunting other species, and residents who've expressed concerns about brown bears that are frequently observed in rural communities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613945

PROPOSAL 123 --5 AAC 085.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in Berners Bay and Gustavus in Unit 1C as follows:

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

(1)

...

Unit 1(C), Berners Bay drain-
ages

Sept. 15–Oct.15
(General hunt only)

Sept. 15–Oct.15

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

...

Unit 1(C), that portion west
of Excursion Inlet and north
of Icy Passage

1 moose per regulatory year,
only as follows:

1 bull with spike-fork antlers
or 50-inch antlers or antlers
with 3 or more brow tines on
one side by registration
permit only; or

Sept. 15–Oct. 15
(General hunt only)

Sept. 15–Oct. 15

1 antlerless moose
by drawing permit
only; up to 100 permits
may be issued

Nov. 10–Dec. 10
(General hunt only)

Nov. 10–Dec. 10

...

ISSUE: Berners Bay

The Berners Bay Strategic Moose Management Plan calls for a post-hunt count of 90 moose, based on the estimated moose carrying capacity of this area. The Department of Fish and Game (department) has been very successful at maintaining this population level through the harvest of both bull and cow moose.

During 1998–2006, the number of drawing permits issued by the department for this herd ranged from ten bull permits and ten antlerless permits to seven bull permits and no antlerless permits. The average annual harvest of bull moose during this period was seven, while cow harvests in years we issued antlerless permits was four. Although we have the latitude of issuing up to 30 permits annually, we haven't issued more than 20 permits annually during any of the past 10 years; and no permits were issued during the period 2007-2013.

The number of moose counted during the fall aerial surveys determines the number of drawing permits issued. The mean number of moose observed during aerial counts from 1990 to 2006 was 77 moose (range: 59-108). Severe winter weather in 2006, 2007 and 2008 resulted in this population decreasing. The number of moose counted during aerial surveys between 2007 and

2009 ranged between 33-62 moose. Surveys conducted in 2010 and 2011 detected 73 moose, including 10 calves each year. In 2012, under excellent survey conditions, 102 moose were detected (21 bulls, 81 cows, and 14 calves). Based on the 2012 survey and sightability data from collared moose, the Berners Bay moose population is estimated to be 113 ± 11 moose. While the Berners Bay moose population is not increasing rapidly the population has reached management objectives for overall number of moose and bull to cow ratios.

As a result of the severe winters and the impacts they have had on this moose herd, we did not issue any permits between 2007 and 2012, and due to the timing for drawing permit applications, there will not be a hunt in fall 2013. We will continue to monitor this population through annual composition and calving surveys, and use these numbers to decide whether or not we will issue any permits. In addition we will be collecting information on moose survival, mortality, and recruitment. Very likely a limited number of bull only permits will be available for the foreseeable future. In spite of this, we would prefer to keep the antlerless hunt available so we have this tool in the future if needed.

Gustavus

The Gustavus moose population (Unit 1C) increased rapidly from just a few animals during the 1980's and 1990's peaking at 404 moose observed in 2003. By 2002 the department estimated the winter range moose density at Gustavus exceeded five moose per km², with only a small portion of that area being productive winter range as identified by abundant stands of willow. Because of concerns with these high moose numbers, department biologists began conducting spring browse utilization surveys in 1999, and documented 85–95% of the current annual growth of willow twigs available to moose had been consumed.

Based on the browse utilization data and overall moose densities at Gustavus, an antlerless hunt was first authorized for the Gustavus area by the board in fall 2000. Between 2002 and 2008, hunters harvested 11 to 67 antlerless moose annually depending on the number of permits made available. A hunt was not held in fall 2007 due to high winter-related moose mortalities. Antlerless hunts were not held in the Gustavus area between 2009 and 2013.

A goal of the Gustavus antlerless moose hunts is to control the number of moose on the available winter range to ensure the available habitat is adequate to support the animals utilizing it. Based on aerial survey data and the use of collared moose to determine sightability estimates it appears this strategy is working. During the period 2000-2009 aerial survey counts ranged from 207-404 moose; surveys in 2010 and 2011 counted 165 and 136 moose, respectively. In 2012, with excellent survey conditions, 274 moose (33 bulls, 201 cows, and 40 calves) were observed. Using sightability data collected from collared moose, the Gustavus area moose population was estimated to be 317 ± 37 moose. In 2008, Gustavus calf survival decreased significantly to <10%. Surveys in 2010 and 2011 indicate calf numbers are increasing and the survival estimate for the period was 20% and 40%, respectively. The annual adult female survival estimate is 90% for the period 2004-2011. Improving calf numbers and stable adult female survival suggests the Gustavus moose population has the potential to increase.

Research conducted on this moose population during 2003-2009 revealed cow moose in relatively poor body condition (as measured by rump fat thickness), and low reproductive indices

(as measured by pregnancy and twinning rates) when compared to other coastal moose populations in Yakutat and Berners Bay. Through the implementation of the antlerless hunts, the density of moose was lowered at Gustavus, resulting in improved body condition and reproductive indices and a more resilient moose population. The population is now at a level the department believes is sustainable within the available habitat.

Although an antlerless hunt was not held during 2009-2013, biologists believe it is important to keep this tool available to implement should the moose population increase to a point where there are detrimental impacts to available habitat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose populations could increase and exceed the carrying capacity of the habitat as they have done in the past. Moose harvest will be restricted to bulls thereby limiting opportunity for hunters.

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613928

PROPOSAL 124 -5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in Unit 5A as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(3)		
Unit 5(A), that portion (south of Wrangell-Saint Elias National Park, north and east of	Nov. 15 - Feb. 15	Nov. 15 - Feb. 15

Russell and Nunatak
Fiords, and east of
the east side of East
Nunatak Glacier to
the Canadian
Border (Nunatak Bench)

1 moose by registration
permit only; up to 5
moose may be taken

...

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

The Nunatak Bench Strategic Moose Management Plan calls for a post-hunt population of a maximum of 50 moose. A high of 52 moose were counted on the Nunatak Bench in 2001, after which time a decline in moose numbers was observed. During the period 2005-2011 (no surveys were conducted in 2010 and 2012) the number of moose counted has ranged from eleven to fourteen, with only one to two calves observed on each flight. The decline in moose numbers may be related to the 68 foot rise in water level that flooded this area in 2003 when the advancing Hubbard Glacier created a dam. A similar situation occurred in 1986 that caused a similar decline in moose numbers. The cause of the moose declines post flooding appears to be due to the decimation of preferred willow browse by the high water, causing emigration of moose from the area.

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

Although the moose numbers at this time do not support a harvest, the department would like to keep this antlerless authorization active should the moose numbers again reach a harvestable level (25 moose observed during aerial surveys). To date, moose have not recolonized the area as quickly as they did in the past, and it is unknown if moose numbers will increase sufficiently to

provide hunting opportunity. The department will continue to monitor this moose population and again allow a harvest when the survey counts reach or exceed 25 moose.

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

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and EG050613929

PROPOSAL 125 - 5 AAC 085.045(4). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6C as follows:

Seasons and Bag Limits (4)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
Unit 6(C)		
1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 40 permits for bulls and up to 20 permits for antlerless moose may be issued; or	Sept. 1-Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season.
1 moose by registration permit only;	Nov. 1-Dec. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season.

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. The population objective is 400 moose. A census completed during February 2012 yielded an estimate of 600 moose, 21% of which were calves. Because the available antlerless harvest quota in Unit 6C is currently harvested under a federal subsistence season administered by the U.S. Forest Service, we have not held the antlerless hunt since the 1999-2000 season. We recommend reauthorizing the state antlerless hunt as a backup to the federal subsistence hunt. Continuation of the antlerless hunts will be necessary to hold the population at objective levels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity will be lost, and the population may exceed the objective, which is based on the availability of adequate habitat during severe winters.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters desiring to take a moose in Unit 6C.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613930

PROPOSAL 126 - 5 AAC 085.045(5). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Twentymile/Portage/Placer hunt area in Units 7 and 14C as follows:

Units and Bag Limits (5)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season

...

Unit 7, the Placer River drainages, and that portion of the Placer Creek (Bear Valley) drainage outside the Portage Glacier Closed Area, and that portion of Unit 14(C) within the Twentymile

River drainage

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits for bulls will be issued in combination with nonresident hunts, and up to 70 permits for antlerless moose will be issued

Aug. 20—Oct. 10
(General hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits for bulls will be issued in combination with resident hunts

Aug. 20—Oct. 10

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. A November 2011 aerial composition count of moose in the Twentymile, Portage, and Placer river drainages found 178 moose with a bull:cow ratio of 21 bulls per 100 cows and a calf:cow ratio of 29 calves per 100 cows. This population has a history of rapid increase following mild winters; consequently, in 2009, antlerless permits were issued for the first time since 2004. Thirty antlerless permits per year were issued for 2009, 2010, and 2011, and twenty antlerless permits were issued for 2012. Harvests for 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 were 25 bulls and 17 cows, 15 bulls and 15 cows, 19 bulls and 8 cows, and 12 bulls and 7 cows, respectively. Twenty permits were issued for 2013 and permits for 2014 will be determined based on surveys in the fall of 2013.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population will probably increase and could suffer major losses during a severe winter. Habitat may be overbrowsed, reducing carrying capacity in subsequent years, and road and train kills will increase.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who obtain a drawing permit, wildlife viewers and motorists driving in the Portage area. Visitor use is high and viewing is an important activity in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who are opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSAL 127 - 5 AAC 85.045(11). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the drawing permit hunts for antlerless moose in Unit 13 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(11)		
Unit 13		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
...		
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 200 permits may be issued; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf	Oct. 1 – Oct. 31 Mar. 1 – Mar. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the Board of Game (board). This regulation allows hunters to take a limited number of cows in specific areas to keep the population within objectives.

This Unit 13 antlerless hunt was initially adopted in March 2011, and the first Unit 13 antlerless hunt under this regulation took place in September 2012. Ten permits were issued for a western portion of Unit 13A, and four cow moose were harvested. In regulatory year 2013, ten permits will be issued for the same area with an October and March season based on new season dates adopted by the board in February 2013.

Moose in Unit 13 have generally increased at a rate of 3-5% per year in the intensive wolf management area during the past 10 years. As anticipated, moose increased in some portions of the unit faster than others.

The population objective for Unit 13A is 3,500 – 4,200; the population estimate was 3,530 moose in 2009, 3,490 in 2010, and 3,890 in 2011. These numbers are based on conservative extrapolation of count data and sightability estimates. There is also a good possibility there are more moose in the area that are not included in our estimate.

The number of cows in western Unit 13A is expected to continue increasing given reduced predation. To maintain a healthy density and balance of moose in this area, a limited antlerless harvest opportunity in western Unit 13A may be necessary to slow the growth of this population as it approaches a level that will be sustainable in the long-term. Providing an antlerless hunt opportunity will maximize the annual sustained yield.

Based on this analysis, we intend to continue offering a limited antlerless hunt in portions of Unit 13A. No additional antlerless opportunities in other portions of Unit 13 are recommended at this time.

If this antlerless moose hunting opportunity is not reauthorized in Unit 13, the intensive management program and objectives will likely need to be restructured to maintain the moose population within a population size range that does not result in nutritional limitations for the moose and to achieve the harvest objectives recommended by the public, advisory committees, and the board.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Portions of the Unit 13 moose population could outgrow available habitat, leading to nutritional stress, lower productivity, and higher mortality. Substantial harvest opportunity could be lost for many years to come. If antlerless hunts are not approved and Unit 13 moose begin to show signs of nutritional stress due to overpopulation, intensive management efforts will need to be curtailed, reducing hunt opportunities for bulls and cows.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; by keeping the population within objective, harvest can be maximized, while avoiding nutritional stress which leads to increased susceptibility to adverse weather events, predation, parasites and disease.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People that want to maintain a healthy, productive moose population in the Copper River Basin and utilize moose for human consumption.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anyone who disagrees with the harvest of antlerless moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613931

PROPOSAL 128 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 14C as follows:

Units and Bag Limits (12)	Resident	
	Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season

...

Unit 14(C), Joint Base
Elmendorf-Richardson
(JBER) Management (General hunt only)
Area

Day after Labor Day
—Mar 31

Day after Labor Day
—Mar 31

1 moose per regulatory year by
drawing permit, and by muzzleloading
blackpowder rifle or bow and arrow
only; up to 185 permits may be issued

Unit 14(C), that portion
known as the Birchwood
Management Area

Day after Labor Day
—Sept. 30
(General hunt only)

Day after Labor Day
—Sept. 30

1 moose by drawing permit, by
bow and arrow only; up to 25
permits may be issued

Unit 14(C), that portion
known as the Anchorage
Management Area

Day after Labor Day
—Nov. 30
(General hunt only)

No open season

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit
only, and by bow and arrow, shotgun,
or muzzleloader only; up to 50 permits
may be issued

Unit 14(C), that portion
of the Ship Creek drainage
upstream of the Joint Base
Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER)
Management Area

1 moose by drawing permit
only; up to 50 permits may
be issued; or

Day after Labor Day
—Sept. 30
(General hunt only)

Day after Labor Day
—Sept. 30

1 bull by registration permit
only

Oct. 1—Nov. 30
(General hunt only)

Oct. 1—Nov. 30

...

Remainder of Unit 14(C)

1 moose per regulatory year,
only as follows:

1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or	Day after Labor Day —Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day —Sept. 30
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits may be issued; or	Day after Labor Day —Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season
1 bull by drawing permit only, by bow and arrow only; up to 10 permits may be issued	Oct. 20—Nov. 15	No open season

...

ISSUE: Moose in Unit 14C are managed intensively for a population objective of 1,500-1,800 moose and an annual harvest objective of 90-270 moose. In 2011, we estimated a moose population of approximately 1,500 moose. At this population level, we have experienced a dramatic decline in human-moose conflicts and decreased winter mortalities. Harvesting cow moose is paramount to maintaining the population at the low end of the objective while providing adequate harvest opportunity.

Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually. During summer, an estimated 200-300 moose inhabit the Anchorage metropolitan area. This number can increase up to 700-1,000 moose during the winter, when moose move into the metropolitan area from the surrounding mountain valleys. As a result, high moose densities cause severe overbrowsing in some areas and lead to an increased incidence of moose-vehicle collisions and conflicts with humans. The number of antlerless permits we issue depends on the current population estimate and bull:cow ratios, as well as estimated winter mortality (Table 1).

Table 1.

Regulatory Year	Either Sex Permits	Antlerless Permits	Cows Harvested
2003	55	60	32
2004	57	80	20
2005	100	46	33
2006	110	46	33
2007	110	40	37
2008	110	35	36
2009	110	25	29
2010	110	23	31

2011	67	23	25
2012	58	23	18
2013	58	23	

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will be unable to maintain the moose numbers at the low end of the population objective. As a result, moose will continue to overbrowse winter habitat and mortality of moose attributable to collisions with vehicles and starvation during severe winters will continue.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who acquire permits for antlerless moose hunts. People who believe there are too many moose in the Anchorage Bowl.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to hunting antlerless moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None. These hunts have been successful in creating additional moose hunting opportunity in the state's most heavily populated area with little or no controversy. They may also ameliorate overbrowsing in the limited winter range and reduce vehicle collisions and conflicts with residents in nearby urban areas.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613933

PROPOSAL 129 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the drawing permit hunts for antlerless moose in Unit 14A, and the existing targeted winter hunt for antlerless moose in Units 14A and 14B as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
Unit 14(A)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
...		
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 1000	Aug. 20-Sept. 25 (General hunt only)	No open season

antlerless moose permits may be issued; or	Nov. 1-Dec. 15 (General hunt only)	
1 moose by targeted permit only; by shotgun or archery only; up to 200 permits may be issued	Winter season to be announced (General hunt only)	No open season.

Unit 14(B)

1 moose per regulatory year,
only as follows:

...

1 moose by targeted permit only; by shotgun or archery only; up to 100 permits may be issued	Winter season to be announced (General hunt only)	No open season.
---	---	-----------------

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the Board of Game. Moose surveys conducted in November 2011 resulted in an estimate of 7,467 moose in subunit 14A. This estimate was greater than the post-hunt objective of 6,000 – 6,500 moose and is an increase from the results of the 2008 survey that produced an estimate of 6,613 moose. A 2012 composition survey estimated the bull ratio to be 26 bulls:100 cows and the calf ratio to be 28 calves:100 cows.

Based on current projections, the subunit 14A moose population is expected to grow and continue to exceed population objectives. If the density of moose is allowed to increase, we anticipate an increase the number of moose-human conflicts, and moose may experience nutritional stress as the population nears carrying capacity. Cow harvests are warranted to prevent control the moose population's growth and recommended as a way to provide additional moose hunting opportunity in the Mat-Su Valley.

The targeted moose hunt in subunits 14A and 14B is an effective tool to address public safety concerns related to moose-vehicle collision and nuisance management issues.

Moose-vehicle collisions result in property damage and may result in human injury or death. An average of 266 moose per year were killed in the Mat-Su Valley area during the last few years of average snowfall and substantially more were killed during higher snowfall years. The Department of Fish and Game (department) also receives periodic complaints from the public about crop depredation and aggressive behavior that can be mitigated by this hunt structure.

The department uses this hunt to mitigate public safety concerns by issuing permits to selected hunters and assigning them to hunt areas that correspond with areas of high moose-vehicle

collisions or reoccurring nuisance issues. Eligible hunters are selected randomly from a list of pre-registered hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Portions of the Unit 14A moose population could grow beyond the ability of the habitat to sustain the population. Increased cases of starvation, conflicts with humans, and vehicle collisions will occur.

Portions of the subunit 14A and 14B moose populations will continue to be killed on the roads and highways of the Matanuska – Susitna Valley area. Increasing conflicts with humans and vehicle collisions will occur as the human population of the Mat-Su Borough continues to grow.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; excessively high moose density can lead to nutritionally stressed animals in the harvest, and moose harvested under the targeted hunt regulation will generally have better quality meat than that provided through the state’s road kill program.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All who wish a healthy, productive moose population in the Mat-Su Valley, wish to reduce motor-vehicle/moose collisions and conflicts with humans, and those who wish to use antlerless moose for human consumption.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who oppose the harvest of antlerless moose and/or winter moose hunts.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Winter drawing antlerless moose hunts.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613932

PROPOSAL 130 - 5 AAC 085.045(13). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Unit 15C as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident	Nonresident
	Open Season	
	Subsistence and General Hunts)	Open Season
(13)		

...

Unit 15(C), that portion south of the south fork of the Anchor River and northwest of Kachemak Bay

1 bull with spike antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or	Aug. 20—Sept. 20 (General Hunt only)	No open season
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; the taking of calves, and females accompa- nied by calves, is prohibited; up to 100 permits may be issued	Aug. 20—Sept. 20	Aug. 20-Sept. 20

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. The Homer benchland in Unit 15C often holds high moose densities in winters when deep snow pushes the moose down into human populated areas. Even without deep snow, a high number of moose die due to malnutrition and negative interactions with humans are common as moose become more aggressive in their search for food around human residences.

In February 2013, 1218 moose were counted during a population survey in the northern portion of Unit 15C, of which 13.7% were calves (19 calves:100 cows). Fall composition counts in November 2012 provided a bull ratio of 22 bulls:100 cows. The number of permits issued will depend on the fall 2013 survey information for this area. Fifty permits were issued in each of the last 10 years resulting in an average harvest of 23 cows per year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Deep snow winters will result in a high number of moose deaths due to malnutrition and continued conflicts between aggressive moose and humans.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? A limited antlerless moose hunt may improve overall browse quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wildlife viewers and hunters receiving permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals opposed to antlerless moose hunts.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613935

PROPOSAL 131 - 5 AAC 085.045(14). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt on Kalgin Island in Unit 16B as follows:

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

(14)

...

Unit 16(B), Kalgin Island

1 moose per regulatory year,
by registration permit only

Aug. 20 - Sept. 20

Aug. 20 - Sept. 20

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually. The population objective for this predator-free, 23-mi² island is 20-40 moose, a density of 1-1.75 moose/mi². During a December 2012 survey, Department of Fish and Game (department) staff counted 104 moose, approximately 4.5 moose/mi². Because of concerns of over-population and deteriorating habitat conditions, a drawing permit hunt for cows was initiated in 1995. In an attempt to reduce the population quickly, the Board of Game established a registration hunt for any moose for the fall 1999 season. The population of moose on Kalgin Island is high at this time and remains above the objective of 20-40.

The "any moose" registration hunt is recommended to provide additional mortality on this predator-free island population. A registration hunt also allows the department to continue gathering biological information from specimens provided by successful hunters. The difficult hunting conditions and limited access will minimize the danger of over-harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Without a liberal harvest including cows and calves, the population will continue to exceed the island's carrying capacity, resulting in habitat damage and ultimately decline in moose numbers through starvation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If the island population size is kept at or near objective levels, moose will have adequate available forage and therefore, show less sign of being nutritionally stressed.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who make the effort to get to Kalgin Island will have the opportunity to take any moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Seasonal residents of Kalgin Island have been concerned about hunters trespassing on their land and cabins. The current season dates concentrate hunter activity when most seasonal residents are present.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A general season for any moose will also work to lower moose densities, but would diminish the ability to collect biological information.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613936

PROPOSAL 132 - 5 AAC 85.045(15). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the existing winter hunt for antlerless moose in Unit 17A as follows:

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

(15)

...

Unit 17(A)

Up to 2 moose per
regulatory year only as follows:

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by registration permit only; or	Aug. 25-Sept. 20 (Subsistence hunt only)
---	---

Up to 2 moose by registration permit; during the period Dec. 1 - Jan. 31, a season of up to 31 days may be announced by emergency order	(To be announced) (Subsistence hunt only)
--	--

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the Board of Game (board). The board adopted an antlerless moose hunt in Unit 17A in support of the Unit 17A Moose Management Plan, which was modified during a meeting of the Unit 17A Moose Management Planning Group in December 2012. The planning group consists of entities interested in the management of this moose population and includes representatives from the Bristol Bay Federal

Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, the Nushagak and Togiak Fish and Game Advisory Committees, the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge, and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game Unit 17 management office.

According to the third goal of the revised Unit 17A Moose Management Plan, antlerless moose hunting opportunity can be offered when the population is above 600 moose and increasing. The revised plan also recommends that a bag limit of up to two moose when the population exceeds 1,200 moose. Based on the most recent surveys, there were 1,166 moose in Unit 17A during March 2011.

The moose population in subunit 17A is growing and can sustain additional harvest; however, the objectives for this population include allowing it to expand into neighboring areas as well as provide for additional harvest opportunity. The population is currently contributing to the growth of moose populations, especially to the north and west.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population in Unit 17A will continue to grow and could eventually experience nutritional limitations. Any potential antlerless moose hunting opportunity that could be realized at this stage of the population's growth would be forgone.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Reauthorizing the antlerless moose hunts in Unit 17A will help control population growth with the goal of promoting continued high recruitment rates and widespread distribution of moose in the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone who participates in this hunt and anyone who thinks this population should be managed for long-term sustained yield and human consumption.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who oppose the harvest of antlerless moose and/or winter moose hunts.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613937

Statewide Regulations

Proposal Index

Hunter Education

- 133 Require IBEP certification for all big game bow hunters, statewide.
- 134 Modify the IBEP requirements for all bears taken over bait by bow and arrow, statewide.

Harvest Tickets, Permits, Reports, and Hunts

- 135 Specify game taken for certain religious ceremonies is to be used within this state.
- 136 Establish a definition for general hunts.
- 137 Establish definitions for subsistence hunting and subsistence uses.
- 138 Establish emergency subsistence moose hunt procedures.
- 139 Remove harvest ticket requirement and require harvest reports for certain non-permit hunts.
- 140 Require each harvest report or permit to specify whether the hunt was conducted to provide a wildfood harvest for subsistence uses or for recreational values.
- 141 Specify where locking tags are to be affixed.
- 142 Remove the requirement to show applicable licenses and permits to peace officers or department employees.
- 143 Repeal the requirement for raw fur shipping permits.
- 144 Repeal the requirement for an export permit or shipping tag and an export report or postcard prior to transporting raw skins of fur animals and fur bearers from Alaska.
- 145 Increase the number allowed to apply for party/group draw hunts to three hunters.
- 146 Remove the reference to a proof of guide contract and guide use area registration at the time of application for drawing hunts.

Permits for Possessing Live Game (Clean List)

- 147 Add five species of domestic finches to the list of animals allowed to be sold and possessed without a permit
- 148 Add the hamster genus, *Phodopus sp.*, to the list of animals allowed to be sold and possessed without a permit.
- 149 Clarify regulations regarding Muridae rodents.
- 150 Clarify regulation prohibiting possession of a wolf or wolf hybrid.

Migratory Birds, Waterfowl

- 151 Require guides to keep migratory bird log books /questionnaires.
- 152 Modify the definition of edible meat for wildfowl.
- 153 Modify the definition of hindquarter for wildfowl.
- 154 Modify the definition of trophy to include salvage of edible meat, and to include wildfowl.
- 155 Modify the definition of possession limit for migratory birds.

Sealing and Salvage Requirements

- 156 Modify the definition of processed for human consumption.
- 157 Modify the definition of salvage.
- 158 Modify the definition of edible meat for brown bear.
- 159 Remove the meat salvage requirement for brown bear taken over bait.
- 160 Modify the definition of edible meat for brown bear to match black bear.
- 161 Modify the definition of edible meat for brown bear to match black bear.
- 162 Clarify that brown bear can be taken over bait under the conditions of a permit.
- 163 Allow use of bear meat and bones not required to be salvaged to be used as bait.

Intensive Management

- 164 Require the department to compile a yearly predator management/predator control report.
- 165 Repeal the special provisions in predation control areas concerning the sale of hides and skulls, and allowing airborne hunters to harvest black bear over bait.

Definitions

- 166 Establish a definition for transporter.
- 167 Establish a definition for guide and assistant guide.
- 168 Establish a definition for brow palm.
- 169 Establish a definition for broken, as it pertains to a full-curl horn of male Dall sheep.
- 170 Modify the definition for full-curl horn of male Dall sheep.
- 171 Modify the definition for full-curl horn of male Dall sheep.
- 172 Remove black bears from the furbearer classification.
- 173 Modify the definition for bag limit, and define mortally wounded.

Falconry

- 174 Allow nonresident falconers to capture raptors

Miscellaneous

- 175 Review and determine the advisory committees that have jurisdiction for approving antlerless moose hunts.

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
Statewide Regulations, Cycle A Schedule
March 14-18, 2014
Dena'ina Civic and Convention Center
Anchorage, Alaska

~TENTATIVE AGENDA~

NOTE: This Tentative Agenda is subject to change throughout the course of the meeting.

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

Friday, March 14, 8:30 AM

OPENING BUSINESS

Call to Order

Introductions of Board Members and Staff

Board Member Ethics Disclosures

Purpose of Meeting (overview)

STAFF AND OTHER REPORTS

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

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

Saturday, March 15, 8:30 AM

PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY Continued

BOARD DELIBERATIONS (Upon conclusion of public testimony)

Sunday, March 16 – Tuesday, March 18, 8:30 AM

BOARD DELIBERATIONS Continued

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

ADJOURN

Special Notes

- A. This agenda is TENTATIVE and subject to change during the meeting. A list of staff reports and a roadmap will be available at the meeting. Scheduled updates will be available on the Board of Game website.
- B. Meeting materials are available at: www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=gameboard.meetinginfo or by contacting the ADF&G Boards Support Office in Juneau at 465-4110.
- C. A live audio stream for the meeting is intended to be available at: www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov
- D. The State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game complies with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). Individuals with disabilities who may need auxiliary aids, services, and/or special modifications to participate in this hearing and public meeting should contact 465-4110 no later than February 28, 2014 to make any necessary arrangements.

Hunter Education

PROPOSAL 133 - 5 AAC 92.003. Hunter education and orientation requirements. Require IBEP certification for all big game hunters, statewide as follows:

Education requirements bowhunters: an International Bowhunter Education Program (IBEP), or equivalent certification, is required to hunt big game with a bow and arrow in Alaska, remainder of requirements as currently written.

ISSUE: Make bow hunter education a requirement of all hunting with bow and arrow.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo, but not the best education for the hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Requiring all bowhunters to have IBEP certification will make all bowhunters equivalent, not just those hunting in "archery only" hunts. This will improve hunter ethics, knowledge, and shooting competency.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The game being hunted, and fellow hunters who currently have the required certification.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those bowhunters who do not currently have IBEP certification, and do not want to take the class.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? If the original premise for requiring IBEP certification is valid (it is) then the rationale should apply to all bowhunters equally. There really is no down side to this proposal that I can see.

PROPOSED BY: Len Malmquist EG042013750

PROPOSAL 134 - 5 AAC 92.003. Hunter education and orientation requirements. Provide options to align International Bowhunter Education Program requirements for all bears taken over bait by bow and arrow, statewide as follows:

5 AAC 92.003. Hunter education and orientation requirements.

Option 1-remove International Bowhunter Education Program (IBEP) requirement for all bears taken over bait statewide:

...

(g) [A PERSON MAY NOT TAKE A BLACK BEAR OVER BAIT IN UNIT 7 AND UNITS 14 - 16 WITH A BOW AND ARROW UNLESS THE PERSON HAS

SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED A DEPARTMENT - APPROVED BOWHUNTING COURSE.]

Option 2-align brown bear with current requirements for black bear:

...

(g) A person may not take a [BLACK] bear over bait in Unit 7 and Units 14 - 16 with a bow and arrow unless the person has successfully completed a department - approved bowhunting course.

Option 3-expand IBEP requirement for all bears taken over bait statewide:

...

(g) A person may not take a [BLACK] bear over bait [IN UNIT 7 AND UNITS 14 – 16] with a bow and arrow unless the person has successfully completed a department - approved bowhunting course.

ISSUE: In March of 2012 the Board of Game passed a regulation that allowed the take of brown bears at bait sites and stated that all of the regulations in 5 AAC 92.044 applied. An additional regulation requiring IBEP or equivalent for bowhunters harvesting black bears over bait in Units 7 and 14-16 is found under 5 AAC 92.003-Hunter education and orientation requirements. The Department of Fish and Game (department) would like to make the requirement for IBEP the same for both black and brown bears, and has presented three options for making the change.

Currently, taking brown bears over black bear bait sites is allowed in Units 7, 12, 13D, 15, 16, 20C, 20E, and 21D. Without alignment of the regulation, bowhunters taking a black bear over bait in Units 7, 15 and 16 would be required to be IBEP certified, but bowhunters taking a brown bear in these same units, even at the same site, would NOT be required to have IBEP certification.

This proposal seeks to align the regulations for all bears taken over bait. The department has no recommendation, other than aligning both bear species to prevent confusion and simplify regulations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be differing regulations regarding what hunters can and can't do at bait stations dependent on the targeted species.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will benefit greatly by being able to more clearly understand what is and is not allowed at bait stations because the regulations regarding the two species will be aligned.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Require IBEP certification statewide for all big game hunters using bow and arrow.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613948

Harvest Tickets, Permits, Reports and Hunts

PROPOSAL 135 - 5 AAC 92.019. Taking of big game for certain religious ceremonies. Specify game taken for certain religious ceremonies is to be used within this state as follows:

5 AAC 92.019. Taking of big game for certain religious ceremonies. (a) The hunting and taking of game species having a positive finding in 5 AAC 99.025, outside the seasons or bag limits established in 5 AAC 85, for use within Alaska as food in customary and traditional Alaska Native funerary or mortuary religious ceremonies within 12 months preceding the ceremony is authorized if consistent with sustained yield principles.

ISSUE: During the Statewide Board of Game (board) meeting in 2012 the board specified game taken for cultural purposes was to be used within this state. The regulation for taking game for certain religious ceremonies was not on the call for proposals at that time so the board was unable to change this very similar regulation until now.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The regulations for use of game for cultural purposes and for religious ceremonies will not be consistent relative to limiting use within the state.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those attempting to follow the regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613924

PROPOSAL 136 - 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. Establish definitions for subsistence hunting and subsistence uses as follows:

General hunt means: a hunt that is regulated in a nonsubsistence area; a regulated hunt that lays outside a nonsubsistence area and the game being taken does not have a positive finding of customary and traditional (C&T); when the harvestable surplus is above the maximum amount necessary for subsistence (ANS) and the board has determined other uses can exist; nonresident opportunity.

ISSUE: Create a new definition for general hunts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The term “general hunts” appears mainly in Section 84 (in regulation) hunting season and bag limits. The other term used is subsistence

hunts (both are used somewhat randomly). Some have no designation. We need to keep subsistence opportunity or allocation separate from nonsubsistence uses. This new definition is needed to keep the harvest accounted for by who are eligible and the choice or level the user participates in.

If you research Section 84, you will find many inconsistencies of our issue. Examples of three, but there are many more, are:

1. 5 AAC 85.025, Unit 20E Fortymile caribou: This population has a positive C&T. Yet there is no designation of subsistence or general season. How do users know what kind of hunt they are participating in? How is the harvest accounted for? Was the resident harvest all subsistence? Are all residents participating as subsistence users?

2.5 AAC 85.045, Unit 25B moose: This population has a positive C&T and has been designed as a general hunt. Clearly it is a subsistence opportunity.

3.5 AAC 85.056, wolves, 85.057, wolverine, and 85.060, furbearers: Outside any of the nonsubsistence areas, all these game have a positive C&T, yet they are designed as general hunts.

What we are pointing out here is how do Alaskans know if they are participating in a subsistence allocation or not? Does an individual want to participate in a subsistence hunt? And how do we record the harvest, subsistence or other uses? This becomes real important data when determine ANS. We should also expect consistency in our regulations.

We also will point out in each section of game species (Section 85) it says: “(a) in this section, the phrase “general hunt only” means that there is a general hunt for residents, but no subsistence hunt, during the relevant open season. For those units or portions of units within the nonsubsistence areas established by the Joint Board of Fisheries and Game (5AAC 99.015), there is a general hunt only”.

This also seems inconsistent with how it is applied as we pointed out and you can review throughout Section 85 (most notable in 85.056 - 060).

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal addresses accountability of what allocation the users participate at (subsistence, nonsubsistence, or nonresident). It also addresses the accountability of the harvest as to what harvest took place, subsistence or other uses.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskan users, whereas it will be clear at what level of opportunity residents are participating at. Residents should know when they are participating in a subsistence opportunity and their effort be recorded as such, to protect all subsistence uses.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Somewhat the Department of Fish and Game, as they will have to make many clerical fixes in regulation. The traditional harvest reports/tickets should be

addressed as there is no statement or language inferring that these are general hunt harvest reports/tickets.

The Board of Game, as they will have to clearly distinguish between what is a subsistence opportunity by residents and what is a general hunt. Most likely could be achieved by separate permits and or season dates, when dealing with game that has a positive C&T finding.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Al Barrette

EG043013843

PROPOSAL 137 - 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. Establish a definition for subsistence hunting and subsistence uses as follows:

The Board of Game (board) should adopt definitions under 5 AAC 92.990 for both "subsistence hunting" and "subsistence uses" consistent with the Alaska State Constitution (Article 8, Section 3) regarding common use of public wildfood resources.

ISSUE: Use of location of domicile as a factor in determining subsistence users.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A quarter of a century (1989) after the Alaska Supreme Court struck down the rural residency requirement for subsistence users it's still printed in statute: AS 16.05.940(31) - (33), AS 16.05.258(b)(4)(B)(ii) and in regulation 5 AAC 99.010(c)(2). If the statutory definitions for "subsistence hunting" and "subsistence uses" continue to require an unconstitutional rural residency to participate in a subsistence hunt the board should adopt their own definitions consistent with numerous Alaska Supreme Court rulings.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposal is allocative in nature.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaskans who believe game regulations should be consistent with the letter of the law.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who believe the state should implement a rural subsistence priority to public wildfood resources regardless of numerous Alaska Supreme Court rulings to the contrary.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Having the board request that the legislature amend all references to "domiciled in a rural area" out of the state subsistence law, AS 16.05.258 and definitions, AS 16.05.940. Not likely to happen soon, this simple solution continues to remain unachievable in the current political climate in Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Outdoor Council

EG042913834

PROPOSAL 138 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. New Section. Establish emergency subsistence moose hunt procedures as follows:

Allow so many moose to be harvested in each village for emergency subsistence hunts, according to village population and moose population (to be determined); moose to be divided and distributed by authorities.

ISSUE: The need for emergency subsistence moose hunt in time of no access to food because of state, national or natural disaster. The Alaska Food Policy Council suggested this action.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If people get hungry there will be no control over how many moose are harvested and moose populations could plummet if an emergency regulation is not in place (similar to potlatch regulations).

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hungry people and the moose population so the risk of wiping them out is reduced.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Villagers and moose alike will suffer much less if solution is adopted. Authorities will have multiple arrests.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Raising cattle or buffalo is not practical now. Not making a regulation and just shooting what we want at any time. The law won't matter.

PROPOSED BY: Ed Sarten, Alaska Food Policy Council

EG042913820

PROPOSAL 139 - 5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets and reports. Remove the harvest ticket requirement and require harvest reports for certain non-permit hunts as follows:

(a) The number of each harvest [TICKET] **report** issued to a hunter must be entered on the hunter's license. A harvest [TICKET] **report** issued the previous calendar year and still valid must also be entered on the hunting license.

[(B) AFTER KILLING AN ANIMAL FOR WHICH A HARVEST TICKET IS REQUIRED, THE HUNTER SHALL REMOVE IMMEDIATELY, BEFORE LEAVEING THE KILL SITE, THE DAY AND MONTH OF THE KILL FROM THE HARVEST TICKET WITHOUT REMOVING ANY OTHER DAY OR MONTH, AND SHALL KEEP THE VALIDATED HARVEST TICKET IN POSSESSION UNTIL THE ANIMAL HAS BEEN DELIVERED TO THE LOCATION WHERE IT WILL BE PROCCESED FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION.]

(c) Within 15 days after taking the bag limit for a species or, if the hunter does not take the bag limit, within 15 days after the close of the season, the hunter shall submit a completed harvest report to the department. A person may not falsify any fact on a harvest report submitted to the department under this subsection.

(d) A hunter who is younger than 10 years of age may not be issued a big game harvest [TICKET] report.

(e) For a permit hunt, the permit takes the place of a harvest [TICKET AND] report.

f) For deer, a person may not hunt deer, except in a permit hunt, unless the person has [IN POSSESSION A DEER HARVEST TICKET, AND IN UNITS 1 - 6, AND 8 HAS] obtained a harvest report [(ISSUED WITH THE HARVEST TICKET). IN UNITS 1 - 6 AND UNIT 8, A PERSON MUST

(1) HAVE IN POSSESSION THAT PERSON'S UNUSED DEER HARVEST TICKETS WHILE HUNTING DEER; AND

(2) VALIDATE THE DEER HARVEST TICKET IN SEQUENTIAL ORDER, BEING WITH HARVEST TICKET NUMBER ONE.]

(g) For caribou, a person may not hunt caribou, except in a permit hunt, unless the person [HAS IN POSSESSION A HARVEST TICKET AND] has obtained a harvest report [(ISSUED WITH THE HARVEST TICKET); HOWEVER A PERSON WHO RESIDES NORTH OF THE YUKON RIVER AND IS HUNTING NORTH OF THE YUKON RIVER IS NOT REQUIRED TO USE HARVEST TICKETS OR HARVEST REPORTS BUT MUST REGISTER TO HUNT CARIBOU IN THE ARTIC.]

(h) For moose and sheep, a person may not hunt moose or sheep, except in a permit hunt or in the Gates of the Arctic National Park, unless the person has [IN POSSESSION A HARVEST TICKET FOR THE SPECIES AND HAS] obtained a harvest report [(ISSUED WITH THE HARVEST TICKET); HOWEVER, A PERSON WHO IS HUNTING DALL SHEEP IN THE GATES OF THE ARCTIC NATIONAL PARK MUST REGISTER WITH THE DEPARTMENT.]

(i) For elk, a person who takes an elk in Units 1 - 5 where a drawing or registration permit is not required shall report the sex and location of the kill to the department's division of wildlife conservation office in Petersburg within five days of harvest.

(j) For black bear, a nonresident hunter who takes a black bear on Kuiu Island in Unit 3 shall report the sex and location of the kill to the department's division of wildlife conservation office in Petersburg within five days of harvest.

(k) Repealed 7/1/2010.

(l) For black bear, a person may not hunt black bear in Units 1 - 7, 11 - 16, 19(D), and 20, except when a permit is required, unless the person has [IN POSSESSION A HARVEST TICKET FOR THE SPECIES AND HAS] obtained a harvest report. [(ISSUED WITH THE HARVEST TICKET).]

ISSUE: Remove/peel the harvest ticket requirement. Require hunters to obtain a harvest report prior to taking moose, deer, caribou, black bear, elk and Dall sheep that are not permit hunts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? 1. Harvest tickets have little to no value to the Department of Fish and Game (department), Board of Game (board), or the management of wildlife resources specified. The vast majority of citations issue for harvest tickets and reports are for hunters not immediately validating harvest tickets (even though the take was lawful in all aspects). Currently only permit hunts and general season moose, caribou, deer, some black bear and Dall sheep hunts have a harvest ticket associated with them. Why?

A.) One may conclude, so an unlawful individual will not be able to harvest over the bag limit. Yet the board has allowed the harvest of all waterfowl, small game, fur bearers, and big game wolves, wolverines, some black bears and grizzly bears without harvest tickets requirements. Most have some kind of bag limits associated with the take. So is this a valid concern? It would appear the board may not be concern about unlawful/possession take of these game animals.

B.) Harvest tickets must be validated and in possession while transporting the harvest game.

If this regulation passes, the hunter would still have to be in possession of a hunting license, which will have the harvest report number recorded on the back of the license (per requirement of existing regulation, no change). This still gives wildlife enforcement the ability to validate legality of harvest and bag limits. If game harvested and not in possession of the harvester, then as required via, transfer of possession is required (5AAC 92.135).

2. There are currently still some hunts under this regulation that do not require a state harvest report. This harvest data is vital to the department and the board in addressing new management plans of state wildlife resources, regardless of land ownership or status of hunters (state, federal, or subsistence). This should be changed so all game harvested under this regulation is accounted for and hunters are accountable for information given.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Harvest reports: We all have been to many board meetings only to witness incomplete harvest data, gaps in yearly harvest information, and or best guess estimations of harvest data.

Harvest tickets: Has no direct impact on the improvement or quality of the resource harvested. But it does affect hunters who may have followed all regulations in the take of the resource but failed to validate the harvest ticket and in most cases receive a citation. This is not really necessary.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Harvest reports: Board members, as they have to make decisions on allocation, seasons and numbers of animals to be harvested. The department as they have to present best available data to the board. Subsistence users and other users as they want the most opportunity to harvest state wildlife resources. To protect subsistence user and uses.

Harvest tickets: Hunters, as they would not be cited for not properly validating harvested tickets.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Al Barrette

EG042913825

PROPOSAL 140 - 5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets and reports. Require each harvest report or permit to specify whether the hunt was conducted to provide a wildfood harvest for subsistence uses or for recreational values as follows:

5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets and reports. Add the requirement to specify on each harvest report or permit whether the hunt was conducted to provide a wildfood harvest for subsistence uses or for recreational values.

ISSUE: Aid Alaska Department of Fish and Game's Division of Subsistence in achieving its legislative mandate found in Alaska Statute 16.05.094 to report subsistence hunting harvest data for all Alaskan residents. Currently data necessary for the Board of Game to determine the amount necessary for subsistence (ANS), numbers for customary and traditional (C&T) populations are not being accurately gathered.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Alaska Department of Fish and Game's Division of Subsistence will continue to provide the board with inaccurate subsistence harvest data for Alaskan resident hunters living in state nonsubsistence areas, 5 AAC 99.010. The Department of Fish and Game lacks the funding necessary to gather household subsistence harvest survey data for 83% of the state population residing in state nonsubsistence areas.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, the proposal when adopted would provide more credible subsistence harvest data to the board to rely on when deliberating on subsistence use proposals.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Law abiding Alaskan residents who choose to live in state nonsubsistence areas and continue to participate in a subsistence way of life.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who prefer that only rural Alaskan residents have a priority to publicly owned subsistence food resources.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Amend 5 AAC 99.030. Eligibility for subsistence and general hunts, to include issuances of a recreational hunting license for nonsubsistence hunts. Rejected this solution for the sake of simplicity of just adding a box to check off on a harvest report or permit.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Outdoor Council

EG042913831

PROPOSAL 141 - 5 AAC 92.012. Licenses and tags. Specify where locking tags are to be affixed as follows:

If the Board of Game chooses to adopt this change the new regulation would read as follows;

5 AAC 92.012(E) : In any hunt where a numbered, non-transferable locking tag is required, a person taking big game shall immediately affix the locking tag to the portion of the animal required to be salvaged from the field and the person shall keep the tag affixed until the animal is prepared for storage, consumed or exported.

ISSUE: Create a new section in 92.012 that addresses where locking tags must be affixed when required. Under AS 16.05.340 (15) and (20), nonresidents and nonresident aliens are required to affix a locking tag to the animal immediately upon capture and it must remain affixed until the animal is prepared for storage, consumed or exported. For residents, locking tags are required to be affixed on musk ox and brown bear (where required) and the resident taking the game shall immediately affix the tag to the animal and shall keep the tag affixed until the animal is prepared for storage, consumed or exported. The specific problem is that different animals have different salvage requirements. A hunter could attach a locking tag to a black bear hide and then leave the hide with the tag attached in the field and not be in violation if the bear was taken during the time that salvage of the hide was optional.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If this problem is not addressed, hunters will continue to be confused about their requirement for affixing locking tags on harvested animals.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who do not know which part of the animal the locking tag must be affixed to.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Troopers

EG043013836

PROPOSAL 142 - 5 AAC 92.012. Licenses and tags. Remove the requirement to show applicable licenses and permits to peace officers or department employees as follows:

5AAC 92.012(b) [UPON REQUEST FROM AN EMPLOYEE OF THE DEPARTMENT OR A PEACE OFFICE, A PERSON MAY NOT REFUSE TO PRESENT FOR INSPECTION ANY

LICENSE, HARVEST TICKET, PERMIT, OR TAG, ANY GAME, OR ANY APPARATUS DESIGNED TO BE AND CAPABLE OF BEING, USED TO TAKE GAME.]

All persons engaged in hunting or trapping or in possession of game must show their hunting or trapping license, special permit, or stamps to any department employee or peace officer. (This mirrors what the regulation states for fishing. (5 AAC 75.005))

ISSUE: Violation of our civil liberties. The Alaska Constitution grants us protection of unwarranted searches and seizures. In Article 1 sec.3 and sec. 7 and sec.14., also AS 16.05.180 says each peace officer designated in AS 16.05.150 may without a warrant search anything or place if the search is reasonable or is not protected from searches and seizures without warrant within the meaning of art. I, Sec. 14, Alaska State Constitution, which specifically enumerates "persons, houses and other property, papers and effects." However, before a search without warrant is made, a signed written statement by the person making the search shall be submitted to the person in control of the property or object to be searched, stating the reason the search is being conducted. A written receipt shall be given by the person conducting the search for property which is taken as a result of the search. The enumeration of specific things does not limit the meaning of words in nature.

We realize hunting and trapping are highly regulated activities. But operating a motor vehicle is also a highly regulated activity. A peace officer of the state cannot stop you, as a primary reason, just to see if you have a valid driver's license. Nor do you have to allow him to search your vehicle without a warrant.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Having language in regulation saying, "no person may refuse to present for inspection any license or tag, any game, or apparatus designed to be, and capable of being, used to take game". This allows law enforcement to ask for licenses, tags, or permits at any time or anywhere. It also allows those same persons to inspect all apparatuses any time or anywhere. I can only conclude that apparatuses are vehicles, ATVs, boats, firearms and so on (personal property). I believe 5AAC 92.012 (b) is not supported by statute. In fact the statute that gives this regulation authority 16.05.330 (a) says: "Except as otherwise permitted in this chapter, without having the appropriate license or tag in actual possession, a person may not engage in (2) hunting, trapping or fur dealing". So, you must possess these while engaged in hunting or trapping. The statute also says nothing about inspecting. But we may assume the intent of the statute gives law enforcement the ability to check licenses or tags while engaged in hunting or trapping, but it says nothing about apparatuses. This regulation needs to be amended.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All persons hunting and trapping. As rights that were granted to us through our constitution, Alaskans should not have to forfeit those rights when they accept a state license. Also there would be no difference between when fish users are by regulation obligated to produce proper licensing versus when a hunter or trapper is obligated by regulation to produce proper licensing.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Law enforcement, as they may argue that you may be taking away a tool of theirs to catch possible violators of wildlife regulations. Are not our freedoms and protection granted to us by the Constitution and in this case State Statute more important?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Use 5 AAC 75.005. We did not reject it, just amended it to fit the game side.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee

EG042613795

PROPOSAL 143 - 5 AAC 92.025. Permit for exporting a raw skin. Repeal the requirement for raw fur shipping permit as follows:

Repeal the regulation, 5 AAC 92.025. If it is not going to be enforced, why have it as a citable offense.

ISSUE: Importance of data collected by the Department of Fish and Game (department) from the Raw Fur Shipping Permit? How can a fur buyer/taxidermist sign a statement that the furs they are shipping were legally taken and possessed, if the fur buyer/taxidermist was not involved with the take?

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Is the data that is collected from the permit viable in the management of fur bearer populations? Data that is asked for such as “taken in GMU” only applies to an individual trapper/hunter not fur buyers or taxidermists. If raw fur is shipped outside the state without a permit, an individual is susceptible to a state wildlife violation and could be also prosecuted by the federal wildlife enforcement as a Lacy Act violation. Furthermore if the shipment of raw fur has a value of over \$500.00 this would be federal felony under the Lacy Act provision. Carriers and post offices are also susceptible to violations under this permit, as they are not allowed to accept or ship a package that contains raw fur without the documentation/permit on the outside of the package. Carriers and post offices don’t ask if you are shipping raw fur. This still does not exempt them from prosecution.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Does not.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans. Persons shipping raw fur will not have to find or locate raw fur shipping permits or identify to the public that their package contains raw fur. The department may, as we do not know how this data is important to them, as it really only tells them what fur has left the state and some data as what unit it was taken in (if a hunter/ trapper is shipping).

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Alaskans shipping raw fur. We don’t know of a case in which an individual has ever been prosecuted for not having a permit, nor have we ever heard of it being enforced. But the state did refuse to cite persons for not having a permit when U.S. Fish and Wildlife (though one of their investigations) had made them aware of Alaskans shipping raw fur to a tannery outside for dressing and not in compliance with this regulation.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Leaving it as is. Not a productive process.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee

EG042613794

PROPOSAL 144 - 5 AAC 92.025. Permit for exporting a raw skin. Repeal the requirement for an export permit or shipping tag and an export report or postcard prior to transporting raw skins of fur animals and fur bearers from Alaska as follows:

5 AAC 92.025. Permit for exporting a raw skin. Repealed [(a) NO PERSON MAY SHIP, MAIL, OR OTHERWISE TRANSPORT FROM ALASKA THE RAW SKIN OF A WILD FUR ANIMAL OR FUR BEARER UNLESS THE PERSON FIRST OBTAINS AN EXPORT PERMIT OR SHIPPING TAG AND AN EXPORT REPORT OR POSTCARD AVAILABLE FROM THE DEPARTMENT, POST OFFICES, OR COMMERCIAL CARRIERS.

(b) A PERSON WHO SHIPS, MAILES, OR OTHERWISE TRANSPORTS FROM ALASKA THE RAW SKIN OF A WILD FUR ANIMAL OR FUR BEARER SHALL ATTACH A FUR EXPORT PERMIT TO THE OUTSIDE OF ANY PACKAGE CONTAINING THE RAW SKIN AND SHALL INCLUDE A STATEMENT THAT EACH SKIN WAS LEGALLY TAKEN AND POSSESSED. NO CARRIER OR POST OFFICE MAY ACCEPT FOR SHIPMENT FROM ALASKA A RAW SKIN OF A WILD FUR ANIMAL OR FUR BEARER UNLESS A FUR EXPORT PERMIT IS ATTACHED. BEFORE SHIPMENT, THE PERSON SHIPPING, MAILING, OR OTHERWISE TRANSPORTING THE RAW SKIN SHALL DETACH THE FUR EXPORT REPORT FROM THE FUR EXPORT PERMIT, AND SHALL COMPLETE IT AND MAIL IT TO THE DEPARTMENT.]

ISSUE: The information obtained from the raw fur skin export cards is not used by the Department of Fish and Game (department) and the department would like to remove this undue burden on the public. If the state regulation requiring the export report form is removed, the hunter or trapper can use anything to label the outside of the box and be in compliance.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters and trappers will continue to be confused by overlapping state and federal shipping regulations.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those shipping raw furs out of state.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613923

PROPOSAL 145 - 5 AAC . 92.XXX. New Section. Increase the number allowed to apply for party/group hunts to three hunters as follows:

Increase the number of hunters allowed to apply for group hunts. I would prefer the Board of Game and game managers decide the proper number to be considered for a group. I would like to see at least three people in a group. With the current regulations, if four people put in for a group of two each, and don't draw the same unit they can split up. With three, we can't split because one person is not going to venture into the bush alone.

ISSUE: Changing the number of hunters that may be considered as a party for limited draw hunts for moose. Only two people may be considered as a group. Myself and two other friends are planning a moose hunt for 2015. After doing some research into harvest statistics for different units and subunits I found that 30 to 40 % of these permits for limited draw subunits were not used. This is a resident and nonresident problem. For example Unit 23, DM875), 101 people applied for 24 tags. 24 tags were issued, but only 12 people actually hunted. I'm sure there are many reasons why people didn't hunt. One reason could be that there are groups like us that will put in for the draw hunts as a group of two and an individual. If all three of us don't draw we will hunt in a general harvest ticket area. As a group we can apply for three draw areas. The chances of us drawing together are slim. If we don't put in for these draws we are being shut out of some good moose areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Things will remain the same.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? I would think that this would help game managers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Outfitters would benefit from this. After talking to some outfitters, they say they have clients ready to go but they didn't draw. Hopefully more of these draw tags will be used.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I don't see a down side.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Tod Martin

EG043013844

(Note: The Board of Game approved an Agenda Change Request to consider this proposal at the Statewide Regulations meeting scheduled for March 2014.)

PROPOSAL 146 - 5 AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep and mountain goat drawing permit hunts; 5 AAC 92.061. Special provisions for brown bear drawing permit hunts; and 5 AAC 92.069. Special provisions for moose drawing permit hunts. Remove the reference to proof of a guide contract and guide use area registration at the time of application for drawing hunts as follows:

5 AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep and mountain goat drawing permit hunts.

(a) In a sheep drawing permit hunt specified in this section, a nonresident may apply for and obtain a permit only as follows:

(1) the department may issue a drawing permit under this section only to a successful nonresident applicant who meets the requirements of this section;

(2) the department shall enter, in a nonresident drawing, each complete application from a nonresident who will be accompanied by a guide or relative; [THE DEPARTMENT MAY ENTER AN APPLICATION FOR THE APPLICABLE HUNT ONLY TO A NONRESIDENT APPLICANT WHO PRESENTS PROOF AT THE TIME OF APPLICATION THAT THE APPLICANT WILL BE ACCOMPANIED BY A

(A) RESIDENT OVER 19 YEARS OF AGE WHO IS THE SPOUSE OR OTHER RELATIVE OF THE APPLICANT WITHIN THE SECOND DEGREE OF KINDRED, AS DESCRIBED IN AS 16.05.407(A); OR

(B) GUIDE, AS REQUIRED UNDER AS 16.05.407 OR 16.05.408, AND THAT THE GUIDE HAS A GUIDE USE AREA REGISTRATION ON FILE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH AS 08.54.750 AND 12 AAC 75.230, FOR THE APPLICABLE GUIDE USE AREA DURING THE SEASON THE DRAWING PERMIT IS VALID.]

...

(c) In a goat drawing permit hunt in Unit 13(D), Unit 14(A), and Unit 14(C), a nonresident may apply for and obtain a permit only as follows:

(1) the department may issue a drawing permit under this subsection only to a successful nonresident applicant who meets the requirements of this section;

(2) the department shall enter, in a nonresident drawing, each complete application from a nonresident who will be accompanied by a guide or relative; [THE DEPARTMENT MAY ENTER AN APPLICATION FOR THE APPLICABLE HUNT ONLY TO A NONRESIDENT APPLICANT WHO PRESENTS PROOF AT THE TIME OF APPLICATION THAT THE APPLICANT WILL BE ACCOMPANIED BY A

(A) RESIDENT OVER 19 YEARS OF AGE WHO IS THE SPOUSE OR OTHER RELATIVE OF THE APPLICANT WITHIN THE SECOND DEGREE OF KINDRED, AS DESCRIBED IN AS 16.05.407(A); OR

(B) GUIDE, AS REQUIRED UNDER AS 16.05.407 OR 16.05.408, AND THAT THE GUIDE HAS A GUIDE USE AREA REGISTRATION ON FILE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN

ACCORDANCE WITH AS 08.54.750 AND 12 AAC 75.230, FOR THE APPLICABLE GUIDE USE AREA DURING THE SEASON THE DRAWING PERMIT IS VALID.]

5 AAC 92.061. Special provisions for brown bear drawing permit hunts.

(a) In the Unit 8 general brown bear drawing permit hunt, the department shall issue permits, and a hunter may apply for a permit, as follows:

...

(3) the department shall enter, in a guided nonresident drawing, each complete application from a nonresident who will be accompanied by a guide; [THE DEPARTMENT MAY ENTER AN APPLICATION AND ISSUE A DRAWING PERMIT FOR THE GENERAL HUNT ONLY TO A SUCCESSFUL NONRESIDENT APPLICANT WHO PRESENTS PROOF AT THE TIME OF APPLICATION THAT THE APPLICANT WILL BE ACCOMPANIED BY A GUIDE, AS REQUIRED IN AS 16.05.407 OR 16.05.408];

(4) the following provisions apply to a guided nonresident drawing under this section:

...

(D) if a guided nonresident drawing permit is available, but the alternate list is exhausted, the permit becomes available, by registration at the Kodiak ADF&G office, to the first applicant [FURNISHING PROOF THAT THE APPLICANT WILL BE ACCOMPANIED BY A GUIDE];

...

(b) In the Unit 10 brown bear drawing permit hunt, a nonresident may apply for and obtain a permit only as follows:

(1) the department may issue a drawing permit under this section only to a successful nonresident applicant who meets the requirements of this section;

(2) repealed 7/1/2013;

(3) the department shall enter, in a nonresident drawing, each complete application from a nonresident who will be accompanied by a guide or relative; [THE DEPARTMENT MAY ENTER AN APPLICATION FOR THE APPLICABLE HUNT ONLY TO A NONRESIDENT APPLICANT WHO PRESENTS PROOF AT THE TIME OF APPLICATION THAT THE APPLICANT WILL BE ACCOMPANIED BY A

(A) RESIDENT OVER 19 YEARS OF AGE WHO IS THE SPOUSE OR OTHER RELATIVE OF THE APPLICANT WITHIN THE SECOND DEGREE OF KINDRED, AS DESCRIBED IN AS 16.05.407(A); OR

(B) GUIDE, AS REQUIRED UNDER AS 16.05.407 OR 16.05.408, AND THAT THE GUIDE HAS A GUIDE USE AREA REGISTRATION ON FILE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH AS 08.54.750 AND 12 AAC 75.230, FOR THE APPLICABLE GUIDE USE AREA DURING THE SEASON THE DRAWING PERMIT IS VALID].

5 AAC 92.069. Special provisions for moose drawing permit hunts. (a) In a moose drawing permit hunt specified in this section, a nonresident may apply for and obtain a permit only as follows:

(1) the department may issue a drawing permit under this section only to a successful nonresident applicant who meets the requirements of this section;

(2) the department shall enter, in a guided nonresident drawing, each complete application from a nonresident who will be accompanied by a guide; [THE DEPARTMENT MAY ENTER AN APPLICATION FOR THE APPLICABLE HUNT ONLY TO A NONRESIDENT APPLICANT WHO PRESENTS PROOF AT THE TIME OF APPLICATION THAT THE APPLICANT WILL BE ACCOMPANIED BY A GUIDE, AND THAT THE GUIDE HAS A GUIDE USE AREA REGISTRATION ON FILE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH AS 08.54.750 AND 12 AAC 75.230, FOR THE APPLICABLE GUIDE USE AREA DURING THE SEASON THE DRAWING PERMIT IS VALID];

ISSUE: Over the last few years, the Board of Game (board) has adopted regulations modifying the requirements for nonresidents applying for guided drawing hunts in specific areas. These regulations were designed to require nonresidents hire a guide who had previously selected a guide use area within the drawing hunt area before they are able to make application. Because guide use area selection is done through a different department in the state, and is completed long after the current drawing application period is closed, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (department) does not have the ability to verify applicants are selecting a guide that is in compliance with the existing regulations.

Because these regulations have requirements for both the hunter and the guide, it has been determined that the current implementation of these regulations in the drawing application process, by having the nonresident applicant provide the name of the guide they have contacted for the hunt at the time of application, is not sufficient for enforcing the guide responsibilities. To remedy this problem it would be necessary to make significant programming changes to the current application process and to have access to complete and timely electronic information for the Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development. The department is willing to discuss solutions to the problems associated with implementing these regulations, without creating an unreasonable workload for the department, but until a new system is developed and implemented, the department considers this regulation unworkable and asks that the board repeal it.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nonresident applicants and guides will fail to be in compliance with regulations that are extremely difficult to enforce.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Guides who want to put their clients in for drawing hunts and then register after the clients have won a permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides who consistently select the same guide use areas and do not move around the state to provide their services in response to client hunt opportunities.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Move these regulations to the Big Game and Commercial Services Board and have all requirements for these regulations handled by that regulatory body.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613921

Permits for Possessing Live Game (Clean List)

PROPOSAL 147 - 5 AAC 92.029. Permit for possessing live game. Add five species of domestic finches to the list of animals allowed to be sold and possessed without a permit as follows:

Allow the five most common species of domestic finches to be on the clean list to allow those animals to be kept as pets. Those species are *zebra*, *society*, *gouldian*, *spice*, and *strawberry*.

ISSUE: As it stands now, finches are not on the state's clean list, and can therefore not be brought into the state for pets. In 2010 when a similar proposal was put forth, one of the five criteria used to assess this species was "Does the species otherwise present a threat to the health or population of a species indigenous to Alaska" and the answer to that question was probably not a threat to wild species found in Alaska. Another one of the five criteria used is "Is the species capable of surviving in the wild in Alaska". While it is highly doubtful that these animals could survive in the interior in the wild, the Department of Fish and Game (department) noted that there was a possibility of the animal surviving in the southern part of the state. Currently on the clean list are other bird species that are known to survive the winters in Alaska such as turkey and pigeon, yet one can still possess them.

The main reason the department gave for not supporting the original proposal was that it suggested the entire family be added to the clean list. I have refined that down to the five most common types. These five, the *zebra*, *society*, *gouldian*, *spice*, and *strawberry* are not considered threatened, endangered, or vulnerable. It is also my understanding that these five are bred only in captivity, with domestic breeding populations being already firmly established, so there would be no active capture of these animals from the wild.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People will not be able to own and enjoy domestic finches in their homes, businesses and schools.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who enjoy small birds in their lives.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No others considered.

PROPOSED BY: Alan Armbruster

EG042613807

PROPOSAL 148 - 5 AAC 92.029. Permit for possessing live game. Add the hamster genus *Phodopus sp.*, to the list of animals allowed to be sold and possessed in Alaska without a permit as follows:

Petco requests the addition of the genus *Phodopus sp.*, of the family Muridae, to 5ACC 92.029. Permit for possessing live game (b) allowing the sale and possession of this genus of hamster without a permit.

ISSUE: The addition of the hamster genus *Phodopus sp.* to the list of animals allowed to be sold and possessed in the state of Alaska without a permit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Our customers will not be able to have the companion pet that is incredibly popular and which helps teach children responsibility and compassion.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, it is not applicable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The pet industry, our customers who want this companion animal, and the state, as it would ease the burden of enforcement as well as generating additional tax income due to sales.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Our customers. Petco sells *Phodopus sp.* in over 1000 stores, nationwide as they are very popular pocket pets. Additionally, the tax income generated by sales of *Phodopus sp.* supplies is vast so the state loses money by not allowing the sale of this hamster.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The only other solution is to leave the regulation as it is currently written. This choice was rejected for two reasons: (1) our customers would like this companion animal and (2) the state has limited resources and more pressing areas to focus on.

PROPOSED BY: Petco EG042913822

PROPOSAL 149 - 5 AAC 92.041. Transport, harboring or release of live Muridae rodents prohibited. Clarify when Muridae rodent are allowed as pets, and when an emergency permit may be issued to allow uncaged rodents to enter the state due to extreme circumstances as follows:

5 AAC 92.141. Transport, harboring, or release of live Muridae rodents prohibited.

(a) It is unlawful [FOR THE OWNER OR OPERATOR OF A VESSEL, VEHICLE, AIRCRAFT, STRUCTURE BEING TRANSLOCATED, OR OTHER MEANS OF CONVEYANCE TO KNOWINGLY OR UNKNOWNLY] without a permit issued by the department for anyone to transport or harbor live uncaged Muridae rodents in a vessel, vehicle, aircraft, structure being translocated, or other means of conveyance, or to enter this

state, including the waters of this state, while [KNOWINGLY OR UNKNOWINGLY] transporting or harboring live uncaged Muridae rodents.

(b) [IT IS UNLAWFUL FOR AN INDIVIDUAL TO RELEASE TO THE WILD A LIVE MURIDAE RODENT.] Except for a facility where a Muridae rodent eradication plan has been developed and implemented, it is unlawful for the owner or operator of any facility to harbor live uncaged Muridae rodents. The owner or operator of any facility in which live uncaged Muridae rodents or signs of such rodents including tracks, droppings, chew marks, and nests have been found shall: (i) notify the department in writing within 30 days of detection; (ii) develop and implement a written ongoing rodent eradication or control plan, the intent of which is to eliminate all Muridae rodents or prevent the spread of Muridae rodents beyond the facility, and which shall be provided to the department upon request; and (iii) allow representatives of the Department of Fish and Game or the Department of Public Safety to inspect the facility during business hours for compliance with this section.

(c) [IT IS UNLAWFUL FOR THE OWNER OR OPERATOR OF A FACILITY TO KNOWINGLY OR UNKNOWINGLY HARBOR LIVE MURIDAE RODENTS. THE OWNER OR OPERATOR OF A HARBOR, PORT, AIRPORT, OR FOOD PROCESSING FACILITY IN WHICH LIVE MURIDAE RODENTS HAVE BEEN FOUND SHALL DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT AN ONGOING RODENT RESPONSE AND ERADICATION OR CONTROL PLAN.] “uncaged” means not intentionally confined by the owner to a cage or similar container that prevents escape.

(d) “facility” includes harbors, ports, airports, railroads, landfills, warehouses, storage yards, cargo handling sites, and establishments that serve, process, or store human or animal food.

ISSUE: Regulation 5 AAC 92.141(a), which prohibits harboring or transporting all live Muridae rodents, conflicts with regulation 5 AAC 92.029(b), which allows possession, importing, transporting, breeding and commerce with some Muridae rodent species including varieties of the European house mouse, albino Norway rats, and gerbils. This conflict results in confusion for pet owners and dealers, law enforcement agencies, and shippers including airlines and the Alaska Ferry System over the legality of importing and possessing Muridae rodents that may be legally possessed under 5 AAC 92.029(b).

Regulation 5 AAC 92.141 also lacks a provision authorizing the commissioner to issue a permit to import, harbor, or transport live uncaged Muridae rodents when it is in the public’s interest to do so. In 2011 the lack of a permitting provision resulted in confusion when the US Coast Guard seized the vessel, *Bangun Perkasa*, for illegally fishing in the North Pacific. A boarding party determined the vessel harbored uncaged rats. Weather at the time was predicted to become rough and there were concerns for the vessel’s seaworthiness, so the Coast Guard planned to escort the vessel to a sheltered anchorage in or near Unalaska/Dutch Harbor. Prior to entering state waters the Coast Guard learned of the prohibition against importing uncaged rats in 5 AAC 92.141 and contacted the Department of Fish and Game (department) for permission to do so. Without clear permitting authority, the department first needed to ask the Department of Law if we had legal

authority to approve entry. Eventually the Department of Law determined that the department had sufficient statutory authority, and the commissioner authorized the Coast Guard to bring the vessel into state waters subject to a rat control plan approved by stakeholders. Providing authority in this regulation will clarify the commissioner's ability to issue permits.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Regulations 5 AAC 92.141(a) and 5 AAC 92.029(b) will continue to conflict, and the department will continue to lack clear authority to permit import and transport of uncaged Muridae rodents when it is in the public's interest.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The public.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: The Department of Fish and Game. EG050613925

PROPOSAL 150- 5 AAC 92.030. Possession of wolf and wild cat hybrids prohibited.
Clarify regulation prohibiting possession of a wolf or wolf hybrids as follows:

If the Board of Game (board) adopted this change to regulation it would read as follows;

5 AAC 92.030(a). It is unlawful, without a permit issued by the department, for a person to possess, transport, sell, advertise or otherwise offer for sale, purchase, or offer to purchase a **wolf or** wolf hybrid.

ISSUE: Add the word "wolf" in 5 AAC 92.030(a) to make it unlawful to possess a "wolf" or wolf hybrid.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the board does not fix this issue in regulation, it will be unclear whether 5 AAC 92.030 makes it unlawful for a person to possess, transport, sell, advertise, or otherwise offer for sale, purchase, or offer to purchase a wolf.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No. This is a house keeping issue and addresses the board's intent in prohibiting the possession of a wolf or a wolf hybrid.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The public will benefit through clear regulations which convey the intent of the board.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Persons who want to possess or sell wolves or wolf hybrids

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Not adding this to regulation. Rejected because it is a problem that needs to be addressed.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Troopers

EG051613950

Migratory Birds/Waterfowl

PROPOSAL 151 - 5 AAC 92.013. Migratory bird hunting guide services. Require guides to keep migratory bird log books and questionnaires as follows:

5 AAC 92.013. Migratory bird hunting guide services

A log book made available to all migratory bird hunting guides to fill out important daily harvest data. Guides will either submit this log or enter it into user friendly online survey to communicate sea duck harvest by March 1st following the harvest seasons or they will be unable to purchase a license or register for the following year's season.

(a)(2) the area **hunting areas within units** in which the migratory bird hunting guide will operate; and

(a)(3) the name, address, and telephone number of any business that employs the migratory bird hunting guide or that the guide is affiliated with for the purposes of providing migratory bird hunting guiding services **such as water taxis lodges and fishing charter outfitters.**

(a)(4) A check off by species will be provided to discern the intent to guide clients for sea duck harvest to determine if they will be required to participate in the online survey

...

(c)(2) "migratory bird hunting guide services" means to assist, for compensation or with the intent to receive compensation, a migratory bird hunter to take or attempt to take migratory birds by accompanying or personally directing the hunter in migratory bird hunting activities;

(d) In addition to the annual registration in (a) above, a migratory bird hunting guide shall submit online no later than March 1st after the closure of migratory bird hunting seasons, a completed species/gender/ client/ area/ crippling, questionnaire provided online by the department, of the previous seasons hunting activity that includes at least the following information:

(1) A log of the names, permanent residence address, mailing address, and phone number of the daily migratory bird hunters guided;

(2) A map showing the areas within the units in which the migratory bird hunting guide operated; and

(3) the number of each species (*not Genera*) of sea duck (including goldeneye) taken;

(For instance surf scoter, black scoter, or white winged scoter (not Scoter). Common goldeneye, Barrows goldeneye, (not goldeneye etc.)

(4) The gender of each sea duck species taken;

(5) Number, species, and gender of crippled birds per day not recovered;

(6) Number of birds taken by the guide or assistant guide per day;

(e) Guides shall submit answers to an easy to use check off survey using their daily log of sea duck harvest activity by March 1 following the harvest seasons before they can purchase a license or register for the following years season.

ISSUE:

- 5 AAC 92.013. Migratory bird hunting guide services
- Migratory bird managers need accurate harvest data of certain limited migratory bird species like tribe Mergini (sea ducks) this includes goldeneye species.
- The only available long term breeding population and habitat surveys show most species of Tribe Mergini including goldeneye have shown trends below long term averages for decades.
- Through the registration process, migratory bird guides can submit accurate and detailed harvest data to improve management and aid managers.
- The Sea Duck Joint Venture has shown that present harvest data is scanty and inaccurate.
- Alaska must contribute to the mandates of the Migratory Bird Treaty and the bilateral conventions for the *“protection of each species and recognized population.”*
- Hunters have played an important role in both wildlife management and wildlife conservation. As long as we can continue this alliance and do our part to promote stable to increasing populations the future of hunting and the birds will remain secure.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

- Birds showing trends below long term averages for decades require us to pay attention to all mortality including human harvest.
- Management requires accurate data for these least understood and less abundant K-selected sensitive species.
- Without accurate harvest data collection, fulfilling the goal of sustainable biologically based management is not possible.
- Species with more sensitive K-selected diver reproductive strategies cannot compensate for harvest mortality as readily as r-selected dabblers that are above or at long term averages.
- Species below long term averages shows a vulnerability that needs to be monitored to aid sustainable, healthy populations as per the North American Waterfowl Management Plan and Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Guides will become more educated and aware of each species, gender, and crippling numbers to aid in producing more accurate quality harvest data for quality sustainable management.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The billion people within the Migratory Bird Treaty countries who share concern for this resource in Canada, Mexico, United States, Japan, and Russia. Guides will benefit from educating themselves and providing data of the significance and importance of migratory birds below long term averages with sensitive reproductive strategies.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who do not share concern to assist a tribe of birds showing depleted status.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I did not reject them and I hope you consider them: Better: Include water taxis, fishing charter outfitters, combo hunting/fishing boats, captains and lodges, all of who participate in guiding for waterfowl as required to register. Adding these professionals would collect more accurate data and more factual representation of guided harvest participants. Best: Include all sea duck hunters in a user friendly online survey to allow all to participate in sustainable sea duck management

PROPOSED BY: Sea Ducks Unlimited Inc.

EG050113874

PROPOSAL 152 - 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. Modify the definition of edible meat for wildfowl as follows:

(17) "edible meat" means, in the case of **wildfowl** or a big game animal, except a black bear, the meat of the ribs, neck, brisket, front quarters as far as the distal joint of the radius-ulna (knee), hindquarters as far as the distal joint of the tibia-fibula (hock), and the meat along the backbone between the front and hindquarters; in the case of a black bear, the meat of the front quarters and hindquarters and meat along the backbone (backstrap); [IN THE CASE OF WILD FOWL, THE MEAT OF THE BREAST;] however, "edible meat" of big game or wild fowl does not include meat of the head, meat that has been damaged and made inedible by the method of taking, bones, sinew, incidental meat reasonably lost as a result of boning or a close trimming of the bones, or viscera;

ISSUE: The definition of "edible meat" pertaining to wildfowl. Requiring only the meat of the breast of wildfowl squanders the remaining meat on the bird. This outdated definition promotes wanton waste and lack of respect for the resource, especially in those populations of migratory bird species that are below long term averages.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More edible meat is available on wildfowl than just the breast. Promotion through regulation of wanton waste of edible meat from harvested wildlife continues to educate generations of Alaskans that squandering of meat is acceptable behavior. Waste of meat is unacceptable. Ripping out only the breast of wildfowl and leaving the remaining edible leg, wing and body meat produces wanton waste and added spoilage potential.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? A whole plucked bird, compared to a ripped out breast

salvages more quality edible meat that will not spoil as rapidly. The carcass of the bird can be boiled or roasted and made into soup producing another meal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who understand and have learned how easy it is to pluck birds efficiently and who harvest wildfowl to eat and enjoy the taste.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who have not learned how to pluck a bird, do not care to take care of their meat or who harvest birds to kill but not to eat

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Pioneer Alaskan Fisheries Inc.

EG050113856

PROPOSAL 153 - 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. Modify the definition of hindquarter for wildfowl as follows:

(56) "hindquarter" means the hind leg, excluding the pelvis, unless wildfowl to include pelvis;

ISSUE: Definition of hindquarters to include wildfowl pelvis used in conjunction with edible meat definition of wildfowl.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued wanton waste of wildfowl meat from an outdated regulation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Quality and quantity of meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All from gaining meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Pioneer Alaskan Fisheries Inc.

EG050113858

PROPOSAL 154 - 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. Modify the definition of trophy to include salvage of edible meat, and to include wildfowl as follows:

(42) "trophy" means after all edible meat has been salvaged, a mount of a big game animal, or wildfowl, including the skin of the head (cape) or the entire skin, in a lifelike representation of the animal, including a lifelike representation made from any part of a big game animal; "trophy" also includes a "European mount" in which the horns or antlers and the skull or a portion of the skull are mounted for display;

ISSUE: Definition of “trophy” to include wildfowl and meat of trophy must be salvaged. Trophies for wildfowl are not addressed in the regulations. It is important to delineate removal of wildfowl taken as a trophy from wildfowl that are eaten for food. “Trophy” requires confirmation that this practice does not remove the responsibility to salvage meat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Indifference, lack of understanding and respect of the resource. Edible meat will continue to be squandered for an ornament.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, edible meat is not unwittingly squandered.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All as they would still have to keep the carcass cool to prevent spoilage but they would get the bonus of edible meat to eat with their trophy.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who don't hunt to eat or want edible meat but just seek a skin.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Pioneer Alaskan Fisheries Inc.

EG050113862

PROPOSAL 155 - 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. Modify the definition of possession limit for migratory birds as follows:

(71) "possession limit",

(A) **A prescribed possession limit for migratory game birds in a person's custody includes those that are canned, frozen, smoked, dried or otherwise processed for human consumption. It is no more than the cumulative days bag limit, of a species or designated aggregate of species in a specified geographic area.**

Removal of waterfowl or other migratory birds, from possession limit can occur only when consumed or gifted before commencing hunting. Gifted birds counts against daily limit total and requires your name and license information to be attached to the bird except if you gift the bird at someone's residence.

All birds in possession require that a feathered wing or head be attached during transport to processed condition or your home freezer.

[MEANS THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF LAWFULLY TAKEN MIGRATORY GAME BIRDS OF A SINGLE SPECIES DESIGNATED AGGREGATE OF SPECIES THAT MAY BE POSSESSED BY ANY ONE PERSON IN ANY SPECIFIED GEOGRAPHIC AREA FOR WHICH A POSSESSION LIMIT IS PRESCRIBED;]

(B) for resident game birds, means whole birds or the edible meat of game birds, excluding those that are canned, frozen, smoked, dried or otherwise processed for human consumption [AFTER A 15 - DAY PERIOD;]

ISSUE: Possession regulations for migratory birds are different from upland resident game birds however; this difference is not clearly understood by the public. A well-defined definition for possession limit for migratory birds as compared to resident birds promotes sustainability and needs clarification.

Migratory birds are federally protected by The Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918. They are shared by five signatory countries due to unwitting indiscriminant, waste in the late 1800's that led to extinctions even without motorized vehicles or boats.

Possession limit is designed so the birds remain sustainable for all citizens of Canada, Mexico, Russia, Japan and the United States including Alaska, to share into perpetuity the miracle of migratory birds.

Federal rules state possession limits, depending on species of "no more than" a certain days bag limit, can be in a person's possession.

Possession means the number of birds in your freezer, in a stew, in your truck, in your boat anywhere... period. Turning ducks and geese into jerky or sausage does not remove them from your possession.

Removal of migratory birds from possession can only occur when consumed or gifted. You can gift birds, but any gifted bird counts against your daily limit total and requires your name and license info to be attached to the bird. Migratory birds must be tagged before being left any place other than the hunter's residence or placed in the custody of another person for any purpose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Confusion will continue of what possession limit for federally protected migratory game birds as compared to state resident game birds, actually means and why the regulation has value.

The intent of possession limit for migratory birds is so people consume their birds including all processed forms of birds prior to hunting again as incentive to eat what they have killed and processed first, to prevent squander.

State resident bird possession limits excludes processed birds from the possession limit. Like fish, many birds are squandered when stock piled in the freezer getting freezer burned then thrown out wasted.

People who harvest birds need to have clear regulations that are easily understood, not obscured, to reduce confusion or contention that leads to federal or state violation of birds under treaty or state law..

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Clarity of possession limits promotes sustainability of all bird species. People who harvest birds need to have clear regulations that are easily understood not obscure so they can understand the meaning and intent.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All one billion citizens from the five signatory countries of the Migratory Bird Treaty: Canada, Russia, Mexico, Japan, and the United States benefit from sustainable migratory bird populations into perpetuity

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who don't understand the history or importance of sustaining migratory bird populations into perpetuity, or the significance of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the billion citizens who share this resource.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Pioneer Alaskan Fisheries Inc.

EG050113868

Sealing and Salvage Requirements

PROPOSAL 156 - 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. Modify the definition of processed for human consumption as follows:

(54) "processed for human consumption" means prepared for immediate consumption or [PREPARED] **preserved** in such a manner, [AND IN AN EXISTING STATE OF PRESERVATION], **to prevent edible meat from spoiling, rotting or going to waste,** as to be fit for human consumption after a [15] day period.

ISSUE: Definition of "processed for human consumption."

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? With the high percentage of harvested meat spoiling prior to preserving for human consumption, stronger wording is needed to reduce this waste. Confusion as to importance of not allowing meat to spoil or rot and of food safety.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, quality of meat can be improved. With the high percentage of harvested meat spoiling prior to preserving for human consumption, stronger wording can alert harvesters of the need to reduce this waste and the danger of meat not cared for properly.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All who will enjoy a higher quality and quantity edible meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who do not care about quality or quantity meat or food safety.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Add comprehensive food safety to hunter education.

PROPOSED BY: Pioneer Alaskan Fisheries Inc.

EG050113871

PROPOSAL 157- 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. Modify the definition of salvage as follows:

(49) "salvage" means to transport **in as cool a temperature, as quickly as possible and protected from any heat source** the **freshly killed** edible meat, skull, or hide, as required by statute or regulation, of a game animal or wild fowl to the location where the edible meat will be [CONSUMED BY HUMANS OR] processed for human consumption in order to [SAVE] **preserve** or prevent the edible meat from **spoiling, rotting or going to** waste, **until consumed by humans,** and the skull or hide will be put to human use;

ISSUE: A high percentage of harvested meat spoils prior to preserving for human consumption. Stronger wording in salvage are needed to promote reduction of this waste.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued indifference as to importance of not allowing meat to spoil or rot.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Quality meat fit for human consumption.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone from reducing waste of our wildlife.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Monetary fines to instill understanding that speed of processing meat is required and spoilage is not condoned.

PROPOSED BY: Pioneer Alaskan Fisheries Inc.

EG050113857

PROPOSAL 158 - 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. Modify the definition of edible meat for brown bear as follows:

(17) "edible meat" means, in the case of a big game animal, except bears, the meat of the ribs, neck, brisket, front quarters as far as the distal joint of the radius-ulna (knee), hindquarters as far as the distal joint of the tibia-fibula (hock), and the meat along the backbone between the front and hindquarters; in the case of a [BLACK] bear, the meat of the front quarters and hindquarters and meat along the backbone (backstrap); in the case of wild fowl, the meat of the breast; however, "edible meat" of big game or wild fowl does not include meat of the head, meat that has been damaged and made inedible by the method of taking, bones, sinew, incidental meat reasonably lost as a result of boning or a close trimming of the bones, or viscera;

ISSUE: In units with brown bear meat salvage requirements the current definition requires brown bear hunters to salvage additional meat (ribs, neck, and brisket) not required to be salvaged for a black bear. This definition causes confusion about salvage requirements and requires brown bear hunters to salvage meat normally considered lower in quality and less desirable. I ask the Board of Game to change the definition of edible meat to read the same for brown and black bears.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will be forced to salvage lower quality meat unnecessarily. This harvest requirement will potentially dissuade hunters from harvesting an animal that they otherwise would have harvested due to the additional salvage, time and transport requirements.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Brown bear hunters who hunt in areas with meat salvage requirements.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions considered.

PROPOSED BY: Adam Lammers

EG042913816

PROPOSAL 159 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. Remove the meat salvage requirement for brown bear taken over bait station as follows.

ISSUE: Brown bear salvage requirements that force hunters to salvage meat that may be inedible. Also it is confusing to hunters because salvage requirements are different for brown bears and black bears.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unreasonable salvage requirement for meat that may be inedible.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Keeps hunters from being required to salvage poor quality meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those hunters who harvest brown bears over bait who do not wish or are unable to eat the meat that has been harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None. Meat may still be salvaged if it is determined to be of good quality.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Require same salvage criteria as black bear. Rejected because brown bear are more likely to be consuming rotten meat prior to harvest, rendering their meat inedible.

PROPOSED BY: Joel Doner

EG042313754

PROPOSAL 160 - 5 AAC 92.990 (a)(17). Definition of edible meat. Change the definition of the edible meat of a brown bear to match the definition of the edible meat of a black bear as follows:

(a)(17) “edible meat” means, in the case of a big game animal, except a black **or brown** bear, the meat of the ribs, neck, brisket, front quarters as far as the distal joint of the radius-ulna (knee), hindquarters as far as the distal joint of the tibia-fibula (hock), and the meat along the backbone between the front and hindquarters; in the case of a black **or brown** bear, the meat of the front quarters and hindquarters and the meat along the backbone (backstrap); in the case of wild fowl, the meat of the breast; however, “edible meat” of big game or wild fowl does not include meat of the head, meat that has been damaged and made inedible by the method of taking, bones, sinew, incidental meat reasonably lost as a result of boning or a close trimming of the bones, or viscera;

ISSUE: Currently the edible meat of a brown bear is categorized differently than the edible meat of a black bear. This causes confusion among bear hunters in areas where meat salvage is required for both. This proposal would align the meat salvage requirement for both brown and black bear.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to be confused when it comes to what parts of a brown bear are required to be salvaged in hunts that require the salvage of edible meat.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who are trying to comply with regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613918

PROPOSAL 161 - 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. Modify the definition of edible meat for brown bear to match black bear as follows:

Definitions: edible meat....black, **brown, or grizzly** bear: the meat of the front quarters and hind quarters and meat along the backbone (backstrap).

ISSUE: The definition of edible meat does not include grizzly bear. The edible meat of black bear is defined but not brown bear meat. When baiting brown or grizzly bears the requirement is to salvage "edible meat" which is a lot more than what is required of black bear. So either the black bear edible meat definition can be changed to say "bear" by omitting the word "black" OR add the words grizzly or brown bear to the black bear definition.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters can be confused with two different salvage requirements for bear meat.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bear hunters using bait for grizzly or brown bears.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Eliminating salvage requirement for brown or grizzly bears taken over bait. Did not reject.

PROPOSED BY: Smokey Don Duncan

EG050113867

PROPOSAL 162 - 5 AAC 92.230. Feeding of game. Clarify that brown bears can be taken over bait under the conditions of a permit issued under 5 AAC 92.044 as follows:

5 AAC 92.230. Feeding of game. Except as provided in (b) of this section or under the terms of a permit issued by the department, a person may not

(1) negligently feed a moose, deer, elk, sheep, bear, wolf, coyote, fox, wolverine, or deleterious exotic wildlife, or negligently leave human food, animal food, mineral supplements, or garbage in a manner that attracts these animals;

(2) intentionally feed a moose, deer, elk, sheep, bear, wolf, coyote, fox, wolverine, or deleterious exotic wildlife, or intentionally leave human food, animal food, mineral supplements, or garbage in a manner that attracts these animals.

(b) The prohibitions described in (a) of this section do not apply to the use of bait for trapping furbearers or deleterious exotic wildlife, or hunting [BLACK] bears under 5 AAC 92.044, or hunting wolf, fox, or wolverine with bait as described under 5 AAC 92.210, and elsewhere under 5 AAC 84 – 5 AAC 92.

ISSUE: This regulation allows the use of bait for hunting black bears under the terms of a baiting permit. In 2012 the Board of Game (board) allowed the take of brown bears at bait stations but did not change this regulation to allow those practices. The result is two conflicting regulations, by changing this regulation to match the board's intent the two will no longer be in conflict.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be differing regulations regarding what hunters can and can't do at bait stations dependent on the targeted species.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will benefit greatly by being able to more clearly understand what is and is not allowed at bait stations because the regulations regarding the two species will be more closely aligned.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613922

PROPOSAL 163 - 5 AAC 92.990(4). Definitions. Allow the use of bear meat and bones not required to be salvaged as bait as follows:

....except bear (black brown or grizzly) meat that is not required to be salvaged may be moved from the kill site and used as bait.

ISSUE: Amend the definition of bait: Add an exemption to the end of the definition to further read: “except bear (black brown or grizzly) meat that is not required to be salvaged may be moved from the kill site and used as bait.”

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bears taken over bait are moved immediately and typically whole and intact if possible so the bait site is not scented up with hunters scent and sound. Actually skinning a bear at the kill site will damage the bait site. Meat and bones of bears that is not required to be salvaged should be allowed to be returned to a bait site.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Maybe and maybe not. It may help attract grizzlies and scare off black bears if bear meat is left at the bait.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bear hunters will be able to use unsalvaged meat for bait instead of discarding it somewhere else or somehow.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Smokey Don Duncan

EG050113865

Intensive Management

PROPOSAL 164 - 5 AAC 92.106. Intensive management of identified big game prey populations. Require the department to compile a yearly predator management/predator control report as follows:

We suggest the Board of Game (board) adopt a regulation that requires the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (department) to:

(a) 1) Each report should define the goal and justification for predator management/predator control/intensive management in each site specific area.

2) The report should identify the annual financial cost of predator management/predator control for each area. This should fully indicate all costs borne by the state (fixed wing aircraft, helicopter, staff time providing permits directly associated with the program, meeting costs, printing costs, advertising, law enforcement).

3) It should include a quantitative assessment of the scale of reduction in predator numbers and increases in prey numbers by species.

4) It should include a cost/benefit analysis. i.e. approximate value in dollars created through prey number increases versus costs of doing predator control.

5) It should include for each area how well the program ensured that predators as well as prey were being maintained on a sustained yield basis. This request is based upon Article VIII of the Alaska Constitution and Sullivan v. Resisting Environmental Destruction on Indigenous Lands et al (March 29, 2013).

(b) Yearly state the cumulative effects of:

b) Yearly state the cumulative effects of:

1) predator control on the predators in the subject unit/subunit/management area.

2) any change in the means and methods of hunting/trapping.

(c) See *Sullivan v State of Alaska*, decided March 29, 2013 which said the State of Alaska (state) has a constitutional duty under Article VIII to file a yearly statement of cumulative effects of its policies.

ISSUE: a) Lack of publicly available information on the cumulative effects of predator control on predators within each unit, and each subunit, each smaller management unit. b) The lack of publicly available information on the cumulative effect of changes to means and methods of

harvesting predators (hunting/trapping) as to sustained yield of the species and the corpus of that species.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The public will be denied information on the state's management of its scarce, renewable resources. Lack of information causes a loss of trust by the public in the state's management of its trust obligations and renewable resources will not receive the constitutional protection they / it deserve.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposal would affect the quality of the information produced by the state/board/department and also lead to better management of renewable resources and hence the quality of the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The citizens of Alaska are likely to benefit from access to better information and that will lead to better renewable resource management.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer if citizens have better information.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The duty to file cumulative reports was a new requirement. Each relevant section could be modified but that requires many amendments; therefore, an entirely new section should be adopted and placed at the beginning of Chapter 92.

PROPOSED BY: Ronald West and Paul Joslin

EG042913821

PROPOSAL 165 - 5 AAC 92.116(a). Special provisions in predation control areas. Remove the requirement for the Department of Fish and Game to issue permits to sell untanned hides with claws attached and skulls of black bears taken in active predator control areas. In addition, remove the section that allows hunters who have been airborne to harvest a black bear over bait in active predator control areas, since this is now allowed under general baiting seasons in most areas as follows:

5 AAC 92.116. Special provisions in predation control areas. (a) **repealed.** [FOR BLACK BEARS TAKEN IN AN ACTIVE PREDATION CONTROL AREA,

(1) THE DEPARTMENT WILL ISSUE PERMITS ALLOWING HUNTERS TO SELL UNTANNED HIDES, WITH CLAWS ATTACHED, AND SKULLS AFTER SEALING AS REQUIRED IN 5 AAC 92.165;

(2) A HUNTER WHO HAS BEEN AIRBORNE MAY TAKE OR ASSIST IN TAKING A BLACK BEAR WITH THE USE OF BAIT OR SCENT LURES UNDER A PERMIT ISSUED BY THE DEPARTMENT, IF THE HUNTER IS AT LEAST 300 FEET FROM THE AIRPLANE AT THE TIME OF TAKING.]

...

ISSUE: This regulation is no longer necessary because untanned black bear hides with claws attached and black bear skulls can legally be sold under general hunting regulations without a

permit on a statewide basis. Sealing is still required for hides and skulls intended for sale and removing this regulation will not change the sealing requirement.

From 2011 to 2012, the Board of Game(board) considered each unit individually and allowed the take of black bears at bait stations the same day the hunter has been airborne in areas where the population could handle the possible additional increase in harvest and in places where it would not create unnecessary conflict between users. At the time the regulation was passed, all units that had predator control areas were included. Since this regulation was passed, two more predator control plans have been established by the board, in Units 1A and 3. In these areas, no public control permits will be issued, as the control will be done by contracted trappers, so the regulation would not have applied anyway.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? For 5AAC 92.115(a)(1), nothing will happen aside from an unnecessary regulation remaining in place. For 5AAC 92.115(a)(2), if the Department of Fish and Game issues any predator control permits in Units 1A or 3 hunters will be allowed to harvest black bears at bait stations the same day they have flown.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? N/A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613919

Definitions

PROPOSAL 166 - 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. Establish a definition for transporter as follows:

() Transporter means: Air taxis; water taxis, fishing charter outfitters; combo hunting/fishing outfitters; captains of private boats; and lodges;

A business or affiliated business, that assists hunters; transports hunters; personally directs hunters in hunting activities and either waits for these clients as they hunt or drops them off and returns to pick up them up; for compensation, or with the intent to receive compensation, to a specified destination, by land, air or sea.

ISSUE: Businesses that transport harvesters for monetary pay are diverse and are a big part in the equation of wildlife management. This segment of professionals is not defined in regulation. Transporters include but are not limited to: air taxis; water taxis; fishing charter outfitters; combo hunting/fishing boats; captains in private boats; and lodges when they receive compensation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Managers and all for clarification.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Pioneer Alaskan Fisheries Inc.

EG050113855

PROPOSAL 167 - 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. Establish a definition for guide and “assistant guide as follows:

Guide and assistant guide means those present, assisting or directing during the hunting activity for compensation that are not a paying client.

ISSUE: Define guide, assistant guide, registered guide, big game guide, etc. to avoid confusion.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Confusion over what is a guide, big game guide, assistant guide, registered guide, waterfowl guide etc. in regulations.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? No one.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Pioneer Alaskan Fisheries Inc.

EG050113854

PROPOSAL 168 - 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. Establish a definition for "brow palm" as follows:

Define the term "brow palm" as it pertains to the taking of a legal moose in a restricted antler moose hunt. The terms "point", "tine", "brow tine", "moose antler" and "naturally shed antler" are currently defined. Since "brow tines" originate from the "brow palm", it would be appropriate to define this term.

ISSUE: If the board chooses to define this term it should be based upon recommendations from the Department of Fish and Game (department) and the public. Consideration should be given to other areas where the term "brow palm" is defined. Alaska Wildlife Troopers (AWT) will be able to comment as to the enforceability of this term and will be able to assist in drafting the definition.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The term "brow palm" is used in regulation and the "handy dandy" regulation booklet. This term continues to be a problem when faced with enforcement of regulations that require a hunter or enforcement to determine what a "brow palm" is when taking a moose under antler restricted hunts. If this term is not defined by the board, AWT and the public will continue to struggle when determining if the antler configurations comply with the board's intent.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. By defining this term, the public will have a better understanding of a legal animal. Further, AWT and department biologists will have a defined term to work with.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users of this resource, the department and AWT will benefit through the definition of this term.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Persons wishing to shoot a bull moose that does not comply with the antler restriction configuration.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Not defining this term. Rejected because it is a problem that needs to be addressed.

PROPOSAL 169 - 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions: Establish a definition for “broken” as it pertains to full-curl horn as follows:

Define the term "broken" as it pertains to the definition of "full-curl horn" and Dall sheep.

ISSUE: The term "broken" is used in 5AAC 92.990(19) and states that; full-curl horn of a male (ram) Dall sheep means that:

- (A) the tip of at least one horn has grown through 360 degrees of a circle described by the outer surface of the horn, as viewed from the side, or
- (B) both horns are broken, or
- (C) the sheep is at least eight years of age as determined by horn growth annuli.

If the Board of Game chooses to define this term it should be based upon recommendations from the Department of Fish and Game (department) and the public. Consideration should be given to other areas in North America where the term 'broken' is defined. Alaska Wildlife Troopers (AWT) will be able to comment as to the enforceability of this term and will be able to assist in drafting the definition.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The term broken continues to be a problem when faced with enforcement of this regulation. Further, the public has difficulty determining if a Dall sheep is legal when attempting to take the animal under (B) of this regulation. If “broken” is not defined, both the public and enforcement will continue to make their best guess as to the boards intent.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. By defining this term, the public will have a better understanding of a legal animal. Further, AWT and department biologists will have a defined term to work with.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users of this resource, the department and AWT will benefit through the definition of this term.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Persons wishing to shoot Dall sheep under the 'broken' exception when the sheep does not satisfy the perceived requirement.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Not defining this term. Rejected because it is a problem that needs to be addressed.

PROPOSAL 170 - 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. Modify the definition for full-curl horn as follows:

(19) full-curl horn of a male (ram) Dall sheep means that

(A) the tip of at least one horn has grown through 360 degrees described by the outer surface of the horn, as viewed from the side, or

(B) the tip of at least one horn has grown through the plane of the bridge of the nose, as viewed from the side, and determined using the Department of Fish and Game's standardized "sheep horn jig"; or

(c) both horns are broken, or

(d) the sheep is at least eight years of age as determined by horn growth annuli.

ISSUE: The definition of a full-curl sheep.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The ongoing confusion among hunters, inconsistencies in application and enforcement by state employees, and increasing (and unnecessary) animosity of the hunting public toward the Department of Fish and Game will continue. Fewer hunters will try sheep hunting for the first time, and others will quit after bad experiences with the current definition and application of a legal sheep. Nonresident hunters will continue to hear bad reports about Alaska's poorly defined and applied "full-curl" rule, and some will decide not to hunt in Alaska.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Fewer sublegal rams will be harvested if hunters understand how the definition will be applied, i.e. the standardized jig will be used.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The intent is that everyone involved in sheep hunting now or in the future and the state employees that determine legal sheep will all benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Can't think of anyone who would suffer from a more understandable, field-useable, and enforceable regulation.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Wait for the Division of Wildlife Conservation to come up with a better definition of a legal ram. Rejected because the wait has been too long and these problems persist to the detriment of everyone.

PROPOSED BY: Tony Russ

EG050113861

PROPOSAL 171 - 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. Modify the definition of full-curl horn as follows:

(19) full-curl horn of a male (ram) Dall sheep means that

(A) A full-curl horn, whose tip of at least one horn has grown through 360 degrees of a circle described by the outer surface of the horn, as viewed from the side.

(B) both horns are broken, or

(C) the sheep is at least eight years of age as determined by horn growth annul, and

(D) any ram is legal until the Alaska Department of Fish and Game has a specific, repeatable method that all state employees are mandated to use to determine if a set of sheep horns is legal or sublegal. Also, this method will be in writing with graphics included and this paper will be available at all times to the public from any Alaska Department of Fish and Game office that seals sheep horns, and available on the Department website.

ISSUE: The definition of a full-curl sheep.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will be uncertain how their sheep horns will be judged by enforcement and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (department). Hunters will not continue sheep hunting, more hunters will not start sheep hunting, sheep hunters will not bring their horns in for sealing, and hunters will continue to complain about the department and wildlife enforcement personnel, and those departments in general. Nonresidents will continue to hear about Alaska's inconsistent enforcement of their full-curl definition and some will continue to choose to hunt Canada instead of Alaska.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Fewer sublegal rams will be taken if hunters can actually see and understand, before they go sheep hunting, how the state employees (department and Wildlife Troopers) will apply the full-curl definition.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters and the state (after the paper has been written and made available).

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? State employees who have to come up with this standardized procedure.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Change the regulation to make it simpler – difficult to do if we want to harvest the same average-age ram. And, we would also have to then completely re-educate the hunting public and the state employees involved in sheep sealing and enforcement of the regulation.

PROPOSED BY: Tony Russ

EG050113864

PROPOSAL 172 - 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions: Remove black bears from the furbearer classification as follows.

The new regulation will omit black bears from the list of furbearers to read:

(21) "furbearer" means a beaver, coyote, arctic fox, lynx, marten, mink, least weasel, short-tailed weasel, muskrat, land otter, red squirrel, flying squirrel, ground squirrel, Alaskan marmot, hoary marmot, woodchuck, wolf or wolverine; "furbearer" is a classification of animals subject to taking with a trapping license;

ISSUE: The 2010 decision to list black bears as a furbearer paved the way to allow bear snaring for the first time since statehood. Nowhere else in North America is it legal to trap or snare bears under a general trapping license in areas where grizzly bears are known to be present.

The reason the Board of Game amended the regulations to include black bears as furbearers has nothing to do with citizens needing to put meat on the table for their families, but rather another backdoor attempt to kill more bears. In fact, it is not a requirement to salvage the meat from bears caught and killed in snares.

Not only is this promoting the wanton waste of an animal, but it completely disregards the ethics of fair chase and respect for the animal. The Board of Game regards black bears with the same disdain as sewer rats: vermin that need eradicating.

Bear snaring is indiscriminate, wasteful, and cruel and poses a danger to the public. With unlimited numbers of snares and long open seasons, snaring may kill more bears than is sustainable. Snaring and killing of bears regardless of age, species, and gender is incompatible with the scientific principles and ethics of modern wildlife management.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More bears will become food-conditioned, posing a hazard to people. More grizzly bears and other non-target species will become victims. Bear meat will be wasted. Bears will suffer. This controversial practice will continue to tarnish the reputation of Alaska and its hunting and trapping community. Bear populations could diminish, disrupting the natural balance of ecosystems.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Black bears are big game animals and should be classified as such. Bear snaring is wasteful and requires no salvage of meat, only the hide and skull. Trappers will still be allowed to harvest a bear under trapping licenses by using a firearm and bait stations. Under this method, a trapper can be selective in harvesting a bear and avoid taking non-target species and cubs or females with cubs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans and visitors who value wildlife and sound biological management of our wildlife resources and who want to view wildlife. Tourism-related businesses will benefit. The reputation of ethical hunters and trappers will benefit along with the State of Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The reclassification of black bears as furbearers doesn't benefit anyone. The practice of bear snaring only promotes waste and disrespect for wildlife.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None. The practice of snaring bears needs to stop.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Alliance EG042613796

PROPOSAL 173 - 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. Modify the definition for bag limit and define mortally wounded as follows:

(3) bag limit means the maximum number of animals of any one game species a person may **harvest (kill and reduce to his possession).** Animals disturbed in the course of legal hunting do not count toward the bag limit. **Animals known to be mortally wounded and lost may count against the bag limit for certain species and in certain units.**"

The definition of "mortally wounded" should be: **An animal struck with a hunting projectile which dies as a direct result of being struck with the hunting projectile.**

ISSUE: The definition of "bag limit" includes the word "take". The definition of "take" is so broad and all inclusive that anyone in the field can be charged with exceeding his/her bag limit. The definition of "bag limit" should not include the word "take".

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Our regulations will continue to be confusing for ethical hunters who try to read, understand and closely follow the regulations. Ethical hunters might stop hunting knowing that they have attempted to take more than their bag limit even if they never fired a shot. Guides and hunters may continue to have different motivations and not function well together if the guide encourages a marginal shot knowing that if the animal is superficially wounded she/he may call the hunt finished while the hunter may pass up a very reasonable shot waiting for only a 100% certain shot. Unethical hunters and guides are not limited by the regulations because they are aware that there is very little chance of enforcement of this type of regulation.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Ethical hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one with the possible exception of guides looking for a quick easy end to a hunt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Changing the definition of the word "take". However, it is our understanding that the definition of "take" can only be changed by the legislature. While changing the definition of "bag limit" can be done by the Board of Game.

PROPOSED BY: Alaskan Bowhunters Association EG042913832

Falconry

(This proposal was deferred from the 2012 Statewide Regulations meeting. It was previously numbered as proposal 40).

PROPOSAL 174 - 5 AAC 92.037. Permits for falconry. Allow nonresident falconers to capture raptors as follows:

1. Nonresident falconers would be allowed to capture three gyrfalcons, three Peale's peregrines, two anatum peregrines, two tundra peregrines, three merlins, three goshawks, three red-tailed hawks and three sharpshinned hawks. While there is no biological justification for such a limited capture according to the "*Final Environmental Assessment: Take of Raptors from the Wild Under The Falconry Regulations...*, USFWS June 2007" (FEA) concerning the insignificance of falconry harvest on raptor populations), an initial conservative capture quota may allay some Alaska falconers' concerns over nonresident take. However, should the Alaska falconers and the Alaska Board of Game (board) agree that the proposed nonresident, raptor capture quota is unnecessarily restrictive, American Falconry Conservancy (AFC) would support more liberal allowances.
2. Nonresident falconers would not be allowed to capture: eyass gyrfalcons in Units 13, 14 and 22; eyass goshawks in Unit 14C; eyass arctic peregrines along the Sagavanirktok River; and eyass anatum peregrines in Unit 20. Although AFC understands that very few wild raptors are captured by Alaska falconers, we believe the unit restrictions reflect Alaska falconers' concerns over outside competition in areas favored by residents.
3. Applications for a nonresident capture lottery would be submitted between February 1 and March 31. A nonresident quota on take may necessitate a lottery.
4. Unless other concerns surface, all other take provisions or limitations applicable to residents, such as capture seasons and off limit areas like the Colville River corridor, would also apply to nonresidents.
5. Native tribal lands within Alaska's borders would be off limits for nonresident raptor capture unless authorized by the native corporation. Some Alaska falconers have voiced concerns about nonresidents attempting to capture raptors on native lands. This is no different from other states and we propose that such activities be clarified in Alaska's provisions. To assist capture, AFC is willing to create maps depicting all Alaska areas closed to nonresident capture of raptors.

ISSUE: For reasons outlined herein, AFC respectfully requests that the Board of Game (board) adopt provisions to allow nonresident falconers to capture raptors in Alaska and bring them to their home states for falconry.

AFC is an association of North American falconers dedicated to the right of practicing the art and sport of falconry and to the conservation of raptors based on sound science and the rule of

law. AFC has actively pursued opening the doors to nonresident U.S. falconers for wild raptor take in the handful of states that previously did not or presently do not have such provisions. Over the last several years, AFC was successful in convincing resident falconers in Minnesota, South Dakota, Montana, Nebraska and Colorado to open their doors to nonresidents, and provided technical assistance in achieving those ends. North Dakota has a legislative provision for nonresident take, but the Fish and Game Department (department) needs to work out a regulatory framework for such provisions. To AFC's knowledge, the only states that do not have nonresident, raptor take provisions are West Virginia, Connecticut, Alaska and Hawaii. Hawaii is unique in that it has no falconry laws or regulations.

It is to Alaska that the falconry community now looks in hopes that the people of Alaska will invite their neighbors from other states to further share in Alaska's bountiful resources. AFC has communicated with Alaska falconers to better understand their position on this subject. Some feel it is too complicated a proposition to undertake or are concerned about competition by nonresidents in traditional resident capture areas; others are indifferent; and some agree that Alaska should be open to nonresidents. This mirrors the same sentiments experienced in other states who recently adopted or are in the process of adopting nonresident, raptor capture provisions. The only difference AFC has observed between Alaska and other states is complacency within the falconry community in spearheading the process; to our knowledge neither Alaska nor at-large falconers have ever asked the board to open wild raptor take to nonresidents.

Based on our conversations with members of the Alaska falconry community, AFC believes that if nonresident falconers were to concede to certain limits, Alaska falconers would be more comfortable embracing a nonresident raptor capture program. With Alaska falconers' concerns in mind, AFC presents this proposal with the supporting justification for raptor capture by nonresident falconers:

The following points are presented in an effort to answer the broad question: If nonresident raptor take were to be implemented, what would this mean to the State of Alaska and Alaska falconers?

1.) No harm would come to raptor populations. Alaska has the largest populations of breeding raptors (among other raptor species, over 400 pairs of breeding gyrfalcons and 1000 pairs of breeding peregrine falcons) in the U.S., so nonresident capture of a few birds is a biological non-issue. There are approximately 4250 authorized falconers in the United States (FEA, p. 34), compared to millions of fisherman and hunters. The majority are flying captive bred raptors. The demand for wild raptors by falconers is far too small to have any effect on raptor populations (See tables 1, 2, and 3 on, respectively, pages 10, 29, and 33 of the FEA). Also, FWS has a wild raptor take limit of two birds per falconer per year. In addition, to our knowledge no state has experienced harvest pressures from resident and/or nonresident falconers to the point where intervention was warranted by state fish & game departments. What is more, the board would have emergency powers to restrict or eliminate harvest should a particular raptor population experience a decline to the point where it is threatened. Owing to our long history of devotion to the conservation and protection of raptors, AFC in particular and the falconry community in general would be the first to support such restrictions where and when warranted.

Historically, falconers have been a valuable resource for raptor knowledge and conservation and actually lead the charge in saving the peregrine falcon from extinction in the Lower 48 when the peregrine became endangered; it was a falconer who discovered how to breed raptors in captivity and it was predominately falconers who then bred and released peregrines in reintroduction and restoration efforts.

2.) Considering Alaska's large size and its vast and robust raptor populations, and taking into account the proposed raptor quota numbers in this proposal, AFC is confident nonresident capture of raptors would have no negative effect on either the raptor resource or the resident falconers of Alaska. If anything, the adoption of nonresident take provisions would broaden Alaska falconers' liberties and opportunities for the following reasons:

a. Currently Alaska falconers are prohibited from capturing wild raptors from states that have nonresident, raptor capture reciprocity - you can capture in our state only if we can capture in yours - provisions (e.g. New Mexico, Montana, Alabama and Texas). Texas just recently adopted such reciprocity provisions, and other states are in the process of adopting such provisions. AFC is aware of at least one Alaska falconer who previously captured a red-tailed hawk from Texas. Also, around 2009-2010 Alaska falconers Mike Houser and Rio Bergman were warmly received by Oregon falconer Richard Hoyer who helped them trap red-tailed hawks in Oregon, which were then taken back to Alaska. Alaska would need to be open to falconers residing in reciprocity states if Alaska falconers wish to enjoy the raptor resource benefits of such states.

b. Nonresidents are able to provide locations of raptors taken in Alaska, which provides additional data (e.g. eyrie (nesting) locations when eyasses (nestlings) are taken) on Alaska's raptor resource at no cost to the department.

c. Additional revenue to the department would be beneficial. Like a nonresident big game permit, a \$200 permit fee would not be unreasonable. It should be noted, however, that most states' fees for nonresident, raptor capture are significantly lower and generally are on par with the administrative costs associated with issuing a capture license.

d. As in all tourist type activities, additional revenue would be brought into Alaska's economy by visiting falconers, which would benefit Alaska small businesses and increase Alaska state tax revenues.

e. One good turn often earns another – it is human nature that the prospect of reciprocity often compels one to go out of their way to assist ones neighbor. This is especially true and invaluable in falconry, where more often than not a neighboring state falconer possesses a more intimate knowledge of the raptor resources in his or her state and is more inclined to share such knowledge with and offer assistance to a nonresident if that nonresident is able and willing to reciprocate.

In an effort to further investigate the effects of nonresident take, AFC's Nonresident Take Liaison, Dr. Jim Ingram, contacted a number of state wildlife agencies and reports the following: "I contacted several of the most popular states for nonresidents to trap raptors to see how many

permits were given out on average. Texas – 8-15 permits per year, most resulted in taking a Harris’ Hawk; Kansas – 15 permits per year, mostly redtails, and sometimes prairie falcons; Wyoming – 21 permits per year issued on average with only 12 resulting in a take (average annual take for goshawks is 3; for merlins 1.8; and for gyrs 0.16); Wisconsin – 4-5 permits per year, mostly Cooper’s hawks; Florida – 3 permits per year, mostly merlins. None of these states, or their falconry communities, reported problems with their raptor populations as a result of nonresident take.”

In general AFC proposes that the same rights and privileges provided to residents be provided to nonresidents, as the Privileges and Immunities Clause of the U.S. Constitution instructs; unless some state difficulty arises where a less discriminatory method is unavailable to the state, in which case the state has the right to serve its residents’ interests above nonresidents. The various states manage nonresident capture in a variety of ways. The following are offered for the board’s consideration:

1. The State of New York requires a hunting license and the submission of a “Raptor Capture Authorization” form, along with a copy of the permittee’s falconry license.
2. Oregon provides a State Capture Permit. The applicant merely submits a completed form, a copy of his falconry permit, and \$10.
3. Kansas, which AFC believes is a very good model for nonresident take regulations, requires a Kansas hunting license and authorization, in the form of a letter from the Fish and Game Department.
4. Alabama requires a hunting license and that the nonresident’s home state also provides the same opportunity to Alabama falconers.
5. Wyoming charges a fee of \$201.00 to nonresidents and requires authorization from the Fish and Game Department.
6. Upon submission of an application and a copy of a valid falconry permit from the applicant’s home state, Minnesota issues a raptor capture permit at no charge to the applicant.

One might ask why Alaska should adopt nonresident take provisions. The simple answer is that access to our natural resources is a national issue in the sense that all Americans wish to be able to enjoy the outdoors in any state of the union. It is understood that we are one country, with a Constitution that obligates us to one another. Each region of our nation has features that provide unique opportunities and all Americans would like to have access to resources that appeal to them.

Alaska has very large numbers of, among others, three raptor species falconers are interested in accessing: gyrfalcons, peregrine falcons and goshawks. Table 1 on page 10 of the FEA informs us that the average annual nationwide harvest of these raptor species from 2003-05 was quite low (52.66 goshawks, 11.33 gyrfalcons and 10.66 peregrines) in relation to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife’s (USFWS) recommended annual harvest levels of 5% of the populations (450

goshawks, 82 gyrfalcons and 150 peregrines) and extremely low in relation to USFWS's determination that "... many raptor populations can sustain eyass [nestling] or passage [juvenile] harvest rates of 10% to 20%, and sometimes higher" (See page 24 of Draft Environmental Assessment: Take of Raptors from the Wild Under The Falconry Regulations..., USFWS June 2006 (DEA)). The DEA also points out on page five that the take of nestling raptors by falconers provides "higher survival rates" compared to nestlings from unharvested nests. In addition, FWS falconry regulations only allow falconers to capture first year (juvenile) wild raptors, and individual general and master class falconers can take no more than two wild raptors per year. It has been demonstrated that a nonresident capture of raptors would have no effect on the raptor resource or the falconers of Alaska. Since the raptor resource of Alaska far exceed any demand that falconers would place on it, and since the mortality rate (or surplus) of first year raptors is high, the adoption of nonresident, raptor take provisions would conform with the sustainable yield principles expressed in the preamble of the department's mission.

Also, it is clear that nonresident, raptor take conforms to the department's mission of developing the use of natural resources "in the best interest of the economy and the wellbeing of the people" no differently than other presently allowed nonresident activities; such as outdoor tourism and all other forms of wildlife harvest.

Beyond the unique resources Alaska possesses, nonresidents are often just as interested in pursuing the adventure Alaska has to offer for the same reasons nonresident fisherman and hunters expend thousands of dollars to travel to one of the most beautiful regions in the world. Falconers can purchase readily available goshawks, peregrines and gyrfalcons from raptor breeders at a lower cost than travel expenses to Alaska, so the reason falconers desire a trip to Alaska is not solely for a bird, it is for the adventure. Like many field sports, the art and sport of falconry embraces the magic in the journey as much or more than the destination or the outcome, it is the means, not the ends that counts. Experiencing nature and spending time in the wild regions is at the very core of the art of falconry and nowhere is this more evident than in Alaska. Nonresidents will feel the cost of this experience is money-well-spent with fond and lifelong memories. Like the sport fisherman, who does not relate the value of the experience on a cost per pound basis, falconers view the taking of wild raptors as an exceptional experience to be cherished with awe.

Presently, Alaska falconers are welcome in most of the Lower 48 to take raptors and to travel with their trained falconry birds to hunt quarry not readily available to them in Alaska, or when the winter is too harsh to fly raptors in their home territory. It is our hope that Alaska will welcome nonresident falconers to their state to more fully enjoy their bountiful raptor resource. AFC thanks the board for their consideration and we continue to offer our assistance in this important matter.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS

PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED:

PROPOSED BY: American Falconry Conservancy

EG052011501

Miscellaneous

PROPOSAL 175 - 5AAC 98.005. Areas of jurisdiction for antlerless moose seasons. Review and determine the advisory committees that have jurisdiction for approving antlerless moose hunts as follows:

5AAC 98.005. Areas of jurisdiction for antlerless moose seasons. For the purpose of implementing AS 16.05.780, antlerless moose seasons require approval by a majority of the active **local** advisory committees **for** [LOCATED IN] **that unit or subunit.** [OR THE MAJORITY OF WHOSE MEMBERS RESIDE IN, THE AFFECTED UNIT OR SUBUNIT.] For the purpose of this section, an “active advisory committee” is a committee that holds a meeting and acts on the proposals. **The following advisory committees have jurisdiction over antlerless moose hunts in the units and subunits specified in this section:**

The advisory committees (ACs) located within the subunits and units for the purpose of authorizing antlerless moose hunts are.

Hunt Area by Subunit	Committee Name	Committee Location
Unit 1A	Hyder	Subunit
	Ketchikan	Subunit
	Saxman	Subunit
	Juneau-Douglas	Unit
	Icy Straits	Unit
	Upper Lynn Canal	Unit
	Klukwan	Unit
Unit 1B	Juneau-Douglas	Subunit
	Icy Straits	Subunit
	Upper Lynn Canal	Subunit
	Klukwan	Unit
	Hyder	Unit
	Ketchikan	Unit
	Saxman	Unit
Unit 1C (Gustavus)	Icy Straits	Subunit
	Juneau-Douglas	Subunit
	Upper Lynn Canal	Unit
	Hyder	Unit
	Ketchikan	Unit
	Saxman	Unit
	Klukwan	Unit
Unit 1C (Berner’s)	Juneau-Douglas	Subunit

Bay)	Icy Straits	Unit
	Upper Lynn Canal	Unit
	Hyder	Unit
	Ketchikan	Unit
	Saxman	Unit
	Klukwan	Unit
Unit 1D	Upper Lynn Canal	Subunit
	Icy Straits	Subunit
	Hyder	Unit
	Ketchikan	Unit
	Saxman	Unit
	Klukwan	Unit
	Juneau-Douglas	Unit
Unit 3	Kake	Unit
	Petersburg	Unit
	Wrangell	Unit
Unit 5A (Nunatak Bench)	Yakutat	Subunit
Unit 5B	Yakutat	Unit
Unit 6A	Copper River/Prince William Sound (PWS)	Unit
	PWS/Valdez	Unit
	Whittier	Unit
Unit 6B	Copper River/PWS	Unit
	PWS/Valdez	Unit
	Whittier	Unit
Unit 6C	Copper River/PWS	Subunit
	PWS/Valdez	Unit
	Whittier	Unit
Unit 6D	Whittier	Subunit
	PWS/Valdez	Subunit
	Copper River/PWS	Unit
Unit 7	Seward	Subunit
	Cooper Landing	Subunit
Unit 9A	Naknek/Kvichak	Unit

	Nelson Lagoon	Unit
	Sand Point	Unit
	King Cove	Unit
	False Pass	Unit
	Chignik	Unit
	Lower Bristol Bay	Unit
	Lake Illiamna	Unit
<hr/>		
Unit 9B	Lake Illiamna	Subunit
	Nelson Lagoon	Unit
	Sand Point	Unit
	King Cove	Unit
	False Pass	Unit
	Chignik	Unit
	Lower Bristol Bay	Unit
	Naknek/Kvichak	Unit
<hr/>		
Unit 9C	Naknek/Kvichak	Subunit
	Nelson Lagoon	Unit
	Sand Point	Unit
	King Cove	Unit
	False Pass	Unit
	Chignik	Unit
	Lower Bristol Bay	Unit
	Lake Illiamna	Unit
<hr/>		
Unit 9D	Nelson Lagoon	Subunit
	Sand Point	Subunit
	King Cove	Subunit
	False Pass	Subunit
	Naknek/Kvichak	Unit
	Chignik	Unit
	Lower Bristol Bay	Unit
	Lake Illiamna	Unit
<hr/>		
Unit 9E	Chignik	Subunit
	Lower Bristol Bay	Subunit
	Nelson Lagoon	Unit
	Sand Point	Unit
	King Cove	Unit
	False Pass	Unit
	Naknek/Kvichak	Unit
	Lake Illiamna	Unit
<hr/>		
Unit 11	Copper Basin	Unit
	Tok Cutoff/Nabesna	Unit

Unit 12	Upper Tanana Fortymile	Unit
Unit 13A	Tok Cutoff/ Nabesna	Unit
	Copper Basin	Unit
	Denali	Unit
	Paxson	Unit
Unit 13B	Tok Cutoff/ Nabesna	Unit
	Copper Basin	Unit
	Denali	Unit
	Paxson	Unit
Unit 13C	Tok Cutoff/ Nabesna	Unit
	Copper Basin	Unit
	Denali	Unit
	Paxson	Unit
Unit 13D	Tok Cutoff/ Nabesna	Unit
	Copper Basin	Unit
	Denali	Unit
	Paxson	Unit
Unit 13E	Tok Cutoff/ Nabesna	Unit
	Copper Basin	Unit
	Denali	Unit
	Paxson	Unit
Unit 14A	Matanuska Valley	Subunit
	Anchorage	Unit
	Susitna Valley	Unit
Unit 14B	Susitna Valley	Subunit
	Anchorage	Unit
	Matanuska Valley	Unit
Unit 14C	Anchorage	Subunit
	Matanuska Valley	Unit
	Susitna Valley	Unit
Unit 15A (Skilak Loop)	Kenai/Soldotna	Subunit
	Central Peninsula	Unit
	Homer	Unit
	Seldovia	Unit
Unit 15B	Kenai/Soldotna	Subunit
	Central Peninsula	Unit

	Homer Seldovia	Unit Unit
Unit 15C (Homer)	Central Peninsula Homer Seldovia Kenai/Soldotna	Subunit Subunit Subunit Unit
Unit 16A	Susitna Valley Tyonek Mt. Yenlo	Subunit Unit Unit
Unit 16B (Kalgan)	Tyonek Mt. Yenlo Susitna Valley	Subunit Subunit Unit
Unit 17A	Togiak Nushagak	Subunit Unit
Unit 17B	Nushagak Togiak AC	Unit Unit
Unit 17C	Nushagak Togiak	Subunit Unit
Unit 18	Central Bering Sea Lower Kuskokwim Lower Yukon	Unit Unit Unit
Unit 19A	Central Kuskokwim Stony-Holitna McGrath	Subunit Subunit Unit
Unit 19B	Central Kuskokwim Stony-Holitna McGrath	Unit Unit Unit
Unit 19C	Stony Holitna Central Kuskokwim McGrath	Unit Unit Unit
Unit 19D	McGrath Stony Holitna Central Kuskokwim	Subunit Unit Unit
Unit 20A	Middle Nenana	Subunit

	Minto/Nenana	Subunit
	Fairbanks	Unit
	Delta	Unit
	Eagle	Unit
	Tanana-Rampart-Manley	Unit
	Upper Tanana/40 –Mile	Unit
	Lake Minchumina	Unit
<hr/>		
Unit 20B	Fairbanks	Subunit
	Minto-Nenana	Subunit
	Tanana-Rampart-Manley	Subunit
	Delta	Unit
	Middle Nenana	Unit
	Eagle	Unit
	Upper Tanana/40 –Mile	Unit
	Lake Minchumina	Unit
<hr/>		
Unit 20C	Middle Nenana	Subunit
	Lake Minchumina	Subunit
	Tanana-Rampart- Manley	Unit
	Fairbanks	Unit
	Eagle	Unit
	Delta	Unit
	Upper Tanana/40-mile	Unit
	Minto-Nenana	Unit
<hr/>		
Unit 20D	Delta	Subunit
	Fairbanks	Subunit
	Middle Nenana	Unit
	Tanana-Rampart- Manley	Unit
	Eagle	Unit
	Upper Tanana/40-mile	Unit
	Minto-Nenana	Unit
	Lake Minchumina	Unit
<hr/>		
Unit 20E	Delta	Subunit
	Eagle	Subunit
	Fairbanks	Unit
	Middle Nenana	Unit
	Tanana-Rampart- Manley	Unit
	Upper Tanana/40-mile	Unit
	Minto-Nenana	Unit
	Lake Minchumina	Unit
<hr/>		
Unit 20F	Tanana-Rampart-Manley	Subunit
	Delta	Unit

	Fairbanks	Unit
	Middle Nenana	Unit
	Eagle	Unit
	Upper Tanana/40-mile	Unit
	Minto-Nenana	Unit
	Lake Minchumina	Unit
Unit 21A	Ruby	Unit
	Grayling/Anvik/Shageluk/Holy Cross (G.A.S.H.)	Unit
	Middle Yukon	Unit
Unit 21B	Ruby	Unit
	Grayling/Anvik/Shageluk/Holy Cross (G.A.S.H.)	Unit
	Middle Yukon	Unit
Unit 21C	Grayling/Anvik/Shageluk/Holy Cross (G.A.S.H.)	Unit
	Middle Yukon	Unit
	Ruby	Unit
Unit 21D	Middle Yukon	Subunit
	Ruby	Subunit
	Grayling/Anvik/Shageluk/Holy Cross (G.A.S.H.)	Unit
Unit 21E	Grayling/Anvik/Shageluk/Holy Cross (G.A.S.H.)	Subunit
	Ruby	Unit
	Middle Yukon	Unit
Unit 22A	Southern Norton Sound	Subunit
	Northern Norton Sound	Unit
	St. Lawrence Island	Unit
Unit 22B	Northern Norton Sound	Subunit
	Southern Norton Sound	Unit
	St. Lawrence Island	Unit
Unit 22C	Northern Norton Sound	Subunit
	Southern Norton Sound	Unit
	St. Lawrence Island	Unit
Unit 22D	St. Lawrence Island	Subunit
	Northern Norton Sound	Unit

	Southern Norton Sound	Unit
Unit 22E	Northern Norton Sound	Subunit
	Southern Norton Sound	Unit
	St. Lawrence Island	Unit
Unit 23	Northern Seward Peninsula	Unit
	Kotzebue	Unit
	Upper Kobuk	Unit
	Noatak/Kivalina	Unit
	Lower Kobuk	Unit
Unit 24A	Koyukuk River	Unit
Unit 24B	Koyukuk River	Subunit
Unit 24C	Koyukuk River	Subunit
Unit 24D	Koyukuk River	Subunit
Unit 25A	Yukon Flats	Subunit
	Central	Unit
Unit 25B	Yukon Flats	Unit
	Central	Unit
Unit 25C	Central	Subunit
	Yukon Flats	Unit
Unit 25D	Yukon Flats	Subunit
	Central	Unit
Unit 26A	North Slope	Subunit
Unit 26B	North Slope	Subunit
Unit 26C	North Slope	Subunit
Unit 26D	North Slope	Subunit

ISSUE: The current regulation for areas of jurisdiction for AC approval of antlerless moose hunts has caused some confusion for the Board of Game (board), the advisory committees, and the public. During the 2012 Interior Region meeting, the Board of Game requested the Department of Fish and Game (department) develop a proposal to clarify which committees have jurisdiction to approve antlerless moose hunts. The proposed language modifies the regulation so that it is consistent with

the Alaska Statute 16.05.780. It also lists advisory committees located within each Unit and Subunit.

The department has no recommendation on the jurisdiction for ACs approving antlerless moose hunts. The intent of this proposal is to provide an opportunity for ACs to comment to the board indicating which hunts they desire to have jurisdiction for approval.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be confusion over which ACs have the authority to approve certain antlerless moose hunts.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Advisory committees, agencies, and members of the public as a result of clarification to the regulation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Include the committees that are not in the unit or subunit but are near the area and hunt the area.

PROPOSED BY: Department of Fish and Game at the request of the Board of Game

EG050613926
