

RC 75

Anchorage Fish & Game Advisory Committee  
Comments

BOG March 4, 2011

Proposal

1. Oppose Not enough Biological information and unable to support for a single subunit.
2. Oppose Not enough Biological information and unable to support for a single subunit.
3. Oppose Not enough Biological information and unable to support for a single subunit.
4. TNA Action on proposal #6
5. TNA Action on proposal #6
6. Amend and support: Amendment is to remove subunit 9A
7. TNA Action on proposal #6
8. Support Having the hunt on the books with the Department ready to issue permits when the biology supports the hunt is better then waiting fot the day and then getting the regulation.
9. TNA
10. Oppose Not supported by the biology
11. Oppose Not supported by the biology
12. Oppose The proposal seeks to continue the so called "rural non rural preference" This is contrary to the State Constitution and Case law requiring equal treatment of all Alaskans.

13. Oppose The proposal seeks to continue the so called "rural non rural preference "This is contrary to the State Constitution and Case law requiring equal treatment of all Alaskans.
14. Oppose This proposal is to far reaching to cumbersome and requires the concentration of to many resources.
15. Has the proposer the AAC withdraws this proposal.
16. Has the proposer the AAC withdraws this proposal.
17. Support
18. TNA Action on 17
19. Oppose The proposer intent seems to be to muddy the water has we deal with allocation from one resource in favor of another. The board has clearly identified the promotion of one species over another with the intent of improving the human use which is the mandate of the board.
20. Oppose The proposer intent seems to be to muddy the water has we deal with allocation from one resource in favor of another. The board has clearly identified the promotion of one species over another with the intent of improving the human use which is the mandate of the board.
21. Oppose. The AAC opposes any type of promotion of a community harvest scheme.
22. TNA. Lack information on the need of this action.
23. Support
24. Support. We support and would advise the BOG to eliminate the Black Bear Harvest Ticket Statewide.
25. Support
26. Oppose We support the reauthorization of the Tag exemption.

27. TNA We had insufficient information at the time of this meeting but could change subsequent to more info.
28. Support We support and would amend if possible to include Nonresident.
29. Oppose We discussed this at length, in the end coming to the conclusion that the salvage requirement was not overly burdensome.
30. Oppose
31. Oppose We felt this population was not yet ready to increase nonresident pressure.
32. Oppose We felt this population was not yet ready to increase nonresident pressure.
33. Support We see this has house keeping.
34. Support
35. Oppose See 36
36. Oppose See 35
36. Support We oppose the use of "the rural nonrural preference and support this proposal to end this practice.
37. Support No biological concern
38. Support
39. Oppose Bio concern
40. Oppose Not supported by the Biology, Agenda driven special interest group not inline with our constituents
41. Support Only has Amended Remove section IV. Before amendment it becomes a select group to benefit including some who personally know the AB.

42. Support We would like to see the entire area redefined has a nonsubsistence. Despite what the department of law would say we believe the court would have to find that the BOG has total control over subsistence game law has it has found that the BOF can determine subsistence for fish. We would like this tested in court and would like the BOG to step up to the plate.

43. Support

44. TNA in light of 42

45. TNA see 42

46. Support only has amended ANS to be the range of 200-400caibou.

47. Oppose

48. Support

49. Support has amended to a ANS of 400

50. Oppose We continue to oppose this proposal and continue to question the board making its own proposals

51. Support

52. Support

53. Support

54. Oppose A statewide issue

55. Oppose Bio Concern

56. Oppose

57. Support

58. TNA

59. Oppose

60. Support

61. Oppose The AC oppses the CHP

62. Oppose

63. Support

64. Oppose

65. Oppose

66. Oppose

67. Support

68. Oppose

69. Support

70. Oppose

71. Support Amend to include the rest of the region.

72. Oppose These are not pets.

73. Support The department stated it would be unlikely to have any large increase in hunter take in the area, but still wanted to keep the bag limit the same. We attempted to reach a compromise at 2 bears but the AB still felt he wanted just one because half of the hunter take in 14A was sows. We see this has a favorable trend and without a real survey we wish to increase the take at least the minor amount the Department foresees. With the depletion of Dall Sheep in 14A and black bears being documented predators of sheep we need this action.

74. Support

75. Oppose The proposer intent seems to be to muddy the water has we deal with allocation from one resource in favor of another. The board has clearly identified the promotion of one species over another with the intent of improving the human use which is the mandate of the board.

76. Support

77. Support

78. Oppose

79. Support It is reasonable to have some hunts (especially roadside hunt) restricted to residents only when this was a registration hunt before we achieved the goals. The Department wanted this experiment which we lobbied against. Now the experiment failed, rather than tinker with this lets just go back to what wasn't broke.

80. Support We support this only if nonresidents are excluded. We strongly feel this should be a resident hunt only. This is a small number of goats with a small quota in a easy access area. Some hunts we should reserve for the constituent.

81. Oppose This is counter productive from where we want to go. We had a working registration hunt here before 7 days and then you had to go renew it or quit hunting. It was working so put it back.

82. Oppose We were puzzled why our sister AC would even suggest this, no biological reason or concern just a leg up for the lucky few, healthy hunter competition is a good thing. Also with the new "hot spot hunt" you could be drawn and never get to hunt but since it would be a cow permit it would prevent you from hunting in the general season.

83. Support We are looking to reduce this type of bull population in order to see any long term effect on herd bull makeup. This population is at the high end and we feel it is a experiment whose time has come.

84. Oppose The moose population in 14A doesn't warrant this it is healthy and growing.

85. Oppose The hunter is not now restricted to any weapon. If someone wishes to use a bow they may. No need to allocate anything to one group.

86. TNA Action on 87

87. Support Amend to include bulls has well.
88. Support
89. Support
90. Oppose Apples and oranges
91. We has the proposer withdraw 91 in favor of 87
92. Lack of information
93. Oppose
94. TNA
95. Oppose
96. Oppose
- 97 Oppose
98. Oppose
99. TNA
100. Support
101. Oppose See comments on proposer's other proposals
102. Oppose See comments on proposer's other proposals
103. Support Well planned out.
104. Support
105. Support We have found a general acceptance for this in the constituency. There is no biological concern.
106. Support There is no reason not to start this black bear are fur bearing The board should establish a season and methods. If the board doesn't want to do all

the work now at least establish a season and limit so that trappers can start taking bear.

107. Support has amended Strike options #1 and #2, remove from #3 "who personally accompanies a client at the bait station" And remove from #4 "and may maintain stations for his assistant."

108 Support We wish to talk at length with the board on this subject, it is purely allocative in nature. This give us a great ability to manage for full utilization of the resource.

109. Oppose

110. Support

111. TNA Action on 112

112. Support There is no biological concern , this is one of the most prolific and adaptable species on the planet, their impact is being felt by the heavy predation of ungulates to hares and their displacement of other predators such as marten and fox.

113. Support See 112

114. Support

115. Support Sheep numbers are down statewide. This addresses several concern which we hear from sheep hunters. It is intended to mollify some of the allocation issues we here from Alaskans and address these falling numbers. While there are not many ewes being shot we can't really justify any with the declines we have.

116. Support There is little to no support for anything other than full curl horn restrictions in the sheep hunting community.

117 Oppose We do not feel with numbers down statewide it is the time to start new sheep hunts.

118. Support has amended Remove 14A has this unit should be residents only.

119. Support

120. Oppose

121. TNA Action taken on 119

122. We support the idea of all the board's powers being returned to it, any condition the Department feels it needs on a hunt. Can be put on any hunt by the board at the scheduled meetings giving the public the ability to comment on or propose to put condition thru the board process. This is what the legislature had in mind when it created the board system. Had the legislature wanted the Administration to have this authority it would have delegated the authority directly to it. By giving the Department these powers you subvert the public process and the separation of powers between the Administration and the Legislature. This could become a constitutional question/problem if allowed to continue.

192 Oppose We Continue to oppose the onesided argument, it is always trappers who are ask to change while other user refuse to practice due diligence and care of their pets.

193. Oppose This proposal comes back over and over without the benefit of any real science.

194. Oppose See#193

195. Support

196. Support

197. Support

198. Support

199. Oppose these measure put in by those who oppose hunting in general are intended just to reduce hunting.

200. Oppose

201. Oppose

202. Support

203. Support

204. Oppose

205. TNA

206. Support

207. Support

208. Support

209. Support

210. Support

211. Support

212. Support

213. Support

214. Oppose

215. We support the idea of all the board's powers being returned to it, any condition the Department feels it needs on a hunt. Can be put on any hunt by the board at the scheduled meetings giving the public the ability to comment on or propose to put condition thru the board process. This is what the legislature had in mind when it created the board system. Had the legislature wanted the Administration to have this authority it would have delegated the authority directly to it. By giving the Department these powers you subvert the public process and the separation of powers between the Administration and the Legislature. This could become a constitutional question/problem if allowed to continue.

221 Oppose We can't believe that the department actually proposed this one. If by chance someone zaps a moose ,bear or porcupine . So be it! We doubt there is anyone out there really hunting with one of theses and if they are we don't think they will be with us long.

222. We oppose the destruction of antlers or any trophy

