

Regionwide & Multiple Units

Note: The Board of Game deferred this proposal from the 2016 Statewide Regulations Meeting to each regional meeting. It was previously considered by the board for the Arctic/Western Region (Proposal 20), Interior/Northeast Region (Proposal 48), and the Central/Southwest Region (Proposal 71).

PROPOSAL 1

5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions.

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

Allow the use of crossbows in restricted-weapons hunts for the Southeast Region as follows:

In order to allow more opportunity for those hunters wishing to use a crossbow while hunting during special hunts like the roadside "targeted hunts" for moose in Southcentral and the Interior, or while hunting in specific game management areas or state refuges around the state where either muzzleloaders or shotguns and bow and arrow are the approved hunting tools, I would ask the Board of Game to include the use of crossbows as a fourth approved hunting tool.

In addition to those wishing to hunt with a crossbow, there are those older or smaller hunters who, for whatever reason, cannot use a bow and arrow that meets the existing requirements. A person who cannot draw and hold a bow and arrow can normally still use a crossbow if that tool was legal for use.

What I am proposing is that the category of crossbow be added to the list of approved hunting tools for those hunts in game management areas, state game refuges, and special hunts where either a muzzleloader or shotgun is legal along with bow and arrow. For areas or hunts that are specified as bow and arrow only, nothing will change.

A crossbow has certain advantages over a bow and arrow and also has some major disadvantages compared to a bow and arrow. However, the two hunting tools are still relatively comparable in power and range. A crossbow does not even come close to a muzzleloader or shotgun in comparison. If a muzzleloader or a shotgun is legal to use, along with bow and arrow, then there are no practical concerns to not allow a crossbow along with bow and arrow in those areas or hunts which also allow a muzzleloader or shotgun.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? There are currently several state game management areas, state refuges, and special hunts statewide which support weapons restricted big game hunts. Most of these hunts prohibit the use of centerfire, high-powered rifles and specify that only muzzleloaders, shotguns using slugs, or bow and arrow (or some combination of the specified implements) are allowed. Hunters choosing to use muzzleloaders or bow and arrow must comply with existing regulation requirements for these hunting tools, i.e., things like muzzleloading caliber or the bow's draw weight.

These restrictions in areas or refuges or special hunts are done largely for safety reasons because all of the approved hunting tools are considered short-range compared to a high-powered rifle.

The Board of Game recently defined crossbows in regulation into their own category with requirements on power, bolt length, etc. This was done because crossbows as hunting tools are gradually increasing in hunting use for big game in Alaska during the general season and have become the fastest growing hunting tool in the Lower 48 for hunting animals like white-tailed deer and black bear. It was felt that a distinction between bow and arrow and crossbow was necessary.

Since crossbows are defined separately from bow and arrow, current regulations allowing the use of bow and arrow exclude the use of a crossbow for hunting during that same hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Howard Delo (EG-C15-037)

PROPOSAL 2

5 AAC 92.230. Feeding of game.

Allow the feeding of deer in the Southeast Region as follows:

Allow food plotting on private property for feeding and harvesting deer in all game units that are applicable.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? I would like the board to consider changing the hunting regulations on the restriction of feeding deer, making it possible for hunters to feed deer year-round and to harvest deer, observing all other current hunting regulations while using food plots on private property only.

I believe allowing food plots to be used year-round will give deer more food throughout the winter and help the deer population. I also believe that by using food plotting techniques the hunters will be more apt to want to harvest more mature bucks.

PROPOSED BY: Lucas Shilts (EG-F18-008)

PROPOSAL 3

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

Modify the salvage requirement for deer in Units 1–5 as follows:

Add an exception to 5 AAC 92.220 stating that salvage of rib meat for Sitka black-tailed deer in Units 1–5 is optional.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Current regulations require the salvage of rib meat off Sitka black-tailed deer. This proposal would make the salvage requirement of rib meat optional for Sitka black-tailed deer in Units 1–5. Listed are the reasons for this proposal:

(1) On many deer, this is really a small amount of meat, between two to five pounds total. Strips of meat are maybe one-half inch in thickness, which is why there's not a lot of meat. The meat that is salvageable is likely less than this as it is mixed in with large amounts of gristle and fat.

(2) If the deer is shot through the ribs, the amount of meat decreases even more. This is especially true because many hunters in Unit 4 (Admiralty, Baranof, Chicagof) are using large caliber rifles due to brown bear presence.

(3) Spending time salvaging rib meat increases the chances of a bear encounter.

(4) Many other western states do not require salvage of rib meat of even larger animals. Such states include: Oregon, Montana, Idaho, Colorado, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Arizona.

PROPOSED BY: Nicholas Orr (EG-F18-036)

PROPOSAL 4

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

Allow the harvest of game from a boat in Units 1–5 as follows:

Remove Section (9):

"from a boat in Units 1–5; however, a person with physical disabilities, as defined in Alaska Statute 16.05.940, may hunt from a boat under authority of a permit issued by the department;"

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? I propose allowing harvest of game animals in Southeast Alaska (Units 1–5) from a boat not under power. Southeast Alaska is the only part of Alaska where it is illegal to shoot from a boat that is not under power. This is not due to general concerns over shot placement or hunter ethics, as shooting from a boat is allowed in all other parts of the state. This is also not because of any concerns that are particular to Sitka black-tailed deer or brown/black bears. Prince William Sound has all three species and it is legal to shoot from a boat not under power there. Kodiak has Sitka black-tailed deer and brown bears and it is also legal to shoot from a boat not under power in that unit as well.

It is common for hunters in Units 1–5 to shoot from a boat not under power; each year there are a number of pictures on social media that are highly suggestive of deer harvested from a boat as well as posts on social media/internet from other hunters throughout Southeast Alaska that either admit to or imply shooting from a boat is being used as a harvest method. When combined with the occasional violation charged in the court system, both support that this is happening on a regular basis.

Changing this rule would bring regulations regarding shooting from a boat not under power in Units 1–5 in line with those in the rest of the state. It is unlikely that it would lead to significant increase in the number of deer harvested as it is not uncommon for hunters to harvest deer in this way.

PROPOSED BY: Nicholas Orr (EG-F18-035)

PROPOSAL 5

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

Shorten the hunting seasons and change the bag limit for moose in the Southeast Region as follows:

The solution may be to shorten the season to two weeks (October 1 to October 15) and allow “any bull” moose to be legally taken.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? I request the Board of Game consider the number of illegal moose being taken in Southeast Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: Harold Martindale (EG-F17-005)

PROPOSAL 6

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

Change the salvage requirement for black bear in Units 1–5 as follows:

Remove the requirement for residents to salvage black bear hides in Units 1–5 and instead require salvage of the meat throughout the season.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Remove the requirement for residents to salvage black bear hides but require meat salvage season-round. I've harvested black bear at all times during the season and find the meat is good any time. Hides often-times have no value. The Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) will say that when bears feed on salmon, the bear meat is not good. This is debatable. Some black bear in Southeast do not feed on salmon, contrary to popular belief.

PROPOSED BY: Mark Freshwaters (EG-F18-033)

PROPOSAL 7

5 AAC 92.165. Sealing of bear skins and skulls.

Eliminate the black bear sealing requirement for resident hunters in the Southeast Region as follows:

Eliminate the sealing requirement of black bear by resident hunters in Southeast.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? I would like the Board of Game (board) to eliminate the requirement for resident hunters to seal black bears but harvest reports/tickets would still be required. It's an inconvenience, especially for residents who do not live near Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) locations. ADF&G receives enough data from nonresidents required to seal black bear.

PROPOSED BY: Mark Freshwaters (EG-F18-032)

PROPOSAL 8

5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear.

Rescind the guide requirement for nonresidents hunting black bear in the Southeast Region as follows:

Rescind the must-be-guided requirement for black bear for nonresident U.S. citizens in Region I (Southeast).

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?
Must-be-guided requirement for nonresidents hunting black bear.**

Alaska’s must-be-guided law (AS 16.05.407) was enacted based on the rationale that nonresident U.S. citizen hunters needed assistance in judging legality of animals, protections when hunting certain dangerous game such as brown/grizzly bear, or when hunting in dangerous terrain for Dall sheep or mountain goat.

The legislature never intended for the Board of Game to create new must-be-guided species beyond brown bear, Dall sheep, and mountain goat without legislative approval.

But the Board of Game has done just that with black bear in Region I, using “conservation” concerns for black bears to create a new must-be-guided species for nonresidents.

As long as a nonresident hires a licensed guide to hunt black bear in Region I, he or she is granted unlimited opportunity under this new system. But if a nonresident is hunting without a guide, he or she must first draw a permit from a limited allocation.

Instead of equally limiting all nonresident black bear hunters because of conservation concerns, the Board of Game essentially granted yet another state-sponsored subsidy to guides. This is akin to saying there are too many cars on Southeast Alaska roads, but instead of fairly limiting all cars, Toyotas are guaranteed access at all times whereas all other car brands are limited in when they could be on the road. Such a scheme surely helps Toyota dealers, but this is not how the free market system is supposed to work.

There was never an allowance either to allow nonresidents hunting with a resident relative within second degree of kindred to hunt without being required to apply for a draw permit, further going against the intent of the must-be-guided law that allows a resident Alaskan to act as an (unpaid) guide. Alaskans who wanted to hunt black bear with their nonresident relative were denied that opportunity unless the nonresident relative first drew a draw permit.

When there are conservation concerns for any species that center around nonresident harvests, the solution should always be to limit nonresident harvest across the board, equally. The Board of Game should not use the must-be-guided statute as a game management tool, nor be in the business of giving a preference to, or limiting opportunity for, specific nonresident hunters who hunt on their own, with a registered guide, or with a resident relative within second degree of kindred.

PROPOSED BY: Resident Hunters of Alaska (HQ-F18-022)

PROPOSAL 9

5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear.

Change the nonresident black bear permit hunts for Units 1B, 1C, and 1D to general season hunts as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 1(B) RESIDENT HUNTERS: 2 bears, not more than 1 of which may be a blue or glacier bear	Sept. 1—June 30 (General hunt only)	
[NONRESIDENT HUNTERS WITH GUIDE: 1 BEAR]		[SEPT. 1—JUNE 30]
[NONRESIDENT HUNTERS WITHOUT GUIDE: 1 BEAR BY DRAWING PERMIT ONLY; UP TO 40 PERMITS MAY BE ISSUED]		[SEPT. 1—JUNE 30]
<u>NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:</u> <u>1 bear</u>		<u>Sept. 1—June 30</u>
Units 1(C), north of Taku Inlet and the north bank of the Taku River		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 2 bears, not more than 1 of which may be a blue or glacier bear; however, a white-colored bear may not be taken	Sept. 1—June 30 (General hunt only)	
[NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: WITH GUIDE: 1 BEAR; HOWEVER, A WHITE-COLORED BEAR MAY NOT BE TAKEN]		[SEPT. 1—JUNE 30]
[NONRESIDENT HUNTERS WITHOUT GUIDE: 1 BEAR BY DRAWING PERMIT ONLY; UP TO 30 PERMITS MAY BE ISSUED; HOWEVER, A WHITE-COLORED BEAR MAY NOT BE TAKEN]		[SEPT. 1—JUNE 30]

NONRESIDENT HUNTER:
1 bear; however, a white-colored
bear may not be taken

Sept. 1—June 30

Remainder of Unit 1(C)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:
2 bears, not more than 1
of which may be a blue or glacier
bear; however, a white-colored
bear may not be taken

Sept. 1—June 30
(General hunt only)

[NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:
WITH GUIDE: 1 BEAR; HOWEVER,
A WHITE-COLORED BEAR MAY
NOT BE TAKEN]

[SEPT. 1—JUNE 30]

[NONRESIDENT HUNTERS WITHOUT
GUIDE:
1 BEAR BY DRAWING PERMIT ONLY;
UP TO 30 PERMITS MAY BE ISSUED;
HOWEVER, A WHITE-COLORED BEAR
MAY NOT BE TAKEN]

[SEPT. 1—JUNE 30]

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:
1 bear; however, a white-colored
bear may not be taken

Sept. 1— June 30

Unit 1(D)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:
2 bears, not more than 1
of which may be a blue or glacier
bear; however, a white-colored
bear may not be taken

Sept. 1—June 30
(General hunt only)

[NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:
WITH GUIDE: 1 BEAR; HOWEVER,
A WHITE-COLORED BEAR MAY
NOT BE TAKEN]

[SEPT. 1—JUNE 30]

[NONRESIDENT HUNTERS WITHOUT
GUIDE:
1 BEAR BY DRAWING PERMIT ONLY;
UP TO 20 PERMITS MAY BE ISSUED;

[SEPT. 1—JUNE 30]

levels at RY 2007–2009 achieved the department’s goal of reducing the black bear harvest in Southeast Alaska.

This proposal will not change unguided nonresident drawing hunt requirements for Unit 1C south, Unit 2, Unit 3 Kuiu Island, or Unit 3 Kupreanof Island. As noted above, those units were the original areas of conservation concern, and the department continues to believe harvest by unguided nonresidents in those areas is best managed through drawing permits.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F18-036)

PROPOSAL 10

5 AAC 92.170. Sealing of marten, fisher, lynx, beaver, otter, wolf, and wolverine.

Require sealing of coyote in Units 1–5 as follows:

Coyote must be sealed within 30 days after the close of the season.

You may shoot a coyote on the same day that you have flown in an airplane if the coyote is either caught in a trap or a snare or you are more the 300 feet from the airplane.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Coyote hunting seasons runs from September 1 – April 30. Coyote trapping season runs from November 1 – April 30.

Both hunting and trapping have no limit on the number animals harvested. Coyote distribution and abundance are unknown. Anecdotal information from trappers and observations in the field are that coyote numbers may be increasing but there is no way to tell for certain.

An increase in hunters and trappers in the 2017–2018 season have people wondering if the population can stand the increased pressure. Also, what really is the population and how many can we harvest.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Lynn Canal Fish Game Advisory Committee (EG-F18-045)

PROPOSAL 11

5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping.

Extend the trapping season for beaver in Units 1–5 as follows:

Beaver, Units 1–5.....Nov. 10 – May 15.....No limit

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Return beaver season, Units 1–5, back to the closure of May 15.

PROPOSED BY: Robert Jahnke (EG-F18-024)

PROPOSAL 12

5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping.

Modify the trapping season for beaver in Unit 1 as follows:

We are proposing to make the beaver trapping season in Unit 1 have no closed season so trappers can easily remove problem beavers.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? We would like to be able to trap nuisance beaver year-round without having to obtain a special permit.

PROPOSED BY: Luke Rauscher and Darren Belisle (HQ-F18-018)

PROPOSAL 13

5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.

Require identification tags for traps and snares in Units 1–5 as follows:

I recommend reinstating previous language for trap tag requirement: In Unit 1–5, trappers are prohibited from using a trap or snare unless the trap or snare has been individually marked with a permanent metal tag upon which is stamped or permanently etched the trappers name and address or the trapper’s permanent identification number.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? There is currently no requirement for owners to mark traps, unlike crab pots and similar gear. Marking of traps promotes trapper accountability, encourages ethical trapping throughout the season and closure of traps at the end of the season. Trap marking also allows members of the public to contact proper authorities with trap information, who in turn can contact trappers, in situations where a non-target animal is trapped, or when a hiker comes across an animal that is trapped but not lethally. Wildlife is a public resource, and trappers gain financially through the harvest of this resource, yet at the same time, trapping and snaring present a risk to humans and their dogs and to non-target wildlife. Trapper accountability through trap tag marking and following the Trapper’s Code of Ethics shows conscientious trapping by trappers and helps build public support of trapping into the future. Marking of traps used to be required throughout Southeast Alaska; this was a well-accepted program and was supported by ADF&G, Alaska Wildlife Troopers, and both trappers and non-trappers.

Please consider my experience in 2017: my dog was caught in a snare while I was hiking off-trail; my dog was within five feet of me when snared; it was not ranging off in the distance. I observed a snared wolf, not dead, but instead tethered on about 10 feet of cable, running back and forth, partially choking. Lastly, outside the trapping season, I came across three active snares that were still set on a trail. As an avid hiker and dog owner who also respects that trapping is a legal means of taking furbearers, I ask that you reinstate the requirement of marking traps in Southeast Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: Lauri Jemison (EG-F18-067)

PROPOSAL 14

5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.

Require trappers to post identification signs for traps and snares in Units 1–5 as follows:

In Unit 1–5, trappers are prohibited from using a trap or snare unless a sign is posted within 50 yards that list the trapper’s name and address or the trappers permanent identification; the trapper must use the trapper’s Alaska driver’s license number or state identification card number as the required permanent identification number. Signs at a snaring site must be at least 8.5” x 11” in size, be clearly visible, and have numbers and letters that are at least one inch high and 1/2-inch-wide in a color that contrasts with the background color of the sign. Signs must be placed at both the start and end of a trapline.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? There is currently no requirement for trappers to provide warning or post a sign near traps in an area where trapping occurs. Furbearers are a public resource, used by consumptive and non-consumptive persons, however, trapping and snaring present a risk to humans, their dogs, and to non-target wildlife. As a user of wildlife resources (through wildlife viewing and photography), as well as an avid hiker and dog owner, I feel that trappers should shoulder some responsibility for the danger that their activity poses to other user groups by placing signs within 50 yards of a trap set. Placement of signs will warn recreational user groups of the potential for danger ahead, allowing hikers a choice whether to continue into an area where traps are present. Posting traps and traplines may help to reduce the unintended capture of domestic pets. Placement of signs demonstrates that trappers are actively trying to reduce conflicts with other wildlife users; I believe this action will go a long way toward building public support for trapping. Some trappers have voluntarily taken the initiative to use signs to mark trails where they are trapping; I know this activity is greatly appreciated by dog owners. In most circumstances, especially when hiking only with my dogs (and not a second person), I will avoid an area if I know it is actively being trapped. One consideration is to require signage only for large traps and snares, as these are most likely to injure or kill unintended targets.

PROPOSED BY: Lauri Jemison (EG-F18-068)

PROPOSAL 15

5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game.

Lengthen the hunting season for waterfowl in the Southeast Region as follows:

Expand the waterfowl hunting season for Southeast Alaska into January and February.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Why does the season for waterfowl in Southeast Alaska end with the calendar year? Many other states hunt into the new year. The birds are not breeding. Depending on the year and how harsh or tame the climate is, we don't even see a decent flush of birds until the end of the season. Why can't the season run through at least January and even February?

PROPOSED BY: Perry Klein (EG-F17-006)

PROPOSAL 16

5 AAC 85.065(4)(A-F)(H) and (I). Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game.

Shift the hunting season for migratory game birds in Units 1–4 as follows:

If adopted, the migratory game bird season for Units 1–4 would be open **Sept. 1—Dec. 16** [SEPT. 16—DEC. 31] for residents and nonresidents.

Should the Board of Game (board) members find themselves unable to adopt this proposal, I urge them to consider alternating the waterfowl season annually, a September 1 – December 16 season on odd years and a September 16 – December 31 season on even years. This would be a reasonable compromise for all hunters should there continue to be interest in late December hunting opportunities.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? In 2008, the board passed a proposal that changed the waterfowl season opening date for Units 1–4 from September 1 to September 16. I hold some responsibility for the change as I spearheaded the effort by submitting the proposal. The purpose of my proposal was to allow for a couple more weekends of mallard hunting in December as late season hunting in the early 2000s was excellent. At the time, a hunter survey completed by the Department of Fish and Game showed a small preference toward the later start date, however, opinions varied throughout the region.

This proposal is submitted in an effort to return the Southeast Alaska waterfowl season back to a start date of September 1. Following the implementation of the current September 16 start date, there have been several board proposals and public comments supporting a return to the former start date. Reports from the Gustavus area indicate that access to sandhill crane hunting has been reduced by the later start date and folks in the Haines area seem unhappy with the current season structure as well. The loss of opportunities for other hunters was an unintended consequence of the change in season dates and this issue has weighed on me for some time.

My observations, as well as those of others, over the past five or six years have shown good numbers of pintail, teal and wigeon moving down the outer coast in late August and early September and many of these birds have passed through the area prior to the September 16 opener. I have made fewer late season hunting trips recently and have not seen the consistency in those December trips that there was a decade ago. I continue to find myself gravitating more toward opportunities earlier in the season and can no longer advocate for the delayed season.

It is my opinion that the importance of restoring those regional hunting opportunities in early September outweighs any benefit of the later hunting season. I cannot offer any information on current hunter participation levels during the last two weeks of December, but I ask the board to consider upcoming public and advisory committee comments when addressing this issue.

PROPOSED BY: Mike Vaughn

(HQ-F18-015)
