Proposal 86

Submitted by: ADF&G

Effect of the proposal: Reauthorize the Intensive Management Plan in 92.113(a)(1) for predation control in Upper Yukon Tanana Predation Control Area through June 2026

ADF&G Position: Support

Upper Tanana–Fortymile AC: Supports

Current vs. Proposed comparison:

- **Current regulation:**
  - An Intensive Management Plan exists for Upper Yukon/Tanana Predation Control Area and expires in June 2020

- **Proposed regulation:**
  - Re-authorize the Upper Yukon/Tanana Intensive Management Plan (92.113)
  - Retain FCH and Wolves
  - For 6 years, expiring June 30, 2026
History of program

- **2004** Program first authorized
- **2005–2009** Grizzly bear baiting included
- **2005–2014** Moose northern Unit 12 and 20E included
- **2005–2018** Public Aerial Wolf Control
- **2006** Expanded wolf control area to include FCH
- **2009–2018** Department Helicopter Wolf Control
- **2012–2018** Department Control focused in FCH calving range
- **May 1, 2018** Wolf Control suspended for evaluation
Fortymile Herd Size

- 2006 Pop Est. = 43,837 demographic model
- Photocensus Counts - Minimum Count from photographs
  - 2009 = 46,510
  - 2010 = 51,675
  - 2017 = 73,009
- 2017 Minimum Count adjusted for missing caribou (Rivest et al. 1998) = 83,659
- 2019 Pop Est. = 82,000–85,000 demographic model

COMPARISON OF FCH POPULATION ESTIMATES AND IM OBJECTIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FCH - Pop Estimate</th>
<th>FCH - IM Pop Obj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 Census = 83,659</td>
<td>50,000–100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 ~ 82,000–85,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FCH Harvest Management Plan

- Guides Harvest Management
- Harvest Management Coalition
  - International Planning Team
- Goal:
  - Promote herd growth to restore herd to historic range in Alaska & Yukon
  - Without compromising herd health.

FCH Harvest 2006 - 2019

- AK Max Allowable Quota (Annual+15% Overrun)
- AK Reported Harvest

* Preliminary harvest data
COMPARISON OF FCH HARVEST AND IM OBJECTIVE

FCH-2019 Harvest
Alaska Quota = 2,507*
Alaska Harvest = 2,689

FCH-IM Harvest Obj
1,000 – 15,000

* Maximum quota, included 15% allowable over run of quota based on recommendations in 2012-2018 FCH Harvest Plan

FCH Non-human Mortality Factors

Calf predation by wolves
• First 6 weeks of life
• Primary Factor Limiting Growth
  • Boertje and Gardner (1998, 2000)
  • Boertje et al. 2008

Other Predators - minor relative to wolf predation
• Boertje and Gardner (1998, 2000), Boertje et al. 2008

Disease – not limiting
• Zarnke 2001, 2012 Disease Survey

Weather – not identified as limiting
Research


Fall 2004 Wolf Pop Calving/Post Calving Range (Pre-control)
- Range 150-210
- Mid-Point = 180

Wolf Removal/Reduction
(Entire 18,750 mi² Control Area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hunt</th>
<th>Trap</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Removal</th>
<th>Spring Abundance (Range)</th>
<th>% Reduction from Pre-control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>(197-322)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>(268-300)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>(200-223)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>(170-197)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>(197-232)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>(222-257)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>(252-288)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>(273-309)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>(195-235)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>(232-269)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVG</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Wolf Reductions in Packs Overlapping FCH Calving/Post-Calving Range (4,646 mi²)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reg. Year (July 1- June 30)</th>
<th>% reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006–2007</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–2008</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–2009</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2010</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2011</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2013</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>&gt;70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>&gt;70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>&gt;65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Inadequate information available to estimate wolf numbers and % reduction.

**Wolf Objectives**

- **Control Objective:** No fewer than 88 wolves by May 1 of each year
- **Department effort focus on:** Reducing wolves in packs with territories that overlap the calving/post calving range by 60-80% of the pre-control levels

Area-wide wolf numbers currently near pre-control levels. Anticipated recovery in all areas in no more than 2 more years.
Wolf Control

- Retaining ability to reimplement wolf control important
  - Rapid response to unexpected changes in population size or nutritional condition of the herd

- Focused removal on calving range
  - Target wolf predation on young calves (≤ 6-weeks)
  - Primary Factor Limiting FCH growth

- Removal in entire control area
  - Adults and calves likely to benefit to some degree

Program Evaluation (2016–2023)

- Evaluate impacts of wolf removal from calving and post-calving range (2016–2018)
  - Early caribou calf survival (≤ 6-weeks)
  - Annual calf and adult survival

- Post-wolf control (2019–2023)
  - Calf and adult survival - without wolf control
  - Wolf population recovery

- FCH nutrition
  - Parturition rates
  - Fall calf weights
  - Herd movements and range use
Operational Plan 2020–2025

Wolf Control Decision Framework

Triggers to activate Wolf Control:

1. Slow unexpected herd declines
   - Avoid falling below IM Population and Harvest Obj.

2. To grow the herd if nutritional condition allows
   - Maximize available harvest
   - Encourage range expansion

Control suspended until 2023 for Program Evaluation
Wolf Control Decision Framework

Triggers to **suspend** Wolf Control if reactivated:

1. Herd nutrition is compromised, and herd stabilization or reduction is unsuccessful through harvest alone.

2. The FCH exceeds 100,000 caribou and herd growth cannot be stabilized or reduced through harvest alone.

Proposal 86

Submitted by: ADF&G

**Effect of the proposal:** Reauthorize the Intensive Management Plan in 92.113(a)(1) for predation control in Upper Yukon Tanana Predation Control Area through June 2026

**ADF&G Position:** Support

**Upper Tanana–Fortymile AC:** Supports
Proposal 87 – Eliminate the Fortymile caribou registration hunt in Unit 20 and establish a drawing hunt for Fortymile caribou.

Submitted by: Public

- **Effect of Proposal:** Eliminate the Fall (RC860) and Winter (RC867) Fortymile caribou registration hunts in the portion of the Fortymile Hunt Area in Unit 20 and establish a drawing permit hunt for Fortymile caribou to provide for better hunter safety and hunt quality.

**ADF&G Recommendation:** Neutral on allocation; Opposed to reduced hunter opportunity
Proposal 87 – Safety and Hunt Quality Concerns

- **Current regulations:**
  - Registration Hunt (Zones 1-4)
  - **Residents:**
    - August 1–September 30, up to 3 caribou;
    - October 21–March 31, up to 3 caribou
  - **Nonresidents:**
    - August 10–September 30, one bull

- **Proposed regulation:**
  - Eliminate Registration Hunt
  - Establish a Drawing Hunt
  - No hunt details specified
    - Resident/Nonresident
    - Season Dates
    - Bag Limit

Fortymile Caribou Findings and Objectives

- **C&T Fortymile caribou**
- **Herd ANS of 350-400**
- **Intensive Management Objectives**
  - Population Objective = 50,000–100,000
  - Harvest Objective = 1,000-15,000
- **Herd Status**
  - ~82,000-85,000
  - Reduced nutritional status
Fortymile Harvest Management Plan

- Guides Harvest Management
- Harvest Management Coalition
  - International Planning Team
- Goal:
  - Promote herd growth to restore herd to historic range in Alaska & Yukon
  - Without compromising herd health.

Fortymile Caribou Herd Management Strategy

- Management Goal
  - Reduce herd to improve nutritional condition
- Management Objectives
  - Annual harvest quota set to stabilize/reduce herd growth
- Risk Management
  - Harvest objectives need to be met
- Caribou harvest management
  - Herd movements unpredictable

Hunters + Caribou = Harvest Objective Met
Fortymile Caribou Herd Management Strategy

- **Current Registration Hunt**
  - Unlimited participation
  - Over the counter permit availability
  - Liberal seasons dates
    - Access to caribou when available
    - Closures by EO in 2-5 days normal once caribou become available
  - Hunter crowding issues have always been associated with caribou hunts near roads

- **Drawing Hunt**
  - Unlimited drawing permits would be needed
  - Long seasons
  - Hunter Crowding and Safety issues will persist
  - Emergency Orders could still be used
Fortymile Caribou Herd Management Strategy

Other considerations:
- Apply for drawing permits
- Fee for Drawing permit
- Lost hunting opportunity
- Subsistence opportunity may not be adequate
- AWT – hunter orange

Proposal 87 – Fortymile Caribou

Subsistence statute (AS 16.05.258 (b)(2)(A) and (f):
- The board “shall adopt regulations that provide a reasonable opportunity for subsistence uses” defined as an opportunity that allows “a normally diligent person with a reasonable expectation of success”

Drawing permit hunts do not provide reasonable opportunity for subsistence users under Alaska Statute 16.05.258(f).
Proposal 87 – Eliminate the Fortymile caribou registration hunt in Unit 20 and establish a drawing hunt for Fortymile caribou.

Submitted by: Public

- **Effect of Proposal:** Eliminate the Fall (RC860) and Winter (RC867) Fortymile caribou registration hunts in the portion of the Fortymile Hunt Area in Unit 20 and establish a drawing permit hunt for Fortymile caribou to provide for better hunter safety and hunt quality.

**ADF&G Recommendation:** Neutral on allocation; Opposed to reduced hunter opportunity

Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E
Intensive Management – wolf control

Submitted by: Upper Tanana-Fortymile AC

- **Effect of the proposal:** Implement wolf control under an Intensive Management (IM) program to benefit moose within portions of Units 12, 20D, and 20E
  - Feasibility assessment

**ADF&G Recommendation:** Neutral

**AC Recommendations:**
- Upper Tanana-Fortymile AC: Support
- Eagle AC:
- Tok Cutoff/Nabesna Road AC:
- Delta AC:
Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control

Proposed 6,710 mi² area
- 77% within Unit 20E
- 17% within Unit 12
- 6% within Unit 20D

Aerial wolf control by:
- Public permittees
  - Retrieval by rotocraft (permit)
- Department

Proposal goals

Use wolf control to maintain moose:

1. Population at or above current levels
2. Bull-to-cow ratios above objectives
   - Avoid restrictive hunting regulations
3. Harvest/success rates near current levels
## Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control

### IM population objectives

#### Unit 12:
- **Objective**: 4,000-6,000 moose
  - Current estimate = 6,394 (5,280-7,509)
    - 1.1 (0.9-1.3) moose/mi²

#### Unit 20E:
- **Objective**: 8,000-10,000 moose
  - Current estimate = 7,262 (6,207-8,318)
    - 0.7 (0.6-0.8) moose/mi²

### Unit 12 IM harvest objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>IM population objective</th>
<th>IM harvest objective</th>
<th>ANS</th>
<th>Harvestable surplus exceeds ANS?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4,000-6,000</td>
<td>250-450</td>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20D</td>
<td>8,000-10,000</td>
<td>500-700</td>
<td>5-15 (north)* 5 (south)*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20E</td>
<td>8,000-10,000</td>
<td>500-1,000</td>
<td>50-75</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Outside of the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence Area

ANS = Amount reasonably necessary for subsistence uses

---

 Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control

### IM population objectives

**Unit 12:**
- Objective = 4,000-6,000 moose
  - Current estimate = 6,394 (5,280-7,509)
    - 1.1 (0.9-1.3) moose/mi²

**Unit 20E:**
- Objective = 8,000-10,000 moose
  - Current estimate = 7,262 (6,207-8,318)
    - 0.7 (0.6-0.8) moose/mi²
**Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control**

**IM harvest objectives**

**Unit 12:**
- Objective = 250-450 moose
  - RY14-RY18 average = 154 (range 108-191)
    - Includes potlatch
  - Challenges = land ownership, access

**Unit 20E:**
- Objective = 500-1,000 moose
  - RY14-RY18 average = 224 (range 199-245)
  - Challenges = access

**Background**
- Long history of predator management
- 2004: wolf and brown bear control
Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control

2006 - areas expanded

2009 – bear control stopped
- Removal objectives not met

2014 – moose removed from plan
- No focused wolf control

Wolf control for FCH through spring 2018
- Public permittees
- Department: RY08-RY09, RY11-RY17
  - Calving/post-calving range
- Moose benefit?
Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control

Eastern Unit 20E moose population

- 1,531 square miles
  - 24% of area
- Low density, stable
  - 0.5 moose/mi² (2019)
  - Higher in 1990s
- High bull:cow ratio
  - Obj. = 40 bulls:100 cows
  - 51 bulls:100 cows (2019)
- Limited hunter access
  - Ladue CUA
  - Remote

Taylor Corridor (Unit 20E) moose population

- 1,821 square miles
  - 27% of area
- Higher density, trend
  - 1.5 moose/mi² (2019)
- Lower bull:cow ratio
  - Obj. = 30 bulls:100 cows
  - 35 bulls:100 cows (2019)
- Good access
  - Hwy and trails
- High harvest
Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control

Taylor Corridor (Unit 20E) moose density

![Graph showing moose density over years](image)

Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control

Taylor Corridor (Unit 20E) moose bull:cow ratios

![Graph showing bull:cow ratios over years](image)
Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control
Taylor Corridor (Unit 20E) moose bull and cow estimates

Observable moose/m²
(90% CI)

Year

Cows
Bulls

Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control
Taylor Corridor (Unit 20E) moose calf:cow ratios

Calf:cow ratio
(90% CI)

Year
Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control

Unit 20E reported moose harvest

Total harvest vs Regulatory year

- RM865
- General harvest ticket
- Draw hunts

*Preliminary data; general harvest ticket data not available

Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control

Unit 20E moose hunter success rates

Success rate vs Regulatory year

- 0%
- 5%
- 10%
- 15%
- 20%
- 25%
- 30%
Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control

Southern Unit 20E moose productivity

Twinning rate (90% CI)

Year

Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control

Habitat

- 1989-2018 fires
  - 44% of proposed area
  - Mostly 2004-2005 fires

- Prescribed fire
  - Maintain habitat
  - Accessible areas
Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control

Moose mortality – 1980s Unit 20E

- Calves
  - Survival: 20%
  - Grizzly bears: 52%
  - Non-predation: 12%
  - Wolves: 13%
  - Black bears: 3%

- Total population (including calves)
  - Survival: 62%
  - Grizzly bears: 22%
  - Wolves: 7%
  - Non-predation: 6%
  - Hunters: 2%
  - Black bears: 1%

- Reduced wolf numbers during study
- SW Yukon study – similar results

Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control

Wolf harvest within proposed area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory year</th>
<th>Hunters/trappers</th>
<th>Public wolf control</th>
<th>ADF&amp;G wolf control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control

Other considerations

- Fortymile caribou herd
- Ongoing research projects
  - Fortymile caribou calf mortality
  - Fortymile wolves

Feasibility assessment

Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control

Summary

1. IM population objectives
   - Close to or exceed minimum

2. IM harvest objectives
   - Not being met
     - Land ownership, access
   - Current IM harvest objective
     - Unit 12 = 6.2-7.5%; Unit 20E = 6.3-10%
   - Change for Unit 12 and 20E?
Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control

**Summary (cont.)**

3. Moose population
   - Eastern portion – stable at low density
   - Central portion (Taylor Corridor)
     - Increasing
     - Bull:cow ratio near objective

   Primary reasoning behind proposed wolf control

---

Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control

**Conclusions**

1. ADF&G recommendation = NEUTRAL
   - No biological concerns

2. Conflicting proposed goals
   - Maintain moose:
     - Population
     - Bull:cow ratios > objectives
     - Harvest/success rates

3. Antlerless harvest – help meet goals
   - IM harvest objectives
Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E
Intensive Management – wolf control

**Submitted by:** Upper Tanana-Fortymile AC

**Effect of the proposal:** Implement wolf control under an Intensive Management (IM) program to benefit moose within portions of Units 12, 20D, and 20E

- Feasibility assessment

**ADF&G Recommendation:** Neutral

**AC Recommendations:**
- Upper Tanana-Fortymile AC: Support
- Eagle AC:
- Tok Cutoff/Nabesna Road AC:
- Delta AC:

---

Proposal 89 – Unit 20E
Caribou and Moose Registration Permits

**Submitted by:** Public

**Effect of the proposal:** Allow hunters to simultaneously possess registration permits for both caribou (RC860) and moose (RM865) in Unit 20E

**ADF&G Recommendation:**
- Support – Additional opportunity
- Neutral – Allocation

**AC Recommendations:**
- Upper Tanana-Fortymile AC: Oppose
- Eagle AC:
Proposal 89 – Unit 20E moose and caribou

Current moose regulations

Residents:
- Aug. 24-28 and Sept. 8-17
- Any-bull

Nonresidents:
- Sept. 8-17
- 50” or 4 BT

Permits:
- RM865 – 94% of unit
- GM000 – 6% of unit

Proposal 89 – Unit 20E moose and caribou

Current caribou regulations

RC860 permit:
- Aug. 10-Sept. 30
  - Res: 1 caribou
  - Nonres: 1 bull
- Harvest quota by zone

Zone 2:
- Remote – rarely closes

Zone 3:
- Accessible – Taylor Hwy
- Some years closed by EO
**Proposal 89 – Unit 20E moose and caribou**

**RM865 and RC860 permits**

**Currently:**
- RM865 OR RC860 permit
  - Not both simultaneously
  - Applies to individuals
    - Hunting parties - both
    - Swap permits

**Proposal:**
- Allow individuals to simultaneously possess RM865 and RC860

**Background**

Permit restriction implemented in 2001

- Concerns with moose population
  - Low density (0.4-0.6 moose/mi²)
  - moose harvest
  - bull:cow ratio in accessible areas
  - # caribou hunters
    - Incident moose harvest

- BOG proposal – discretionary permit authority

*Purpose - reduce incidental moose harvest by caribou hunters*
Proposal 89 – Unit 20E moose and caribou

Since 2001 – Unit 20E moose:

➢ Densities increased
  ▪ 0.6-0.8 moose/mi² unitwide
    ○ Southern Unit 20E 1.5 moose/mi²

➢ Hunting pressure increased
  Average # Unit 20E moose hunters/harvest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001-2003</th>
<th>2016-2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunters</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

➢ Bull:cow ratio near objective in accessible areas

Proposal 89 – Unit 20E moose and caribou

Effect of the proposal

➢ Opportunity to hunt caribou and moose simultaneously

RC860 (Zone 3 – Taylor Hwy) and RM865
# days overlapping season dates

Overlapping seasons likely to continue
Proposal 89 – Unit 20E moose and caribou

Effect of the proposal

- Caribou/moose harvest
  - Increase?
    - Hunting parties currently mix permits

- No biological concerns
  - Fortymile caribou herd – harvest quota
  - Unit 20E moose
    - Small harvest increase likely ok
    - Bull:cow ratios near objectives

- Steese Hwy – currently hunt both species

Proposal 89 – Unit 20E moose and caribou

Additional considerations

If passed:

- Change to RM865 unitwide?
Proposal 89 – Unit 20E
Caribou and Moose Registration Permits

Submitted by: Public

Effect of the proposal: Allow hunters to simultaneously possess registration permits for both caribou (RC860) and moose (RM865) in Unit 20E

ADF&G Recommendation:
- Support – Additional opportunity
- Neutral – Allocation

AC Recommendations:
- Upper Tanana-Fortymile AC: Oppose
- Eagle AC:

Proposal 90 – Sheep
Tok Management Area (TMA)

Submitted by: Public

Effect of the proposal: Reduce the proportion of TMA sheep draw permits awarded to nonresidents hunting with relatives within second-degree of kindred (SDK)

ADF&G Recommendation: Neutral - Allocation

AC Recommendations:
- Upper Tanana-Fortymile AC: Oppose
- Tok Cutoff/Nabesna Road:
Proposal 90 – Tok Management Area Sheep

Current TMA permit (60-120 annually) allocation

Resident vs. nonresident permits

- Residents 90%
- Nonresidents 10%

Nonresident permits (10% of total)

- Max of 50% to hunters accompanied by SDK
- Remainder to guided nonresidents

Since 2007, altered 2014

Proposal 90 – Tok Management Area Sheep

Proposed TMA permit (60-120 annually) allocation

Resident vs. nonresident permits

- Residents 90%
- Nonresidents 10%

Nonresident permits (10% of total)

- Max of 50% 25% to hunters accompanied by SDK
- Remainder to guided nonresidents

Since 2009
Proposal 90 – Tok Management Area Sheep

Nonresident permits

Guided – 65%  Second-degree kindred – 35%

Proposal 90 – Tok Management Area Sheep

Guided/SDK allocation depends on # permits

- 60 to 120 permits annually
  - Split evenly - early/late season

80 permits

72 residents

8 nonresidents

4 early season

Max 2 SDK

Remaining guided

4 late season

Max 2 SDK

Remaining guided

Max of 50% (4 of 8) to SDK
**Proposal 90 – Tok Management Area Sheep**

**Guided/SDK allocation depends on # permits**

- 60 to 120 permits annually
  - Split evenly - early/late season

![Diagram showing permit allocation](Diagram.png)

**Remaining guided**

**Max of 33% (2 of 6) to SDK**

---

**Proposal 90 – Tok Management Area Sheep**

**Current vs. proposed allocation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total permits</th>
<th>Nonresident allocation (10%)</th>
<th>Maximum SDK allocation (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 - (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 - (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4 - (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6 - (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposal 90 – Tok Management Area Sheep

Current vs. proposed allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total permits</th>
<th>Nonresident allocation (10%)</th>
<th>Maximum SDK allocation (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current (50%)</td>
<td>Proposed (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2 - (33%)</td>
<td>0 - (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>4 - (50%)</td>
<td>2 - (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>4 - (40%)</td>
<td>2 - (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>6 - (50%)</td>
<td>2 - (17%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Currently – SDK ≤50% nonresident permits
   - Received 35% during 2015-2019

2. Proposal – reduce SDK allocation to ≤25%
   - Actual % - depend on total # permits
   - No biological concerns
     - Guided success > SDK success
     - Small # permits – minimal impact

3. ADF&G recommendation – NEUTRAL
   - Allocation issue
Proposal 90 – Sheep
Tok Management Area (TMA)

Submitted by:
Public

Effect of the proposal: Reduce the proportion of TMA sheep draw permits awarded to nonresidents hunting with relatives within second-degree of kindred (SDK)

ADF&G Recommendation: Neutral - Allocation

AC Recommendations:
- Upper Tanana-Fortymile AC: Oppose
- Tok Cutoff/Nabesna Road: