

5 AAC 96.625. JOINT BOARD PETITION POLICY

(effective September 19, 2019)

(a) Under AS 44.62.220, an interested person may petition an agency, including the Boards of Fisheries and Game, for the adoption, amendment, or repeal of a regulation. The petition must clearly and concisely state the substance or nature of the regulation, amendment, or repeal requested, the reason for the request, and must reference the agency's authority to take the requested action. Within 30 days after receiving a petition, a board will deny the petition in writing, or schedule the matter for public hearing under AS 44.62.190--44.62.210, which require that any agency publish legal notice describing the proposed change and solicit comment for 30 days before taking action. AS 44.62.230 also provides that if the petition is for an emergency regulation, and the agency finds that an emergency exists, the agency may submit the regulation to the lieutenant governor immediately after making the finding of emergency and putting the regulation into proper form.

(b) Fish and game regulations are adopted by the Alaska Board of Fisheries and the Alaska Board of Game. Annually, the boards solicit regulation changes through regulatory proposals described in 5 AAC 96.610(a). Several hundred proposed changes are usually submitted to each board annually. The Department of Fish and Game compiles the proposals and mails them to all fish and game advisory committees, and to other interested individuals.

(c) Copies of all proposals are available at local Department of Fish and Game offices and on the boards support section's website. When the proposal books are available, the advisory committees and hold public meetings in the communities and regions they represent, to gather local comment on the proposed changes. Finally, the boards convene public meetings, which have lasted as long as six weeks, taking department staff reports, public comment, and advisory committee reports before voting in public session on the proposed changes.

(d) The public has come to rely on this regularly scheduled participatory process as the basis for changing fish and game regulations. Commercial fishermen, processors, guides, trappers, hunters, sport fishermen, subsistence fishermen, and others plan business and recreational ventures around the outcome of these public meetings.

(e) The Boards of Fisheries and Game recognize the importance of public participation in developing management regulations, and recognize that public reliance on the predictability of the normal board process is a critical element in regulatory changes. The boards find that petitions received under (a) of this section can detrimentally circumvent this process and that an adequate and more reasonable opportunity for public participation is provided by regularly scheduled meetings.

(f) The Boards of Fisheries and Game recognize that in rare instances circumstances may require regulatory changes outside the process described in (b) - (d) of this section. It is the policy of the boards that a petition will be denied and not scheduled for hearing unless the problem outlined in the petition justifies a finding of emergency under AS 44.62.250(a). In accordance with state policy expressed in AS 44.62.270, emergencies will be held to a minimum and are rarely found to exist. Except for petitions dealing with subsistence hunting or subsistence fishing, an emergency is an unforeseen, unexpected event that either threatens a fish or game resource, or an unforeseen, unexpected resource situation where a biologically allowable resource harvest would be precluded by delayed regulatory action and such delay would be significantly burdensome to the petitioners because the resource would be unavailable in the future. Petitions dealing with subsistence hunting or subsistence fishing will be evaluated under these criteria:

- (1) the petition must address a fish or game population that has not previously been considered by the board for identification as a population customarily and traditionally used for subsistence under AS 16.05.258; or
- (2) the circumstances of the petition otherwise must require expedited consideration by the board, such as where the proposal is the result of a court decision or is the subject of federal administrative action that might impact state game management authority.

(Eff. 9/22/85, Register 95; am 8/17/91, Register 119; readopt 5/15/93, Register 126; am 2/23/2014, Register 209; am 9/19/2019, Register 231)

Authority: AS 16.05.251, AS 16.05.255, AS 16.05.258


ALASKA JOINT BOARDS OF FISHERIES AND GAME

CRITERIA FOR DEVELOPMENT OF BOARD-GENERATED PROPOSAL


It has been suggested that criteria need to be established to guide the Alaska Joint Boards of Fisheries and Game, Board of Fisheries, and Board of Game (boards) members when deliberating on whether or not to develop a board-generated proposal. The boards will consider the following criteria when deliberating the proposed development and scheduling of a board-generated proposal:

1. Is it in the public's best interest (e.g., access to resource, consistent intent, public process)?
2. Is there urgency in considering the issue (e.g., potential for fish and wildlife objectives not being met or sustainability in question)?
3. Are current processes insufficient to bring the subject to the board's attention (e.g., reconsideration policy, normal cycle proposal submittal, ACRs, petitions)?
4. Will there be reasonable and adequate opportunity for public comment (e.g., how far do affected users have to travel to participate, amount of time for affected users to respond)?

Findings adopted this 16th day of October 2013.



Ted Spraker, Chairman
Alaska Board of Game
Vote: 6-0



Karl Johnstone, Chairman
Alaska Board of Fisheries
Vote: 7-0

**Findings for the Alaska Board of Game
2019-223-BOG
Board Recommendation to the Department of Fish and Game
for Allocation of Nelchina Caribou Permits
January 15, 2019**

The Board of Game finds as follows, based on information provided by Department staff, Alaska residents and other wildlife users:

The Board recommended the Department take the following actions for allocating Nelchina caribou harvests:

- 1) When the Nelchina caribou herd is above the upper end of the population objective in 5 AAC 92.108:
 - a) The one Community Subsistence Harvest hunt will be held; and
 - b) the two Tier I registration hunts will be held; and
 - c) the one youth drawing hunt will occur, the bag limit is one caribou, and up to 200 permits may be issued; and
 - d) the one resident drawing hunt will occur, the bag limit is one caribou, and up to 5,000 permits may be issued; and
 - e) the one nonresident drawing hunt will occur, the bag limit is one bull, and up to 200 permits may be issued; and
 - f) all 200 youth drawing permits will be issued each year, and the number of resident and nonresident permits to be issued will be enough that the Department would project to reach the harvestable surplus (also referred to as the quota), but not more than 5,000 and 200 respectively.

- 2) When the Nelchina caribou herd is within the population objective:
 - a) the one Community Subsistence Harvest hunt will be held; and
 - b) the two Tier I registration hunts will be held; and
 - c) all 200 youth drawing permits will be issued, and the number of resident and nonresident permits to be issued will be enough that the Department would project to reach the harvestable surplus (also referred to as the quota), but not more than 5,000 and 50 respectively. The nonresident permits will be issued after all 5,000 resident drawing permits are issued.

- 3) When the caribou population is below the management objectives and when the estimated harvestable surplus will not be adequate to meet the lower end of the amount reasonably necessary for subsistence:
 - a) a resident only Tier II hunt will be administered in the next application cycle; and
 - b) the Community Subsistence Harvest hunt will not be held in the subsequent year but will be held if applications are received and permits announced; and
 - c) Neither Tier I registration hunt will be held in the subsequent year, but will be held if applications are received and permits announced; and

- d) the one youth drawing hunt will be held if permit winners have been announced, but will not be held if permit winners have not been announced; and
- e) the one resident drawing hunt will be held if permit winners have been announced, but will not be held if permit winners have not been announced; and
- f) the one nonresident drawing hunt will be held if permit winners have been announced, but will not be held if permit winners have not been announced.

In an effort to reduce hunter confusion and maintain hunt consistency the Department will in some cases allow hunts to run their course and management action will be taken in the following year. For example, issued permits will be allowed to be hunted but quotas and/or seasons may be reduced, and/or the number of available permits may be reduced the following year.

If population objectives change, the Board may revisit this plan.

Vote: 6-0
Adopted: January 15, 2019
Petersburg, Alaska



Ted Spraker, Chair
Alaska Board of Game

Findings of the Alaska Board of Game
2017-222-BOG
Alaska Board of Game Nonresident Hunter Allocation Policy
(This policy supersedes BOG policy #2007-173-BOG)

In consideration that Article 8 of the Alaska Constitution states that:

§ 2. General Authority — The legislature shall provide for the utilization, development, and conservation of all-natural resources belonging to the state, including land and waters, for the maximum benefit of the people.

§ 3. Common Use — Wherever occurring in their natural state, fish, wildlife, and waters are reserved to the people for common use.

§ 4. Sustained Yield — Fish, forests, wildlife, grasslands, and all other replenishable resources belong to the State shall be utilized, developed, and maintained on the sustained yield principle, subject to preferences among beneficial uses.

And, Alaska Statute 16.05.020 states that one of the primary functions of the commissioner of the Department of Fish and Game is to:

(2) manage, protect, maintain, improve, and extend the fish, game, and aquatic plant resources of the state in the interest of the economy and general well-being of the state.

And further, that; AS16.05.255 directs that the Board of Game, among other duties, may adopt regulations for:

(10) regulating sport hunting and subsistence hunting as needed for the conservation, development, and utilization of game.

(13) promoting hunting and trapping and preserving the heritage of hunting and trapping in the state.

The Alaska Board of Game establishes this document as a general statement of its views related to nonresident hunter participation in the State of Alaska.

The Alaska Board of Game finds that:

1. Carefully controlled hunting and trapping have been used since statehood to assure that Alaska's wildlife populations are healthy and sustainably managed. Alaska's wildlife populations are minimally impacted by the hunting pressure experienced today, and most hunted populations are either stable or growing. There are few remaining opportunities in North America where a hunter can experience both the quality of largely uninhabited and undeveloped environment, minimal private land ownership boundaries, or the type of hunting opportunities that Alaska has to offer. Alaska is the

only place in the United States where coastal brown bears, caribou and Dall sheep can be hunted, for instance, and there has been great demand for hunting opportunities of these species by U.S. and foreign citizens for many generations.

2. Alaska is one of the last remaining places in the United States where there are large segments of public lands open for general season hunting opportunities. The State of Alaska maintains authority for wildlife management across multiple land ownership designations yet the board recognizes that approximately 60% of the state remains in Federal ownership and is managed for the benefit of all U.S. citizens equally. In recognition of our state's constitutional mandate to manage the state's wildlife for the "common use" and "maximum benefit" of the people, the board has maintained a resident priority for hunting opportunities through management actions such as longer seasons, less restrictive antler requirements, resident tag fee exemptions, and lower licensing fees. The board has also maintained general season opportunity to the greatest degree possible for the benefit of all hunters, resident and visitor alike.
3. Under the Common Use Clause of the Alaska Constitution, access to natural resources by any person's preferred method or means is not guaranteed, and protecting public access to those resources requires an adaptive and informed balancing of demands and needs consistent with the public interest. As such, the state has considerable latitude to responsibly, equitably, and sustainably establish priorities among competing uses for the maximum benefit of the public.
4. From region to region, Alaska often has differing patterns of use, values, and traditions related to the harvest of game. Some areas welcome nonlocal hunters more readily than others, and other areas have little concern regarding who else is hunting the area, so long as local needs are met. The board has recognized that there is no single simple allocation formula that adequately covers the needs, desires, and historical use patterns of the diverse regions of our state.
5. Nonresident hunters have played a crucial and often undervalued role in support of Alaska's wildlife conservation efforts since Territorial times. Early in the last century, nonresident hunters partnered with Alaskan sportsmen to advocate for the conservation of brown bear and grizzly populations, perhaps most notably on Kodiak Island, which reversed territorial, and later state policy that was at one point directed toward the complete elimination of some segments of these populations by any means available. Nonresident hunting groups and resident hunters successfully advocated for the creation of McKinley National Park to address market hunting depletions of Dall sheep populations in that region, and later played an important role in advocating that National Park Preserves and National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska would not only allow for hunting, in the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, but that hunting and fishing would be recognized in law as priority uses under the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997. These cooperative actions substantially protected continued hunting opportunities across large areas of federally managed lands in Alaska. More recently, nonresident hunters have contributed meaningfully in the

effort to prevent disease introduction in Alaska, and continue to be knowledgeable allies in safeguarding both our resources and our access to these resources in the face of external pressures.

6. Nonresident hunters typically harvest wildlife at low levels across the state, with few known exceptions. While most big game animal populations are typically harvested at a rate of less than 10 percent by nonresidents, there are some areas where it can be higher (e.g. nonresident sheep harvests averages between 35 and 40% annually and brown/grizzly bear harvests typically exceed resident harvest in much of the state.
 - The board recognizes that, in recent years, there has been a renewed effort to restrict or eliminate nonresident hunter opportunity, especially in relation to Dall sheep harvest. The board conducted an extensive survey of sheep hunter perceptions and experiences; requested that the Alaska Department of Fish and Game gather all known data regarding hunter participation and harvest rates statewide; and, convened a Dall sheep working group made up of Alaskan residents to discuss the known data, survey results, and issues more broadly in an open setting.
 - Nonresident hunter numbers are restrained due to many factors, such as the guide requirement for Dall sheep, mountain goat and brown bear/grizzly, a law primarily addressing hunter safety issues. This requirement also results in higher success rates due to the greater experience and area familiarity of hunting guides. Nonresident sheep hunters have also been limited by federal guide concessions, which have capped the number of guides in large portions of sheep ranges and held them to predetermined numbers on 10-year cycles. The competitive bidding nature for obtaining rights in these areas requires that guides hold to the number of clients they have proposed during their tenure, allowing for predictable participation and anticipated harvest rates.
7. Despite comparatively low participation and harvest rates for most species due to restricted opportunity, nonresident hunters provide the majority of direct funding into Alaskan wildlife management programs through relatively expensive license and big game tag fees. This level of funding has allowed for stable wildlife management and educational activities for decades. The additional benefit to wildlife management from receiving Pittman-Robertson matching funds, which come primarily from nationwide weapon purchases, cannot be overstated. The level of funding that nonresident license sales have provided for department survey and inventory programs, among other programs, has allowed the board to have increased confidence in providing for higher levels of harvest opportunities under sustained yield principles. Alaskan hunters have benefited most from these management programs through generally avoiding harvest quotas, draw permits, antler restrictions, and shortened seasons for the majority of hunt opportunities in Alaska. This enhances our ability to satisfy our legal mandate to manage, preserve and promote hunting and trapping throughout the state, while

providing the maximum benefit for all the people as Alaskans take home an estimated 90% of the big game animals harvested for their meat value in the state each year.

8. Nonresident hunters contribute substantially directly to the Alaskan economy through contracting with service providers, equipment rentals, supply purchases from local vendors, hotel and tourism related expenses, and meat processing and trophy expediting services. Visiting nonresident hunters are typically comprised of 80% of unguided hunters, 20% guided nonresident hunters, or hunters accompanied by second degree of kindred relatives.

- Unguided nonresident hunters often contract with air-taxis or transporters for transportation services to remote hunting locations and primarily focus their efforts on moose, caribou, deer, and black bear. Nonresident hunter dispersal through transportation services provides benefit to both resident hunters who find the more accessible hunting areas less crowded, and nonresident hunters who often have access to more remote areas that provide unique hunting settings or access to migratory resources. Unguided nonresident hunters often donate meat through their service providers to remote villages, especially portions of their moose and caribou, due to prohibitive transportation costs. There have been numerous complaints over the years related to donated meat quality, hunter crowding, overbooked services, and competition with local hunters related to air-taxi and transporter operations – resulting in the creation of controlled use areas to limit hunting-related aircraft use in several areas of the state and most recently both modified state and new federal controlled use areas in northwest Alaska. The board recognizes that these issues are not typically driven by lack of resource availability, but at times due to variance in wildlife migrations or weather and at other times unchecked competition for limited access points by multiple service providers. The board believes that these conflicts can be best addressed through greater oversight of transportation related services in our state rather than strictly limiting general hunting opportunity where resources are in many cases stable or abundant.
- Approximately 86% of registered or master guides in Alaska are Alaskan residents and upwards of 66% of assistant guides are Alaskan residents. Guided hunt opportunity is generally disbursed across the state on both state and federal lands, and to a lesser degree on private lands. A recent economic analysis of the economic impact of the guide industry notes that 3,242 guided nonresident hunters contributed approximately 87.2 million dollars to Alaska's economy in 2015, and supported 2,120 Alaskan jobs. A significant amount of game meat was donated by guided hunters in communities across the state during this same period, providing both economic relief and direct dietary benefit to mostly rural Alaskans. The benefit this brings to Alaskan communities is supported by testimony from across Alaska. There has been complaint regarding hunter crowding or competition for Dall sheep resources on state owned lands in several regions for a number of years and the board

has recently taken a very detailed look at these and other issues with the aid of a resident-comprised Dall sheep working group, as noted above. The board has advocated for the restoration of guide-concessions on state lands to both provide a comprehensive program to address quality of hunt issues such as these, and to assure that stewardship-based guided-hunt opportunities are provided in these areas.

- Recent data and testimony indicate that the trend of nonresident hunters accompanied by second degree kindred resident relatives for Dall sheep, brown bear, and mountain goat appear to be increasing. The board recognizes the high value of continued opportunity for Alaskans to share unique hunting opportunities with nonresident family members. The board has heard complaints that, in portions of the state, strictly limited permit opportunities for nonresident guide-required hunts have at times been taken to a large degree by second degree kindred hunters accompanied by resident relatives, an effect unanticipated when allocations were established. The board desires to address these issues in a manner that both protects the careful allocation frameworks that the board has already anticipated and determined as appropriate, and provide continued or expanded opportunity for Alaskans to maintain family centered hunting traditions with nonresident relatives where possible.

The primary goals and efforts of the Alaska Board of Game are directed toward the management of stable and healthy wildlife populations capable of producing harvestable surpluses to provide for a variety of uses and, at times, differing values of the public. While many uses of wildlife do not directly conflict with one another, such as wildlife viewing and hunting, with some notable exceptions, some consumptive uses do require thoughtful allocation decisions. Historically, the board has viewed meeting the subsistence needs of the Alaskan populace as its primary goal, as directed by state law.

Preferences have been granted by the state in the following order:

- 1) Alaskan Resident subsistence hunting - for all species with a customary or traditional use classification
- 2) Alaskan Resident general season hunting – for moose, deer, caribou, elk
 - Residents have longer seasons, more liberal bag limit and antler restrictions, and lower license and tag fees
- 3) Resident and Nonresident general season hunting – for Dall sheep, brown/grizzly bear, and mountain goat. Typically managed for trophy-related values.
 - Guide-required species for nonresidents can be a limiting (financial) factor for many nonresident hunters, in addition to license and tag fees
- 4) Nonresident Alien hunting – same as nonresident hunting
 - Guide-required for all big game species and with higher license and tag fees

The Alaska Board of Game has recognized the above inherent preferences and general practices that benefit Alaskan hunters and will continue to do so. In addition, the board will address allocation issues in the following circumstances, if season and/or method and means adjustments are deemed insufficient:

- 1) When there is suitable harvestable surplus - it is the board's policy to allow maximum opportunity for all hunters, within the bounds of sustained yield management practices, regardless of residency.
- 2) In times of non-hunting-related population decline - it will be the board's policy to restrict all non-subsistence hunting if it is predicted to contribute to the decline or have the potential to slow the recovery of these populations appreciably. Nonresident hunters will be restricted first in these circumstances, unless their portion of the overall harvest is deemed insignificant.
- 3) In times of hunting-related population decline – it will be the board's policy to identify the potential causes and address each case individually. Nonresident hunters will be restricted first in these circumstances, unless their portion of the overall harvest is deemed insignificant or the restriction of nonresident hunters does not address the primary cause of decline.
- 4) Nonresident hunting will not be authorized for any moose, caribou or deer population under a current intensive management predator control program until the minimum intensive management population or harvest objectives are met unless the board determines that such hunting will not adversely impact resident opportunity, will not adversely impact the recovery of the target population, and is determined to provide for the maximum benefit of the people of Alaska.
- 5) The board may choose to address areas of conservation, hunter overcrowding, or conflict issues by placing limitations on or between commercial service-dependent hunts, or request that the appropriate regulatory body address the service provider issue if it is beyond the board's authority. This may be accomplished by guided-only or non-guided-only permit stipulations for any species, as the board has done in several places in the past. Sustained yield will be the first test in these circumstances, then subsistence obligations, historical use patterns, and quality of hunt experience will be considered.
- 6) When a draw hunt is deemed necessary, allocation will be determined on a case by case basis and will be based upon the historical data of nonresident and resident permit, harvest or participation allocation over the past ten or more years. When a guided nonresident hunter applies for a drawing permit, proof of having a signed guide-client contract is required and contracting guides shall be registered in the area prior to the drawing. When a guide signs a guide-client contract, the guide is providing guiding services and therefore must be registered for the use area at that time.

- 7) The board has supported the reestablishment of state-managed guide concessions to address user conflicts and hunt quality issues for more than a decade. The board continues to support this avenue to address known conflict areas. It will be the board's policy to address nonresident allocations under state or federal concessions that have overlaying draw requirements in a manner that cooperates with land management efforts and goals, as deemed appropriate by the board.

Vote: 5-1-1

Adopted: November 17, 2017

Anchorage, Alaska

Handwritten signature of Ted Spraker in black ink.

Ted Spraker, Chairman

Alaska Board of Game

**Findings for the Alaska Board of Game
2017-220-BOG**

**Board Recommendation to the Department of Fish and Game provided
during the Special Meeting on Copper Basin Area Moose and Caribou Hunting
March 21, 2017**


The Board of Game finds as follows, based on information provided by Department staff, Alaska residents and other wildlife users:

The Board recommended the Department take the following actions:

1. When necessary, increase the bag limit to two caribou, except during the September 1 – 20 moose season.
2. Regarding the Copper Basin Community Subsistence Harvest “CSH” moose hunt, and consistent with earlier findings, the board found that the ability to take any bull moose regardless of antler size or configuration is an important component of the community pattern of subsistence hunting. The ability to take any bull regardless of antler characteristics must be limited because of the potential to overharvest certain age classes of bulls. For many hunts, regulations that restrict antler characteristics of legal animals to spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines (SF50/4) protects those age classes, however, they do not provide the any bull opportunity consistent with the community pattern of subsistence harvest.
3. Currently, the board limits any bull opportunity in the CSH moose hunt by providing 1 any bull permit for every three households and closes the hunt when 100 bulls in the middle age classes needing protection are taken.
4. However, the board found that providing 1 any bull permit for every three households does not satisfy the need for reasonable opportunity for three reasons. First, the hunts can be very short and may close with little warning and participants may not get a chance to hunt before the season closes. Second, the competition from hunters can be very intense during the early days of the season. Third, some households do not receive an any bull permit and are not able to take a bull that is presented to them. The board heard testimony that it is traditional in the Ahtna culture to take any bull that presents itself to the hunter, and that it would be culturally inappropriate to not take a bull that presents itself.
5. Because the opportunity for hunting for any bulls in the community pattern of harvest must be restricted, the board determined that the any bull permits should be distributed to CHS moose hunt participants using the existing scoring criteria described in 5 AAC 92.070.
6. The any bull hunt does not currently provide reasonable opportunity and participation must be restricted. The SF50/4 portion of the population does not require participation to be restricted, and all moose hunts in this area allow harvest of SF50/4. The combination of a limited number of any bulls distributed through existing scoring criteria described in

5 AAC 92.070 and the opportunity to take bulls that meet antler restrictions (either through the CSH or other hunts) satisfies the need to provide a reasonable opportunity for subsistence, and the need to provide opportunity to take any bulls in a hunt consistent with the community pattern of harvest identified in earlier findings.

Vote: 5-1-1
Adopted March 21, 2017
Glennallen, Alaska


Ted Spraker, Chairman
Alaska Board of Game

**Findings for the Alaska Board of Game
2015-209-BOG
Board Recommendation to the Department of Fish and Game
Provided during the Central/Southwest Region Meeting
March 18, 2015**


The Board of Game finds as follows, based on information provided by Department staff, Alaska residents and other wildlife users:

The Board recommended the department take the following actions:

1. Establish individual quotas for each sub area of the Copper Basin community subsistence hunt for the moose that do not meet general season antler requirements in Units 11 and 13 and attempt to achieve the quota for each subarea regardless of whether or not the total harvest exceeds the total allocation for the CSH program.
2. As a permit condition, require hunters to report within 24 hours of harvesting a moose in the Copper Basin community subsistence hunt.
3. Keep the Copper Basin community subsistence caribou hunt open for the entire season or until the Copper Basin community subsistence caribou quota has been met, whichever occurs first.

Adopted March 18, 2015:

Vote: 6-1



Ted Spraker, Chairman
Alaska Board of Game

**Findings for the Alaska Board of Game
2013-201-BOG
Board Direction to the Department of Fish and Game
Provided during the Central/Southwest Region Meeting
February 14, 2013**


The Board of Game finds as follows, based on information provided by Department staff, Alaska residents and other wildlife users:

The Board directed the department to take the following actions:

1. Issue 20 permits the first year for 17A nonresident moose drawing permit (the first year of the hunt will be the 2014/2015 regulatory year).
2. Use discretionary authority to restrict aircraft access during the fall season for moose hunting in 17A in a 2 mile corridor along the rivers and lakes as identified in the Unit 17A Moose Management Plan recommendations. The board did not adopt the moose management plan in its entirety.
3. Come back to the Board at the October 2013 work session with a review of the application and reporting form for the Copper Basin Community Subsistence Hunt. This will include a review of possible changes to the program that were raised by the department and public at this meeting.
4. Allow the take of brown bears at bait sites in Unit 16 only during the existing spring baiting season (April 15-June 30).
5. Registration permits for Unit 13 winter moose hunt will be available only in Glennallen 10 working days prior to the hunt opening and ending the day prior to the hunt opening. November 17-28, 2014. Reporting period will be within 24 hours of returning from the field.

With regards to items 1, 2, 4 and 5, the Board acknowledges that the direction provided concerning these changes is the purview of the department under its discretionary and fiscal authority. The department will attempt to make the changes as directed, but may choose to exercise its authority in the future and make changes necessary to provide additional opportunity and cost savings.

Vote: 7-0
February 14, 2013
Wasilla, Alaska



Ted Spraker, Chairman
Alaska Board of Game

**Findings of the Alaska Board of Game
2011-184-BOG**

**Game Management Unit 13
Caribou and Moose Subsistence Uses**

These findings supplement 2006-170-BOG as to uses of Nelchina caribou and Unit 13 moose. In the 2006 finding, the Board indentified the specific pattern of subsistence uses upon which the positive customary and traditional use finding for Nelchina caribou and Unit 13 moose, set forth in 5 AAC 99.025, were based. This pattern of uses originated within the communities of the indigenous Ahtna Athabascan inhabitants of the Copper River Basin. Among other things, the findings emphasized the “community-based” nature of this traditional pattern of use. As described in those findings, this community-based subsistence pattern:

- Links families in widespread networks of sharing that are shaped by traditional norms of behavior;
- Provides a context in which skills, knowledge, and values are passed across generations; is accomplished efficiently with thorough, non-wasteful use of the harvested game and often by hunters who specialize in harvesting meat for the community; and
- Occurs within a broader pattern of use of and dependence upon a variety of locally-harvested wild foods that is a key element of the way of life of the local area.

The board has also noted that this community-based pattern as established by the Ahtna has been adopted and modified by other local settlers and, to a more limited degree, by other Alaska residents. This community-based, local use pattern was contrasted to a largely nonlocal, Rail belt based pattern that was probably most properly characterized as a non-subsistence use pattern. Thus, the 2006 findings addressed and discussed two basic use patterns for Nelchina caribou and Unit 13 moose.

The Board finds that there is need to recognize the range of uses within the previously-described subsistence use pattern that have developed as individuals, families, and other social groups, both within and outside the local area, have adapted to changing economic, demographic, and cultural conditions. Differences have developed concerning the level of organization of subsistence uses of Nelchina caribou and Unit 13 moose, such that the traditional uses are practiced among households and families in addition to the community-based pattern established by the Ahtna. The Ahtna community-based pattern persists within close-knit communities that are also widespread both within and outside the basin. Other basin residents and some nonlocal residents who are not part of the traditional Ahtna community engage in subsistence uses at a more individual, household, or extended family level. Both sub-patterns exhibit, with some variation, most of the criteria listed in 5 AAC 99.010(b), but different regulatory options may be necessary to provide reasonable opportunities for each. The range of uses that characterize these sub-patterns are as follows.

Since the beginning of the towns and settlement areas within the range, or with easy access to, the Nelchina Caribou Herd and Unit 13 moose, individuals, households, and families from

those towns and settlements have hunted the herd to provide for their basic necessities of life, especially food, and not just for recreational or trophy purposes. This relatively small use is not community based in nature, in that these individuals, households, and families are not linked to extensive networks of cooperation and sharing or are not part of larger social groups that organize and promote traditional knowledge and behavior, but is focused primarily on procuring food and has, as of the date of these findings, existed now for at least three generations in some of these areas. As set forth in greater detail below, this use has at least a few identifiable characteristics which separate it from the larger Rail belt based, non-subsistence use patterns.

Since at least the early 1930's, hunting of the Nelchina Caribou Herd and Unit 13 moose have been regulated by season and bag limits. Nonlocal hunters interviewed in the 1980's by the Subsistence Division of ADF&G confirmed that most hunt in the fall, with fewer participating in winter hunts. All hunters currently tend to focus their harvest efforts during the late summer and early fall, when caribou and moose are in their best physical condition and relatively accessible from the road system. Winter hunts have been an important back-up opportunity for the community based subsistence use pattern described in the 2006 findings, and may also be relied on by other subsistence users, to a somewhat lesser extent. The winter hunts do not appear to be important to non-subsistence users.

Regarding efficiency of hunting effort, the Board has not been presented with any information that would distinguish non-local subsistence users from other users based primarily from the Rail belt. Compared to community-based and other local users who hunt close to home, non-local users tend to travel greater distances (typically 200-300 miles), thereby incurring greater costs, to harvest Nelchina caribou and Unit 13 moose, making their use less efficient. However, data from the 1980's illustrates that even non-local subsistence users tend to hunt in the areas most accessible to their communities. Thus, Fairbanks-area hunters tended to hunt near the Denali Highway, and Anchorage-area hunters tended to hunt near the Glenn Highway. Also, efficiency by non-community based subsistence users may be fostered to some extent by limiting hunting to a few well-known areas year after year, within relatively easy, and predictably economical, reach of participants.

Non-local subsistence users of the Nelchina Caribou Herd and Unit 13 moose and others who are not organized at the community-level have testified, and Board members know from experience, that they prefer to return year-by-year to one or more well-known and long-established camping/hunting sites. These are traditional "caribou," "moose," or "caribou and moose" camps for these individuals and their families. If caribou or moose are not obtained during these forays, chances are they will not be obtained at all because subsistence users, unlike non-subsistence users, tend not to travel around the state to experience a wide variety of hunting opportunities. Unlike subsistence users who are organized at the community level, many other users tend to travel further into the backcountry, away from major roads and rivers, often using off-road vehicles to get to the remotest locations possible.

The Board has not been presented with any information that would distinguish the handling, preparing, preserving, and storing techniques used by individuals, households, families outside the traditional community-based context to distinguish them from their neighbors who hunt for recreation. Most users of Nelchina caribou and Unit 13 moose based along the Rail belt

freeze their harvested meat and use modern methods of handling, preparing, preservation, and storage. Compared to those who follow traditions established by the Ahtna and adopted by some other users, there is less use of organ meats, and almost no use of the hide and bones; and the roles in handling and preparing harvested animals are less formal and not based on longstanding, widely-understood rules of proper behavior towards the animals taken, as is the case for those who follow the Ahtna, community-based traditions.

Because households and families engaged in subsistence uses tend to hunt from long-established, multi-generational camps, lore about how and where to hunt is handed down from generation to generation. This intergenerational transmission of knowledge is less formalized than the way knowledge is passed on within the Ahtna community based use pattern, but it is more apparent and traditional than is the case for non-subsistence uses, in which knowledge is clearly passed from one generation to the next but very little in the way of a formal and traditional transmission system exists, and knowledge is not necessarily tied to any particular location.

All subsistence users tend to share their harvests within their families and with close friends and, to some extent, this sharing is expected from year to year, and plays parts in traditional meals and celebrations. Non-local hunters interviewed by the Division of Subsistence in the 1980's confirmed that they shared mostly within their own households, while approximately 1/3 also said they shared with friends. Sharing among nonlocal hunters, as well as among some hunters who live in the local area, is less formal than is true under the community based use pattern as practiced by the Ahtna and some other local residents, and community and peer pressure to share is far less pronounced, but it is greater than is generally the case for the non-subsistence uses of Nelchina caribou and Unit 13 moose. Some long-established families living in close proximity to, and with a well-established history of hunting the Nelchina Caribou Herd and Unit 13 moose, do expect that, if a family member successfully harvests a Nelchina caribou, the meat will be shared.

Some nonlocal hunters have testified that, as is generally the case in a subsistence use pattern, they prefer to consume wild foods over purchased foods, and often obtain the majority of their protein needs from Alaska's fish and game resources, as well as pick berries and harvest other wild foods. These preferences are sometimes expressed by non-subsistence hunters as well. Such users often travel to different, favored locations to harvest fish and game and other wild foods, but many of these locations are outside of the range of the Nelchina Caribou Herd and/or Unit 13 moose. Most non-local residents interviewed by the Division of Subsistence in the 1980's reported that moose was more important than caribou in their harvesting priorities, and often travelled to other locations to obtain moose. Locally-based users, on the other hand, tend to concentrate all of their wild food harvests in close proximity to the herd's range, and often try to harvest more than one resource per trip. Non-subsistence users tend to rely on wild foods to a much lesser degree, or not at all, compared to both groups of subsistence users.

Based on public testimony provided during the Board's last several meetings addressing the Nelchina Caribou Herd, on the Board's own experience, and on the above finding and 2006-170-BOG, the Board, applying its expertise and judgment, concludes that, at most, a few thousand people use the Nelchina Caribou Herd and Unit 13 moose in accordance with the identified subsistence use patterns, and that, therefore, a range of 600-1000 caribou and 300-600

moose are necessary to provide a reasonable opportunity for both identified subsistence uses of this herd. This finding may be updated as appropriate and as additional data on the uses is gathered.

Vote: 6-1
March 7, 2011
Wasilla, Alaska


Cliff Judkins, Chairman
Alaska Board of Game

**Alaska Board of Game
Policy for the
Annual Reauthorization of Antlerless Moose**

#2007-172-BOG

Background

Alaska Statute **AS 16.05.780** requires the Board of Game to reauthorize the Antlerless moose seasons in each Game Management Unit, subunit or any other authorized antlerless moose season on a yearly basis.

In order for the Board to comply with AS 16.05.780, it must consider that antlerless moose seasons require approval by a majority of the active advisory committees located in, 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 proposal.

Because of the requirement for yearly reauthorization, the Board of Game approves of the proposals in order to insure they remain in regulation. In the case of the antlerless moose seasons, the Board of Game has delegated authority to the Department which allows them to administer a hunt if there is an allowable harvest of antlerless moose. The Board of Game has provided language to allow the Department to issue an “up to” number of permits so that we do not have to try and set a hard number each year. In most years it would be very difficult for a decision on allowable harvest to be made prior to the surveys the Department makes of the moose population.

This requirement for yearly authorization takes a lot of valuable Board time as well as requiring the Department to bring in area biologists or regional supervisors to present to the Board information on the proposed regulation. The attendance of many of these area biologists or regional supervisors is not required for any other proposed regulatory changes that the Board will consider in the normal Board cycle of proposals.

Because this requirement increases the cost to the Department and the Board, and because the annual reauthorization for some of the antlerless moose seasons may be considered a house keeping requirement in order to comply with AS 16.05.780, the Board has determined that a more efficient way to handle the annual reauthorization should be adopted and has established the following policy in agreement with the Department.


Policy for yearly authorization of Antlerless Moose Hunts by the Board of Game

Each year, the Department will present as a package for approval all of the antlerless moose proposals. During that presentation, if there are any changes that will be required to be considered, they will be noted for later discussion.

Because the Board had delegated the authority to the Department to hold antlerless moose hunts, there are many hunts that do not occur based on biology. The Department and the Board finds that it is important to keep these regulations on the books so that when opportunity exists, the Department will have the ability to provide additional opportunity for the use of antlerless moose.

The Board agrees that it will minimize debate during the presentation and only consider extensive discussion on any reauthorization that will be associated with a pending proposal submitted during the normal cycle to be considered. This discussion will be limited to any proposal submitted to the Board and not during the approval fo the packaged proposals for reauthorization of antlerless moose seasons.

The Board is aware of the time and expense required to comply with AS 16.05.780; it feels that by adopting this policy both the Department and Board will be better served.



Cliff Ludkins, Chairman
Alaska Board of Game

Vote: 7-0
March 12, 2007
Anchorage, Alaska

**Findings for the Alaska Board of Game
#2006 – 170 - BOG**

**Game Management Unit 13
Caribou and Moose Subsistence Uses**

Background

Virtually since its inception, the Tier II subsistence permit system has been plagued with public complaints about inequities, unfairness, and false applications. Over the years, the Alaska Board of Game (Board) has amended its regulations numerous times to try to address management and legal problems, but the controversy continues and the system remains rife with problems. Public complaints have been primarily directed at the Tier II permitting system—particularly those near urban areas like the Minto moose hunt and the Nelchina Tier II caribou hunt.

The Board has primarily focused on the Nelchina basin caribou and moose hunts because these have generated the vast majority of the interest and complaints from the general public. In addition, Board members are concerned the hunting patterns no longer meet the Board's intent when these subsistence hunts were originally established in regulation. A review of these hunts question whether the current hunts are consistent with the Board's customary and traditional use findings based on the eight criteria the Joint Boards of Fish and Game established (5 AAC 99.010) for implementing the state subsistence law (AS 16.05.258(a)).

Statistics associated with the Nelchina caribou hunt illustrate some troubling trends. Permits have been slowly shifting away from local Alaskan residents the Board identified as the most dependent on the wildlife resources in the region and towards less subsistence dependent urban residents. Testimony from some local residents of Unit 13 indicated they no longer participated in the state subsistence program. The present Tier II scoring and permit allocation system has made it more difficult for long-time, resource-dependent residents of the area to compete for permits, forcing them to rely more heavily on the federal system to provide for subsistence opportunities. The system also makes it almost impossible for area newcomers and younger Alaskans to ever qualify for the limited permits despite their subsistence dependence on wildlife resources for food. In addition, many of the traditions associated with a subsistence way of life are being sidestepped and avoided, such as the traditional teaching of the art of hunting, fishing and trapping to younger generations; and the processing, utilization, and other long-term social and cultural relationships to the resources being harvested and to the land that produces those resources.

The Board's long-term goal is to design a system to accommodate subsistence-dependent users in such a manner that permits can be virtually guaranteed from year to year. The reliability of available hunting opportunities is critical to the maintenance of the subsistence way of life. This could be similar and complementary to the federal subsistence permit system. The federal program allows any Alaska resident living in the Copper Basin and several communities outside

of GMU 13 to harvest two caribou and one moose per year, there is no limit per household except in Unit 13(E) for moose, harvest of caribou by gender is also generally unrestricted in units 13(A) and 13(B), and moose hunters may only take any antlered bull under the federal system.

Bag limits may not be accumulated across both state and federal systems, so hunters can take a total of only one moose and two caribou for the year. State regulations allow all Alaskan residents to harvest a bull moose with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 brow tines on at least one side from September 1 – 20. In addition, up to 150 Tier II permits are issued for any bull moose, August 15 – 31, with only one permit being allowed per household. The moose seasons for federally qualified users on federally-managed lands are much longer from August 1 – September 20.

Under the state system, all caribou permits are issued under Tier II regulations and were limited to 3 per household. The Board recently changed the limit to 2 per household. The bag limit is one caribou, although in recent years, harvest under state regulation has been limited to bulls only. The caribou season for federally qualified users on federal land is 10 days longer in the fall, ending September 30 rather than September 20.

State regulations do not jeopardize a qualified federal subsistence hunter from hunting under a federal permit. However, if there are too many state applicants, controlling statutes mandate that permits be issued under the Tier II criteria, with all of its attendant problems.

The Board intends to explore subsistence hunt provisions that reflect and accommodate the customary and traditional use patterns of Nelchina caribou and moose in Game Management Unit (GMU) 13, while distinguishing those uses from other uses.

In accordance with the Joint Boards of Fisheries and Game eight criteria for implementing the state subsistence law, the following findings are made:

Findings

When the Board originally determined there were customary and traditional uses of the Nelchina Caribou Herd and moose in GMU 13, it recognized these subsistence uses were established by Ahtna Athabascan communities within the Copper River basin, and were later adopted by other Alaska residents. Due to the importance of, and high level of competition for subsistence permits in this area, the Board has undertaken, as precisely as possible, the task to identify the particular characteristics of these customary and traditional use patterns. Although they have changed over time due to limited access associated with demographic, economic, and technological factors, the patterns are characterized by traditional fall and winter hunting seasons, efficient methods and means, thorough use of most of the harvested animal, harvest areas traditionally associated with local communities, traditions about harvesting and uses that are passed between generations orally and through practice, and reliance on other subsistence resources from within these same traditional harvest areas

Criterion 1. A long-term consistent pattern of noncommercial taking, use, and reliance on the fish stock or game population that has been established over a reasonable period of time of not less than one generation, excluding interruption by circumstances beyond the user's control, such as unavailability of the fish or game caused by migratory patterns.

This criterion presupposes that an identifiable, consistent “pattern” of noncommercial taking, use, and reliance is characteristic of subsistence use. The Board finds, even though there are many similarities among all users of the moose and caribou resources in the area, there continue to be identifiable distinctions, constituting a unique pattern of subsistence use, that is traceable in direct line back to the original Ahtna Athabascan and later non-native customary and traditional use.

The Board has concluded that the pattern of moose and caribou subsistence use for this region was originally defined by the Ahtna Athabascan residents and then adopted and modified by other local settlers in the early 20th century. This pattern of use was established over many generations and focused on the total aggregate of fish, wildlife, and plant resources locally available to the area residents.

The greatest dependency on subsistence resources occurred prior to the completion of the existing road system in the 1940s. After about 1950, historical use patterns changed rapidly, especially with the introduction of more mechanized access methods. The mobility of the subsistence and non-subsistence users, the availability of seasonal and part-time employment, increased human populations, increasing competition for wildlife resources, and fluctuating game populations (particularly moose and caribou) caused major shifts in subsistence dependency of people within and adjacent to the region. Nevertheless, aspects of the traditional Ahtna Athabascan use pattern are present today, but subsistence-dependent families engaged in that pattern now account for a smaller percentage of all users than a half-century ago.

Most of the long-term subsistence patterns in this area are community-based. The area's communities tend to be long-established, by Alaskan standards, and the residents of these communities tend to be long-term residents, descending from multi-generational families with long ties to the area. These communities tend to exhibit a use of local resources that stretches back to well before Euroamerican contact. In contrast, the use pattern based out of nearby urban areas tends to involve much more recently established communities, a high degree of turnover among residents, short-term residency and, generally, a relatively brief history of use.

Criterion 2. A pattern of taking or use recurring in specific seasons of each year.

Local communities established a tradition of hunting caribou, moose, and other big game species in the late summer and early fall following subsistence fishing, and again hunting in the winter as fresh meat was needed and game was available. Winter hunts have always been critical to subsistence users, as very few other subsistence resources are available during this time. This need for, and use of, winter hunting opportunities is different from use patterns developed by residents of Alaska's more developed and urban areas, where almost all big game hunting takes place exclusively in the fall and is controlled largely by regulations. Thus, as late as 1984, over 60% of the caribou harvest taken by local residents was taken during the winter. Recent changes in that pattern can be largely attributed to regulatory changes, competition from non-local

hunters and shifting migratory patterns of the caribou herd. The seasonal use pattern was based on the traditional Ahtna seasonal movements and the general availability of game. For example, the fall hunt traditionally followed the salmon harvest, whereas the winter hunt took place whenever meat was needed and game was available.

Criterion 3. A pattern of taking or use consisting of methods and means of harvest that are characterized by efficiency and economy of effort and cost.

Before the mid-20th century, Ahtna Athabascan hunters tended to rely on boat access along the area's major waterways in fall, on foot along established trails, and by dog team along winter trails after freeze-up. With the opening up of the Nelchina basin to highway access, and the introduction of off-road vehicles, snowmachines, four-wheelers, and other transportation innovations, a shift in the use pattern occurred. Now, local residents tend to utilize roads as hunting corridors in place of rivers in the fall, and use snowmachines to access the backcountry in winter. Recently, expensive off-road vehicles have been purchased and used by many non-local users and a few more affluent local residents in an attempt to compete with non-local hunters and to increase their opportunity for success. The use of all terrain vehicles may create their own hunting efficiencies as hunting effort and transportation take advantage of labor-saving devices. Hunting methods have changed over the last 75 years. Automobiles, snowmachines, and less expensive all terrain vehicles may make hunting more effective because local and non-local residents can now cover larger areas when hunting caribou or moose. Local hunters can, when animals are available, make relatively short trips that fit into a contemporary work schedule. On the other hand, the use of highway, off-road, and similar vehicles has promoted more frequent short trips with considerable transportation costs for depreciation, fuel, and maintenance. What are being lost are the multi-resource harvest efficiencies associated with long subsistence-oriented summer and fall camping trips traditionally engaged in by Ahtna communities. Thus, recent transportation improvements and fuel prices may have changed traditional subsistence activities to the point where it is unlikely that there is a positive cost/benefit (from an economic standpoint) associated with some of the hunting techniques, especially in cases involving the use of expensive recreational motor vehicles. Overall, the use of some motorized vehicles such as ATVs has blurred the distinction between true customary and traditional patterns and recreational activities.

Residents of local communities—those with the longest histories of use of moose and caribou in the region—have traditionally traveled shorter distances to hunt than do non-local participants; and generally utilize less technology in doing so. Most Ahtna elders testified they still prefer to walk in to hunting areas and maintain permanent camps, whenever possible, in accordance with longstanding means and methods. On the other hand, most non-local users must travel at least 125 miles just to get to the area and have tended to be reliant on all-terrain vehicles (ATVs), aircraft and other expensive off-road and recreational vehicles.

As late as 1984, Copper Basin residents utilized only highway vehicles for hunting access over 65% of the time. It is the Board's conclusion that many of these newer technologies have been adopted based on a perceived need to compete with technologically-oriented recreational hunters from Alaska's urban areas. This may be a direct effect of the 1984 regulations.

Historically, much of the taking of caribou, moose, and small game was done as part of a seasonal round of subsistence activities throughout defined areas used by the community. Family dependence on these resources required a commitment of considerable time and effort to accumulate adequate subsistence resources to meet annual protein requirements and other customary and traditional uses.

Another example of subsistence efficiency in the customary and traditional use pattern has been that specialized hunters tend to provide for the community at large, sometimes or often taking more than necessary for their own family's use in their capacities as community providers, and to fulfill social and cultural obligations. Community subsistence activities are then divided among members and further introduced into traditional patterns of barter and exchange. Thus, some harvest and others process, distribute, receive and utilize the results of the harvest. Each member of the community has a defined role and specialty.

A third example of subsistence efficiency, historically, has been the effort to keep hunting as close to home as reasonably possible, minimizing cost and effort necessary to obtain the wild food resources needed by families and communities. The Board believes that, if competition among users can be reduced, this efficiency is likely to be easier for subsistence users to realize.

In these community efforts, special emphasis has been placed on allowing the maximum opportunity to harvest as many animals and the widest variety of useable species as efficiently as possible. Emphasis was also placed on food gathering activities and other traditions associated with Ahtna Athabascan communities.

Criterion 4. The area in which the noncommercial long-term, and consistent pattern of taking, use, and reliance upon the fish stock or game population has been established.

The Board is examining the area where the subsistence hunting of big and small game occurred prior to the significant change in uses and activities that occurred after approximately 1950 in Game Management Unit 13.

Subsistence uses involve an intimate and exclusive relationship between the user and a very particular set of places generally in close proximity to the hunter's residence. The user is tied to the land. Other types of uses do not exhibit these close, long-term, multi-generational ties to a particularly locality. Even as late as 1981, hunters from Copper Basin communities did not report traveling out of the basin to hunt, while urban-based hunters named alternative areas if they could not hunt Nelchina caribou and moose. Testimony from Ahtna elders emphasized their reliance on local fish and game, and their reluctance, for practical and cultural reasons, to travel outside of their traditional areas for subsistence purposes. Likewise, they described the longstanding family and community use histories and patterns for such areas. Consistently, lifelong residents of the local areas did not share the attitude of utilizing other areas. When Nelchina caribou were not available to them they either added emphasis on moose, and/or use of the Mentasta caribou herd. Resident lake fish species and small game were other alternatives commonly mentioned as alternative and supplemental wild food resources. Families in the range of the Nelchina caribou who harvested little or no wild game mentioned receiving donated meat as an alternative. This differs markedly from the use patterns found in Alaska's urban areas,

where traveling to, and exploring, new game country is deemed a virtue and an essential part of many outdoor experiences.

The Ahtna pattern exhibits a familiarity with terrain and landscape including the associated history of the region transmitted through oral traditions and Ahtna geographic placenames.

Criterion 5. A means of handling, preparing, preserving, and storing fish or game that has been traditionally used by past generations, but not excluding recent technological advances where appropriate.

The traditional pattern has been to salvage and use all parts of the harvested animal, in conformance with traditions prohibiting waste. Lifelong residents of the Copper Basin testified they still practice their traditional methods of harvest by retrieving the entire carcass and all bones, hide, head, heart, liver, kidneys, stomach, and fat. Only the antlers were often left behind. This also differs from patterns based out of urban areas, where hunters tend to focus on the meat and antlers, usually leaving most organs, bones, and the hide in the field.

Ahtna elders also emphasized that preparation and storage are viewed as essential components of their overall use. Women traditionally look forward to practicing their roles as preparers and preservers of harvested game every bit as much as men looking forward to harvesting and providing the game. These traditions and roles are passed on by older relatives to younger family members through in-the-field training and a system of *engii* (rules of appropriate behavior or taboos) that teach traditional means of harvest, handling, and preparation. These “engiis” emphasize traditional Ahtna views of the human place within the natural world and a respectful treatment of animals.

Criterion 6. A pattern of taking or use that includes the handing down of knowledge of fishing or hunting skills, values, and lore from generation to generation.

The Board has concluded that the subsistence traditions of handing down the hunting and fishing knowledge, values and skills through family oriented experiences are an important aspect of the subsistence way of life in this region. Providing the opportunities for the young and old to participate in subsistence activities is critical to the perpetuation of traditional knowledge about hunting locations, hunting methods, methods of handling harvests, and respectful treatment of wildlife. To increase hunting opportunities for youth, a recent provision adopted by the Board allows a resident hunter between the ages of 10 and 17 to hunt on behalf of a resident permit holder. The youth hunter must have completed a certified Basic Hunter Education course and be in direct supervision of the permit holder, who is responsible for ensuring all legal requirements are met.

Ahtna elders have passed this knowledge on to the next generation in the context of community-based traditions that included relatively long summer and fall camping trips described above. As mentioned previously, teaching roles and lessons tend to be more formalized through the system of “engiis” than is the case for uses based out of the urban areas. Skills emphasized included not only those needed to harvest each species, but also the art of field preparation and care for a wide

variety of species and the utilization, preparation, and distribution of game. Most local users learned how to hunt in the local area from other family members in the local area. Most older, local users have also taught other family members. On the other hand, most non-local users learn about hunting in the area by personal experience or from fellow non-local, unrelated hunters. Also, non-local users tend to be controlled primarily by applicable statutes and regulations rather than long-term oral traditions and community-based values.

The Board considers it extremely important to stress the need to pass on skills and knowledge associated with utilization of all parts of the animal taken, as well as preservation of the traditional, cultural rules and family values associated with these subsistence users in this area. Field skills need to be perpetuated for handling not only the meat but the hides, internal organs, stomach, and intestines. This is consistent with the customary practice of maximizing the use of animals taken characteristic of subsistence uses.

Criterion 7. A pattern of taking, use, and reliance where the harvest effort or products of that harvest are distributed or shared, including customary trade, barter, and gift-giving.

Widespread community-wide sharing is customary in local communities, involving all family members, elders, others in need, and taking place in formal settings such as during ceremonial potlatches. As such, sharing has associated social, cultural, and economic roles in the community. Sharing is expected and follows well-understood community standards that are structured on kinship relations and obligations. As an example, young hunters are required by Athabaskan tradition to give all or most of their first harvested animal to elders and others in need. Also, traditional barter and exchange follow these standards. Successful Ahtna harvesters traditionally share some of their moose and caribou meat with other families and communities to meet their social obligations and for ceremonial purposes. This, again, is in contrast to the uses arising out of the urban areas where hunters are completely free to share, or not share, as they see fit and there is not a system of sharing, barter, and exchange. In addition to the key social and cultural roles of sharing in the local rural community, sharing of subsistence resources plays a key economic role in distributing essential food supplies throughout the community. The Board has concluded it is imperative to accommodate the customary and traditional family and community harvest sharing practices as part of the subsistence way of life to the maximum extent possible.

Use of the state authorized proxy system has provided a limited opportunity for individuals to harvest for permittees who are personally incapable of participating in the field but who have a personal history of subsistence use. Proxy hunters are not required to fully accommodate the customary and traditional practices. Non-local users, on the other hand, tend to have few established rules or traditions requiring sharing, and seldom share outside of their own households. External sharing, when it occurs, is usually with friends and co-workers, and extensive kinship networks are absent. There are no non-local traditions of community-wide meat distribution.

Criterion 8. A pattern that includes taking, use, and reliance for subsistence purposes upon a wide diversity of the fish and game resources and that provides substantial economic, cultural, social, and nutritional elements of the subsistence way of life.

The Board has concluded it is critical to emphasize the values associated with the reliance and dependence on a wide variety of fish and wildlife resources as an important element of the subsistence way of life for this region. Subsistence use patterns historically required a significant dedication of time and effort towards the harvesting of adequate fish and game resources to meet the protein and nutritional requirements of the subsistence harvesters, their families, and their communities.

This differs markedly from the more recreational type of uses arising out of the Alaska's more urban areas, where a single, focused effort to harvest only one resource in any given location, and then salvage only what is legally required from that resource, tends to be a predominant characteristic. To the extent that other foodstuffs are harvested, they are often harvested in completely separate areas, far removed from the fall hunting area. Also, different hunting areas are explored in different years. This separation of the interconnected diversity of resource uses also seriously undermines the principles reflected in Criterion 3. As more and more emphasis is placed on single species harvesting patterns, cost is increased, and efficiency is reduced. Such practices do not reflect the customary and traditional use pattern.

Reliance on most, or all, locally available sources of wild food is characteristic of a traditional subsistence way of life where maximum economic and nutritional benefits typically must be derived from the hunt and harvests. The local harvest of salmon has historically been the most important wildlife resource in terms of useable pounds per subsistence-dependent family in Unit 13. Alaska residents are allowed to use a fish wheel in the Copper River between Slana and the Copper River bridge at Chitina to harvest salmon—permits are issued free of charge. The limit is 500 total salmon for a household with two or more members and 200 for a household with one member, with no limit on the number of Chinook salmon in the total harvest by fish wheel. The salmon run in the Copper River is primarily comprised of sockeye and Chinook salmon.

Use of moose and caribou by local communities is embedded in a wide range of other fish and wildlife uses. It is also embedded in a mixed, subsistence-cash economy characterized by seasonal employment and relatively low cash incomes. A wide variety of subsistence foods are still critically important in these local economies. Almost all hunting, fishing, and gathering takes place locally and the majority of meat and fish consumed tends to come from local sources.

Big game species are taken for food and not for their trophy value by families engaged in subsistence uses. The Board may undertake efforts to reduce or eliminate the trophy values of the resources taken to focus entirely on the inherent subsistence values.

Vote: 6/0
November 12, 2006
Anchorage, Alaska

Ron Somerville, Chairman
Alaska Board of Game