

Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Boards Support Section
P.O. Box 25526
Juneau, AK 99802-5526



Jim Marcotte
Interior Regional Coordinator ADF&G
1300 College Road
Fairbanks AK 99701-1599

FIRST CLASS
POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT 131
JUNEAU, AK

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
SPRING 1998 MEETING
March 21 - 30, 1998
Fairbanks, AK**

This publication was released
by the Department of Fish and Game
produced at a cost of
\$3.95 per copy
and printed in Juneau, AK

Because the Alaska Department of Fish and Game receives federal funding, all of its public programs and activities are operated free from discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, or handicap.

O.E.O

U.S. Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C. 20240

If you are a person with a disability who may need a special accommodation in order to participate in the process on the proposed regulations, please contact Diana Cote at (907) 465-6095 no later than March 6, 1998 to make any necessary arrangements. To correspond by text telephone (TDD) call 1-800-478-2028.

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
SPRING 1998 PROPOSAL BOOK**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
PROPOSAL TOPICS LIST	i - ii
REVIEWER LETTER (Instructions for Commenting on Proposals). . . .	iii - iv
BOARD OF GAME TENTATIVE FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE . . .	v
BOARD OF GAME'S MEETING CYCLE	vi - vii
BOARD OF GAME MEMBERS	viii
BOARDS SUPPORT SECTION (Offices and Personnel).	ix
AGENDA	x
PROPOSALS	1 - 109
DRAFT CALL FOR PROPOSALS FOR FALL 98 MEETING	110

<u>PROPOSAL TOPICS</u>	<u>PAGE(S)</u>
Fur Bearer Trapping	1 - 3
Bison	3
Brown Bear	4 - 11
Caribou	12 - 20
Moose	21 - 59
Musk Oxen	60 - 62
Dall Sheep	63
Wolf	63
Coyote and Wolverine	64 - 65
Small Game (ptarmigan)	65
New Regulation for Quota System for Moose and Caribou	65
Brown Bear Tag Fee Exemption	66 - 72
Musk Ox Tag Fee	72
Permits	73 - 76
Unlawful Methods of Taking Big Game; Exceptions	76

(continued on next page)

PROPOSAL TOPICS**PAGE(S)**

Unlawful Methods of Taking Fur Bearers; Exceptions	77 - 83
Wolf Predation Control Implementation Plan	83 - 85
Bag Limit for Brown Bears	85
New Regulation for Sealing Sheep Horns	86
Salvage of Game Meat, Furs and Hides	87 - 91
Areas Closed To Hunting	92
Management Areas	92 - 95
Controlled Use Areas	95 - 106
Definitions	107
Identified Big Game Prey Prey Populations and Objectives	108 - 109

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

REVIEWER LETTER

DEAR REVIEWER:

The attached packet of regulatory proposals will be considered by the Alaska Board of Game at its **Spring 1998** meeting concerning hunting and use of game in the Interior Region, **March 21-30, 1998**, at the Fairbanks Princess Hotel, in Fairbanks, Alaska. The proposals generally concern changes to hunting regulations in Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, and 26C, and additionally furbearer trapping methods and means, and use of muskoxen in Unit 26A.

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

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

You are encouraged to read all proposals presented in this packet, as some regulations have statewide application and may affect all regions of the state.

After reviewing the proposals, you may send written comments to:

ATTN: BOG COMMENTS
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Boards Support Section
P.O. Box 25526
Juneau, Alaska 99802-5526
FAX - (907)465-6094

Comments may be submitted at any time until the public testimony period for that proposal and/or its subject matter is closed at the meeting and deliberation by the board begins. As a practical matter, you are encouraged to have all written comments presented to the above Juneau address by **March 6, 1998**. Receipt by this date will assure that your written comments will be published in the board workbook. Comments received after March 6 will be presented to board members at the time of the meeting, but will not be printed in the board workbook. Written comments will also be accepted during the board meeting, and of course, public testimony during the meeting is appreciated.

When making comments regarding these proposals, on the first line list the PROPOSAL NUMBER to which your comment pertains and whether you favor or oppose the proposal. This will assure that the comments are noted by the board members in relation to the proper proposal(s).

(continued on next page)

The following guidelines will greatly assist the board in understanding your concerns:

Written comments will be hole-punched and copied to go into the board workbook. Therefore, please use 8 1/2 x 11 paper and leave at least a 1 1/2 inch margin on the left side and a 1-inch margin on the right side, top and bottom. If typed, please make sure the print is dark. If handwritten, use dark ink and write legibly. Briefly explain why you are in favor of or opposed to the proposal.

If you plan to testify, a written copy of your testimony is helpful, but is not required. Again not required, but 25 copies of your written testimony is also helpful.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES: In addition to the above, please make sure the meeting minutes reflect why the committee voted as it did. If the vote was split, include the minority opinion. A brief description--a couple of sentences--will do. Detail attendance, number in attendance (e.g., 12 of 15 members) and what interests were represented (such as guides, sport hunters, trappers, etc.).

Additional proposal booklets may be obtained at offices of the Department of Fish and Game.

A tentative agenda for the Spring 1998 meeting of the Board of Game is shown on page x. A roadmap showing a tentative order in which proposals will be considered will be available in early March. During the meeting, a recorded telephone message will be available, with current updates on the board's agenda and roadmap. That phone number is 465-8901 (Juneau) or 1-800-764-8901 outside of Juneau.

If you are a person with a disability who may need a special accommodation in order to comment on the proposed regulations, please contact the Boards Support Section at 465-6095 no later than March 6, 1998. To correspond by text telephone (TDD), call 1-800-478-2028.

Sincerely,

BOARDS SUPPORT SECTION

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

TENTATIVE FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE

as of January 1998

	<u>Dates & Location</u>	<u>Topic</u>
SPRING 1998	March 21 - 30 Fairbanks Princess Hotel Proposal Deadline: January 9, 1998 Comment Deadline: March 6, 1998	Interior Region
FALL 1998	October 23 - 28 Ketchikan Proposal Deadline: August 7, 1998 Comment Deadline: October 9, 1998	Southeast Region
SPRING 1999	Dates to be determined Location to be determined Proposal Deadline: To be announced Comment Deadline: To be announced	Southcentral Region
FALL 1999	Dates to be determined Location to be determined Proposal Deadline: To be announced Comment Deadline: To be announced	Arctic and Western Region
WINTER 2000	Dates to be determined Location to be determined Proposal Deadline: To be announced Comment Deadline: To be announced	Statewide Regulations*

For information on the Board of Game's past, current, and upcoming meetings and actions, including proposal forms, access our web site at:

www.state.ak.us/local/akpages/FISH.GAME/boards

*See Board of Game's meeting cycle on pages vi - vii for list of statewide regulations that will be considered during the Winter 2000 meeting.

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME MEETING CYCLE

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

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

Regulations which are specific to an area (e.g., Permits for Access to Round Island) will be taken up when the board is scheduled to consider regulations in that region.

Two statewide regulations will be taken up annually, at the spring meeting: Reauthorization of Antlerless Moose Hunts, and Brown Bear Tag Fees. Proposals for changes to these regulations will be considered each spring.

Other statewide regulations will not be taken up every meeting cycle. Statewide regulations are scheduled to be reviewed on a four-year cycle, distributed between winter meetings scheduled to occur every other year. The list of statewide regulations and the associated meeting cycle is attached.

<u>Area</u>	<u>Cycle**</u>			
SOUTHEAST-REGION I	Fall 1998	Fall 2000	Fall 2002	
Game Management Units:				
1, 2, 3, 4, 5				
SOUTHCENTRAL-REGION II	Spring 1999	Spring 2001	Spring 2003	
Game Management Units:				
6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17				
All GMUs:				
Brown Bear Tag Fees				
Reauthorization of Antlerless Moose Hunts				
ARCTIC AND WESTERN-REGION V	Fall 1999	Fall 2001	Fall 2003	
Game Management Units:				
18, 22, 23, 26A				
INTERIOR-REGION III	Spring 1998	Spring 2000	Spring 2002	
Game Management Units:				
12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, 26C				
All GMUs:				
Brown Bear Tag Fees				
Reauthorization of Antlerless Moose Hunts				
**THE MEETING CYCLE REPEATS ITSELF ON TWO-YEAR INTERVALS				

This schedule was adopted October 20, 1995; updated August 1, 1997

Alaska Board of Game Winter Meeting Schedule

STATEWIDE REGULATIONS: 5 AAC 92

CYCLE: Winter 2002, 2006, 2010, 2014, etc.

- .001 Application of this Chapter
- .002 Liability for Violations
- .004 Policy for Off-Road Vehicle Use for Hunting and Transporting Game
- .005 Policy for Changing Board Agenda
- .010 Harvest Tickets and Reports
- .011 Taking of Game by Proxy
- .012 Licenses and Tags
- .016 Muskoxen Tag Fees
- .018 Waterfowl Conservation Tag
- .019 Taking of Big Game for Certain Religious Ceremonies
- .020 Application of Permit Regulations and Permit Reports
- .025 Permit for Exporting a Raw Skin
- .027 Permit for Exporting Big Game Trophies
- .028 Aviculture Permits
- .029 Permit for Possessing Live Game
- .031 Permit for Selling Skins and Trophies
- .033 Permit for Sci, Ed, Propagative, or Public Safety Purposes
- .039 Permit for Taking Wolves Using Aircraft
- .110 Control of Predation by Wolves
- .165 Sealing of Bear Skins and Skulls
- .170 Sealing of Marten, Lynx, Beaver, Otter, Wolf, and Wolverine
- .200 Purchase and Sale of Game
- .210 Game as Animal Food or Bait
- .220 Salvage of Game Meat, Furs, and Hides
- .230 Feeding of Game
- .250 Transfer of Muskoxen for Sci and Ed Purposes
- .450 Description of Game Management Units
- .990 Definitions

STATEWIDE REGULATIONS: 5 AAC 92

CYCLE: Winter 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, etc.

- .037 Permit for Falconry
- .040 Permit for Taking of Furbearers with Game Meat
- .041 Permit to take Beavers to Control Damage to Property
- .043 Permit for Capturing Wild Furbearers for Fur Farming
- .049 Permits, Permit Procedures, and Permit Conditions
- .050 Required Permit Hunt Conditions and Procedures
- .051 Discretionary Trapping Permit Conditions & Procedures
- .052 Discretionary Permit Hunt Conditions and Procedures
- .062 Priority for Subsistence Hunting; Tier II Permits
- .068 Permit Conditions for Hunting Black Bear with Dogs
- .070 Tier II Subsistence Hunting Permit Point System
- .075 Lawful Methods of Taking Game
- .080 Unlawful Methods of Taking Game; Exceptions
- .085 Unlawful Methods of Taking Big Game; Exceptions
- .090 Unlawful Methods of Taking Fur Animals
- .095 Unlawful Methods of Taking Furbearers; Exceptions
- .100 Unlawful Methods of Hunting Waterfowl, Snipe, & Crane
- .130 Restriction to Bag Limit
- .135 Transfer of Possession
- .140 Unlawful Possession or Transportation of Game
- .150 Evidence of Sex and Identity
- .160 Marked or Tagged Game
- .260 Taking Cub Bears & Female Bears with Cubs Prohibited
- .400 Emergency Taking of Game
- .410 Taking Game in Defense of Life or Property

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

(Revised October 1997)

NAME AND ADDRESS	PHONE NUMBER	TERM EXPIRES
Bob Churchill 3415 Wentworth Anchorage, AK 99508	279-8927 277-5251 (FAX)	1/31/00
Mike Fleagle P.O. Box 33 McGrath, AK 99627	524-3385 524-3701 (FAX)	1/31/99
Larry Holmes, Chair P.O. Box 454 Girdwood, AK 99587	783-2188 (H) 783-2188 (FAX)	1/31/98
Lori Quakenbush P.O. Box 82391 Fairbanks, AK 99708	479-3210 (H) 474-7662 (W) 474-7204 (FAX)	1/31/00
Greg Roczicka P.O. Box 513 Bethel, AK 99559	543-2903 (H) 543-7342 (W) 543-3596 (FAX)	1/31/99
Walter Sampson, Vice-Chair P.O. Box 49 Kotzebue, AK 99752	442-3301 (W) 442-3605 (H) 442-2866 (FAX)	1/31/98
Greg Streveler P.O. Box 94 Gustavus, AK 99826	697-2287 697-2287 (FAX)	1/31/99

NOTE: All written comments to proposals published in this proposal booklet must be sent to the ADF&G Boards Support Section at the address below in order to be included and published in the Board of Game's Spring 1998 board workbook. Written comments regarding the proposals in this proposal booklet may not be published if the comments are sent to individual board members.

Board members may also be reached at:

ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
Boards Support Section
P.O. Box 25526
Juneau, AK 99802-5526

BOARDS SUPPORT SECTION

ADVISORY COMMITTEE COORDINATORS

SOUTHWEST REGION

Joe Chythlook
P.O. Box 1030
Dillingham, AK 99576-1030
Phone: 842-5142
Fax: 842-5514

SOUTHCENTRAL REGION

Ann Wilkinson
333 Raspberry Road
Anchorage, AK 99518-1599
Phone: 267-2354
Fax: 267-2489

WESTERN REGION

Ida Alexie
P.O. Box 1788
Bethel, AK 99559-1788
Phone: 543-4467
Fax: 543-4477

SOUTHEAST REGION

Margaret Edens
P.O. Box 25526
Juneau, AK 99802-5226
Phone: 465-4110
Fax: 465-6094

ARCTIC REGION

Susan Bucknell
P.O. Box 689
Kotzebue, AK 99752-0689
Phone: 442-3420
Fax: 442-2420

INTERIOR REGION

Jim Marcotte
1300 College Road
Fairbanks, AK 99701-1599
Phone: 459-7215
Fax: 474-8558

HEADQUARTERS STAFF

1255 West 8th Street
P.O. Box 25526
Juneau, AK 99802-5526

PHONE: 465-4110
FAX: 465-6094

Diana L. Cote, Exec. Dir., BOG
Margaret Edens, Regs Specialist, BOG
Vacant, Admin Clerk, BOG
Laird Jones, Exec. Dir., BOF
Bob Speed, Regs Specialist, BOF
Art Hughes, Admin Clerk, BOF
K.C. Love, Administrative Asst.

Phone: 465-6095
Phone: 465-2027
Phone: 465-4110
Phone: 465-6098
Phone: 465-4111
Phone: 465-6097
Phone: 465-6096

Board Meeting Recording:

Phone: 465-8901 (in Juneau)
1-800-764-8901 (outside of Juneau)

TDD

Email address:

Phone: 1-800-478-2028
dianac@fishgame.state.ak.us

TENTATIVE AGENDA
BOARD OF GAME
March 21 - 30, 1998
FAIRBANKS PRINCESS HOTEL, FAIRBANKS, ALASKA

[NOTE: This is a tentative agenda for this meeting of the Board of Game. It is subject to variance throughout the course of the meeting. At the discretion of the chair, additional periods of public testimony may be set. Also, evening sessions may be scheduled as necessary. A more detailed agenda will be available in early March.]

Saturday, March 21
8:30 AM

OPENING BUSINESS

Call to Order; Introductions of Board Members and Staff
Purpose of Meeting (overview)
Future Meeting Schedule

STAFF REPORTS

1:00 PM or at the conclusion of staff reports

PUBLIC TESTIMONY - This is the primary time for testimony on all issues before the Board of Game. At the chair's discretion, there may be additional sessions.

TO TESTIFY BEFORE THE BOARD ON PROPOSALS BEING CONSIDERED AT THIS MEETING, YOU MUST COMPLETE A BLUE TESTIMONY CARD. PUBLIC TESTIMONY WILL CONTINUE UNTIL ALL WHO SIGN UP HAVE TESTIFIED.

<p>DEADLINE FOR <u>SIGN-UP</u> TO TESTIFY IS: 12 NOON, SUNDAY, MARCH 22</p>

Sunday, March 22
8:30 AM

Continue public testimony

At the conclusion of public testimony the Board will begin deliberation on the proposals.

Monday, March 23 through Monday, March 30
8:30 AM

Board Deliberation on proposals
Miscellaneous Business, if any

The Board schedule will generally be: 8:30 AM - 12:00 noon and 1:00 - 5:00 PM with lunch from noon until 1:00 PM. This schedule is subject to change at the discretion of the chair.

PROPOSAL 1 - 5 AAC 84.270(1). FUR BEARER TRAPPING. Amend this regulation as follows:

Remove the bag limit on beaver in Units 20A, 20B, 20C, 20F, and 25C.

ISSUE: Beaver are widely distributed in most all of the riparian habitat in Unit 20.

The bag limit for beaver is a relic from a half a century ago when beaver fur was valuable and a trapper could make a good living trapping full time. In those days, the limit was necessary because full time trappers were spread across most of the beaver habitat and trappers were harvesting as many as they could. Today there aren't many beaver trappers and the great majority of the beaver population in Unit 20A is not harvested.

The limit means little as a management tool now because very few trappers take their limit.

Removing the bag limit will probably not substantially increase the number of beaver harvested, but it will provide more opportunity for the hard-working trapper who wishes to take more than twenty-five.

Some trappers are currently catching more than their limit and using friends and relatives to help seal them. Removal of the bag limit would provide more accurate harvest data for ADF&G, and bring these peoples' activities into legal bounds.

Within Unit 20B, beavers still cause significant property damage by flooding homes, property, roadways and cutting down trees despite the accessibility and heavy trapping pressure. This is additional evidence that the proposed change will have no significant effect on beaver populations in the subunits listed above.

Factors that limit beaver trapping naturally:

- Beaver trapping is very hard work
- Beaver have a relatively low pelt value
- A common practice is to only harvest 2 to 4 adults out of a colony of 6 to 10 beaver

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People who wish to take more than twenty-five beaver will be limited to that, with no biological justification.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The few people that trap full time and the people that wish to work hard and catch more than twenty-five beaver.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Increase the bag limit to 100 or more.

PROPOSED BY: C. Tom Seaton (I-98S-G-004)

PROPOSAL 2 - 5 AAC 84.270(2). FUR BEARER TRAPPING. Change this regulation in Unit 20 as follows:

No closed season on coyotes, no limit.

ISSUE: Seasons on coyote harvesting in all game management units and particularly in Unit 20.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Coyotes will continue to prosper to the detriment of Dall sheep, especially lambs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone, as the coyote is a recent arrival in the Alaska ecosystem that is flourishing to the detriment of game animals.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, the coyote is a vermin who excels like no other animal at adaptation and is adapting to this environment at the expense of others.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Coke W. Wallace (I-98S-G-026)

PROPOSAL 3 - 5 AAC 84.270(5). FUR BEARER TRAPPING. Extend trapping season dates in Units 12 and 20E as follows:

Units 12 and 20E: Residents and nonresidents, two lynx, November 1 - March 15.

ISSUE: Unnecessarily restrictive hunting season for lynx while populations are strong.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunities will continue to be restricted for the people that would like to pursue them.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The people that would like to hunt lynx later in the spring when the weather is better and the pelts are at their best. This would match the current fox season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Advisory Committee (I-98S-G-022)

PROPOSAL 4 - 5 AAC 84.270(6). FUR BEARER TRAPPING. Change trapping seasons in Unit 21 as follows:

Marten season in Unit 21. This proposal would amend the regulations to open marten season on Oct. 20 instead of the current Nov. 1.

ISSUE: There is no valid reason not to open Oct. 20 as it used to be. Fur is prime, fur buyers have never distinguished between October and November caught marten. Many trappers spend freeze-up out on their lines and the Oct. 20 start up date would allow them an earlier start with no loss of pelt value. Obtaining an early collection of marten is important and a form of conversation because the best prices are usually obtained at the first auction of the season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued loss of trapping time for marten as well as loss of pelt values.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers who live out the year round and who rely on trapping for a large part of income. Also the trappers who go out before freeze-up to work on lines or cabins, etc.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: John Stam (I-98S-G-047)

PROPOSAL 5 - 5 AAC 85.010. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BISON. Change the maximum number of permits that may be issued in Unit 20D from 150 to 200.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(3)		
Unit 20D	July 20—Mar. 31 (General hunt only)	July 20—Mar. 31
1 bison every 5 regulatory years by drawing permit only; up to [150] <u>200</u> permits will be is- sued		

ISSUE: The department is currently authorized to issue up to 150 drawing permits annually for the Delta bison hunt. The department has manipulated hunting to reduce the bull:cow ratio in order to increase the number of calves produced annually which has resulted in an increase in harvestable surplus. This has allowed the issuance of a larger number of permits. During the 1997-98 season 130 permits were issued.

The current Delta bison population goal is for a pre-calving (i.e., immediately preceding the calving period) herd size of 360 bison. This normally results in a post-calving population of 450-500. Herd size is regulated by hunting, controlled by the number of permits issued. As the number of permits issued annually approaches the regulatory limit of 150, it is conceivable that the department will need to issue more than 150 permits to maintain the desired herd size.

Factors that could result in more than 150 permits being required to meet herd size goals include further reductions in the bull:cow ratio, or reduced hunter success rates resulting from factors such as reduced access to private land. For example, during the 1996-97 bison hunting season it was necessary to issue an emergency order to extend the hunting season in order to achieve the required harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A situation may develop where the department is not authorized to issue enough Delta bison hunting permits to meet herd size goals.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bison hunters may benefit from increased numbers of hunting permits, and the department will benefit by having a management tool to meet herd size goals.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals who do not think Delta bison herd size should be limited.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Remove all restrictions on the number of permits the department is authorized to issue for hunting Delta bison.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-061)

PROPOSAL 6 - 5 AAC 85.020(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR. Change season dates in Unit 19B as follows:

Brown/grizzly bear
Unit 19B Sept. 1 - May 31

ISSUE: Change the brown/grizzly bear season in Unit 19B so the dates line up with those of Units 19C and 19D. Change to Sept. 1 - May 31.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The above three areas have different brown/grizzly season. It is more practical for this season to start on Sept. 1 to match the other areas and to match the moose season opening date of Sept. 1.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Less confusion for Protection Division. More practical for all hunters - both resident and nonresident. Most bear hunting is done incidental to moose and caribou hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Jim Harrower (SC-98-G-023)

PROPOSAL 7 - 5 AAC 85.020(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR. Extend brown bear season in Unit 19B as follows:

Brown/grizzly bear Unit 19B
Open season Aug. 25 - May 25

ISSUE: Grizzly bear opening. There gone by then or darn hard to find. The bears are off the salmon stream by then.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? When you fly over this area you can't believe how many bears you see. But can't really get to them, off streams, in deep hills.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and moose. A chance to take a few bear during early season when you have practical chance at them.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A few bears.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: J.P. Ford (SC-98-G-038)

PROPOSAL 8 - 5 AAC 85.020(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR. Change this regulation in Unit 19B as follows:

Brown/grizzly bear hunters:
Unit 19B resident and nonresident. One bear every four regulatory years. Open season Aug. 20 - May 25.

ISSUE: Brown/grizzly bear season opening in Unit 19B. Bears in Unit 19B are off salmon stream by then.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More bears and more missed opportunities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The people (hunters). State of Alaska selling more bear tags. Bears are off salmon by last of August, in the hills by then. Moose benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? We will shoot a few more bears maybe.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Michael Mroczynski (SC-98S-G-041)

PROPOSAL 9 - 5 AAC 85.020(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR. Change regulations in Unit 19B as follows:

Unit 19B: Residents and nonresidents: One bear every four regulatory years, Sept. 1 - May 25

ISSUE: The date at which the grizzly season opens in Unit 19B. It opens so late in the fall that it effectively prevents any fall grizzly hunting. This is because the snow is so deep hunters can't get around. Also, planes can't get in or out of the lakes because of ice. In addition, by Sept. 10 most bears are starting to hibernate.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Very few, if any hunters will get to hunt grizzlies in Unit 19B. In my 12 years hunting the area the grizzly population has remained healthy and stable, whether the season opened early or late.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who hunt the area will benefit. They will have the opportunity to hunt grizzlies in beautiful fall weather instead of in heavy snow and freezing temperatures.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I can't think of any who will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: David S. Haeg (HQ-98S-G-006)

PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 85.020(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR. Change these regulations in Unit 19D East as follows:

Resident hunters:
One bear per year in Unit 19D East.

ISSUE: During the Spring 1996 meeting, the Alaska Board of Game designated Game Management Unit 19D East as an intensive management zone and authorized the Department of Fish and Game to conduct wolf control within this area. The decision was subsequently overturned by Governor Knowles. Because of this inaction on the part of the State of Alaska, predation has effectively maintained moose populations at extremely low densities.

In an effort to reduce the effects of predation, especially on moose calves, increases in the legal harvest of brown bears is desirable. Allowing hunters to harvest a brown bear every regulatory year instead of limiting the harvest to one bear every four years may encourage local hunters to take additional bears from the area. Currently, local harvest is extremely low. Harvest in the area by nonresidents is nonexistent. The current harvest is significantly below the suspected sustainable annual harvest, and minor increases in the harvest would probably not negatively influence the overall bear population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The opportunity for moose hunters in the local area to meet their subsistence needs will continue to decline, as will success rates when moose populations continue to decline or show no significant increases. Predation on moose calves will continue to take the annual recruitment, and populations will dwindle further. Failure of the Board of Game to adopt necessary changes to existing regulations will result in further imbalances in predator/prey ratios.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will be allowed to incidentally harvest brown bears that are encountered during other activities. All local hunters that are dependent on moose for their subsistence meat requirements will potentially benefit. All people who are interested in maintaining a reasonable balance in predator/prey ratios, thus leading to a healthier ecosystem will see benefits, whether they are interested in wildlife populations for viewing, for photographing, or for consumptive uses.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? If, in fact, the change in the legal bag limit results in an increase in the harvest of brown bears, those people who are philosophically against consumptive uses may suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The Board of Game's decision to authorize wolf control in the area would obviously be the best course of action to contend with the problem of low recruitment rates in local moose populations. However, pursuing that avenue is apparently politically incorrect.

PROPOSED BY: McGrath Advisory Committee (I-98S-G-019)

PROPOSAL 11 - 5 AAC 85.020(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR. Change season dates in Unit 20A as follows:

reasonable opportunity for subsistence users. If it does not, then restrictions only to non-subsistence hunts will need to be considered.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The bear harvest in Unit 26B could continue to exceed the estimated sustainable harvest goal of 13 per year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters generally by maintaining a reasonable harvest opportunity without reverting to a permit system.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters that want to harvest bears in August.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Reinstate drawing permit system for nonresidents; reduce season for nonresidents; season closure.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-066)

PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 85.020(23). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR and 5 AAC 92.015. BROWN BEAR TAG FEE EXEMPTION. Amend these regulations in Unit 25D as follows:

One brown bear every two regulatory years. Remove the tag fee.

ISSUE: The amount of moose calves was extremely low at moose survey time. Four per ten miles. The moose population is very low. Barely meeting local needs.. The brown bear and black bear populations have appeared to increase. Brown and black bears kill a lot of moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will stay flatlined or could decline. The subsistence needs of local people will not be met.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All moose hunters. The moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anti-hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Predator control. Not legal. Promote an increase in harvest, in the works. Stop hunting moose. Not likely, not possible.

PROPOSED BY: Craig L. Fleener (I-98S-G-006)

PROPOSAL 15 - 5 AAC 85.020(24). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR. Amend this regulation in Unit 26B as follows:

Brown bear season Unit 26B: Sept. 1 - May 31. "X" number of permits will be issued to nonresidents accompanied by registered big game guides. Nonresidents accompanied by second degree kindred would be exempted from the permit requirement.

ISSUE: Two years ago the permit requirement for nonresidents was eliminated and the season moved from September 1 to August 20. These changes resulted in the brown bear harvest increasing from approximately 13 per year to in excess of 25 for the past two years. Estimated allowable harvest for Unit 26B is 13 per year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Joe Want (I-98S-G-044)

PROPOSAL 16 - 5 AAC 85.020(24). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR. Amend this regulation in Unit 26B as follows:

Reinstate the same regulations in place prior to 1996 when annual harvest equaled the desired sustainable level.

- 1) Move opening date from Aug. 20 back to Sept. 1.
- 2) Reinstate nonresident hunters only on permit drawing.

ISSUE: The grizzly bear harvest in Unit 26B has exceeded the target level set by ADF&G by 100% in both years, 1996 and 1997, since the season was opened in August and nonresident permits removed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Quickly drive this population to a level where the season will be closed to everyone. The same consequences to be expected when any population is harvested at twice its sustainable rate.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Dan L. Wetzel (I-98S-G-041)

PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 85.025(7). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR CARIBOU. Provide additional hunting opportunity by amending seasons and bag limits for caribou in Unit 12.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(7)		
Unit 12, that portion east of the Nabesna River and south of the winter trail from the Nabesna River to Pickerel Lake to the Canadian border	Sept. 1-Sept. 20 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1-Sept. 20
1 bull by registration permit only; the season will be closed when 20 bulls have been taken		
<u>Unit 12, that portion west of the Glenn Highway (Tok Cutoff) and south of the Alaska Highway within the Tok River drainage</u>		
<u>1 BULL</u>	<u>Sept. 1-Sept. 20</u>	<u>No open season</u>
<u>Unit 12, that portion west of the Glenn Highway (Tok Cutoff) and south of the Alaska Highway excluding the Tok River drainage</u>		
<u>1 bull by registration permit only; up to 50 bulls may be taken in combination with Unit 20(D), that portion south of the Tanana River</u>	<u>Aug. 10-Sept. 30</u>	<u>No open season</u>

...

(15)

...

Unit 20D south of the
Tanana River

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

Aug. 10—Sept. 30

No open season

1 bull by registration
permit only; up to 50
bulls may be taken in
combination with Unit 12,
that portion west
of the Glenn Highway (Tok
Cutoff) and south of the Alaska
Highway excluding the Tok
River drainage

[NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:]

[No open season]

...

ISSUE: During spring 1996, all of Unit 12 except the southeastern portion was closed to caribou hunting to prevent harvest of Mentasta and Macomb caribou. Subsequent radiotelemetry surveys have shown that Mentasta caribou are not present in Unit 12 west of the Glenn Highway in August or September. Hence, neither of the two proposed hunts will affect the Mentasta caribou. The Macomb caribou population has recovered sufficiently to allow a limited harvest. A registration hunt was initiated in 1997, but only in Unit 20D. However, the Macomb caribou also use areas to the east in Unit 12 including the Robertson River and drainages along the north face of the Alaska Range. By extending the geographic boundaries of the existing Macomb registration permit hunt into immediately adjacent areas of Unit 12, hunting opportunity will be restored to match the actual range of the Macomb caribou.

A few hundred caribou occur in the Tok River drainage west of the Glenn Highway throughout summer and fall. These animals do not calve in the same area as the Nelchina herd, but instead calve locally on the south slope of the Alaska Range. Nor are these caribou part of the Macomb, Mentasta, or Fortymile herds. Access into this area is difficult and is utilized by few hunters. Prior to the 1996 closure, caribou harvest within this area ranged between 3-10 animals and was incidental to moose and sheep hunting. Given the short season and necessity to maintain a minimal harvest in this limited area, we recommend no open season for nonresidents.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters wishing to hunt caribou in a remote portion of Unit 12 and subsistence hunters because immediate hunting opportunity is increased.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A small number of nonresidents.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Maintain closure. However, this will continue to unnecessarily prevent opportunity to harvest caribou in the northwestern corner of Unit 12.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-058)

PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC 85.025(14). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR CARIBOU. Change caribou hunting regulations in Units 19A and 19B as follows:

Remainder of Units 19A and 19B:

Residents - 5 caribou; however no more than two may be bulls. Aug. 25 - Apr. 1.

Nonresidents and nonresident aliens: 1 caribou Aug. 25 - Apr. 1.

ISSUE: Caribou hunting season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Increase in wanton waste of caribou meat, and violations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters. Enforcement is easier when hunting of big game opens same day (moose, caribou, bear, etc.).

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who hunt and waste the meat of animals.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Stricter enforcement of game laws, regulations, rules, but this will not take place.

PROPOSED BY: Sleetmute Traditional Council (HQ-98S-G-026)

PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 85.025(14). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR CARIBOU. Change this regulation in Unit 19B as follows:

Nonresidents and nonresident alien: One caribou Aug. 25 - Oct. 15.

ISSUE: Caribou bag limit harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wanton waste of meat is staggering, Fish and Game unable to enforce vast area of Unit 19. Putting harvest to one caribou would immediately cut wanton waste of meat by fifty percent.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? More funding for Fish and Game, and men/women. Also better management of funding, but know this will not take place.

PROPOSED BY: Sleetmute Traditional Council (HQ-98S-G-028)

PROPOSAL 20 - 5 AAC 85.025(15). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR CARIBOU. Amend this regulation in Unit 20A as follows:

Increase the number of drawing permits for caribou in Unit 20A to at least 100 permits as opposed to the present allocation of 75.

ISSUE: The number of caribou harvested in Unit 20A could be increased with little or no effect on the effort to enhance the herd population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Lose hunting opportunity for no rational biological reason other than to feed more wolves.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Caribou hunters in Unit 20A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Wolf control - rejected because the present administration is anti-hunting in general and afraid of the political backlash.

PROPOSED BY: Kenneth Lamb (I-98S-G-017)

PROPOSAL 21 - 5 AAC 85.025(15). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR CARIBOU. Amend this regulation in Unit 20A as follows:

Unit 20A caribou drawing permit: issue up to 250 bull caribou with more than 6 tines on one side and issue to residents of Alaska only.

ISSUE: Unit 20A: increase the number of caribou drawing permits up to 250, take only larger bulls and make it resident of Alaska only.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bigger bull caribou are older and should be harvested before they die. Younger bulls do most of the mating. The resident hunter should have the opportunity to hunt caribou in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The resident hunters of Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Nonresidents.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Clemens M. Clooten (I-98S-G-037)

PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 85.025(15) and (20) HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR CARIBOU. Change the White Mountains caribou winter drawing hunt to a registration hunt.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(15)		
...		
Units 20B and 20F, those portions north and west of the Steese Highway, north and east of the Elliott and Dalton Highways, and south of the Yukon River		
1 caribou per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 bull	Aug. 10--Sept 20 (General hunt only)	Aug. 10--Sept 20
1 caribou by [DRAWING] registration permit only; up to [250 PERMITS MAY BE ISSUED] 100 caribou may be taken	Feb. 1--Mar 31 (General hunt only)	Feb. 1--Mar 31

...

(20)

...

Unit 25C, those portions
north and west of the
Steese Highway

1 caribou per regulatory year,
only as follows:

1 bull	Aug. 10--Sept 20 (General hunt only)	Aug. 10--Sept 20
1 caribou by [DRAWING] <u>registration</u> permit only; up to [250 PERMITS MAY BE ISSUED] <u>100 caribou may be taken</u>	Feb. 1--Mar 31 (General hunt only)	Feb. 1--Mar 31

ISSUE: This change will not affect any other aspect of the hunt including the existing access restrictions which allow motorized access during February 1 - 28, and nonmotorized access during March 1 - 31. Interest has decreased in the White Mountains caribou herd winter drawing hunts (dc877 and dc878). When the hunts were initiated in 1990, 229 hunters applied for 100 permits. The number of applicants peaked in 1993 when 615 hunters applied for 150 permits. The number of applicants for the 1997 drawing was 235 with 250 permits available.

Interest has decreased because hunter success is very low for these hunts. Hunter success is low because of both the remoteness of the areas in which the White Mountains herd over-winters and the number of hunters that actually hunt is also low. The difficulty of success in this hunt has apparently contributed to the decline in hunter interest. Decreases in applicants were further exacerbated by the board's action to allow only every-other-year application for drawing permit hunts.

The maximum reported harvest and participation since 1987 for the winter hunt is 3 caribou and 26 hunters, respectively. The maximum number of hunters using their permits is 37 in 1995-96, none of whom harvested a caribou. Survey data and modeling exercises indicate the herd currently could easily sustain a winter harvest of 30 caribou. The White Mountains herd can offer more hunters opportunity to hunt caribou during winter if the hunt is changed from a drawing permit to a registration permit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Opportunity will continue to be lost by hunters interested in winter caribou hunting in the White Mountains.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Winter hunters who would like to take advantage of this opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Open a general season hunt in winter. However, the White Mountains herd is relatively small and there is a great deal of interest in road system

accessible caribou hunts. Therefore, it is essential for the welfare of the resource that ADF&G be able to conduct timely monitoring of hunting pressure and harvest. A registration hunt will make this possible.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-059)

PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC 85.025(15). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR CARIBOU. Amend this regulation in Unit 20D as follows:

Establish a Tier II hunt for one bull from the McComb herd during February and March in Unit 20D. Healy Lake would like to have a percent of the fall hunt allocated to a winter Tier II permit hunt.

ISSUE: We would like a winter caribou hunt in eastern Unit 20D.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will not have enough meat to feed our families.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents of Healy Lake and other permit recipients.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Healy Lake Village Council (I-98S-G-035)

PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC 85.025(15). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR CARIBOU. Amend regulations in Unit 20E as follows:

The new regulation would allow the taking of 450 bulls in Unit 20.

ISSUE: I would like the Board of Game to increase the caribou bag limit in Unit 20E from 150 to 450 animals (increase the registration permits from 150 to 450).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the caribou bag limit is not increased then the Department of Fish and Game is not following the Fortymile Caribou Plan which allocates hunters' take of two percent of the herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The local businesses in and around Unit 20E, such as businesses in Tok, Chicken and Eagle, which provide services to the hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer. Prior to the reduction of the caribou bag limit, the original bag limit for Unit 20E was 450 animals. Based upon the herd's present size, the 450 bag limit is still less than the plan's goal for the hunters' take of two percent of the herd size.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Another solution is to raise the caribou bag limit to 300 bulls for a period of time, then after that time period, raise the bag limit up to 450 bulls. Although the bag limit of 300 bulls is not two percent of the herd based on the herd's present size, it does offer a compromise between the plan's goal of increasing the herd size and the hunters' take of two percent.

PROPOSED BY: Terry Lee Peterson (HQ-98S-G-007)

PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC 85.025(20). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR CARIBOU. Amend this regulation in Units 25A, B and D as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit[S] 25A [25B, AND THE REMAINDER OF 25D]		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
10 caribou	[JULY 1]Aug. 1 - Apr.30	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		[JULY 1] Aug. 1 - Apr.30
5 caribou		
Units 25B and the remainder of 25D		
RESIDENT HUNTERS		
10 caribou	July 1 - Apr. 30	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS		
5 caribou		July 1 - Apr. 30

ISSUE: Residents of Arctic Village believe that caribou hunting on the south slope of the Brooks Range during July can influence caribou migrations and prevent them from moving to wintering grounds near Arctic Village. This regulation change would eliminate caribou hunting under state regulations in Unit 25A during July. Federal regulations would still allow caribou hunting by rural residents on federal land during July.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Caribou migrations may be disrupted.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who hunt caribou in Unit 25A in August.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who wish to hunt caribou in July.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Yukon Flats Advisory Committee (I-98S-G-011)

PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC 085.045(1). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the existing cow moose season at Berners Bay.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(1)		
...		
Unit 1C, Berners Bay drainages Oct.15	Sept. 15-Oct.15	Sept. 15-
1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 20 permits will be issued.		
...		

PROBLEM: This status quo proposal is necessary to accommodate cow moose hunting in Berners Bay. The strategic moose management plan for Berners Bay calls for a post-hunt moose population of 90 moose. Fall 1994 surveys enumerated 75 moose, indicating that as many as 150 moose may be present in the hunt area. The bull to cow ratio (38:100) from that survey indicated that the cow segment of the population can and should be harvested to curtail population growth. The calf to cow ratio in that survey was 29:100, higher than the 25:100 called for in the plan. All fall, 1997 hunters were successful, killing eight bulls and seven cows. The moose plan calls for 30 hunter-days and 10 hunters; in 1997 15 hunters expended 42 hunter days, exceeding the objectives.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population will continue to grow and could exceed carrying capacity of the habitat. The harvest of moose in Berners Bay will be restricted to bulls.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will have more opportunity to hunt moose. The moose population will benefit from either-sex harvests that will balance the herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-071)

PROPOSAL 27 - 5 AAC 85.045(3). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.

Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season at Nunatak Bench.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(3)		
...		
Unit 5A, Nunatak Bench	Nov. 15-Feb. 15 (General hunt only)	Nov. 15-Feb. 15

1 moose by registration permit only;
up to 5 moose may be taken

...

PROBLEM: This proposal to retain the status quo is necessary to continue the any moose hunting season at Nunatak Bench. The Nunatak Bench strategic moose management plan calls for a post-hunt moose population of 50 moose in this area. Fall 1994 surveys enumerated 25 moose, suggesting that up to 50 moose may be present in the hunt area. The bull to cow ratio from that survey was 17:100, indicating sufficient cows to justify harvesting a limited number. The calf to cow ratio in that survey was 22:100. A late winter survey in January 1996 resulted in the count of 33 moose (18% calves).

During the 1996 season, no moose were taken in this area. As a result, the objectives in the strategic moose plan were not met. The 1997 season is still open at the time this proposal was submitted; no moose have been taken up to January 2, 1998.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The harvest of moose at Nunatak Bench will be limited to bulls.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will have more opportunity to hunt moose. The moose population will benefit from either-sex hunts that will help balance the herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-072)

PROPOSAL 28 - 5 AAC 85.045(4). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6A.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 6A, all drainages into the Gulf of Alaska from Cape Suckling to Palm Point		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
A moose by registration permit only; up to 30 bulls may be taken	Sept. 1- Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	
An antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 drawing permits may be issued	Sept. 1- Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 5 drawing permits may be issued		Sept. 1-Oct. 31
Remainder of Unit 6A		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
A bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side	Sept. 1-Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1-Oct. 31
An antlerless moose by registration permit only; up to 20 antlerless moose may be taken	Nov. 15-Dec. 31 (General hunt only)	Nov. 15-Dec. 31

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. We recommend continuation of the antlerless season to promote population stability. The desirable post-hunt population size

in Unit 6A west of Cape Suckling is 300 to 350 moose. A census completed during January 1996 yielded a population count of 316 moose with 45 calves (14%). The reported harvest during 1996 was 24 bulls and 9 cows. Reported harvest during 1997 was 18 bulls. We canceled the antlerless hunt in this area during 1997 because census results indicated that calf survival was poor in adjacent Unit 6B. We plan to reinstate the antlerless season for 1998 season if calf survival improves.

The desirable post-hunt population size in Unit 6A east of Cape Suckling is 300 to 350 moose. A census completed during January 1996 yielded a population count of 282 moose with 29 calves (10%). Reported harvest was 16 bulls in 1996. A preliminary harvest of 10 bulls has been reported for 1997. No antlerless hunts were held during either year to allow the population to increase. Harvest of antlerless moose may be needed in 1998 to stabilize the population within our management objective.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If calf survival improves and an antlerless hunt is possible, hunting opportunity will be needlessly lost.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Individuals who desire to hunt antlerless moose in Unit 6A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who are opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-073)

PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 85.045(4). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6B.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 6B		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
An antlered moose by registration permit only; up to 30 antlered moose may be taken; a moose may not be taken until after 3:00 a.m. on	Aug. 27-Oct. 31 [SEPT. 30] (General hunt only)	No open season.

the day following the day on which an airboat is used for transportation, and all airboats used for transportation must display an ADF&G identification number

An antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 drawing permits may be issued for antlerless moose; during the time the registration permit hunt is in effect, a moose may not be taken until after 3:00 a.m. on the day following the day on which an airboat is used for transportation, and all airboats used for transportation must display an ADF&G identification number.

Aug. 27-Oct. 31
[SEPT. 30]
(General hunt only)

No open season.

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. We recommend continuation of an antlerless season to promote population stability. Desirable post-hunt population size is 300-350. A census completed during December 1996 yielded a count of 308 moose with 19 (6%) calves. The reported harvest during 1996 was 17 bulls and 6 cows. We canceled the bull and antlerless hunts during 1997 because results of the census indicated that calf survival was poor. If calf survival improves, both hunts may be reinstated for the fall 1998 season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If calf survival improves and a season is possible, hunting opportunity will be lost.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Individuals who desire to hunt antlerless moose in Unit 6B.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who are opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-074)

PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 85.045(4). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6C.

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

Unit 6C

1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 20 permits for bulls and up to 20 permits for antlerless moose may be issued	Sept. 1-Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season.
--	--	-----------------

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. We recommend continuation of an antlerless season to promote population stability. A census completed during December 1996 yielded a population count of 260 moose with 45 (17%) calves. The current population objective, established in 1995, is to allow the population to increase to 400 moose by the year 2006. We will achieve the increase by limiting cow harvest to a maximum of 5 per year. The reported harvest during 1996 was 17 bulls and 5 cows, and during 1997 was 18 bulls and 5 cows.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters desiring to take a moose in Unit 6C.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-075)

PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 85.045(5). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Units 7 and 14C.

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

(5)

Unit 7, the Placer River drainages, and that portion of the Placer Creek (Bear Valley) drainage out-	Aug. 20-Oct. 10 (General Hunt Only)	Aug. 20-Oct. 10
--	--	-----------------

side the Portage
Glacier Closed Area, and
that portion of 14C
within the Twentymile
River drainage

1 moose by drawing permit
only; up to 60 permits
for bulls and up to 70
permits for antlerless
moose will be issued.

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorize annually. Total moose observed during annual trend counts completed during 1992-1994 and 1996 were 232, 207, 206, and 168 moose, respectively. No survey was completed during 1995. During those years, the ratio of the number of bulls per 100 cows was 35, 40, 38, and 37, respectively. The ratio of the number of calves per 100 cows during those years was 47, 50, 46, and 40, respectively. No survey has been conducted in 1997; however, we believe that moose numbers are probably below the management objective of 250 moose. The population peak of 333 moose in 1990 probably exceeded the carrying capacity of the habitat, and an aerial survey completed 2 years later found that many of the moose had dispersed or died. The population also declined 25 to 30% during the severe winter of 1994-95. Consequently, harvest quotas and the number of permits issued were reduced in 1997. Bull harvests from 1994 through 1996 were 15, 16, and 21 moose, respectively. Cow harvests over the same period were 7, 5, and 3 moose, respectively.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population will probably increase and could suffer major losses during a severe winter. Habitat may be overbrowsed, reducing its carrying capacity in subsequent years, and road and train kills will increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who obtain a drawing permit, wildlife viewers and motorists driving in the Portage area. Visitor use is high and viewing is an important activity in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who are opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-076)

PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 85.045(8). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Authorize an antlerless moose hunt in Unit 9B.

Unit 9B, Dec. 1 - 31, antlerless moose may be harvested.

ISSUE: Authorization of antlerless moose hunts in the December season. This has traditionally been an antlerless hunt until it was taken away.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Local harvesters that traditionally used to harvest antlerless moose will have to continue to get bull moose that are lean and tough or not be able to harvest moose at all. This season some bulls are dropping antlers by the middle of December this year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Traditional cow moose hunters that would rather have a fatter, tastier moose. Also be able to harvest moose when the bulls drop their antlers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lake Iliamna Advisory Committee (HQ-98S-G-013)

PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 85.045(8). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Unit 9C.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open season
...		
Remainder of Unit 9C		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 moose; however, antlerless moose may be taken only during the period Dec. 1- Dec. 31	Sept.1-Sept. 15 Dec. 1-Dec. 31	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side		Sept. 5-Sept. 15
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. The remainder of Unit 9C consists primarily of the Alagnak (Branch) River. The average harvest during recent years is 3 antlerless moose per year. During 1996, 2 cows were taken. During a composition survey completed on December 2, 1997, we counted 169 moose with ratios of 40 bulls per 100 cows and 20 calves per 100 cows. Access to the Alagnak River during December is primarily by aircraft or snowmachine. During recent winters, poor travel conditions have kept hunting effort low. A continued harvest of a few cows is sustainable by the moose population, and will provide some additional harvest opportunity.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The opportunity to take a few antlerless moose in the Alagnak (Branch) River drainage will be lost.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those hunters who have the opportunity to take an antlerless moose in the Alagnak (Branch) River drainage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who oppose any antlerless moose hunt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-077)

PROPOSAL 34 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunting season in Unit 14A.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 14A		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
A bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side, by bow and arrow only	Aug. 10-Aug. 17 (General hunt only)	Aug. 10-Aug. 17
A bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side	Aug. 20-Sept. 20 (General hunt only)	Aug. 20-Sept. 20

Any bull by drawing permit only; up to 300 permits may be issued	Aug. 20-Sept. 20 (General hunt only) Nov. 1 - Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	Aug. 20-Sept. 20 Nov. 1 - Nov. 15
An antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 600 antlerless moose permits may be issued	Aug. 20 - Sept. 20 (General hunt only) Nov. 1 - Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	Aug. 20-Sept. 20 Nov. 1-Nov. 15
A bull with spike-fork antlers	Nov. 20-Dec. 15 (General hunt only)	Nov. 20-Dec. 15

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually. The size of the subpopulation of moose in Unit 14A is currently above the post-hunt management objective of 5,500 moose total and 3,440 cows. Despite moderate levels of accidental mortality from collisions on highways and railroads, a high natality rate and a high over-winter survival rate provide a surplus of up to 300 antlerless moose from this subpopulation in any given year. During a November 1996 census, we estimated the population contained 3,500 cows and observed a calf:cow ratio of 42 calves per 100 cows. In a small sample of moose observed during surveys completed during early December 1997, we estimated a slightly smaller calf:cow ratio that ranged from 30 to 33 calves per 100 cows. During an average winter, we anticipate 20% to 30% mortality among calves and 6% to 7% mortality among cows in addition to accidental deaths. Reported harvest of cows during the fall 1996 season was 283 moose (570 permits issued). Preliminary results for the cow harvest during the fall 1997 season indicate that 240 moose were taken (520 permits issued).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Unit 14A moose subpopulation will quickly grow beyond the ability of the habitat to sustain that population level if an antlerless moose hunt is not authorized. Increasing starvation of moose and conflicts with humans will occur.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All who wish a healthy, productive moose population in the Matanuska-Susitna Valley and those who wish to use antlerless moose for consumption.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Any who disagree with the harvest of antlerless moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-078)

PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt on Elmendorf Air Force Base in Unit 14C.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 14C, Elmendorf Air Force Base	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30

1 moose by drawing permit, by bow and arrow only; up to 15 permits may be issued.

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Moose on Elmendorf Air Force Base are part of a resident wintering population of about 435 moose that also occupy Fort Richardson. During September, up to 150 of these moose frequent lands managed by Elmendorf. A majority of these animals move to Fort Richardson during late fall and winter, many into areas where hunting is not allowed. Because the density of hunters on Fort Richardson has reached maximum manageable levels, the Elmendorf hunt provides additional hunter opportunity and helps achieve desired harvest levels. During the 1995 season, hunters took 8 bulls and 4 cows, and in 1996, 8 bulls and 4 cows. Five antlerless permits were issued in 1996 and 1997.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The overall Fort Richardson-Elmendorf A.F.B. moose population is thought to have been over carrying capacity during the 1994-1995 winter. Browse was overutilized over extensive areas during the severe winters of 1989-1990, 1991-1992, and 1994-1995.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bowhunters who draw permits. Persons living on or near Elmendorf Air Force Base who incur damage to their gardens and shrubs and motorists on Elmendorf and in north Anchorage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to antlerless moose hunting, bow and arrow hunting, or hunting in general.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Long-term, large-scale habitat enhancement is desirable, but difficult because of costs and conflicts with military operations.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and Elmendorf Airforce Base
(HQ-98S-G-079)

PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Birchwood Management Area and the remainder of Unit 14C.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 14C, that portion known as the Birchwood Management Area	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30
1 moose by drawing permit, by bow and arrow only; up to 25 permits may be issued		
Remainder of Unit 14C		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
A bull with spike/fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 20 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 20
An antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits may be issued	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 20 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 20

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Composition counts are not routinely flown in the Birchwood Management Area. However, we believe that a small resident population of 10-15 moose as well as an equal number of animals from Fort Richardson frequent the area. During the 1995 season, archers took from this area 1 bull and 1 cow, and in 1996, 1 bull. Five antlerless permits were issued each year during 1996 and 1997.

The number of cow moose in those portions of the remainder of Unit 14C where antlerless moose hunts are held appears to be lower than observed during the early 1990s. Cows observed during annual trend counts from 1990 through 1994 ranged from 179-154. However, numbers are still more than sufficient to sustain existing harvest levels. Antlerless moose harvests

reported for 1995 and 1996 hunting seasons were 6 and 5 moose, respectively. Twenty-five permits were issued in 1996 and 1997.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The opportunity to harvest antlerless moose will be lost, and urban moose-human conflicts would likely increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Persons who acquire permits for antlerless moose hunts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to antlerless moose harvest or hunting in general.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-080)

PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC 85.045(13). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area of Unit 15A.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 15A, the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area	Sept. 15-Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15- Sept. 30
1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 50 permits for antlerless moose and up to 30 permits for spike-fork antlered moose may be issued; the taking of calves and females accompanied by calves is prohibited		

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. The density of moose in Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area (SLWMA) exceeds the management objective of 2 moose per square mile. The SLWMA was closed to moose hunting in 1987 to allow the summer and fall resident population to increase. A joint management objective developed for this area by the department and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service calls for a fall population of approximately 2 moose per square mile or about 130 moose counted during the fall survey. A

survey completed on December 1 and 2, 1997 yielded a count of 175 moose composed of 38 bulls (4 spike-fork, 7 yearlings with antlers 3 point or larger, 15 mid size, and 12 with antlers 50" or larger), 102 cows and 35 calves. Ratios observed were 37 bulls per 100 cows and 34 calves per 100 cows. Assuming a 75 percent observation rate, we estimate that the resident moose population in the SLWMA numbers at least 233 animals. Because the SLWMA is managed for a primary goal of wildlife viewing, another management objective requires that we maintain a minimum bull:cow ratio of 40 bulls per 100 cows. Because the 1997 bull:cow ratio was below this objective, we do not anticipate allowing a harvest of bulls at this time. The last antlerless moose season was held during 1995 when 40 permits were issued and 7 antlerless moose were harvested.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The SLWMA is a wintering area for moose. During moderate to severe winters, this area supports up to 300 moose, more than twice the desired resident population size. If resident moose are allowed to increase beyond the management objective, excessive use of the habitat will occur, affecting both resident and migratory moose that depend on this area. Viewing opportunities will be adversely affected as well.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wildlife viewers and hunters receiving permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals opposed to hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Increase the moose carrying capacity of the area. Additional habitat enhancement is expensive and no projects are currently planned.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
(HQ-98S-G-081)

PROPOSAL 38 - 5 AAC 85.045(13). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Unit 15C.

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

...

Unit 15C, that portion beginning at the mouth of Falls Creek on Kachemak Bay, then northerly along Falls Creek to the headwaters, then northwesterly approximately 1

mile to the headwaters of the Anchor River, then downstream along the South Fork of the Anchor River, to the bridge at the North Fork Road approximately 3 miles from the Sterling Highway to where Diamond Creek crosses the road, then downstream from the Sterling Highway to Kachemak Bay, then along the mean tide line to the point of origin

1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side

Aug. 20-Sept. 20
(General hunt only)

Aug. 20-Sept. 20

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; the taking of calves, and females accompanied by calves, is prohibited; up to 50 permits may be issued

Nov. 1-Nov. 30

Nov. 1-Nov. 30

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. The Homer benchland in Unit 15C serves as traditional moose wintering range. Moose migrate into lower elevation areas when snow levels in upper elevations increase, and much of the browse becomes unavailable. During moderate to severe winters, moose are concentrated onto the Homer benchland earlier and in greater numbers than during mild winters. High winter moose densities calculated at 6 moose per mile during February of 1992 have resulted in severely overbrowsed habitat. Recent survey results indicate that the population remains high with excellent production (64 calves per 100 cows). Many willow stands have become decadent with low annual browse production. In some areas, shrubs are dying from severe overbrowsing.

Winter mortality of moose, primarily calves, from starvation has occurred every year since 1988. The magnitude of the problem has varied with the severity of the winters. The winter of 1994-1995 was moderately severe with 43 starved moose reported. The past 2 winters have been mild. In 1995-96 there was no recorded winter mortality. Only one moose was suspected of winter mortality during 1996-97.

The department has initiated a program to improve habitat conditions on the Homer benchlands. Goals of this program are to reduce the moose population to allow the decadent browse stands to recover. The department begun enhancement projects to improve production and availability.

We estimated that it would take 5 to 10 years to reduce the moose population to a size that existing habitat could support and which could sustain an annual harvest of 25 to 30 moose. The existing antlerless moose hunt has only been in place for 3 years.

Sixteen moose were harvested by 30 permittees during the 1995 season, and 22 moose by 40 permittees during the 1996 season. Preliminary results indicate that 20 moose were taken by 40 permittees during the 1997 season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The overall carrying capacity of this area will decline as decadent browse stands die off from continued overbrowsing.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wildlife viewers and hunters receiving permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals opposed to hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-082)

PROPOSAL 39 - 5 AAC 85.045(13). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend the antlerless moose hunt in Unit 15C as follows:

Delete: "or antlerless moose by permit." The taking of cows accompanied by calves is prohibited.

ISSUE: Stop the antlerless moose hunt in Unit 15C.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Cows needed for breeding. Stock will continue to be killed off. We already have a major harvest of antlerless moose through road kills and poaching. We don't need an open season on them too.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone that moose hunts in Unit 15C.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A few hunters that want to shoot a cow moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Cecil R. Jones (HQ-98S-G-037)

PROPOSAL 40 - 5 AAC 85.045(14). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt on Kalgin Island in Unit 16B.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 16B, Kalgin Island		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 bull	Aug. 20-Sept. 20	Aug. 20-Sept. 20
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 100 antlerless moose permits may be issued	Aug. 20-Sept. 20	Aug. 20-Sept. 20

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually. We estimated the 1996 post-hunt population at 50 to 55 moose and observed a bull:cow ratio of 67 bulls per 100 cows and a calf:cow ratio of 60 calves per 100 cows. We did not survey the island population during 1997. The population objective for this 23 mile² island is 1 moose/ mile². We estimate that the density of moose on the island is currently 2 moose/ mile². We have issued 50, 60 and 60 permits, respectively, during the 1995, 1996 and 1997 seasons. The harvest of cows during the 1995 season was 9 moose, and 8 cows were taken during the 1996 season. Preliminary data indicate that 11 cows were taken during the 1997 season. These harvest levels appear to have stabilized the size of the island's population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population would grow at a rapid rate in the absence of any predators, quickly exceeding the island's carrying capacity, if an antlerless harvest is not authorized.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who wish to harvest a cow moose from Kalgin Island.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who are opposed to cow moose hunts and residents of Kalgin Island who may not wish to have hunters around their cabins and homes.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-083)

The Board of Game deferred the following proposal from its Spring 1997 meeting:

PROPOSAL 41 - 5 AAC 85.045(14). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Establish a general moose hunt in Unit 16B south of Beluga River.

ISSUE: No general moose hunt in Unit 16B south of Beluga River.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters denied opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All consumptive users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions were considered.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee (HQ-98S-G-002)(SC-97-G-041)

PROPOSAL 42 - 5 AAC 85.045(10) and (18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Provide additional hunting opportunity by amending seasons for moose in Units 12 and 20E as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(10)		
Unit 12	<u>Aug. 15</u> -Aug. 28 [AUG. 20]	No open season
1 bull with spike-fork antlers		

...

(18)

...

Unit 20E, that portion within
the Ladue River Controlled
Use Area

1 bull per regulatory year, only
as follows:

1 bull with spike-fork antlers	<u>Aug. 15</u> -Aug. 28 [AUG. 20]	No open season
1 bull	Sept. 1-Sept. 15 (General hunt only)	Sept. 5-Sept. 15

1 bull by drawing permit only;
up to 100 permits may be issued

Unit 20E, that portion drain-
ing into the Yukon River up-
stream from and including the
Charlie and Seventymile River
drainages, to and including the
Boundary Creek drainages and
the Taylor Highway from Mile
145 to Eagle

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull per regulatory year, only
as follows:

1 bull with spike-fork antlers	<u>Aug. 15</u> - Aug. 28 [AUG. 20]	No open season
1 bull	Sept. 5-Sept. 25 (General hunt only)	

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or
antlers with 4 or more brow tines
on one side

Sept. 5-Sept. 25

Remainder of Unit 20E

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull per regulatory year, only
as follows:

1 bull with spike-fork antlers	<u>Aug. 15</u> - Aug. 28 [AUG. 20]	No open season
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------	----------------

...

ISSUE: A spike-fork antlered bull season in Units 12 and 20E was adopted by the Board of Game in Spring 1995. Rationale was to increase hunter opportunity by selecting this antler type which represents 7-11% of the total bull population but represents only 3-5% of the harvest. Data collected at the Kenai Moose Research Center indicates these animals will not grow as large as palmated yearlings and possibly are not as genetically fit. Additional harvest of this antler type would hopefully protect a larger antlered bull from being shot during the September season.

Between 1995 and 1997, total harvest and the unit's bull:cow ratio has not been affected by the early spike-fork season. Based on public comment, hunter satisfaction with the hunt is high even though harvest was low, ranging between two-four spike-fork bulls annually. Based on comments collected during a Traditional Knowledge workshop held in Northway and from meetings with local advisory committees and the Tanacross and Dot Lake Village Councils, area hunters desire a longer spike-fork season held earlier in August if it does not affect the area's moose population. Count data collected during the past three years indicates the ratio of spike-fork bulls to total bulls in the population and harvest has not changed since the initiation of the hunt. Due to the difficulty in hunting this age and antler class and the lack of nonlocal hunter interest, harvest is not expected to be excessive if a spike-fork season is held from August 15 to August 28. Because the proposed season is scheduled to begin before other moose seasons along the road system and also coincides with the period many people are in the area hunting caribou, this extension should be viewed as experimental and if harvest becomes excessive season length will be reduced.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Additional hunting opportunity would not be realized.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters, especially local residents who know the late summer range of local moose populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Split the season to offer hunters the opportunity to take a moose during optimal meat drying time and a late season, for hunters who prefer to hunt moose closer to the rut. A Tier II hunt in the vicinity of the area's primary rivers, trails, and roads.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-070)

PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 85.045(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize antlerless moose seasons in Unit 19A.

ISSUE: State law requires the reauthorization of antlerless moose seasons each year. The harvest of antlerless moose during the currently authorized season in this unit is within sustainable limits.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters wishing to take antlerless moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-084)

PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 85.045(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Change moose hunting regulations in Unit 19A as follows:

Remainder of Unit 19A Residents:

One bull Aug. 25 - Sept. 15

One moose Nov. 20 - Nov. 30

One moose Feb. 1 - Feb 5

Nonresidents and nonresident aliens: one bull with 55-inch antlers with 4 or more brow tines on at least one side.

ISSUE: Moose hunting season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Overharvest and wanton waste, the longer the season is open in September the less the quality of meat is for human consumption.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters as the meat is very prime and best for human consumption.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Uniform openings are easier for enforcement and would lead to less wanton waste, as bulls are harvested before start of annual rutting season.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Sleetmute Traditional Council

(HQ-98S-G-027)

PROPOSAL 45 - 5 AAC 85.045(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Change this regulation in Unit 19B as follows:

Moose, Unit 19B Open season Sept.1 - Sept. 30

Nonresidents: One bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines.

ISSUE: Moose Unit 19B. Length of season and brow tines.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More missed chances. Weather is a big problem in Unit 19B. We really don't get a 28 day season. No reason for 4 brow tines.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters, there has been no studies in this area to show that 4 brow tines makes sense. Won't have to fight weather. Safer.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? 3 brow tine moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: J.P. Ford

(SC-98-G-039)

PROPOSAL 46 - 5 AAC 85.045(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Change this regulation in Unit 19B as follows:

Unit 19B residents: One bull - Aug. 25 - Sept. 15

Nonresidents and nonresident aliens: One bull, bull with 55-inch antlers or antlers with four or more brow tines on at least one side - Aug. 25 - Sept. 15.

ISSUE: Moose hunting season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wanton waste of meat, increase in size of moose, increase in population of moose and moose size is decreasing in Unit 19B from over harvest and predation from wolf, bears.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters and charitable organizations, as the meat can be given away as prime meat, or retained by hunter in first class prime condition.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those that hunt and waste meat because of unfit or unprime for human consumption.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Quota system of hunters, pick-up of meat within 12 hours after kill. Uneconomical.

PROPOSED BY: Sleetmute Traditional Council (HQ-98S-G-029)

PROPOSAL 47 - 5 AAC 85.045(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Change this regulation in Unit 19B as follows:

Moose Unit 19B
Residents: one bull with 50-inch antlers or with 4 or more brow tines.

ISSUE: Moose in Unit 19B. Residents and nonresidents should both be equal on 50-inch rule, or no 50-inch rule.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If this is a trophy area for nonresidents, the residents are taking this away. It is discriminatory.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose bulls, who will be given a chance to make it to 50-inch.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Residents who are not trophy hunters. But there are not many people who live there.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Michael Mroczynski (SC-98-G-040)

PROPOSAL 48 - 5 AAC 85.045(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation in Units 19B and 19C as follows:

Units 19B and 19C
Residents: one bull
Nonresidents: one bull

ISSUE: To either eliminate the nonresident moose antler restriction to 50-inch antlers or 4 brow tines on either side, or to make the restriction apply to residents as well.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nonresident hunters are tempted to conceal or bury a bull moose they kill that does not meet the minimum 50-inch or 4 brow tine

regulation. The regulation is not accomplishing anything and adds additional burdens on the enforcement officers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The moose. Moose are being killed and buried that would otherwise be salvaged by nonresident hunters. Guides and outfitters. It is very difficult under many conditions to judge a 50-inch moose. Nonresident hunters, the above difficulty to judge a legal moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. The biologists confirm that harvest records do not show an increase in size of moose since the regulation was put in place.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? To place the same restriction on residents as well as nonresidents.

PROPOSED BY: Jim Harrower (SC-98-G-024)

PROPOSAL 49 – 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20A.

ISSUE: State law requires the reauthorization of antlerless moose seasons each year. The harvest of antlerless moose during the currently authorized season in this unit is within sustainable limits.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters wishing to take antlerless moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-085)

PROPOSAL 50 – 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Change moose hunting season dates in Unit 20 as follows:

The moose season should begin on a Saturday and end on a Sunday and should include four full weekends in September or three full weekends in September and one full weekend in October.

ISSUE: Moose season in Unit 20 is too early and too short for Fairbanks area hunters. Far too many moose are killed and crippled on area highways.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Available excess bull moose will not be harvested by hunters and many will die on area roadways and the Alaska Railroad right-of-way.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fairbanks area hunters will enjoy a larger harvest. Motorists will suffer fewer moose/auto collisions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. (Less business for auto body shops.)

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Bill Durning (HQ-98S-G-014)

PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation in Unit 20A as follows:

Unit 20A, Ferry Trail Management Area, one bull, 50 inches or four brow tines.

ISSUE: Raise the brow tine requirement in the Ferry Trail Management Area back to four brow tines or 50 inches, Unit 20A.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population already has dropped. If the electric intertie goes in it will further disturb the habitat and increase access further reducing the population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who looks for big moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who just want to shoot any moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Leroy M. Sutton (I-98S-G-040)

PROPOSAL 52 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation in Unit 20A as follows:

Moose, Unit 20A east of the Delta Creek, open season Sept. 1 - Sept. 15

ISSUE: To shorten the moose season in Unit 20A east of the Delta Creek from Sept. 1 - Sept. 15.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population east of the Delta Creek is less than the remainder of the Unit 20A. If the season is not reduced the moose population will continue to decline.

Snow is on the ground by September 15 in this area hindering the removal of a harvested moose which results in a wanton waste.

Changing the moose season east of the Delta Creek to correspond to the moose season in Unit 20D, which is across the Richardson Highway, would enable the wildlife protection officers to regulate both Units 20A and 20D better.

What moose are in the area seem to congregate after Sept. 15, which allows moose to be harvested at a greater rate.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone, the moose population will increase which will allow people a great opportunity to view, photograph and hunt the moose in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, people who want to hunt in this area will have a better opportunity with an increase in moose population.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Clemens M. Clooten (I-98S-G-038)

PROPOSAL 53 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20B.

ISSUE: State law requires reauthorization of antlerless moose seasons each year. The harvest of antlerless moose during the currently authorized season in this unit is within sustainable limits.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters wishing to take antlerless moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-086)

PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation in Unit 20B as follows:

One moose by Tier II subsistence hunting permit only, however the taking of cows accompanied by calves is prohibited; up to 100 permits may be issued.

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

Jan. 10 - Feb. 28

ISSUE: The harvest of cow moose accompanied by calves in the Minto Flats Management Area is wasting calves from the harvestable population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Orphaned calves will have high mortality rates and will not be available for human harvest in the future. Additionally, lazy hunters will continue to take cows with the calves which is not acceptable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will benefit in two ways: 1) Calves will have a higher survival rate and provide more hunting opportunities. 2) The image of hunters will improve to the public.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Only those unwilling to spend the time to identify a lone cow.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow a calf hunt after the other seasons to harvest orphaned calves. Rejected because of the suggested easy and better fix.

PROPOSED BY: Duane S. Pederson

(I-98S-G-012)

PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Change the bag limit for the Fairbanks Management Area archery hunt to "A bull with spike-fork antlers or greater."

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

(18)

...

Unit 20(B), that portion within
the Fairbanks Management
Area

1 moose per regulatory year,
only as follows:

1 bull with spike-fork or greater
antlers by bow and arrow only

Sept. 1--Sept. 30
(General hunt only)
Nov. 21--Nov.27
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1--Sept 30
Nov. 21--Nov.27

1 moose by bow and
arrow only, by drawing
permit only; up to 25 permits
may be issued

Sept. 1--Sept. 30
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1--Sept 30

...

ISSUE: The Fairbanks Management Area (FMA) archery moose hunt bag limit currently is “1 bull with antlers.” Unfortunately, the term “antler” is not defined in regulation. Therefore, reference to a “bull with antlers” has caused ambiguity in the regulations and some confusion among hunters. The bag limit was changed from “1 bull” to “1 bull with antlers” at the March 1996 board meeting. The intent of the 1996 regulation change was to eliminate the harvest of calf moose. This proposal was initiated by local bow-hunters in reaction to two cases of calf moose shot in the FMA during the 1995 season. One of the calves was turned into the state, and the other dead calf was abandoned. The effect of this proposal will help clarify the bag limit for bow-hunters in the FMA.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Some archery hunters will continue to be confused by the undefined term.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bow-hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Bow-hunters who are trying to find a loophole in the regulations to allow them to take male calves.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? An antler definition was explored but because of the various species of deer in Alaska a single definition is not feasible. In addition, statewide moose antler morphology varies enough to make it difficult, if not impossible, to develop a single, all-inclusive definition.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-060)

PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Change this regulation in Unit 20B as follows:

By bow and arrow only

Remainder of Unit 20B

Residents: One Bull

Nonresidents: One Bull

Sept. 16 - Sept. 25

Sept. 16 - Sept. 25

ISSUE: Bow and arrow hunters have difficulty in finding hunting areas where they are not interrupted by gun hunters. Also, the early closure makes it difficult for them to effectively call moose to the ranges that are necessary for a clean kill. This proposal will improve the quality of the hunt for all hunters by spreading the hunting pressure over a longer period of time, without having any negative impact on the moose population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? As hunting pressure increases, there will continue to be a decline in the opportunities for having a “quality hunt.” Black powder weapons have been excluded from this proposal because of the effectiveness of the modern replicas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters would benefit by distributing the hunting pressure over a longer time period.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? This is a biologically sound proposal and no one would suffer. Bow and arrow hunters do not kill very many animals. This might also expand the opportunities for a few guides since they could plan another hunt and therefore bring more dollars into the local economy.

Expanding the bow and arrow seasons has been tried and proven in most of the Lower 48 states as a way of expanding hunting opportunities without any negative impact on populations.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? An alternative might be Sept. 20 - 25. This would get all of the gun hunters out of the woods and make it easier for Fish and Wildlife Protection to enforce. It would also shorten the season and reduce the harvest.

It might also be good to add a restriction that all bow hunters must have passed the ADF&G proficiency test (or equivalent) in order to hunt. This would have the effect of reducing the loss of wounded animals.

PROPOSED BY: James C. Dunlap (HQ-98S-G-009)

PROPOSAL 57 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Change this regulation in Unit 20B as follows:

By bow and arrow hunting only:

Remainder of Unit 20B

Residents: One bull Sept. 16 - Sept. 25

Nonresidents: One bull Sept. 16 - Sept. 20

Note: All bow hunters must have passed the ADF&G proficiency test (or equivalent) in order to hunt. This will have the effect of reducing the loss of wounded animals.

ISSUE: Bow and arrow hunters have difficulty in finding hunting areas where they are not interrupted. Also, the early closure makes it difficult for them to effectively call moose to the ranges that are necessary for a clean kill. This proposal will improve the quality of the hunt for all hunters by spreading the hunting pressure over a longer period of time, without having any negative impact on the moose population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? As hunting pressure increases there will continue to be a decline in the opportunities for having a “quality hunt.” Black powder weapons have been excluded from this proposal because of the effectiveness of the modern replicas. This proposal eliminates user conflict.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters would benefit by distributing the hunting pressure over a longer time period, thereby eliminating user conflict during the regular season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? This is a biologically sound proposal and no one would suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? An alternative might be Sept. 20 - 25 residents only. This would get all of the gun hunters out of the woods and make it easier for protection to enforce. It would also shorten the season and reduce the harvest.

The “Remainder of Unit 20B” is already well-defined in the regulations and would not overlap with any existing controlled use areas.

Expanding the bow and arrow seasons has been tried and proven in most of the Lower 48 states as a way of expanding hunting opportunities without any negative impact on populations.

PROPOSED BY: James C. Dunlap (HQ-98S-G-034)

PROPOSAL 58 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation in Unit 20D as follows:

Establish a cow moose season in Unit 20D.

ISSUE: Aggressive, belligerent cow moose in a homestead area that are engaged in destruction of crops.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Decreased farm and personal income, increased danger from moose unafraid of humans. See video from UAA campus.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Homesteaders and residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Move wolves from McGrath into area – cost prohibitive.

PROPOSED BY: Hans Geier (HQ-98S-G-001)

PROPOSAL 59 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation as follows:

Provide for an early moose hunt from Aug. 15-28, one bull to be taken from east of the west bank of the Johnson River and north of the Tanana River within the drainages of the Healy River, the Volkmar, George Creek and Sand Creek.

ISSUE: Moose hunt in eastern Unit 20D.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Extreme hunting pressure in the Fall prevents the taking of moose for some residents who are dependent upon the meat for subsistence.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents of Healy Lake and others who hunt in this area would benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one would suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? An early spike/fork season. The area biologist informed us that old bulls are more prevalent than younger ones.

PROPOSED BY: Healy Lake Village Council (I-98S-G-030)

PROPOSAL 60 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation in Unit 20D as follows:

One bull to be taken be Tier II permit, Jan. 1 - Feb 15, south of the north bank of the Tanana River and east of the west bank of the Johnson River and including the Volkmar, Healy River, Sand Creek, and George Creek drainages in Unit 20D.

ISSUE: We would like to extend the Tier II hunt which is now south of the north bank of the Tanana River and east of the west bank of the Johnson River to include the Volkmar, Healy River, Sand Creek and George Creek drainages in Unit 20D.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will not have enough meat to feed our families throughout the winter.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents of Healy Lake and other permit recipients.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We discussed submitting a new proposal, but amending the existing Tier II regulation would work for us and be easier to accomplish.

PROPOSED BY: Healy Lake Village Council (I-98S-G-029)

PROPOSAL 61 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation in Unit 20E as follows:

In order for the welfare and well-being of the indigenous people of this area, they will be allowed to have a subsistence-only hunt Aug. 20 - Sept. 10.

ISSUE: The Grayling IRA Council is requesting an earlier date for the moose subsistence hunt for residents of this area only. They want the dates moved to Aug. 20 - Sept. 10 to ensure that the subsistence users have a chance to get a moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The residents of the community have noticed that it is harder to get a moose. There are too many outside hunters (game hunters and hunters from the Lower Yukon) and every year the number of hunters increases. Subsistence hunters will suffer if this continues.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The people of Grayling and Shageluk.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The subsistence hunt would not hurt anyone since the big-game hunters are only looking for a trophy and the lower Yukon hunters spend thousands of dollars which could buy them several freezers full of meat if they wanted it.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The Council wanted to keep the outside hunters from wiping out the moose population like they have done in other areas of the state but it has not worked.

PROPOSED BY: Grayling IRA Council (I-98S-G-005)

PROPOSAL 62 - 5 AAC 85.045(19). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.

Reauthorize antlerless moose hunt in Unit 21D.

ISSUE:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hardship on unit residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Middle Yukon River Advisory Committee (I-98S-G-010)

PROPOSAL 63 - 5 AAC 85.045(19). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation in Unit 21D as follows:

General season bow hunters are allowed to hunt moose and bear the same time as subsistence hunters in Unit 21D, the lower Koyukuk River.

ISSUE: Allow general season bow hunters to begin hunting Sept. 1, the same time that the subsistence season begins.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Traditional hunting methods will be used by fewer hunters if this change is not made.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters that use traditional hunting equipment.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Joe Caswell (HQ-98S-G-038)

PROPOSAL 64 - 5 AAC 85.045(19). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation in Unit 21D to provide the following:

Allow bow hunters the same hunting season as the subsistence users enjoy. Extend the current season from Sept. 5 - 25 to read Sept. 1 - 25.

ISSUE: Fish and Game believes there are too many hunters in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Further restricting. Hunting moose may follow.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those choosing to hunt by a customary and traditional means would have a few extra days to hunt with less rifle pressure in the unit. This would also help spread out the total hunters during the existing season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Jeff Barnett (HQ-98S-G-041)

PROPOSAL 65 - 5 AAC 85.045(19). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation in Unit 21D to include the following:

Special bow hunting season to coincide with the present subsistence season of Sept. 1 - Sept. 5.

ISSUE: Provide an early season for bow hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? At present anyone who chooses to bow hunt must compete with the general hunting season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those hunters who choose to bow hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None - the nature of the sport is least intrusive and should not impact any other users.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Establish the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area as archery only. However most hunters choose to hunt with firearms may not be fair to them.

PROPOSED BY: Windell Arnold (HQ-98S-G-033)

PROPOSAL 66 - 5 AAC 85.045(19). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation in Unit 21D as follows:

Return to the regulations that governed hunting moose prior to the current restrictions.

ISSUE: Eliminate the restriction allowing only 250 hunters to enter Unit 21D during Sept. 5 - 25 moose season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Restricting hunters where no biological data supports this restriction.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All who choose to hunt Unit 21D.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Eliminate nonresidents first. Loss of revenue to state.

PROPOSED BY: Windell Arnold (HQ-98S-G-032)

PROPOSAL 67 - 5 AAC 85.045(20). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in portions of Units 22B and 22D and in 22E, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits (20)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 22A		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull	Aug.1-Sept. 30 Dec. 1-Jan. 31	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side		Aug. 1-Sept. 30
Unit 22B, [THE NIUKLUK RIVER DRAINAGE AND] that portion <u>west of the west bank</u> of the Fish River [DRAINAGE NORTH AND WEST OF THE FISH RIVER]		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 antlered bull	Aug. 1-Jan. 31	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side		Aug. 1-Jan. 31
Remainder of Unit 22B		

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from Dec. 1 - Dec. 31; no person may take a cow accompanied by a calf

Aug. 1-Jan. 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side

Aug. 1-Jan. 31

Unit 22C

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull

Sept. 1-Sept. 14

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side

Sept. 1-Sept. 14

Unit 22D, that portion within the Kougarak, Kuzitrin and Pilgrim River drainages

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 antlered bull

Aug. 1-Jan. 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side

Aug. 1-Jan. 31

Remainder of Unit 22D

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from Dec. 1 - Dec. 31; no person may take a cow accompanied by a calf

Aug. 1-Jan. 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or
antlers with 4 or more brow
tines on one side

Aug. 1-Jan. 31

Unit 22E

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose; no person may take
a cow accompanied by a calf

Aug. 1-Mar. 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or
antlers with 4 or more brow
tines on one side

Aug. 1-Mar. 31

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Estimates of population size and recruitment provided by annual censuses and late winter surveys indicate that current harvests of antlerless moose are not adversely affecting the population status of moose in most areas of Unit 22. Moose populations in Units 22B and 22D declined significantly during the late 1980s and early 1990s because of severe winter weather conditions. Populations appear to have stabilized, however, in the most accessible portions of Units 22B and 22D moose populations are still significantly below desired levels. In March of 1997 the Board of Game closed the antlerless moose seasons in the depressed portions of Units 22B and 22D to aid in population recovery. In the remainder of Units 22B, 22D and 22E the reported cow harvest is low and is not believed to be adversely affecting population growth and antlerless moose hunting should be continued. During the 1994-95 season, 10 of 211 moose harvested were cows; during the 1995-96 season 13 of 185 moose harvested were cows; and during the 1996-97 season 20 of 198 moose harvested were cows.

The existing language describing that portion of Unit 22B closed to antlerless moose hunting excludes a small portion of Unit 22B that was intended to be closed to cow harvest and is confusing to the public. The confusing areas include drainages that flow directly to the west side of Golovin Bay and other drainages flowing directly to Norton Sound. The department proposes to clarify the description of the bull-only hunting area in Unit 22B by including all areas west of the Fish River in the area closed to antlerless moose hunting.

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-087)

PROPOSAL 68 - 5 AAC 85.045(21). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 23, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(21)		
Unit 23, that portion in the Noatak drainage		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 moose; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from Nov. 1 through Mar. 31; no person may take a cow ac- companied by a calf	Aug.1-Sept. 15 Oct. 1-Mar. 31	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side		Sept. 1-Sept. 15
Remainder of Unit 23		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 moose; no person may take a cow accompanied by a calf	Aug. 1-Mar. 31	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side		Sept. 1-Sept. 20

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless seasons must be reauthorized annually. Late winter aerial surveys conducted during the last five years indicate the calf:cow ratio in Unit 23 has ranged from 15-33:100, and most populations appear stable. Unusually severe winters in 1989-90 and 1990-91 caused higher than normal overwinter mortality. We believe the moose population declined in response to severe winters in some portions of the Unit. However, the reported harvest of cows in Unit 23 remains low, and at current levels is not adversely affecting growth and recovery of the population. During 1994-95, 6 of 133 moose harvested were cows; during 1995-96, 8 of 173 moose harvested were cows; and during 1996-97, 14 of 160 moose harvested were cows.

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-088)

PROPOSAL 69 - 5 AAC 85.045(22). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize all antlerless moose seasons in Unit 24.

ISSUE: State law requires the reauthorization of antlerless moose seasons each year. The harvest of antlerless moose during the currently authorized season in this unit is within sustainable limits.

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-089)

PROPOSAL 70 - 5 AAC 85.045(23). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation in Unit 25 as follows:

Moose season for Unit 25A: No closed season, no limit. However, only one bull may be harvested between the dates of Sept. 5 - Sept. 25. Moose may only be exported from Unit 25A between Sept. 5 - Sept. 28 and must be accompanied with the unboned meat of the animal harvested.

ISSUE: Inability of individuals living in this area to legally harvest wildlife resources as needed to meet nutritional and traditional needs.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Subsistence hunting would continue to be hampered by a permit system.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Joe Want (I-98S-G-042)

PROPOSAL 71 - 5 AAC 85.045(23). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Change moose hunting season dates in Unit 25C as follows:

Change moose hunting season to later in September. Perhaps have it the same dates at Unit 25B, Sept. 5 - 25.

ISSUE: Changing the hunting season dates in Unit 25C.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone. It is too warm the first part of September and the moose are not moving around.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Everyone who is interested in hunting in our area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Community of Central, Alaska (HQ-98S-G-012)

The Board of Game deferred this proposal from its October 1997 meeting:

PROPOSAL 72 - 5 AAC 85.050(2). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MUSK OXEN. Change the regulations in Unit 22 to create a Tier II subsistence hunt and a registration hunt.

The Board of Game adopt a positive C&T for Tier II permit hunts with a surplus harvest by registration.

ISSUE: Method to harvest muskoxen with a positive C&T in Unit 22.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Local subsistence hunters are at a disadvantage, because the Federal Game has a positive C&T.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All local subsistence hunters on the Seward Peninsula and nonlocal hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Local hunters and nonlocal hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Northern Norton Sound Advisory Committee (HQ-98S-G-095)
(HQ-97F-G-027)

PROPOSAL 73 - 5 AAC 85.050(3). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MUSK OXEN. Amend the muskox hunting regulations to allow Tier II permit hunting for up to 40 muskoxen (approximately 75% bulls and 25% cows) in Units 26B and 26C, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident	Nonresident
	Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Open Season
(3)		

Unit 26B East, that portion east
of the Dalton Highway Corridor
Management Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:
1 muskox by Tier II subsistence
hunting permit only; up to 10
permits may be issued

Sept. 15 - Mar. 31
(Subsistence hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season

Unit 26(B) West, that portion west
of the Dalton Highway Corridor
Management Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 muskox by Tier II subsistence
hunting permit only; up to 15
permits may be issued

Sept. 15 - Mar. 31
(Subsistence hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season

Unit[s 26B and] 26C
1 bull by Tier II subsistence
hunting permit only; up to
15 bulls may be taken

Fall season to be announced No open season
(Subsistence hunt only)
Mar. 1 - Mar. 31
(Subsistence hunt only)

ISSUE: For many years there has been controversy about how muskoxen should be managed range on the North Slope. State policy has been to reestablish muskoxen throughout their former Now many North Slope residents believe the expanding muskox population has displaced caribou from important hunting areas and migration paths. During the last 18 months representatives from the North Slope Borough, ADF&G, federal agencies, the North Slope Borough Fish and Game Management Committee, and the Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council have met in a series of meetings to develop a North Slope Muskox Harvest Plan (NSMHP). These stakeholders agree the principal goal for muskox management on the North Slope should change from one of population growth and expansion to providing opportunities for residents to harvest muskoxen while maintaining a stable population, thereby limiting further population growth at this time.

The most rapidly growing segment of the North Slope muskox population is in Unit 26B. The number counted increased from approximately 122 in 1990 to approximately 330 in 1995 (page 7, NSMHP). Harvest from this portion of the population has been limited to 2 to 5 bulls by Tier II permit for the past several years. Management Goal 1(b) of the NSMHP recommends that the harvest in Unit 26B be increased in response to the growing population. The NSMHP Working Group proposes that the total harvest initially be set at 5% of the spring pre-calving population. Based upon the 1995 count of 330 animals, the quota would initially be set at 16 animals. Because Nuiqsut hunters believe that muskoxen in Unit 26B west of the pipeline are displacing caribou from their hunting areas, this segment of the population will be harvested at a higher percentage than the segment in eastern region of Unit 26B. We propose a harvest of 9 animals in 1997-98 in the western region and 7 in eastern 26B. Population surveys will be conducted each year to determine population trends. If the population is increasing or decreasing the level of harvest can be adjusted to maintain a stable population.

Even though the department intends initially to allow taking only 16 muskox in Unit 26B, we propose that the board approve a maximum quota of 40 animals for Units 26B and 26C. This allows managers flexibility to adjust future harvests based on population dynamics and changes in federal management regimes.

Current state regulations authorize taking of up to 15 bulls by Tier II permit in Units 26B and 26C. The state has not issued any permits for Unit 26C in recent years because the Federal Subsistence Board closed federal lands in the unit to nonlocal resident hunting for muskox and established a federal hunt for 15 bulls. All federal permits are issued to residents of Kaktovik. This proposal would amend the bag limit to allow taking cow muskox in Unit 26B. This change is necessary to limit population growth without skewing the sex ratio.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The number of muskoxen in Unit 26B will continue to grow and will be underutilized. The number in the western region will probably increase substantially, which will lead to more conflicts with Nuiqsut hunters. People from Nuiqsut will continue to be dissatisfied because they believe that caribou, a highly valued resource, are being displaced by muskoxen, which they can only hunt in very small numbers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters who desire to harvest muskoxen and those who are concerned that a constantly increasing muskox population in the area will continue to displace caribou from traditional subsistence hunting areas as discussed in the NSMHP, Appendix 3.

The people of the North Slope and local, state, and agency staff. The cooperative spirit of the North Slope Muskox Harvest Plan will be met. It will help all parties work together to resolve problems concerning muskoxen in the future.

Residents of Nuiqsut. In past years many people from Nuiqsut harvested moose from the Colville River population. The moose population has dramatically declined due to a combination of weather, predation, and disease factors to the point where very few moose are now harvested. In addition, very few caribou have been in the Nuiqsut area for the last year. Nuiqsut people would like to hunt more muskoxen to compensate for this lack of meat from other land mammals.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Resident hunters without a history of use of muskox, and those unfamiliar with the Tier II application, because they are likely to receive lower Tier II scores. That public which would like muskoxen to become established throughout Unit 26.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered harvesting both a higher and lower percentage of the population. A 5% harvest rate was recommended because it is greater than the 3% harvest rate recommended in the Seward Peninsula Muskox Management Plan to allow for population growth and is less than the 10-15% harvest rate required to stabilize muskox populations on Nelson and Nunivak Islands. There is not enough data to determine productivity

accurately so we decided to proceed conservatively to avoid overharvest. If the population continues to increase the number of permits will be increased.

A range of hunt/allocation options may be possible or required (Tier I, registration and drawing permit hunts). However, until the board makes an updated finding on the amount reasonably necessary for subsistence use it is impossible to determine which hunt allocation options are appropriate to consider.

PROPOSED BY: North Slope Borough Fish and Game Management Committee, North Slope Borough Department of Wildlife Management, and Alaska Department of Fish and Game
(HQ-98S-G-057)

PROPOSAL 74 - 5 AAC 85.055(10). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR DALL SHEEP. Amend this regulation in Unit 25A as follows:

Sheep season for Unit 25A: No closed season no limit. However, only one full-curl ram may be harvested between the dates of Aug. 10 - Sept. 20. Dall sheep may only be exported from Unit 25A between Aug. 10 and Sept. 25 and must be accompanied with unboned meat and full-curl horns of the animal harvested.

ISSUE: Inability of individuals living in this area to legally harvest wildlife resources as needed to meet nutritional and traditional needs.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Subsistence hunting would continue to be hampered by a permit system

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Joe Want (I-98S-G-043)

PROPOSAL 75 - 5 AAC 85.056(2). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR WOLF, and 5 AAC 84.270(13). FUR BEARER TRAPPING. Amend these regulations in Unit 21D as follows:

Residents of Unit 21D would be allowed to take an unlimited number of wolves. No restrictions on method of harvest.

ISSUE: Predation control.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More moose are killed by wolves in Unit 21D than are harvested by hunters. The wolf population is growing at an alarming rate.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups who enjoy an abundance of wildlife. The sale of wolf hides would benefit the local economy.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Only the ignorant who fail to recognize sound management.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? \$100 bounty on wolves. Funding not available at present.

PROPOSED BY: Windell Arnold (HQ-98S-G-030)

PROPOSAL 76 - 5 AAC 85.057. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR WOLVERINE. Change the season in Unit 19B as follows:

Wolverine
Unit 19B Resident and nonresident: One wolverine, Aug. 10 - March 31

ISSUE: Open the wolverine season Aug. 10 so when hunting sheep and caribou there are more chances. In Unit 19B only.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There isn't any trapping on the east side of Unit 19B. Well some pressure but not much. No problem – just want an early time, more chances.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? 1) The state. More nonresident license fees. 2) The nonresident hunter. We see most of the wolverine in August for some reason.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Lets try it for one year and see if there is any suffering.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Michael Mroczynski (SC-98S-G-042)

PROPOSAL 77 - 5 AAC 85.060(1). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR FUR ANIMALS. Change this regulation for coyotes as follows:

Units 12 and 20E
Residents and nonresidents
10 coyotes Aug. 10 - Apr. 30

ISSUE: Unnecessarily restrictive hunting opportunity for coyotes, while the populations are strong.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunities will continue to be unnecessarily restrictive for the few people that would pursue them.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? A few people that would like to hunt coyotes.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Advisory Committee (I-98S-G-023)

PROPOSAL 78 - 5 AAC 85.065(3). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR SMALL GAME. Amend this regulation in Unit 20 as follows:

Extend ptarmigan season until April 30. Eliminate 5-mile corridor.

ISSUE: Brief ptarmigan season on the Taylor Highway.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Loss of hunting opportunities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Advisory Committee (I-98S-G-021)

PROPOSAL 79 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. NEW REGULATION. Establish a new regulation to provide the following:

Unit 25 residents of Anatic Village, Beaver, Birch Creek, Circle, Chalkyitsik, Canyon Village, Fort Yukon, Stevens Village, and Venetie -- no individual harvest limits or season, but a village/community quota system for moose and caribou (including take under other regulations). Reporting will be done by a community reporting system.

ISSUE: Bag limits for big species is currently set for individual hunters. Would prefer to have a village/community quota system, and eliminate seasons and bag limits.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A lot of households in the villages/communities will continue to be troubled by the pressure of inappropriate seasons and bag limits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All the households in Unit 25 troubled by the present systems.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, because the total number of animals taken would not increase.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Yukon Flats Advisory Committee (I-98S-G-039)

PROPOSAL 80 - 5 AAC 92.015. BROWN BEAR TAG FEE EXEMPTION. Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemption in the Western Alaska Brown Bear Management Area, the Northwest Alaska Brown Bear Management Area, and the Chignik Brown Bear Management Area, as follows:

(a) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in the Western Alaska Brown Bear Management Area (5 AAC 92.530(15)), the Northwest Alaska Brown Bear Management Area (5 AAC 92.530(16)), or the Chignik Alaska Brown Bear Management Area (5 AAC 92.530(17)) if the hunter obtains a registration permit before hunting.

ISSUE: Brown bear tag fee exemptions must be reauthorized annually. Continuation of the tag fee exemptions listed above is necessary in order to facilitate the associated brown bear harvest programs. For the Western Alaska Brown Bear Management Area (WABBMA) the number of registration permits and the number of bears harvested in 1996-97 was similar to the previous regulatory year when 45 permits were issued and no bears were reported taken. In the Northwest Alaska Brown Bear Management Area (NWABBMA), 102 registration permits were issued in 1995-96, six bears were harvested, and nineteen permittees did not report. In the Chignik Alaska Brown Bear Management Area (CABBMA), one permit was issued in 1996, and no bears were reported taken.

We believe it would be difficult to document subsistence harvest by residents hunting primarily for food if the tag fee is in effect. Prior to establishment of the management areas, virtually no harvest was reported by subsistence hunters resident in the areas. Compliance with reporting requirements is relatively high for NWABBMA and WABBMA, averaging above 75% for the past seasons. Knowledge and use of the permits is lower in the CABBMA, and is confused by a duplicate federal subsistence permit system. With additional educational efforts and more efficient ways to distribute permits by the department, we believe this system can be effective in that area as well.

In addition to the tag fee waiver and registration permit, conditions that apply to subsistence hunting in the management areas include: salvaging the meat for human consumption, no use of aircraft for subsistence hunting of brown bears in the NWABBMA, and keeping the hide within the management area unless the skin of the head and front claws are removed at the time of sealing before being exported from the management area. The registration permit is a simple way accommodate local subsistence hunting practices, while still conserving brown bear populations and obtaining harvest data.

Brown bear harvest appears to be within sustainable yield limits in the management areas. Harvest rates do not appear to have increased in response to registration hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The intent of the brown bear harvest programs in these areas will be compromised. There will be less interest and participation in these programs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those residents who wish to take brown bear primarily for food in the brown bear management areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals who are opposed to these brown bear harvest programs.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-068)

PROPOSAL 81- 5 AAC 92.015. BROWN BEAR TAG FEE EXEMPTION. Amend this regulation as follows:

Reauthorize the current brown bear tag fee for portions of Unit 20D.

ISSUE: Brown bear tag fee exemptions are taken up annually by the Board of Game at their Spring meeting. This proposal is to maintain the current brown bear tag fee exemption for portions of Unit 20D.

In 1995 the Delta Fish and Game Advisory Committee submitted an extensive plan for intensive management to the Board of Game at the 1995 Spring board meeting. One portion of their submitted plan was the current brown bear tag fee exemption. It would appear that the Board of Game extrapolated it from the plan and chose to establish it as an independent entity. At the same time, the Board identified Unit 20D as under Intensive Management, a program lacking the definition of the original submission of the Delta Fish and Game Advisory Committee.

It is the opinion of the Delta Advisory Committee that the brown bear tag fee exemption is the only portion of the intensive management plan submitted by them that has had any real significance. Although the effect has been low impact, it has nonetheless produced results.

One side benefit has been the opportunity it has afforded to those who might not otherwise have the opportunity to hunt. The tag fee exemption area contains two Native villages, and many people outside of those villages, for whom the \$25 tag fee is prohibitive. For many people in this area, a hunting license cost \$5 and the opportunity to hunt, not take, a brown bear is five times as much. Is there a reason for denying the people who cannot afford the bear tag an opportunity to take a bear? Even with the tag fee exemptions in place, the brown bear harvest remains within the harvest goals set by the Board of Game.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The brown bear tag fee exemption would be lost for this limited area of Unit 20D. This logical tool of the original intensive management plan presented to the Board of Game in 1995 would be lost, as would a means of increasing calf survival for both moose and caribou in Unit 20D. Individuals who cannot afford a brown bear tag, including those who live within the tag fee exemption areas, would once again be denied the opportunity to hunt brown bears. (Note: The opportunity to hunt is not directly related to success in this case, but the opportunity itself is valuable.)

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? In particular, hunters within and near the tag fee exemption areas who cannot afford Brown Bear tags. Serious Brown bear hunters who can afford the tags will purchase them as this will remove the restriction forcing them to hunt only in this limited area. This will also benefit hunters in the area who may be hunting moose or caribou and are aware that they have the opportunity to take a bear without a tag. Moose and caribou hunters will benefit from this program in future years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The Delta Fish and Game Advisory Committee feels that many of the people they represent are losing the opportunity to hunt brown bear. In addition, Delta Fish and Game Advisory Committee feels that the only item the Board of Game chose to implement from the Delta's extensive Intensive Management proposal, originally made in 1995, would be lost.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Elimination of the tag fee exemption; however, this would eliminate the benefits which accrue through this exemption.

PROPOSED BY: Delta Advisory Committee (I-98S-G-045)

PROPOSAL 82 - 5 AAC 92.015. BROWN BEAR TAG FEE EXEMPTION. Reauthorize the exemption of current brown bear tag fee for portions of Unit 20D.

ISSUE: The Unit 20D brown bear tag fee exemption must be reauthorized annually. The tag fee exemption was implemented in 1995 for portions of Unit 20D primarily to increase the harvest of brown bears for the purpose of reducing predation on moose and caribou calves (Board of Game Policy 95-85-BOG; and 5AAC 92.125[3]).

Current Unit 20D brown bear hunting regulations for those portions of Unit 20D north of the Tanana River, or south of the Tanana River and east of the Gerstle River include no tag fee, an Aug 1-Jun 30 hunting season, a bag limit of one bear/year, and a requirement to have the skull and hide sealed in Unit 20D or in Tok. The southwestern portion of Unit 20D has a \$25 tag fee, a Sept 1-May 31 hunting season, and a bag limit of one bear/four years.

The current brown bear harvest goal adopted by the board in March 1995 is 5-15 bears per year. Brown bear harvest in Unit 20D has increased since implementation of the tag fee exemption. Much of the increase, however occurred in the southwest portion of Unit 20D where bear hunting regulations have not been liberalized. During the 1995/96-fall 1997 hunting seasons, mean annual hunting and other mortality for all of Unit 20D was 14 bears/year.

The Macomb caribou herd management goals have not been met. The Board of Game adopted a Macomb caribou herd population goal of 600-800 caribou with a harvest goal of 30-50 caribou/year by the year 2002. Currently, the herd consists of 500-600 caribou. The Macomb herd was hunted during the 1997 season for the first time since 1991 and 22 caribou were killed.

The Unit 20D moose management goals have not been met. The Board of Game adopted a Unit 20D moose population goal of 8,000 - 10,000 moose with a harvest goal of 240-400 moose/year by the year 2002. The current Unit 20 moose population estimate is 3,862-5,234 moose. Harvest during the 1996-97 hunting season was 210 moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity for brown bears will be reduced. Also, the brown bear tag fee exemption is part of the board's authorized intensive management program for the Macomb caribou herd in southeastern Unit 20D and for the moose population in northern and southeastern Unit 20D. Failure to extend this tag fee exemption would be inconsistent with the intent of board policy 95-85-BOG which is to reduce bear predation on moose and caribou calves to increase the moose and caribou populations in Unit 20D.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Brown bear hunters will continue to benefit from increased hunting opportunity. Moose and caribou hunters may eventually benefit if moose and caribou populations increase enough to allow a larger harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?__We are not aware of anyone who is suffering because of the current tag fee exemption, or who is likely to suffer if the exemption is renewed.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Eliminate the tag fee exemption, and thereby rely only on a longer season and a more liberal bag limit to accomplish the objective of a higher harvest of brown bears.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-062)

PROPOSAL 83 - 5 AAC 92.015(b) BROWN BEAR TAG FEE EXEMPTION. Amend this regulation as follows:

Repeal 5 AAC 92.015(b).

ISSUE: The brown bear tag fee exemption in Unit 20 is a predator control measure aimed at reducing brown bear numbers. Such a policy is unethical and reckless in the extreme given the slow reproductivity of bears, the lack of baseline biological data on brown bears and their habitat, and the difficulty of accurately counting bears. In addition, extensive study of brown bears and bear control measures in Unit 13 has shown no evidence that brown bear control there has yielded any increase in moose number. Given the inability to count brown bears accurately, it is highly possible that liberalized bear hunting regulations could lead to irreversible over harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Brown bears will continue to be threatened by over harvest and localized depletion for no valid reason. The public will be robbed of this priceless resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bears, their prey, their ecosystem, and the Alaskan public at large.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: The Alaska Wildlife Alliance (HQ-98S-G-054)

PROPOSAL 84 - 5 AAC 92.015. BROWN BEAR TAG FEE EXEMPTION. Amend this regulation as follows:

Authorize brown bear tag fee exemption for Unit 19D East.

ISSUE: During the Spring 1996 meeting, the Alaska Board of Game designated Game Management Unit 19D East as an intensive management zone, and authorized the Department of Fish and Game to conduct wolf control within this area. The decision was subsequently overturned by Governor Knowles. Because of this inaction on the part of the State of Alaska, predation has effectively maintained moose populations at extremely low densities.

In an effort to reduce the effects of predation, especially on moose calves, increases in the legal harvest of brown bears is desirable. Elimination of resident tag fees may encourage local hunters to take additional bears from the area. Currently, local harvest is extremely low. Harvest in the area by nonresidents is nonexistent. The current harvest is significantly below the suspected sustainable annual harvest, and minor increases in the harvest would probably not negatively influence the overall bear population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The opportunity for moose hunters in the local area to meet their subsistence needs will continue to decline, as will success rates when moose populations continue to decline or show no significant increases. Predation on moose calves will continue to take the annual recruitment, and populations will dwindle further. Failure of the Board of Game to adopt necessary changes to existing regulations will result in further imbalances in predator/prey ratios.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will be allowed to incidentally harvest brown bears that are encountered during other activities. All local hunters that are dependent on moose for their subsistence meat requirements will potentially benefit. All people who are interested in maintaining a reasonable balance in predator/prey ratios, thus leading to a healthier ecosystem will see benefits, whether they are interested in wildlife populations for viewing, photographing or hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? If, in fact, the elimination of the \$25 tag fee results in an increase in the harvest of brown bears, those people who are philosophically against consumptive uses may suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The Board of Game's decision to authorize wolf control in the area would obviously be the best course of action to contend with the problem of low recruitment rates in local moose populations. However, pursuing that avenue is apparently politically incorrect.

PROPOSED BY: McGrath Advisory Committee (I-98S-G-020)

PROPOSAL 85 - 5 AAC 92.015. BROWN BEAR TAG FEE EXEMPTION. Amend this regulation as follows:

End \$25 brown bear tag fee in Unit 20A and replace with trophy fee to be paid at time of sealing.

ISSUE: The excess cost of annual tag fees for grizzly. Use Unit 20A as an experimental unit to test the use of trophy fees as opposed to the \$25 tag fee. If acceptable and successful increase to a statewide regulation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to be forced into purchasing an annual \$25 tag even when the chances of taking a grizzly are remote. This is nothing but a revenue enhancement scheme.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters and prey populations because legal bears may be taken when opportunity arises.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. The department won't even lose any revenue because the trophy fee can be set at whatever amount is necessary to offset lost revenue.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Kenneth Lamb

(I-98S-G-016)

PROPOSAL 86 - 5 AAC 92.015. BROWN BEAR TAG FEE EXEMPTION. Amend this regulation as follows:

Bears - brown/grizzly, no resident tag required in Unit 20E.

ISSUE: Low bear harvest in comparison to the population. Most of the bear harvest in Unit 20E is incidental. The only way to increase this incidental harvest is to remove the tag requirements. ADF&G is currently involved in predator control program in Unit 20E. Part of the program involves moving bears out of the caribou calving area. Any additional bear harvest would help in this effort. The area adjoining Units 20E and 20D, already has a tag fee exemption.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Harvest of bears will continue to be extremely low. Population and predation will continue to be high.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Caribou, moose calves and hunters that are able to take bears without having a tag.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Advisory Committee

(I-98S-G-024)

The Board of Game deferred this proposal from its Winter 1998 meeting.

PROPOSAL 87 - 5 AAC 92.016. MUSK OXEN TAG FEES. Amend this regulation to apply the tag fee reduction in Units 22, 23, 26B and 26C only to subsistence hunting as follows:

The resident tag fee for hunting musk oxen on Nelson Island and for subsistence hunting in Units 22, 23, 26B, and 26C, or for hunting cow musk oxen on Nunivak Island, is \$25.

ISSUE: Alaska statutes provide that if the board reduces the tag fee for musk ox hunting, permits must be issued on a registration basis. This is appropriate for subsistence hunting, but not for non-subsistence hunting which has generally been regulated through drawing permits. The only way the board can authorize drawing permit hunts is if they have not reduced the tag fee.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The board will not be able to authorize drawing permit hunts for musk oxen in Units 22, 23, 26B or 26C.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Non-subsistence hunters who want to hunt musk ox under drawing permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solution can address statutory requirements.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98W-G-036) (HQ-98S-G-097)

PROPOSAL 88 - 5 AAC 92.046. PERMITS FOR TAKING INCIDENTAL OR STRANDED MUSK OXEN. Allow harvest of musk oxen in Units 24 and 26A.

The commissioner may open by emergency order a season with a bag limit of up to 2 musk oxen per person by permit only in areas and under the conditions set forth below. The resident tag fee is waived.

(a) In Game Management Unit 26A, that portion west of the Utukok River;

(b) In Game Management Units 24 and 26A, that portion bounded on the east by the west bank of the Kanayut River from the northern boundary of the Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve (GANPP) north to the confluence with Terrace Creek, then southwesterly along the south side of Terrace Creek to the divide with Desolation Creek, then across the drainage divide to the unnamed north fork of Desolation Creek, then westerly along the south side of the unnamed north fork of Desolation Creek to the confluence with the Siksikpuk River, then southerly along the east bank of the Siksikpuk River to the northern boundary of GANPP, then easterly along the northern boundary of GANPP to and including all state managed lands in the Anaktuvuk Pass area, and then continuing easterly along the northern boundary of GANPP to the Kanayut River,

(c) Statewide, if the musk oxen are stranded on sea ice or islands and the department determines that the musk oxen have inadequate food and water resources for survival, or that they are doing severe damage to other resources of the island and that all reasonable effort has been made to remove them from the island or sea ice.

ISSUE: This regulation recognizes musk oxen located near Anaktuvuk Pass as surplus to the muskox herd distributed in Unit 26B and 26C; and, authorize the commissioner of ADF&G to issue permits for their harvest. No tag fee would be required.

For many years there has been controversy about how muskoxen should be managed on the North Slope. State policy has been to reestablish muskoxen throughout their former range, even though many North Slope residents believe the expanding muskox population has displaced caribou from important hunting areas and migration paths. During the last 18 months representatives from the North Slope Borough, ADF&G, federal agencies, the North Slope

Borough Fish and Game Management Committee, and the Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council have met in a series of meetings to develop a North Slope Muskox Harvest Plan (NSMHP). These stakeholders agree the principal goal for muskox management on the North Slope should change from one of population growth and expansion to providing opportunities for residents to harvest muskoxen while maintaining a stable population, thereby limiting further population growth at this time. Goal 2 of the NSMHP is to minimize any detrimental effects that muskoxen may have on caribou and caribou hunting.

Bull muskoxen often disperse from established herds residing in Units 26B and 26C. These animals occasionally move into the Anaktuvuk Pass area. Anaktuvuk Pass hunters are quite concerned that if muskoxen settle in the area surrounding the village that they will detrimentally affect caribou migrations. If hunters are given the opportunity to obtain permits to take occasional dispersing muskoxen, they can harvest some animals that move into their caribou hunting areas and help alleviate the problem. In addition, village residents can begin to view muskoxen as a useful source of meat rather than as a detriment. Harvesting these dispersing muskoxen will have little, if any, effect on established breeding populations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People from Anaktuvuk Pass will continue to be concerned that muskoxen settling near the village will deflect the caribou migration and feel that caribou, a highly valued resource, may be displaced by muskoxen, which have less value because they cannot be hunted.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who obtain permits and the community of Anaktuvuk Pass.

The people of the North Slope and local, state, and agency staff. The cooperative spirit of the North Slope Muskox Harvest Plan will be met. It will help us to work together to resolve problems concerning muskoxen in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who would like muskoxen to become established throughout Unit 26A.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Hazing the muskoxen away. Rejected because muskoxen are difficult to haze.

A short season. Rejected because muskoxen may move into the area during any time of the year.

A bull-only bag limit. This was rejected because if a cow muskox moves into the area it will have the same effect on caribou as a bull muskox. The great majority of dispersing muskoxen are bulls, so very few cows will probably be harvested under this regulation.

PROPOSED BY: North Slope Borough Fish and Game Management Committee, and Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-067)

PROPOSAL 89 - 5 AAC 92.050. REQUIRED PERMIT HUNT CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES. Amend this regulation to include the following:

Nonresident and nonresident alien hunters must have a registered Alaskan guide to hunt any big game animal. Each hunter must be accompanied by his/her own registered guide, Class A assistant guide, or assistant guide.

ISSUE: The wanton waste of big game meat by hunters in all of Unit 19.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The unethical wanton waste of meat will continue. Local people who depend on moose as a subsistence resource will continue to see most of the meat that could be used to feed their families, be wasted.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups, especially those subsistence users who rely on big game as a major food source.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who either don't know or don't care about the salvage of meat.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close Unit 19 to all sport hunting until a solution can be found to address the problem of wanton waste of big game animals, especially moose.

PROPOSED BY: Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee (W-98S-G-02)

PROPOSAL 90 - 5 AAC 92.052(5). DISCRETIONARY PERMIT HUNT CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES. Amend this regulation as follows:

In Unit 21B the subsistence registration hunt should require only proof of sex of the animal attached to the meat.

ISSUE: The subsistence registration hunt on the Nowitna requires that the head be brought to the check station so that the antler can be sawed off.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Subsistence hunters no longer have discretion about salvaging the head or antlers. Unit 21B covers 100 river miles on the Nowitna and 90 miles of the Yukon. To transport meat this distance sometimes the antlers and head are not considered edible.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence hunters with small boats and motors.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Tanana-Rampart-Manley Advisory Committee (I-98S-G-009)

PROPOSAL 91 - 5 AAC 92.052(18). DISCRETIONARY PERMIT HUNT CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES. Amend this regulation as follows:

The 250 maximum number of people allowed in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area was pulled out of the air by someone who is misinformed and has the agenda of restricting a resource rather than provide one. Regulations should strike the 250 maximum number of people at one time on the river.

ISSUE: Restriction of a maximum 250 hunters at one time in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nothing negative happened in 1997 or any other year. A restriction that has already proven unnecessary should be eliminated.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters can enjoy a resource they support and have paid for.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Jeff Barnett (HQ-98S-G-040)

PROPOSAL 92 - 5 AAC 92.085(4). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation in Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24 and 25 as follows:

Make the end of the bear baiting season match the end of the period when black bear meat is required to be salvaged.

ISSUE: At this time, black bear meat must be salvaged January 1 through May 31. The bear baiting season is April 15 through June 30 in many areas. The hide of bears is usually damaged from shedding or rubbing after May 31.

This means that for the period between May 31 and June 30, the bear baiter doesn't have to keep the meat, but the hide is no good. I believe this pushes the bear baiters that don't want to salvage the meat into a time when they will be disappointed with the quality of the hide. People hunting for the hide only should not be hunting in June.

If the meat salvage season was made to match the bear baiting season, this problem would not exist, all bear baiters would be required to salvage the meat of their take. This makes bear baiting look better to the general public and makes it easier to defend against anti-hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People can shoot bears in June over bait for just the hide, even though the hide is usually damaged at that time. It is essentially shooting a bear for no reason. It is like taking furbearers when their hide is not prime.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The image of bear baiters and the inexperienced person that would have been disappointed when he or she shot a rubbed bear in June for its hide.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Simply state that the meat of all bears taken over bait must be salvaged.

PROPOSED BY: C. Tom Seaton (I-98S-G-003)

The Board of Game accepted an agenda change request to add the following to its Spring 1998 meeting agenda:

PROPOSAL 93 - 5 AAC 92.095. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR BEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation as follows:

It is illegal to set any wolf snare unless the lock has been modified to facilitate "breakaway" of moose.

ISSUE: To allow any moose which might accidentally be caught in wolf snares to free themselves quickly by failure of the snare lock.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Trappers Association (HQ-98S-G-092)

The Board of Game accepted an agenda change request to add the following to its Spring 1998 meeting agenda:

PROPOSAL 94 - 5 AAC 92.095. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR BEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation as follows:

It is illegal to set any wolf snare so as the top of the loop is more than 40 inches above the snow surface.

ISSUE: Avoid catching moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Trappers Association (HQ-98S-G-094)

The Board of Game accepted an agenda change request to add the following to its Spring 1998 meeting agenda:

PROPOSAL 95 - 5 AAC 92.095. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR BEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation as follows:

It is illegal to fasten a snare meant to take wolves with any material other than cable or wire. The wire cannot be less than Number 9 in size and must be soft annealed wire.

ISSUE: Avoid snares being easily detached from anchors by snared wolves.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Trappers Association (HQ-98S-G-093)

PROPOSAL 96 - 5 AAC 92.095. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR BEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation as follows:

Clarify the regulation by adding words to provide clearer definition of trap width, such as modify existing wording to read “ . . . a conventional steel trap with a jaw spread over 9 inches, measured from inside of jaw to inside of jaw when trap is set . . . ”

ISSUE: Current regulations read “you may not take fur bearers with . . . a conventional steel trap with a jaw spread over 9 inches . . . ” The regulations are too vague regarding how this width is measured.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Trappers will remain confused about the legality of modifying their traps by laminating the jaws to produce a more humane trap.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers who seek to laminate their traps by welding a round rod on the outside of each trap jaw.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: South Central Chapter, AK Trappers Assoc. (SC-98-G-037)

PROPOSAL 97 - 5 AAC 92.095. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR BEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

(12) No more than two snares may be used in a single set. Snare sets must be placed a minimum of 50 linear yards apart.

ISSUE: Saturation snaring of wolves and other species. Snares set in large concentrations in an area can function like high seas drift nets on land leading to excessive killing of wolves, and extreme levels of incidental killing of all wildlife.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wolves will continue to be threatened and locally depleted in private, de facto wolf control efforts. Moose, caribou, bears, eagles, and other wildlife will continue to be caught and killed in unknown numbers as “trash” animals. Entire ecosystems will be threatened by these indiscriminate practices.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska’s wildlife, and ecosystems and the people who enjoy them.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trappers may not catch as many wolves in a single set but will benefit from healthier wildlife populations and ecosystems in the long run.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: The Alaska Wildlife Alliance (HQ-98S-G-056)

PROPOSAL 98 - 5 AAC 92.095. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR BEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation as follows:

No person may use a snare with the intent of trapping a wolf.

ISSUE: Snaring wolves and the resulting (1) high incidental take of caribou, moose, eagles, and other animals; (2) unnecessary suffering of wolves and other animals; (3) private wolf control and bounties outside the public process; and (4) violation of widespread public values and traditions.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued high incidental take, unnecessary suffering, private wolf control and bounties, and violation of widespread public values and traditions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans who oppose high incidental killing of non-target animals, unnecessary suffering, and private wolf control.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?. Persons who wish dramatic reductions in wolf control.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Prohibition of saturation snaring. This does not go far enough and would be difficult to enforce.

PROPOSED BY: Alaskans Against Snaring Wolves, Kneeland Taylor (HQ-98S-G-018)

PROPOSAL 99 - 5 AAC 92.095. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR BEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

Every trap and or snare must be marked with a legible identification tag that displays the trappers Alaska state identification number.

ISSUE: Ability to identify ownership of traps and or snares that have been left in the field after the closure of the most recent trapping season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Traps and or snares left in the field set continue to catch animals. Enforcement is difficult due to the inability to be able to identify the owner of the trap and or snare.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Enforcement of trapping laws will be easier, theft of traps and snares will be more difficult.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Additional burden on trappers to put trap tags on traps and snares.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Division of Fish and Wildlife Protection (HQ-98S-G-035)

PROPOSAL 100 - 5 AAC 92.095. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR BEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

All traps and snares shall be identified with the name and address of the trapper attached.

ISSUE: Inability to enforce trapping regulations, in particular the requirement that snares be removed at the end of a season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Snares, in particular wolf snares, will be left year-round, posing a hazard.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans who believe wildlife should be responsibly managed.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Kneeland Taylor (HQ-98S-G-021)

PROPOSAL 101 - 5 AAC 92.095. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR BEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation as follows:

A trapper shall check his traps once every 24 hours unless there is an unexpected emergency.

ISSUE: Unnecessary suffering of trapped animals.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Same as above.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans who support ethical game management.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Kneeland Taylor

(HQ-98S-G-020)

PROPOSAL 102 - 5 AAC 92.095. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR BEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation as follows:

Trappers should report all animals killed or wounded by traps or snares.

ISSUE: Absence of data regarding incidentally killed animals and birds by trappers, and use of snared caribou and moose as bait by wolf snare trappers.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? No data and continued taking of caribou and moose for bait by snares.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans who support responsible game management.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Kneeland Taylor

(HQ-98S-G-019)

PROPOSAL 103 - 5 AAC 92.095. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR BEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this section by adding a paragraph to prohibit trapping within one-fourth mile of any moose, caribou or deer incidentally taken in a trap or snare as follows:

(12) by placing or leaving any trap or snare set on land within one-fourth mile of a moose, caribou, or deer caught in a trap or snare;

ISSUE: Trappers occasionally take moose, caribou or deer in traps or snares set for furbearers. If the captured animal dies, it may attract furbearers to the site. Under these circumstances, the carcass becomes "bait." Some trappers have been confused regarding whether or not they can continue to trap around the carcasses of incidentally taken game. This regulation would make it clear that traps cannot be set within one-fourth mile of any incidentally taken moose, caribou or deer.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Trappers will continue to harvest furbearers near illegal bait.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers who may be confused by current regulations regarding illegal bait.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trappers who want to take furbearers attracted to the dead animals.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No action—rejected because the law needs to be clarified regarding the take of furbearers near bait.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-069)

PROPOSAL 104 - 5 AAC 92.095(6). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR BEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation as follows:

Eliminate the prohibition on utilizing aircraft for access to beaver trapping in the Minto Flats Management Area.

ISSUE: Beaver are very plentiful in Minto Flats. Prices are very low so its highly unlikely beaver fur sales are a significant contribution to the income of anyone. Most beaver harvest is for personal and family consumption. There is no valid reason aircraft operators should be excluded from this area. Their inclusion would at most increase the harvest from very insignificant to insignificant. Simply eliminate this restriction. (It is the only one like it in the state.)

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A small subgroup of potential users will continue to be restricted from utilizing a very plentiful and largely underutilized resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who want to harvest beaver from Minto Flats Management Area utilizing aircraft for transportation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee (I-98S-G-032)

PROPOSAL 105 - 5 AAC 92.125(2). WOLF PREDATION CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN. Amend this regulation to include the following:

Implement a wolf predation control plan for Unit 20A that would allow same-day airborne hunting.

ISSUE: Caribou and sheep populations are at critically low levels in this area. A small reduction in wolf numbers would obviously benefit both prey populations and the wolves themselves because they can eventually destroy their own food source.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued destruction of wolf prey populations, to the detriment of wolves, prey animals and all human wildlife users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone, human wildlife users of all kinds will benefit from larger healthier populations including wolves. The wolves and their prey will also benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? In the long-term, no one. In the short-term possibly the emotions of the anti-hunting and trapping fanatics.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Wolf bounty -- present administration would reject this because they are more interested in their political agenda than sound wildlife management.

PROPOSED BY: Kenneth Lamb (I-98S-G-018)

PROPOSAL 106 - 5 AAC 92.125(2). **WOLF PREDATION CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.** Amend this regulation in Unit 20 to provide the following:

Privatize the wolf control problem by issuing airborne hunt permits to applicants seeking them to achieve desired harvest numbers.

ISSUE: Wolf control.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wolves will continue to flourish at the expense of caribou, moose and Dall sheep.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone since wolves are flourishing in Unit 20 and surrounding units and even with strong numbers viewing opportunities are limited due to creatures' secretive nature. Caribou, moose, sheep would appreciate responsible management.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solution. States current surgical wolf control plan is a farce and an extravagant waste of money. Privatization of the wolf control problem makes economic good sense. Outfitters could make money by offering a wolf hunt with some chance of success, as currently chances of harvesting a wolf are slim. State would save

thousands of dollars by eliminating such far-flung programs as currently in practice in the Fortymile country. Hotels, restaurants and various other tourist industries would gain economically by hunters' monies spent before, during and after hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Coke W. Wallace (I-98S-G-027)

PROPOSAL 107 - 5 AAC 92.125(4). WOLF PREDATION CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN. Amend this regulation as follows:

Repeal 5 AAC 92.125(4) in its entirety. End the Fortymile wolf control program.

ISSUE: There is no justification for such an ecologically destructive and extreme management action as wolf control in the Fortymile region. The purpose of the plan – to produce more caribou for hunting – is insufficient to justify this action, especially given the ecological dynamics of the Fortymile region. The Fortymile caribou herd has grown steadily by over 400% since the mid-1970s. It grew by 4% from June 1995 - June 1996, and more than 10% from June 1996 - June 1997 according to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The stated goal for wolf control is for the Fortymile herd to grow by an annual rate of 5-10%. That growth rate was exceeded before wolf control began. Additionally, Fortymile wolves should not be the scapegoats for failed wildlife management policy designed to achieve unrealistic and arbitrary hunting objectives set for caribou.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wolves will continue to be killed, relocated, and sterilized in an unjustifiable attempt to increase caribou hunting. Wolves, the Fortymile ecosystem, Alaska's reputation and the majority of Alaskans will suffer as a result.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans, wolves, and the Fortymile ecosystem as a whole will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: The Alaska Wildlife Alliance (HQ-98S-G-055)

PROPOSAL 108 - 5 AAC 92.132(1). BAG LIMIT FOR BROWN BEARS. Amend this regulation in Unit 20 as follows:

Repeal 5 AAC 92.132(1). End the one bear per regulatory year limit and restore the one bear every four years regulatory limit.

ISSUE: Overly liberal brown bear bag limits in Unit 20 aimed at reducing brown bear numbers. Such a policy is unethical and reckless in the extreme given the slow reproductivity of bears, the lack of baseline biological data on brown bears and their habitat, and the difficulty of accurately counting bears. In addition, extensive study of brown bears and bear control measures in Unit 13 has shown no evidence that brown bear control there has yielded any increase in moose numbers. Given the inability to count brown bears accurately, it is highly possible that liberalized bear hunting regulations could lead to irreversible over harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Brown bears will continue to be threatened by over harvest and localized depletion for no valid reason. The public will be robbed of this priceless resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bears, their prey, their ecosystem, and the Alaskan public at large.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: The Alaska Wildlife Alliance (HQ-98S-G-053)

PROPOSAL 109 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. NEW REGULATION. Establish a new regulation for sealing sheep horns in Unit 20A as follows:

Mandatory sealing of sheep horns taken by nonresident hunters in Unit 20A.

ISSUE: Declining numbers of mature rams in Unit 20A. Possible illegal rams taken, and removed from the state. Definite unethical practices by guides.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sheep herds will continue to decline. Certain guides will continue to book four on one sheep hunt, and some residents will continue to have more brothers and sisters each year in the second degree of kindred.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The sheep herds, sheep hunters, guides who have ethics and the state and its resident hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Every guide without ethics, and the ones that don't know how to read growth rings. Maybe there will be a few rams passed up. Residents that always have bigger families each year.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? All sheep sealed, but it would upset the resident population too much.

PROPOSED BY: Mark E. Chambers

(HQ-98S-G-005)

PROPOSAL 110 - 5 AAC 92.220(d). SALVAGE OF GAME MEAT, FURS AND HIDES.
Amend this regulation in Units 9B, 17, 19A and 19B as follows:

Repeal all requirements to salvage the bones attached to the meat, i.e. repeal 5 AAC92.220(d).

ISSUE: The “meat on bone” regulation is a bad one because it:

- A) Imposes an unnecessary burden on hunters.
- B) Is not clearly enough written to tell hunters what bones they must save.
- C) Has undesirable, unintended consequences.
- D) Fails to solve either the problem of true wanton waste or unintentional spoilage.
- E) Is not necessary for enforcement of wanton waste laws.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting pressure will be concentrated close to mechanized access sites with lower overall harvest and more impact on the environment. Increased burden on hunters will either discourage hunting or shift pressure to other areas negating the board’s policy of trying to encourage increased harvest of the rapidly expanding Mulchatna caribou herd. The land will be depleted of valuable minerals as bones normally recycled within the ecosystem are carried out.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone, but especially hunters who like to get away from mechanized access sites, hunters who use aircraft for transportation, hunters dropped off by transporters at common access sites who need to get away from the access site to find good hunting. Local residents who don’t need increased pressure at their traditional access sites, i.e., close to rivers, the courts and enforcement officers who will not have to put up with vagueness challenges to the regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. This regulation was an ill conceived solution to a different problem.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Change the “meat on bone” regulation to read the meat of the hindquarter must be left attached to the femur (thigh bone) and the meat of the front quarter must be left attached to the scapula (shoulder blade). This at least is a more reasonable amount of bone and is certainly clearly defined as opposed to the current wording “bones of the four quarters” which can be interpreted to include the pelvis bones as well as the lower leg and even the foot bones. Forget about the ribs. It is crazy to ask a hunter who has walked 4 miles from his site of mechanized access to bring out a pound of unusable bone for each pound of eatable meat.

This solution was rejected for the same reasons we rejected the "meat on the bone" regulation. The best solution is to simply repeal the regulation.

PROPOSED BY: Safari Club International, Alaska Chapter (HQ-98S-G-046)

PROPOSAL 111 - 5 AAC 92.220(d). SALVAGE OF GAME MEAT, FURS AND HIDES.
Amend this regulation as follows:

New regulation would be the same as prior to 1997.

ISSUE: Requirement to leave meat attached to the bone. Alaska has the most stringent salvage of meat regulations in the U.S. This was prior to the new regulation of 1997, requiring meat to be left on the bone. Packing the bones out constitutes an additional one-third more weight for hunters and pilots to deal with, placing an unreasonable burden on all.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More meat lost to bears due to the unnecessary extra required trips. More spoiled meat due to not being able to open quarters and removing bone, allowing for more complete cooling of meat. Aircraft accidents, and possible deaths.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone, all hunters, pilots etc.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Sheryl and Bill Woodin (HQ-98S-G-047)

PROPOSAL 112 - 5 AAC 92.220(d). SALVAGE OF GAME MEAT, FURS AND HIDES.
Amend this regulation in Units 17 and 19 as follows:

Meat must be left on the bone until October 15. After October 15, meat may be removed from the bones before transporting from the area.

ISSUE: Requirement to leave meat on bones until taken from the area. This is required for the complete hunting season with no thought of hunters after freeze up. There is no spoilage after October 15, as the temperature is too cold.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Residents who hunt during the winter (not after the horns) will not be able to haul as much meat out. I fly a Super Cub, and bone the meat so I can haul more. We seldom use the bones.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters who utilize game for human use. I have used game for a primary meat source as of 1959. I do not purchase beef normally. By boning, I can haul at least one more animal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. There will be more game used and less waste.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Vern Nowell (HQ-98S-G-008)

PROPOSAL 113 - 5 AAC 92.220(d). SALVAGE OF GAME MEAT, FURS AND HIDES.
Amend this regulation in Units 17 and 19 as follows:

All edible meat must be salvaged.

ISSUE: Meat on the bone.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People will injure backs and failure to get meat out.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone, disabled/handicapped, very few people can pack a 130 pound moose quarter.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Other solutions I have considered are: Any nonresident hunter that is not hunting with the next of kin or not with a hunting guide should have to go through a training course. This would include information on how to judge an animal and proper care of meat. This course should be a minimum of at least four hours. This should not be just a video shown, but actual classroom lecturers. I feel this would stop the killing of some of the under-sized animals, and meat spoiling. A fee for this class should be paid by the hunter and this would generate funds to the area where the course is being held.

Air taxis should be held more responsible. They should only be able to charge by the hour. Not by the hunter. This way you'd see air taxis making the extra trip to check up on their hunters during mid-hunt. A lot of meat is spoiled because the hunters are on a week's trip and their transporters don't check on them in mid-hunt. I saw this happen in 1997 with nine caribou hanging on a meat pole with the bone in the meat. This could have been prevented if they had been checked on during the middle of their hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Bill Slemph (HQ-98S-G-017)

PROPOSAL 114 - 5 AAC 92.220(d). SALVAGE OF GAME MEAT, FURS AND HIDES.
Expand the salvage requirement into Unit 21A as follows:

The meat of the forequarters, hindquarters, and ribs of any moose transported out of Unit 21A must remain on the bone until the moose has been transported out of the area or has been processed and packaged for consumption.

ISSUE: Game Management Unit 21A is adjacent to McGrath Unit 19D and much of the hunting in the headwaters portion is accessed by float plane. Much of the meat from this area is flown back to McGrath for processing and our shipment out of the area. Over the years we have noted or been told of a lot of waste due to improper handling. This is particularly true of meat that has been boned out. By the time it arrives in McGrath, sometimes in plastic garbage bags, from one-third to one-half of it is unfit to eat and must be trimmed away in processing. Sometimes none of it is salvageable, where as meat that is left on the bone tends to remain sweet even when spoiled on the outside.

It is also difficult for law enforcement agents to check for wanton waste when you have more than one moose cut up into small pieces. The waste is our main concern however and it does not constitute waste even when it is brought out in a plastic bag where it has been for several days while floating the river to a pickup point.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A valuable resource will continue to be wasted when much of it could be prevented by this requirement.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who enjoy eating moose meat and wish to salvage what they have killed. Some hunters are not aware how much waste will result from boning meat until it is too late. Also individuals who receive meat from hunters by transfer will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters, pilots and air taxis who are not prepared or willing to handle larger pieces of meat. Hunters who do not care if the meat spoils as long as its easier to carry and simple spoilage is not considered wanton waste.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Make the regulation apply to all Interior units. But not all units have the same transportation problems. If game is taken closer to home and processed immediately this problem is not encountered. Make the hunters accountable for spoiled meat? But there are weather conditions and time factors such as how fast the meat will be flown out by air taxis that are out of their control. This is one action that will help that is in the hunters control. Requiring cloth game bags and outlawing plastic would also help but this would pose a problem for pilots who should be encouraged to move the meat while it is as fresh as possible.

PROPOSED BY: McGrath Advisory Committee (I-98S-G-025)

The Board of Game deferred this proposal from its Winter 1998 meeting.

PROPOSAL 115 - 5 AAC 92.220. SALVAGE OF GAME MEAT, FURS AND HIDES.

Amend this section of the regulations to add a requirement to report any illegally or incidentally taken game and provide an affirmative defense to anyone who complies with this regulation as follows:

(h) A game animal taken in violation of AS 16 or a regulation adopted under AS 16 is the property of the state. A person who takes a game animal in violation of AS 16 or a regulation adopted under AS 16

(i) shall comply with all provisions of 5 AAC 92.010, 5 AAC 92.050, 5 AAC 92.052 and 5 AAC 92.062 if hunting,

(ii) shall salvage those portions of the animal required by this section, shall immediately transport them from the field directly to the nearest office of the Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) or the Department of Public Safety (DPS), [AND] shall surrender them to a department representative, and

(iii) shall immediately report the taking to a department representative.

(i) It is an affirmative defense to a prosecution for taking a game animal in violation of AS 16 or a regulation adopted under AS 16 that the person has complied will all requirements of this section.

ISSUE: The Department of Fish and Game and Department of Law developed this language as a way to implement the intent of proposal 37 from the Winter 1998 Board of Game meeting. This language will accomplish the purpose of the initial proposal. It also eliminates a potential conflict with the Fifth Amendment of the US Constitution and improves the department's understanding of the magnitude of illegal or incidental take.

As currently written, this regulation requires a person who takes a game animal in violation of a state law to salvage edible meat and surrender it to the state. Although the regulation does not require the person to report the taking, it is difficult to surrender illegally taken game without implicating yourself. This may violate the Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination. Adding the section to provide an affirmative defense eliminates this problem. This also provides a strong incentive for any person who takes an animal illegally by any means (e.g. taking a sublegal moose or sheep; shooting the wrong sex animal) to salvage and report the illegal take, as doing so would provide a defense against prosecution.

Also, in cases where a trapper catches a moose, caribou or deer in a snare that ultimately kills the animal, there may be no edible meat by the time the trapper finds the animal. Under existing regulations there is no requirement to report the incidental, illegal take under these circumstances. Adding a requirement to report any illegal (including incidental) taking will improve our understanding of how frequently this occurs.

The board considers this action to be a significant departure from the existing regulation. In particular the board is concerned that granting a broad affirmative defense could compromise the effectiveness of selective harvest regulations for species such as moose, caribou and sheep. The

board wants to provide additional time for public review and analysis by agencies before taking final action.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and Department of Law
(SC-98W-G-026) (HQ-98S-G-098)

PROPOSAL 116 - 5 AAC 92.510(14). AREAS CLOSED TO HUNTING. Amend this regulation in Unit 20 as follows:

Chena Hot Springs Road closed to the use of firearms for moose hunting ¼ mile either side of highway from Fairbanks Special Use Area (approx. 4 mile) to Chena Hot Springs Recreation Area (approx. 25 mile).

ISSUE: Road hunting on Chena Hot Springs Road endangering school children and other residents. Shooting in many areas is parallel to road due to vegetation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Possible injury or fatality of school children waiting for school buses, as well as danger to residences and other hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? School children waiting for buses, other residents of subdivisions near road. Sport hunters who might lose firearms hunting in entire area if a shooting accident occurs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those people who now road hunt (use vehicle) along Chena Hot Springs Road.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A lesser distance (150 yards) from road. Difficulty in enforcement.

PROPOSED BY: Willmar A. Schweibert (I-98S-G-013)

PROPOSAL 117 - 5 AAC 92.530(7). MANAGEMENT AREAS. Amend the wording of the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area, as follows:

(7) the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area:

(A) the area consists of those portions of Units 20 and 24 - 26 extending five miles from each side of the Dalton Highway, including the driveable surface of the Dalton Highway, from the Yukon River to the Prudhoe Bay Closed Area;

(B) the area is closed to hunting; however, big game, small game, and fur animals may be taken in the area by bow and arrow only; no motorized vehicle, except aircraft, boats, and licensed highway vehicles may be used to transport game or hunters within the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area; except that hunters who

originate from outside the corridor may use snow machines to travel through the corridor to hunt on the opposite side of the corridor, and to transport harvested animals back through the corridor; any hunter traveling on the Dalton Highway must stop at any check station operated by the department within the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area;

ISSUE: Since the creation of the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area hunters from the North Slope have been prohibited by the wording of the regulation from using snow machines to travel across the corridor and hunt on the other side. This has prevented them from utilizing areas where they have traditionally hunted.

Including the definition of the driveable surface of the Dalton Highway as part of the management area is necessary to close a possible loophole in the definition of the area outside of the management area. Without this wording change it is possible to interpret the highway as being “outside” the management area because the area is defined as 5 miles from the “east side” and “west side” of the Dalton Highway.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? North Slope hunters will continue to be excluded from areas where they have traditionally hunted.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? North Slope hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: North Slope Borough Fish and Game Management Committee, and Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-064)

PROPOSAL 118 - 5 AAC 92.530(8). MANAGEMENT AREAS. Amend the regulations for the Minto Flats Management Area as follows:

Discontinue airboat use in the Minto Wildlife Refuge year round.

ISSUE: Airboats may be destroying wildlife habitat (waterfowl).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wildlife habitat will continue to be destroyed.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Users of Minto Wildlife Refuge.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Airboat users.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Ronnie M. Silas

(I-98S-G-008)

The Board of Game deferred the following proposal from its Spring 1997 meeting:

PROPOSAL 119 - 5 AAC 92.530(9). MANAGEMENT AREAS and 5 AAC 85.055. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR DALL SHEEP. Amend these regulations as follows:

Units 12, 13 and 20, those portions known as the Tok Management Area; bow and arrow registration permit, Aug. 10 - Oct. 15. One ram with full-curl horn or larger every two regulatory years by bow and arrow registration permit. Bow and arrow registration permits will be issued in addition to any weapon drawing permits. Bow and arrow registration permits in the Tok Management Area will be limited to no more than 10 registration permittees in the field at any time until the end of the season or the harvest goals are met. Each registration bow and arrow permit will be issued for 10 days with successful hunters reporting in person and non-successful hunters by phone to ADF&G at the end of their hunt. Persons with a registration bow and arrow permit may not be accompanied by a person with or have in their possession, any rifle, muzzleloading firearm or long-range pistol (barrel over 8 inches and/or scoped).

JUSTIFICATION: Registration permitting is a more scientific method of managing limited game resources to provide maximum recreational opportunity. In an effort to increase the recreational opportunity, in drawing permit areas, I request the Board adopt a policy of authorizing additional registration permits utilizing bow and arrow hunting, which has proven a high number of recreation days per animal harvested, in addition to the number of any weapon drawing permits. Utilizing the very low success rate of bow and arrow hunting in permit areas may be the only way to provide the hunting public additional recreation opportunity with minimal impact on a game species. The bow and arrow Unit 14C sheep drawing permit hunts in 1993, 1994, and 1995 averaged about 7% success rate versus the number of permits to full curl ram or larger which will reduce the success rate to an estimated 2-3%. This very low success rate will allow ADF&G to more intensively manage a limited game resource, through restricting the method of harvest, to allow maximum recreational hunting opportunity.

ISSUE: Low opportunity to participate in recreational hunting in drawing permit areas. Hunting pressure on certain species in specific areas of the state caused the Board of Game to adopt drawing permit hunts to protect the limited game resources in these popular hunting areas. While the drawing permit system has worked well to protect the game resource it is not capable of meeting the increasing recreational needs of the hunting public. In the Tok Management Area sheep (any weapons) drawing permit hunt, the opportunity to participate has been steadily decreasing from 6.2% in 1991, 5.6% in 1992 to 4.9% in 1995. The any weapons drawing permit hunts in 1993, 1994, 1995 averaged about a 33% success rate versus the number of permits issued. While the new 1997 drawing permit regulations, requiring the purchase of a hunting license, may increase the odds of drawing a permit the limited game resource will never satisfy

the recreational needs of the hunting public under a drawing permit system. The drawing permit system allocates a limited game resource to a few lucky individuals who may not even participate in the hunt. The possible number of non-participants results in the drawing permit system relying on statistical analysis to provide a balance between harvest goals, permits issued and recreational opportunity.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Recreational hunting opportunity will continue to decrease for the hunting public in permit areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The general hunting public by providing more hunting opportunity in the field with minimal harvest of game species. The low success rate of bow and arrow permit hunts for sheep in Unit 14C Eklutna Management Area, Sept. 6 - Sept. 30 and Unit 14C, Oct. 1 - Oct. 10 hunts have proven that bow and arrow hunting can provide expanded opportunity for hunters with minimal impact on game species.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? ADF&G, because registration permits require additional personnel time to issue. The Board of Game should consider offsetting cost of ADF&G personnel to issue registration permits with a \$20 fee per permit on all registration hunts. More intensive game management may be required by ADF&G area managers to monitor a registration hunt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Edward Russell (HQ-98S-G-003)(SC-97-G-062)

The Board of Game deferred this proposal from its Spring 1997 meeting:

PROPOSAL 120 - 5 AAC 92.540(2). CONTROLLED USE AREAS and 5 AAC 85.055(3). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR DALL SHEEP. Amend these regulations to provide the following:

Units 13 and 20, those portions known as the Delta Controlled Use Area, bow and arrow registration permit Aug. 10 - Oct. 15. One ram with full-curl horn or larger by bow and arrow registration permit. Bow and arrow registration permits will be issued in addition to any weapon drawing permits. Bow and arrow registration permits in the Delta Controlled Use Area will be limited to no more than ten registration permittees in the field at any time until the end of season or the harvest goals are met. Each registration bow and arrow permit will be issued for ten days with successful hunters reporting in person and non-successful hunters by phone to ADF&G at the end of their hunt. Persons with a registration bow and arrow permit may not be accompanied by a person with, or have in their possession, any rifle, muzzleloading firearm or long-range pistol (barrel over 8 inches and/or scoped).

JUSTIFICATION: Registration permitting is a more scientific method of managing limited game resources to provide maximum recreational opportunity. In an effort to increase the

recreational opportunity, in drawing permit areas, I request the Board adopt a policy of authorizing additional registration permits utilizing bow and arrow hunting, which has proven to provide a high number of recreation days per animal harvested, in addition to the number of any weapon drawing permits. Utilizing the very low success rate of bow and arrow hunting in permit areas may be the only way to provide the hunting public additional recreation opportunity with minimal impact on a game species. The bow and arrow Unit 14C sheep drawing permit hunts in 1993, 1994, and 1995 averaged about a 7% success rate versus the number of permits issued for any sheep. If this proposal is adopted it would limit additional bow and arrow registration permits to full-curl ram or larger which will reduce the success rate to an estimated 2-3%. This very low success rate will allow ADF&G to more intensively manage a limited game resource, through restricting the method of harvest, to allow maximum recreational hunting opportunity.

ISSUE: Low opportunity to participate in recreational hunting in drawing permit areas. Hunting pressure on certain species in specific areas of the state caused the Board of Game to adopt drawing permit hunts to protect the limited game resources in these popular hunting areas. While the drawing permit system has worked well to protect the game resource it is not capable of meeting the recreational needs of the hunting public. In the Delta Controlled Use Area sheep (any weapons) drawing permit hunts, the opportunity to participate is extremely low, running from 9.3% in 1991, 5.6% in 1992, 5.1% in 1994 to 7.9% in 1995. The any weapons drawing permit hunts in 1993, 1994, and 1995 averaged about 23% success rate versus the number of permits issued. While the new 1997 drawing permit regulations, requiring the purchase of a hunting license, may increase the odds of drawing a permit the limited game resource will never satisfy the recreational needs of the hunting public under a drawing permit system. The drawing permit system allocates a limited game resource to a few lucky individuals who may not even participate in the hunt. The possible number of non-participants results in the drawing permit system relying on statistical analysis to provide a balance between harvest goals, permits issued and recreational opportunity.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Recreational hunting opportunity will continue to decrease for the hunting public in permit areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The general hunting public by providing more hunting opportunity in the field with minimal harvest of game species. The low success rate of bow and arrow permit hunts for sheep in Unit 14C Eklutna Management Area, Sept. 6 - Sept. 30 and Unit 14C, Oct. 1 - Oct. 10 hunts have proven that bow and arrow hunting can provide expanded opportunity for hunters with minimal impact on game species.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? ADF&G, because registration permits require additional personnel time to issue. The Board of Game should consider offsetting cost of ADF&G personnel to issue registration permits with a \$20 fee per permit on all registration hunts. More intensive game management may be required by ADF&G area managers to monitor a registration hunt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Edward Russell

(HQ-98S-G-004)(SC-97-G-065)

PROPOSAL 121 - 5 AAC 92.540(2). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this regulation in Unit 20B to provide the following:

Aircraft or airboats may not be used for moose hunting or to transport moose, moose hunters or moose hunting equipment within the following area: starting in Nenana at a point with the north bank of the Tanana River and the Alaska Railroad and continuing north along the railroad to Dunbar, then west along the Dunbar Trail to the boundary of the Minto Flats Management Area, along the boundary to the Tanana River, then north along the bank of the Tanana River to the starting point in Nenana.

ISSUE: Aircraft or airboats may not be used for moose hunting or to transport moose, moose hunters or moose hunting equipment.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Airboats will dominate the hunting and destroy the habitat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone that uses the resources.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody, all still would have equal access.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Minto-Nenana Advisory Committee

(I-98S-G-007)

PROPOSAL 122 - 5 AAC 92.540(2). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this regulation in Units 20 and 21 to provide the following:

The restriction of airboats to hunt moose, transportation of moose or moose hunting equipment in Units 20C, 20F and 21B.

In Unit 20C, all lakes, creeks, sloughs, portages starting at Cos Jacket, 45 miles up the Tanana River from Tanana to the mouth of Corbusier Slough directly south of Tanana approximately one mile.

In Unit 20F, all lakes, creeks, sloughs, portages starting at Cos Jacket, 45 miles up the Tanana River from Tanana to the Tozitna River, 12 miles below Tanana on the Yukon River. Also in Unit 20F, all lakes, creeks, sloughs, portages starting at Rapids, 44 miles up the Yukon River from Tanana to connecting point mentioned by Tanana in Unit 20F.

In Unit 21B, all lakes, creeks, sloughs, portages starting at both sides of the Yukon River below and across from Tanana to both sides of the Yukon River ending at Nowitna River, and also include Nowitna and Melozitna Rivers (everything.)

ISSUE: Restrict airboats in mentioned units.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose hunting methods of Tanana residents would continue to be interrupted by airboats, thereby eliminating the opportunities for Tanana residents to catch their yearly supply of meat by traditional means. The traditional hunting methods are still hunting and calling for moose, canoeing to lakes from sloughs and creeks (portaging,) and just waiting in one area are being adversely interrupted by airboats. The effect of airboats on wildlife and habitat is uncertain because no studies last more than one season in Alaska, extensive studies have to be done to determine the full effect airboats have on wildlife and habitat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Tanana residents who utilize traditional still hunting and calling.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Airboat hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Tanana Tribal Council (I-98S-G-001)

PROPOSAL 123 - 5 AAC 92.540(2). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this regulation for the Delta Controlled Use Area to apply only to the hunting of big game rather than to the hunting of all game:

(ii) the area is closed to the use of any motorized vehicle or pack animal for hunting big game, from August 5 through August 25; ...

ISSUE: The Delta Controlled Use Area (DCUA) was established in 1971 to provide a walk-in-only hunting opportunity for Dall sheep hunters in the eastern Alaska Range during the early portion of the sheep hunting season. DCUA regulations prohibit the use of motorized vehicles or pack animals for hunting of any species from August 5-25.

The northern and western boundaries of the DCUA are the Alaska and Richardson Highways, respectively. Between the highways and the mountainous sheep habitat are approximately 375 mi² of nonmountainous terrain that provides excellent hunting for grouse and hares. Recent wildfires in 1987 and 1994, and a ruffed grouse habitat improvement project, have improved upland game habitat in this area. There are numerous roads and trails within this portion of the DCUA that provide excellent access from the Alaska and Richardson Highways to upland game

hunting. Unit 20D is a very popular location for hunters from many areas of the state to hunt upland game, particularly ruffed and sharp-tailed grouse.

The DCUA access restrictions provide for a very popular walk-in sheep hunt, but also restrict upland game hunters from using motorized vehicles within the DCUA on August 25, the opening day of grouse season. DCUA access restrictions are in effect through midnight August 25. Therefore, there is one-day of overlap of the access restrictions and the grouse season. This is confusing to small game hunters who mistakenly assume the access restrictions apply only to big game hunters in general, and sheep hunters in particular.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Some grouse hunters will continue to be confused about the use of motorized vehicles within the DCUA on the opening day of grouse season. This will result in some hunters unintentionally violating hunting regulations, and Fish and Wildlife Protection will continue to have an enforcement problem for the opening day of grouse season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Grouse hunters in southwest Unit 20D will benefit by gaining motorized access to good hunting areas on the opening day of grouse season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fish and Wildlife Protection may have to deal with big game hunters using motorized vehicles or pack animals under the pretense of hunting for small game.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1. No change. 2. Change the opening day of grouse season from August 25 to August 26 to avoid overlap with DCUA restrictions. The disadvantage of this option is that it delays grouse season opening in the remainder of southwest Unit 20D that is not effected by DCUA restrictions. 3. Change DCUA regulations so that the nonmotorized sheep hunt ends on August 25 instead of August 26. The disadvantage of this option is that it reduces the length of the walk-in hunt by one day. Thus the very popular walk-in sheep hunt would be reduced from 15 days in length to 14 days, which would be unpopular with walk-in sheep hunters.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-98S-G-063)

PROPOSAL 124 – 5 AAC 92.540(2). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend the Nenana Controlled Use Area regulation as follows:

This closure must be rescinded in its entirety.

ISSUE: The Nenana Controlled Use Area closed a section of Units 20A and 20B to the use of airboats for both the taking of moose or setting up moose camp in these areas from Sept. 1 - Sept. 25. This closure is entirely due to a small user conflict and not requested by Alaska Department of Fish and Game based on sound management or biological reasons to prevent overharvest of moose in either of these game management units. On the contrary, moose season in Unit 20A in

the past three years not only has been extended an additional five days, there is also a cow season now in place along with a late season muzzle loader hunt.

More confusing is that airboats can be utilized in this closed area to hunt any other game animal except moose. They can run up and down these areas fishing, camping and even hunting as long as it is not for moose.

As this regulation/closure is written it is unlawful to use public launching facilities located at Nenana, Alaska to launch an airboat even if that airboat is to be used for moose hunting 200 miles downstream. This is because the way this closure is written, no airboat can legally touch the south bank of the Tanana River in the closed area if they are used for moose hunting. This prevents use of state facilities for otherwise legal use by state resident.

This closure also as written prevents free legal movement of airboats over State of Alaska navigable waterways. By wording alone this closure prevents an airboat from traveling through the closed area to moose hunt on sections of rivers that are not affected by this closure.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It would be justification for all user groups to use Alaska Board of Game to write out other user groups even if no sound justification for such closures exists.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All the legal sportsmen that utilize airboats in the same way that everyone else uses their own mode of transportation for the taking of moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Only those that wish to have an area for their exclusive moose hunting area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close entire area to all same-day boat hunting, would be fair to everyone. Rejected due to unpopularity of local hunters.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee (I-98S-G-014)

PROPOSAL 125 - 5 AAC 92.540(2). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this regulation in the Nenana Controlled Use Area as follows:

Eliminate the prohibition on utilizing airboats for access to moose hunting.

ISSUE: Access restriction on airboats for moose hunting

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Litigation. Also, just one more restriction that causes more congestion in other areas. Can't even launch airboats in restricted area to access other areas that are open to airboats.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who wish to use airboats to access moose hunting area in or near the Nenana Controlled Use Area (NCUA). Also, hunters in other areas near NCUA -- more areas to hunt thus less congestion.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee (I-98S-G-033)

PROPOSAL 126 - 5 AAC 92.540(2). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this regulation in the Nenana Controlled Use Area as follows:

There will be no restrictions for any user group in these areas.

ISSUE: The closure of Units 20A and 20C to airboats for moose hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Airboats will not be permitted to hunt moose in these areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups (this will provide more area to spread out so you are not hunting on top of each other).

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Roger Redfern (HQ-98S-G-045)

PROPOSAL 127 - 5 AAC 92.540(2). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend the Nenana Controlled Use Area regulation as follows:

No new regulation is needed. Delete the current regulation 5 AAC 92.540(J)(ii) and return to the original.

ISSUE: Airboat access to the Wood River for the purpose of moose hunting, transporting hunters, gear and meat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Legitimate hunters will continue to be denied access to a traditional hunting area solely because of their choice of transportation. As witnessed by the winter snowmachine hunt and cow permits for this area there is not a shortage of the resource (moose).

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Legitimate hunters who have used this area for years via airboat. If this regulation is followed to the letter, it makes it actually illegal to launch an airboat from the public landing at Nenana for the purpose of moose hunting even though the hunter is going to a different area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The areas hunted by airboaters are accessible only by airboat or helicopter so no one is likely to suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: James Teders (HQ-98S-G-015)

PROPOSAL 128 - 5 AAC 92.540(5). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Create a controlled use area in Unit 19A as follows:

The area is closed during moose hunting season to the use of aircraft for hunting moose, including transportation of any moose hunter or moose parts. However, this does not apply to transportation of a moose hunter or moose parts by aircraft to or from a publicly owned airport in the controlled use area, or airport regularly. Scheduled flights to and between villages by carriers that normally provide scheduled service to this area.

ISSUE: Too easy to violate same-day airborne hunting. Aerial harassment, spotting, herding, serial guiding of moose and other big game animals.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Harassing and herding animals leads to poorer quality of meat for human consumption. Too many same-day airborne hunting, staggering growth of airborne hunters into area. Numbers are unchecked, unmanaged with almost no enforcement. This is leading to less numbers of game, especially moose numbers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters that abide by the laws, rules and regulations of the State of Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? High-rollers and as usual violators.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Total closure, unexceptable.

PROPOSED BY: Sleetmute Traditional Council (HQ-98S-G-023)

PROPOSAL 129 - 5 AAC 92.540(5)(A) and (B). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this regulation in the Upper Kuskokwim and Holitna-Hoholitna Controlled Use Areas to identify boundaries between Units 19A and 19B as follows:

Outlet of Tincan Creek (Stoney River) straight line to High Cache Point (Hoholitna River)
straight line to Fuller Mt. (Tintnuk River) straight line to outlet of Chukowan River (Holitna
River) straight line to outlet of Salmon River (Aniak River).

ISSUE: Boundary lines, Units 19A-19B. Hunters are having a hard time identifying boundaries
between Units 19A and 19B. Main channels have moved, outlet of creeks have shifted or are
overgrown with brush.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Violation of opening and closing dates,
and also cheating. Unintentional and intentional.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Violators.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Sleetmute Traditional Council (HQ-98S-G-024)

PROPOSAL 130 - 5 AAC 92.540(5). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this
regulation in the Holitna-Hoholitna Controlled Use Area as follows:

All hides of big game animals must be salvaged and must be brought to check station or publicly
owned airports.

ISSUE: Hides of moose and caribou by hundreds and/or thousands are being wasted. Only the
hide of the breast are salvaged.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More waste.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters of wild game.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Sleetmute Traditional Council (HQ-98S-G-025)

PROPOSAL 131 - 5 AAC 92.540(6). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this
regulation in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area as follows:

Restrict the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area to resident only.

ISSUE: Current biologist is concerned of over crowding of hunters in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Certainly more restrictions will be imposed on hunting and Alaska residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska residents can hunt this area without more government interference. This way of thinking” residents first,” is used throughout the Lower 48 states.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresidents have other areas in the state to hunt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Jeff Barnett (HQ-98S-G-042)

PROPOSAL 132 - 5 AAC 92.540(6). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this regulation for the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area as follows:

Delete complete sentence from regulation book “Meat of the forequarters, hindquarters and ribs of any moose taken in the area must remain on the bone until transported out of the area.”

ISSUE: Hunters need to have the option of either boning the meat in the field, at camp, at home or not at all. Weather and location of kill varies widely and so should meat care. Is above and beyond AS 16.30.010 which does not include bones. No biological reason for such regulation.

The requirement to keep meat left on the bone originated as an access restriction. Refer to Conclusions and Recommendations by Wildlife Biologist II, in the 1990 - 1991 Game Management Unit 21D Survey - Inventory Progress Report. This was found to be more palatable when turned into a wanton waste issue and now has spread to other areas. If there truly is edible meat being left in the field, than we already have definition and penalty for wanton waste.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? “Meat of the hindquarters and forequarters” . . . is there a butcher diagram in the regulation book to show the exact cuts one should make to comply to this vague regulation? Unreasonable and difficult to enforce. Unjust cost and labor to transport unedible game parts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee (I-98S-G-031)

PROPOSAL 133 - 5 AAC 92.540(6). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this regulation in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area as follows:

Eliminate the use of air boats all tributaries of the Yukon River and restrict their use on the Yukon River.

ISSUE: Air boats used for hunting or fishing in tributaries of the Yukon River.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Noise pollution – disruption of natural habits of wildlife and water fowl – destroys nesting areas – drowns young ducks – disturbs eagles nests – disturbs hunters using traditional methods – disrupts subsistence hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wildlife in general, sport hunters and fisherman, subsistence hunters and fisherman – anyone wanting a peaceful outdoor experience.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY Ronald Murphy (I-98S-G-046)

PROPOSAL 134 - 5 AAC 92.540(6)(A) and (B). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend the Koyukuk and Kanuti Controlled Use Area regulations as follows:

There should be a five-mile expansion of the controlled use area on both sides of the Koyukuk River between the Kanuti Controlled Use Area (NWR) and the Koyukuk NWR. This expanded controlled use area would eliminate hunting by aircraft and the transportation of nonlocal hunters into the areas normally used by residents of Alatna, Allakaket, and Hughes for their traditional subsistence hunting.

ISSUE: There is tremendously unfair competition between local and nonlocal hunters for the moose population around the villages of Alatna, Allakaket, and Hughes. Since the last moose survey done in 1989, there has been a substantial decline in the moose population, thereby making it increasingly difficult for local residents to provide ample food for their communities through traditional subsistence practices.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Should the moose population continue to decline, Alatna will find it more and more difficult to adequately meet the nutritional, cultural,

social and economical needs for our community. Our very way of life will be threatened by diminished ability to follow our traditional subsistence practices.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local residents of Alatna, Allakaket, and Hughes. The declining moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonlocal hunters currently depleting the population at a rate too great to replenish.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alatna Tribal Council (HQ-98S-G-011)

PROPOSAL 135 - 5 AAC 92.540(12). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this regulation in the Wood River Controlled Use Area as follows:

Open the north end of the Wood River controlled use area. The north end of the Wood River Controlled Use Area would be as follows: Ferry Trail to Sheep Creek and Moose Creek to Mystic Mountain east of the Wood River.

ISSUE: Controlled use areas. Amend the Wood River Controlled Use Area as follows; The new Wood River controlled use area northern boundary would be Ferry Trail to Sheep Creek and Moose Creek to Mystic Mountain over to the Wood River.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be a extra high level of moose on the south side of the Rex Trail and too much hunting pressure on the north side. If it's a warm fall the moose are still up in the hills. Not in the flats, which are open now.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People from all over the state. This is a high moose population area and the Department of Fish and Game sends people here all the time. Everyone who hunts this area. This would provide an additional quality hunting area for those of the public who cannot afford air transportation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, because of bad swamps and no airstrips this area is not being used now. There is no biological reason for the Wood River Controlled Use Area other than for description. The moose population is great.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Remove all motorized restriction from the whole Wood River Controlled Use Area. Because the moose population is very healthy. Sheep are protected by horn size, and caribou season is closed except to rare permit drawings. We figured that this would be a compromise to a very old problem.

PROPOSED BY: Middle Nenana River Advisory Committee (I-98S-G-028)

The Board of Game deferred this proposal from its Winter 1998 meeting.

PROPOSAL 136 - 5 AAC 92.990. DEFINITIONS. Adopt the following definitions to apply to implementation of AS 16.05.255(e)-(g):

(_) “Harvestable Surplus” means the number of animals, estimated by the department, that can be removed by human harvest from a population or portion of a population on an annual basis without reducing the population below the population objective, preventing growth of the population toward the population objective at a rate set by the board, or altering the composition of the population in a biologically unacceptable manner.

(_) “Harvest Objective” is the human consumptive use goal set by the board in consultation with the department, and means the number of animals to be made available for human harvest from a population or portion of a population on an annual basis.

(_) “Population Objective” means the desired size of a population or portion of a population, set by the board in consultation with the department.

ISSUE: Regulations proposed to implement AS 16.05.255(e)-(g) use these terms to provide clear guidance to the board, department and public with respect to intensive management of identified big game prey populations. These definitions explain what each term means and who (i.e., department or the board) is responsible for determining the number, or range of numbers. These definitions are needed to ensure consistent application of the law and to provide sound management planning and action. Population and harvest objectives will generally be established as a range to provide high levels of human consumptive use.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE: Without clear definitions, the board’s application of the statute may be inconsistent.

WHO WILL BENEFIT: Everyone will benefit from clear, consistent definitions.

WHO WILL SUFFER: No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: Adopt the definitions into statute. This was rejected as the terms defined are used in regulations, therefore, the definitions should be in regulation.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and Department of Law at the request of the Board of Game (HQ-98W-G-043) (HQ-98S-G-096)

PROPOSAL 137- 5 AAC 99.XXX. IDENTIFIED BIG GAME PREY POPULATIONS AND OBJECTIVES. Adopt a new regulation to identify those ungulate populations that are important for providing high levels of harvest for human consumptive use, and establishing population and harvest objectives.

For purposes of implementing AS 16.05.255(e)-(g), the Board of Game has identified the following populations or portions of populations as important for providing high levels of harvest for human consumptive use and establishes the following population and harvest objectives:

Population	Population Objective	Harvest Objective
Caribou		
Delta Herd	6,000 - 8,000	300 - 500
Nelchina Herd	30,000 - 40,000	4,000 - 5,000
Macomb Herd	600 - 800	30 - 50
etc....		
Moose		
GMU 19D-East	6,000 - 8,000	300 - 400
GMU 20A	10,000 - 12,000	300 - 500
GMU 20D	8,000 - 10,000	240 - 500
etc....		

ISSUE: The board is directed by AS 16.05.255(e)-(g) to adopt regulations providing for the intensive management of “identified big game prey populations” (defined as ungulate populations identified by the Board of Game that are important for providing high levels of harvest for human consumptive use) as necessary to achieve “human consumptive use goals of the board.” To accomplish this, the board must first identify the ungulate populations that are “important for providing high levels of human consumptive use.”

To date, the board has only determined that a few populations are important for providing high levels of human consumptive use. Results of those board findings have not been codified in regulation, except in those cases where the board also adopted a wolf predation control plan.

At the November 1997 meeting, the board decided to take a comprehensive approach to implementation of the intensive management law. At the January 1998 meeting the board adopted regulations that provide specific criteria by which the board will determine which populations are important for providing high levels of human consumptive use. The board plans to apply these criteria at each upcoming regional meeting. The regulation proposed here will provide a record of the board’s determinations.

The second step in implementing AS 16.05.255(e)-(g) is for the board to establish “human consumptive use goals” for those populations. The board will examine the historic and current population size, historic and current human harvest and hunter demand for each population. Based on this information, the board will establish population and harvest objectives for these

populations. Once adopted by the board, these objectives will set the direction for management of these populations and establish the standards by which the board and department can determine whether the population is depleted, or its productivity is reduced.

Because these determinations will be the basis for management planning, regulations and subsequent action by the board under AS 16.05.255(e)-(g), the list of populations and human use goals should be adopted by the board in regulation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE: The board will continue to make decisions on intensive management in a disjunct, reactive mode. The department will not be able to plan effectively for intensive management. Important data needed by the board and department may not be collected on some populations. Board decisions will be inconsistent and subject to legal challenge.

WHO WILL BENEFIT: Everyone will benefit from having a clear understanding of which populations are important for providing high levels of human consumptive use and what the board's consumptive use goals are for these populations. Establishing these populations and objectives will enable the board and department to develop long-term management plans, with public involvement, to ensure attainment of intensive management goals.

WHO WILL SUFFER: No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: Do not codify the list of populations and objectives. This was rejected as it will not provide the same level of public participation in setting the objectives, nor ensure the objectives were as evident to all interested parties.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and Department of Law of the Board
.at the request of the Board of Game (HQ-98S-G-065)

DRAFT CALL FOR PROPOSALS
FALL 1998 BOARD OF GAME MEETING: SOUTHEAST REGION
October 23 - 28, 1998, Ketchikan, Alaska

The Alaska Board of Game is accepting proposed changes to its regulations pertaining to hunting, trapping and the use of game in the *Southeast Region* to be considered at the Fall 1998 board meeting. The Southeast Region is composed of Game Management Units 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

DEADLINE FOR PROPOSALS: 5 PM, AUGUST 7, 1998

The following regulations will be considered:

For ALL SPECIES in Game Management Units 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5:

(Chapters 84, 85, and 99 of the Alaska Administrative Code)

TRAPPING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS

SUBSISTENCE AND GENERAL HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS

***except* reauthorization of antlerless moose hunts**

CUSTOMARY AND TRADITIONAL USE FINDINGS

For statewide regulations applicable to Units 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5:

5 AAC 92.132 Bag Limit for Brown Bears

5 AAC 92.510 Areas Closed to Hunting

5 AAC 92.520 Closures and Restrictions in State Game Refuges

5 AAC 92.530 Management Areas

5 AAC 92.540 Controlled Use Areas

5 AAC 92.550 Areas Closed to Trapping

MAIL OR DELIVER PROPOSALS TO THE FOLLOWING OFFICE:

Margaret Edens, ADF&G
P O Box 25526
Juneau, AK 99802-5526
PHONE: 465-2027
FAX: 465-6094

Susan Bucknell, ADF&G
P O Box 689
Kotzebue, AK 99752
PHONE: 442-3420
FAX: 442-2420

Jim Marcotte, ADF&G
1300 College Road
Fairbanks, AK 99701-1599
PHONE: 459-7215
FAX: 474-8558

Joe Chythlook, ADF&G
P O Box 1030
Dillingham, AK 99576
PHONE: 842-5142
FAX: 842-5514

Ida Alexie, ADF&G
P O Box 1788
Bethel, AK 99559-1788
PHONE: 543-4467
FAX: 543-4477

Ann Wilkinson, ADF&G
333 Raspberry Road
Anchorage, AK 99518-1599
PHONE: 267-2354
FAX: 267-2489

WEB SITE: www.state.ak.us/local/akpages/FISH.GAME/boards

Proposal forms may be obtained from any office of the Boards Support Section. All proposals must contain an original signature. Please print or type the individual's name and an organizational name if appropriate. A fax is acceptable and considered an original. Proposals must be received in one of the above offices by the deadline (a postmark is NOT sufficient for timely receipt). Proposals are reviewed by the board's proposal review committee prior to publication. Language that is emotionally charged detracts from the substance of the proposal. It may draw opposition that may not be germane to the element(s) of the proposal and may elicit nonresponsive charges from the public/board members. The proposal review committee reserves the right to edit proposals containing offensive language. Following publication, proposal booklets will be available to advisory committees and interested members of the public for their review and comments. *If you are a person with a disability who may need a special modification in order to participate, please call 465-6095 (1-800-478-2028 text telephone) no later than two weeks before the proposal deadline.*