

ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH & GAME
Boards Support Section
PO Box 25526
Juneau AK 99802-5526

FIRST CLASS
POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT 131
JUNEAU, AK



ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
WINTER 2000
JANUARY 14-19, 2000
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

FIRST CLASS MAIL

**This publication was released
by the Department of Fish and Game
produced at a cost of
\$ 3.14 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 Margaret Edens at 465-2027 no later than December 31, 1999 to make any necessary arrangements. To correspond by text telephone (TDD) call 1-800-478-2028.

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
WINTER 2000 PROPOSAL BOOK
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

| | |
|---|----------------|
| | <u>PAGE(S)</u> |
| REVIEWER LETTER (Instructions for Commenting on Proposals)..... | i - ii |
| BOARD OF GAME MEMBERS | iii |
| BOARDS SUPPORT SECTION (Offices and Personnel) | iii |
| TENTATIVE AGENDA..... | iv |
| PROPOSALS | 1-92 |
| CALL FOR PROPOSALS FOR SPRING 2000 MEETING | 93-94 |
| BOG TENTATIVE FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE..... | 95 |
| REGULATION PROPOSAL FORM | 96 |

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

REVIEWER LETTER

DEAR REVIEWER:

The attached packet of regulatory proposals will be considered by the Alaska Board of Game at its **Winter 2000** meeting at the WestCoast International Inn, Anchorage, Alaska. The proposals generally concern changes to statewide regulations.

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 **December 31, 1999**. Receipt by this date will assure that your written comments will be published in the board workbook. Comments received after December 31 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 ensure that the comments are noted by the board members in relation to the proper proposal(s).

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, hunters, trappers, etc.).

Additional proposal booklets may be obtained at offices of the Department of Fish and Game. Also, the proposals can be found on our web page:

<http://www.state.ak.us/local/akpages/fishgame/boards/bordhome.htm>

A tentative agenda for the Winter 2000 meeting of the Board of Game is shown on page **iv**. A roadmap showing a tentative order in which proposals will be considered will be available in early January. 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 465-2027 no later than December 31, 1999. To correspond by text telephone (TDD), call 1-800-478-2028.

Sincerely,

BOARDS SUPPORT SECTION

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

(Revised November 1999)

| NAME AND ADDRESS | TERM EXPIRES |
|---------------------------|---------------------|
| Bob Churchill | 1/31/2000 |
| Mike Fleagle | 1/31/2002 |
| Lori Quakenbush, CHAIRMAN | 1/31/2000 |
| Greg Roczicka, VICE-CHAIR | 1/31/2002 |
| Walter Sampson | 1/31/2001 |
| Greg Streveler | 1/31/2002 |
| Eruk Williamson | 1/31/2001 |

BOARDS SUPPORT SECTION

Headquarters Staff

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

PHONE: 465-4110

FAX: 465-6094

Vacant, Executive Director, BOG

Margaret Edens, Regulations Specialist, BOG

Phone: 465-2027

Bertha Horton, Admin Clerk, BOG

Phone: 465-4110

Advisory Committee Coordinators

SOUTHEAST REGION

Margaret Edens
P.O. Box 25526
Juneau, AK 99802-5226
Phone: 465-2027
Fax: 465-6094

SOUTHWEST REGION

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

SOUTHCENTRAL REGION

Sherry Wright
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

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

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

TDD Phone: 1-800-478-2028

Email address: margaret_edens@fishgame.state.ak.us

TENTATIVE AGENDA
BOARD OF GAME
January 14-19, 2000
WESTCOAST INTERNATIONAL INN, ANCHORAGE, 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 January.]

Friday, January 14

8:30 AM

OPENING BUSINESS

Call to Order; Introductions of Board Members and Staff, Board Ethics Disclosure
Purpose of Meeting (overview)

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 TO TESTIFY</u> IS: 2:00 P.M, Saturday, January 15, 2000</p> |
|--|

Saturday, January 15

8:30 AM

Continue public testimony

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

Sunday, January 16 through Wednesday January 19

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 92.003. HUNTER EDUCATION AND ORIENTATION REQUIREMENTS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

Require all applicants for muzzleloader only or for muzzleloader and archery equipment only drawing permit hunts to have completed a muzzleloader hunter education certification course based upon the curriculum of the International Hunter Education association (IHEA) or approved by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game prior to submitting their application for said muzzleloader only or “primitive weapons only” drawing permit hunts.

Require all hunters using a muzzleloader to carry evidence of having completed on IHEA or Alaska Department of Fish and Game certified muzzleloader hunter education course along with their hunting license, on their person.

Rational and Arguments:

Safety Issues: In September, 1998 a 19 year old University of Alaska student lost his left hand, which was vaporized when his brand new Muzzleloader rifle exploded. It was later learned that the gun had been loaded with a charge of powder that was nearly 5 times more than that recommended by the manufacturer, and with a type of powder recommended for use in pistols only. Rather than consulting the manufacture’s user’s manual or receiving formal education and training in the use of muzzleloaders, the victim had asked his brother (who had also received no formal training in the use of muzzleloaders) to recommend a “starting load.” Although muzzleloaders are relatively simple in concept and design, the tasks of loading, shooting and maintaining muzzleloaders is much more complex than the same tasks when performed with a modern breech-loading firearm. If these tasks are not performed properly and with precision the shooter may suffer serious injury or death.

Issues Regarding Conservation and Respect for the Resources: Many hunters who do not own or use muzzleloaders apply for muzzleloader only or archery and muzzleloader only drawing permits and then purchase or borrow a muzzleloader only if they successfully draw such a permit. There is very little time between the time the hunter is notified of his or her success and the opening day of the season for a beginner to learn how to properly load and maintain the gun, to learn the limitations in both accuracy and effective range that are inherent to muzzleloaders, and to learn to shoot the muzzleloader accurately at all reasonable ranges. The unintended result of this practice may be an increased loss of game animals due to wounding.

According to data published in the “Lyman Black Powder Handbook” (Twelfth Printing, July 1997) a projectile fired from a muzzleloader with a velocity of 1200 fps may drop as much as 13.72 inches in 100 yards and as much as 35.01” (almost a full yard) at 150 yards. The muzzleloader hunter must understand the extreme ballistic arch of muzzleloader projectiles, and then practice with the muzzleloader to determine where his projectiles will group at any given range. Failure to learn the ballistic characteristics of the gun makes it impossible to place shots accurately at any range except that for which the gun is sighted “point blank”, and can result in wounding a game animal rather than cleanly killing it. That understanding and some of the practice is provided in muzzleloader hunter education courses.

Because muzzleloader projectiles lose velocity rapidly the effective range (range at which the projectile will both penetrate and expand adequately to kill the animal) is extremely limited.

Many experienced Alaskan muzzleloader hunters consider 75 yards to be the maximum effective range for moose, and 100 yards the maximum effective range for black bear, caribou, deer and similar sized animals, even when using extremely large-bore muzzleloaders (i.e., custom-built, .58 and .62 caliber guns). New, uneducated hunters who do not understand this fact may attempt shots at much longer ranges than is effective, resulting in wounding a game animal and failing to recover it.

The proposal to require muzzleloader hunter education for those applying for muzzleloader only or "primitive weapons" only drawing permit hunts is consistent with the current policies and regulations imposed upon hunters who use archery equipment.

Arguments and Rebuttal:

If Alaska requires a muzzleloader hunter education card, muzzleloader hunters from the Lower-48 might not be eligible to hunt in Alaska, and professional hunting guides and outfitters could lose money.

The IHEA muzzleloader hunter education curriculum was developed under contract by the National MuzzleLoading Rifle Association. Certification courses are taught throughout the United States and in some foreign nations. Many states already require muzzleloader hunters to complete the course before hunting with muzzleloaders. Consequently, this proposed regulation should not deter nonresident muzzleloader hunters from booking hunts in Alaska. Further, it will help ensure those nonresident hunters who are qualified to hunt Alaska's large animals safely and with respect for the resource.

Bow hunters are not required to carry their certification unless they are hunting in specified game management areas. Why should muzzleloader hunters be required to carry their cards outside of special hunts?

Because bows and arrows do not explode in the hunter's hands if they are improperly loaded. Muzzleloaders can and sometimes do.

Requiring hunter education for muzzleloader hunts will deter some hunters from taking up muzzleloader hunting.

Requiring hunter education for archers has not deterred hunters from taking up bow hunting. If anything it has encouraged an increase in the number of hunters applying for archery hunt permits and has helped ensure the future of archery hunting by ensuring that those who are afield are qualified to hunt with their equipment in an ethical and humane manner that shows respect for the resource.

There are not enough muzzleloader education instructors in Alaska to meet the demand for training that will result if hunter education is required.

The Department of Fish and Game, Division of Wildlife Conservation has already trained volunteer instructors in the main centers of the state where most muzzleloader hunters live. Several of these volunteers have expressed their willingness to travel to bush communities and villages to present the course if requested. Additionally, some DWC staff members have been trained and certified as instructor/trainers to ensure the ability to train more instructors as the

need arises. Muzzleloader hunter education clinics have already been offered in Anchorage and Fairbanks and have been well received by students.

Experienced hunters do not need additional training with muzzleloaders to be safe. Safety is not the only concern addressed in hunter education courses. Many experienced hunters do not understand the limited range and limited power of muzzleloaders. Much of this course emphasizes the limitations of muzzleloaders and stresses the importance of hunting with respect for the resource.

One of Alaska's most experienced muzzleloader hunters took the hunter education course in order to become an instructor (the author of this proposal). He learned new information that makes him a safer and more effective hunter. If one who has hunted big game with historically authentic muzzleloaders during each of the past 23 years can learn something new, any muzzleloader hunter in Alaska can learn something new.

ISSUE: New muzzleloader hunters often do not receive education about the limitations of muzzle loading firearms, nor how to safely load, shoot and maintain muzzleloaders. Some dealers and/or manufactures make advertising claims about their products which may be misleading, leaving the new muzzleloader shooter with the impression that his or her muzzleloader is much more efficient than it actually is. This lack of education is known to result in several real or perceived problems. (See Rationale and Arguments.)

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? An increasing number of unqualified hunters will continue to hunt with muzzleloaders and receive drawing permits for hunts restricted to muzzleloader or muzzleloader and archery equipment only.

Because of the above, it is probable that the department will receive an increasing number of reports of big game animals being wounded and lost by muzzleloader hunters.

Because many new muzzleloader hunters do not receive adequate or appropriate education and training, unsafe loading and maintenance practices will continue to cause an unacceptable number of serious injuries and deaths.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Muzzleloader hunters who receive the information necessary to use muzzleloaders in a safe manner that is respectful to the wildlife resources. Muzzleloader hunters also benefit from learning to maintain their equipment properly, extending the useful life of their muzzleloading firearms by many years. Muzzleloader hunters benefit by having a better understanding of their role in the management and conservation of wildlife resources. Initially muzzleloader hunters may benefit from less competition for a limited number of drawing permits, but this benefit will dissolve as more hunters complete the class and resume applying for drawing hunter permits. Muzzleloader hunters may also benefit from increased opportunities to participate in new muzzleloader hunts created by the board to provide increased hunting opportunities in areas where game populations are inadequate support harvest ticket hunts or drawing permit hunts with no restriction on the harvest tools used.

Big game animals and species, due to minimized losses due to wounding and the willingness of educated hunters to assist in wildlife management efforts (see below).

Division of Wildlife Conservation, as educated and trained hunters are more effective at meeting wildlife management objectives, are more likely to understand and accept restrictions or suggestions to help conserve wildlife (such as the suggestion that black bear hunters in the Interior focus on the harvest of large boars rather than smaller boars or females) and are more inclined to comply with rules and regulations established by the Board of Game and the Department of Fish and Game.

Wildlife Protection troopers, as educated hunters are more likely to know, understand and obey hunting laws and regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who do not own muzzleloaders but apply for drawing permit hunts with the idea of buying or borrowing a muzzleloader only if they successfully draw a permit.

Hunters who think they already know all there is to know about muzzleloaders and are unwilling to attend training.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Require muzzleloader hunter education certification only for those participating in special muzzleloader only or "primitive weapons only" drawing permit hunts. This is a "second-best" option which was rejected because it would allow untrained hunters to continue using muzzleloaders during harvest-ticket and registration permit hunts.

Require muzzleloader hunter education certification only for those hunting within a few game management units, primarily located in urban and/or highway-accessible regions. Rejected because it would allow untrained hunters to continue using muzzleloaders in game management units where law enforcement and emergency assistance are least available in the event of an accident, and where losses of animals due to wounding is least likely to be observed and reported.

PROPOSED BY: Thomas Swan (HQ-00W-G-013)

PROPOSAL 2 - 5 AAC 92.003. HUNTER EDUCATION AND ORIENTATION REQUIREMENTS. Amend this regulation to include Units 13 and 20.

(a) Beginning on August 1, 2000, a person born after January 1, 1984, must complete a certified hunter education course in order to hunt in Units 7, 14 and 15.

(b) A nonresident hunter in Unit 19(B) must have attended a department approved hunter orientation course (to include trophy recognition and meat care) or must be accompanied by a registered guide or resident family member within the second degree of kindred.

(c) Beginning on August 1, 2001, a person born after January 1, 1984, must complete a certified hunter education course in order to hunt in Units 13 and 20.

ISSUE: Game Management Units 13 and 20 are heavily hunted due to relatively easy access and close proximity to densely populated areas (Anchorage and Fairbanks). This advisory

committee has seen a marked increase in Units 13 and 20 issues. Issues ranging from moose and caribou management, predator control, ATV access and control, public safety and access to public and private lands. These are complex issues that will take combined efforts from the department, public land managers, private landowners, hunters, and the non-hunting public. Hunter education is not the answer to all your problems. It does provide the opportunity to educate young and less experienced hunters on a wide range of important topics. The program covers hunter responsibility laws and regulations, wildlife conservation and management, firearms safety, wildlife identification and game care. The key element in dealing with and correcting problems is understanding all the issues. Hunter Education programs throughout North America have earned the trust and respect of hunters and non-hunters alike. Education holds the key to the future of hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone concerned with wildlife conservation and the future of hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Everyone. The anti-hunting movement wants to stop state managed wildlife management and hunting. They use firearms safety figures, game law violations and a lack of responsible behavior among hunters as weapons against us.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow hunters to learn from trial and error. Allow wildlife management and hunting issues to be decided through the ballot process.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-027)

PROPOSAL 3 - 5 AAC 92.003. HUNTER EDUCATION AND ORIENTATION REQUIREMENTS. Amend this regulation as follows:

All hunters, regardless of age, must complete a hunter education course before they can get a hunting license or go hunting.

ISSUE: Hunter education and firearm safety. Alaska is the only state that does not require a hunter education course in order to obtain a license.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to have preventable firearm accidents and illegal moose kills.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters as it will make hunting safer and will help combat anti-hunting sentiment.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Persons in remote areas that would have a hard time getting to a course. There would have to be modifications and some sort of phase-in.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Doing it by game management unit instead of statewide. Rejected. Hunter safety is for everyone.

PROPOSED BY: Central Peninsula Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-094)

PROPOSAL 4 - 5 AAC 92.003(a) HUNTER EDUCATION AND ORIENTATION REQUIREMENTS. Amend this paragraph by adding the following:

(a) Beginning on August 1, 2000, a person born after January 1, 1984, must complete a certified hunter education course in order to hunt in Units 7, 14, and 15. Beginning on August 1, 2001, a person born after January 1, 1984, must complete a certified hunter education course in order to hunt in Units 13 and 20.

...

ISSUE: Hunter education requirements for hunters ages 16 and under will go into effect on August 1, 2000 if hunting in Units 7, 14, and 15. The development of new hunter education course materials and delivery systems now permits extension of the hunter education requirement to hunters ages 17 and under if hunting in Units 13 and 20. Extension of hunter education requirements is reasonable because Unit 13 has, for Alaska, a high hunter density, and Unit 20 has the next highest population of hunters after Units 7, 14, and 15.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaska is likely to continue to have the highest hunting accident fatality rate in the United States. Hunter education requirements applied to young hunters has resulted in more than a 75% decrease in hunting fatalities nationwide.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and non-hunters who are in the field during any hunting season benefit by reducing the chances of hunting-related firearms accidents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer. Every state except Alaska provides hunter education requirements for young hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None. This is the solution proposed by the Hunter Education Advisory Committee composed of hunter education instructors representing all regions in Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-00W-G-115)

PROPOSAL 5 - 5 AAC 92.003(b). HUNTER EDUCATION AND ORIENTATION REQUIREMENTS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

Require all nonresidents statewide, as required in Unit 19B, attend a department-approved hunter orientation course (to include trophy recognition and meat care). In addition, in the field they must be accompanied either by a registered Alaska resident guide, or resident family member within second degree of kindred.

ISSUE:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued wanton waste in and out of field due to improper identification of legal game and spoilage due to poor meat care in transportation. Make plastic bags illegal on transportation of meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The state, for fees collected for orientation course as well as improved harvesting and taking of game.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Barbara Broadwater (IIQ-00W-G-041)

PROPOSAL 6 - 5 AAC 92.035. PERMIT FOR TEMPORARY COMMERCIAL USE OF LIVE GAME.

Allow live trapping and export of two wolverine per season in Unit 21B to breeders and zoos (not “commercial purposes.”)

ISSUE: Trapping regulations do not allow live trapping and export of wolverine for sale to breeders and zoos.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers will be able to receive a higher price for their product. Breeders and zoos will be able to enhance their wolverine gene pool. Live wolverine will be more accessible to general public.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Canadian trappers and animal rights activists.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Timothy Gervais (HQ-00W-G-049)

PROPOSAL 7 - 5 AAC 92.035. PERMITS FOR TEMPORARY COMMERCIAL USE OF LIVE GAME. Amend this regulation as follows:

Permits for temporary commercial use of live game, not native or indigenous to Alaska, should be eliminated because it is contradictory allowing loopholes and cannot be enforced.

ISSUE: Businesses are being established to draw personal business and non-native game are being released and therefore not under personal custody.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Competition between the food source of native and non-native species; therefore, the loss of native species for hunters and possible

introduction of parasites and diseases because once released medical evaluations cannot be maintained as stated in statute.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? A healthy native species as well as hunters and tourists.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Business concerns that do not care about our wildlife only their own pocketbooks.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Barbara Broadwater (HQ-00W-G-044)

PROPOSAL 8 - 5AAC 92.049(a) and (b). PERMITS, PERMIT PROCEDURES, AND PERMIT CONDITIONS. Amend this regulation to include references to all permit hunts and procedures, including Tier II permit hunts.

(a) A registration, Tier II or drawing hunting permit required by this title will be issued under 5 AAC 92.050 – 5 AAC 92.052, 5 AAC 92.061–5 AAC 92.063, 5 AAC 92.067, and 5 AAC 92.070.

(b) The department shall produce an annual Tier II permit supplement, registration permit supplement and drawing permit supplement. For each permit hunt the supplement must set out the permit application procedures and permit conditions authorized under 5 AAC 92.050 – 5 AAC 92.052, 5 AAC 92.061 – 5 AAC 92.063, 5 AAC 92.067, and 5 AAC 92.070.

PROBLEM: This is a housekeeping proposal to add language clarifying the various types of permit hunts. Tier II permit hunts were established in 1990 to comply with subsistence hunt requirements, and over the years permit hunt conditions have been added and modified for all types of permit hunts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The regulations will not accurately reflect which sections refer to the various types of permit hunts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People that regularly consult regulations and requirements for the various permit hunts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-00W-G-118)

PROPOSAL 9 - 5 AAC 92.050. REQUIRED PERMIT HUNT CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES. Amend this regulation as follows:

The new regulation/policy would allow for applications for permits to be completed between (for example) April 10 – April 30. Those drawn will be notified by May 20.

ISSUE: Not enough time between the date of notification of having received a drawing permit and the opening of the hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If not solved, some individuals who have been drawn may not have sufficient time to arrange for the hunt, i.e. arrange/book flights, arrange for outfitters and guides, arrange time off from work, arrange child care, arrange coverage at their job, etc. Guides and outfitters cannot plan their seasons efficiently.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who draw a permit. Guides and outfitters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

(HQ-00W-G-098)

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Advisory Committee

(I-OOW-G-025)

PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 92.050. **REQUIRED PERMIT HUNT CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES.** Amend this regulation to include the following:

Applications for permits would be available April 1, deadline April 30, and results June 1.

ISSUE: Time schedule for applying for the drawing permits. Problems under current system: Short notice for time off work, arranging advanced travel, nonresidents lack of time to find a guide, small guide operators cannot comply with 30-day minimum for a guide use area, state losing revenue, no time to get in shape for a physically demanding hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More hunters will continue to be unhappy about the tardiness of learning if they are successful on a hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All successful hunters in planning their hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I do not see that anyone is, other than some unhappy department personnel.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Applications one year in advance. January 1, applications available. January 30, deadline. March 1 results.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/40-mile Advisory Committee

(HQ-00W-G-097)

PROPOSAL 11 - 5 AAC 92.050. **REQUIRED PERMIT HUNT CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES.** Amend this regulation as follows:

Drawing for nonresident hunts that require a guide be processed first and applicants be notified of results by June 20.

ISSUE: Timing of drawing results: A nonresident hunter applying for a permit that requires a guide (sheep, goat, bear) does not learn of a successful draw until around July 20. A guide has to apply for particular guide area 30 days in advance, before guiding in that area. If a guide applies immediately after being notified of a success draw – then add 30 days wait, almost two weeks of the hunt is over and some hunts only last 12 to 14 days. Example: DS-203, DS 124, 127, 130 and 136.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Guides applying for areas after finding out which area their hunter drew a tag in will not have enough time to qualify for that area for many of the earlier hunts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nonresident hunters and guides that are contracting those hunts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Having nonresident hunters apply for hunts requiring guides apply one year in advance.

PROPOSED BY: Copper Basin Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-095)

PROPOSAL 12 - 5 AAC 92.050. REQUIRED PERMIT HUNT CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES. Amend this regulation as follows:

If you get one drawing for any animal then you cannot be chosen for any other drawings.

ISSUE: The random (not) choice for permits. The drawings cannot be chosen randomly. If you look at the results, why would some people get 5 drawings. I have put in for them for 13 years and have never received one. Every year people receive 4 and 5 drawings. Out of staters receive three permits, I do not think that's right.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People that receive five drawings cannot use all of that meat, even if they get all the game. That is a waste and someone else could have used it.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone that puts in for drawings.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People that know people or whatever happens to receive so many drawings.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Not being allowed to receive permits for same animal but so many different animals that they still receive many permits.

PROPOSED BY: Julie M. Byman (HQ-00W-G-012)

PROPOSAL 13 - 5 AAC 92.050. REQUIRED PERMIT HUNT CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES. Amend this regulation as follows:

(9) An applicant for a “certified bowhunters only” permit hunt must have completed a department approved bowhunter education course prior to submitting a permit application.

ISSUE: In the past regulatory year the department removed the requirement for bowhunter education certification prior to applying for a “certified bowhunters only” drawing hunt. The applicant is still required to have the bowhunter education certification prior to hunting if they are successful in drawing a permit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People who draw “certified bowhunters only” drawing hunt but are not certified will demand bowhunter education certification classes after they have been notified. This will put an unrealistic demand on the all volunteer core of instructors during the summer months when they want to enjoy Alaska. The longer this certification is not mandatory before applying for a “certified bowhunter only” drawing hunt the more people will apply not having the certification and the training problem will continue to grow. If a person who is not certified before they apply for a “certified bowhunter only” drawing hunt and does not pass the certifications that drawing permit is wasted because it was not issued to a qualified individual.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Volunteer bowhunter education instructors and hunters who would like a drawing permit that could be lost if the successful applicant cannot pass the bowhunter certification course.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Almost no one because there are certification classes given through the winter and spring and the state also accepts bowhunter education certification for other states.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-091)

PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 92.050(3). REQUIRED PERMIT HUNT CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES. Amend this regulation as follows:

Eliminate the requirement that licenses be purchased prior to the drawing.

ISSUE: Buying a nonresident, nonrefundable hunting license before applying for a drawing permit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Guides will continue to find it difficult to convince prospective hunters to commit to a drawing permit hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Department of Fish and Game, transporters, guides, sport hunters; resident and nonresident.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I cannot think of anyone.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Refunding money to unsuccessful applicant. Rejected because of administrative overhead in refunding money.

PROPOSED BY: George E. Koontz (HQ-00W-G-065)

PROPOSAL 15 - 5 AAC 92.050(9). REQUIRED PERMIT HUNT CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES. Amend this regulation to include the following:

An applicant for a “Certified Bowhunters Only” permit hunt must have completed a department approved bowhunter education course prior to submitting a permit application.

ISSUE: In the past regulatory year the department removed the requirement for bowhunter education certification prior to applying for a “Certified Bowhunter Only” drawing hunt. The applicant is still required to have the bowhunter education certification prior to hunting if they are successful in drawing a permit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People that draw “Certified Bowhunter Only” drawing hunts but are not certified will demand bowhunter education certification classes after they have been notified. This will put an unrealistic demand on all volunteer core of instructors during the summer months when they want to enjoy Alaska. The longer this certification is not mandatory before applying for a “Certified Bowhunter Only” drawing hunt the more people will apply not having the certification and the training problem will continue to grow. If a person who is not certified before they apply for a “Certified Bowhunter Only” drawing hunt and does not pass the certifications, that drawing permit is wasted because it was not issued to a qualified individual.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Volunteer bowhunter education instructors and hunters who would like a drawing permit that could be lost if the successful applicant cannot pass the bowhunter certification course.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Almost no one because there are certification classes given through the winter and spring and the state also accepts bowhunter education certification from other states.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No.

PROPOSED BY: Alaskan Bowhunters Association (HQ-00W-G-077)

PROPOSAL 16 - 5 AAC 92.051. DISCRETIONARY TRAPPING PERMIT CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES. Amend this regulation to include the following:

A trapper shall check all traps set within one mile of any maintained public road once every 24 hours unless there is an unexpected emergency.

ISSUE: Road trappers are trapping and killing domestic pets and causing unnecessary suffering of trapped pets and wildlife by failing to return to their snares and traps on a frequent basis.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Pets will continue to be killed by trappers and pets and wildlife will suffer needlessly.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans who support ethical game management.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Road trappers who are too busy to return to their snares and traps every day.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Kneeland Taylor (HQ-OOW-G-073)

PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 92.051. DISCRETIONARY TRAPPING PERMIT CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES. Amend this regulation to include the following:

Trappers should report all animals killed or wounded by traps or snares.

ISSUE: Absence of data regarding incidentally killed pets and wildlife by trappers, and use of incidentally killed caribou and moose as bait by trappers.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? No data regarding incidentally killed pets and continued taking of caribou and moose for bait.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Pet owners and Alaskans who are unafraid of collecting information on incidentally killed pets and wildlife.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Alaskans who wish to prevent the collection and release of information regarding incidentally killed pets and wildlife by trappers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Friends of Animals (HQ-00W-G-086)

PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC 92.051. DISCRETIONARY TRAPPING PERMIT CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES. Amend this regulation to include the following:

Trappers should be given a number by the ADF&G and the numbers should be attached to all traps and snares. The name of the trapper shall be disclosed to any person whose domestic pet is caught in a snare or trap.

ISSUE: Inability to enforce trapping regulations, in particular the requirement that traps and snares be removed at the end of a season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Traps and snares will continue to be left year-round, posing a hazard.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Pet owners and Alaskans who believe wildlife should be responsibly managed.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trappers who wish to break the law.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Friends of Animals (HQ-00W-G-087)

PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 92.051. DISCRETIONARY TRAPPING PERMIT CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES. The following discretionary trapping permit conditions should be amended to make standard procedure:

1. A trapper will set traps and remove traps in a timely manner.
Why? Because it promotes humane treatment of and respect for our resources.
2. All traps must be labeled and registered each season. Why? Because a trapper then become more accountable for their individual actions.
3. Attend an animal ethics trapping course. Why? It would ensure that we are all being efficient and ethical in the field.

ISSUE:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone benefits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Melissa Gonzalez (HQ-00W-G-055)

PROPOSAL 20 - 5AAC 92.051. DISCRETIONARY TRAPPING PERMIT CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES and 5 AAC 92.080 (4). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS.

5 AAC 92.051. Discretionary Trapping Permit Conditions and Procedures. Amend this regulation to include the following: "All traps and snares must be registered at beginning of season. Treat the animals in a humane manner as is defined in regulation".

5 AAC 92.080(4). Unlawful Methods of Taking Game; Exceptions. Amend this regulation as follows: "Cannot use aircraft, snowmachine, motor-driven boat or other... to exhaust, drive, herd, or molest furbearers because it is inhumane and unsportsman." List this amendment before the ... "shut engine off and then shoot."

ISSUE:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Melissa Gonzalez

(HQ-00W-G-054)

PROPOSAL 21 - 5 AAC 92.052. DISCRETIONARY PERMIT HUNT CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES. Amend this regulation to include the following:

Any person applying for a permit must have in possession, at time of application, a legal hunting license and a bowhunters certification card. Both license and card numbers required on application.

ISSUE: There is no requirement for hunters to be bow certified before applying for cow permit. If it is a restricted area to bowhunting only, then the person should be completely legal before applying.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Permits may be issued to people who are not eligible to begin with and for any reason may not be certified by season, causing an ineligible hunter to lose out.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Eligible bow hunters who have been trying to get a permit for a long time and disabled people like myself to make hunting easier.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I think maybe anti-hunters maybe discouraged and I believe it is likely that if it is not non-certified hunters may get a permit and may not become certified.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? If no certification is required at time of application and a permit is awarded two weeks before the hunt, a person must show proof of certification. If none is given a secondary awardee is given the permit. Should this happen, then the secondary person must at that time show proof, but if what I recommend is adopted then this would not take place. The way I see it is if a hunting area is requiring certain requirements needed to be legal to

hunt the area, then an order to apply for the hunt in the application period the hunter must be totally legal before this period of application to apply for the hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Michael Anthony George (I-00W-G-001)

PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 92.052. DISCRETIONARY PERMIT HUNT CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES. Amend this regulation as follows:

Why not a drop box at Fish and Game building. And there should be a point system along with the drawing permits.

ISSUE: Many hunting permits are lost in the mail. Many applicants have put in for years, (many dollars spent) and no permit. with a point system eventually a permit would be awarded.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Larry Ricke (HQ-00W-G-072)

PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC 92.052(5). DISCRETIONARY PERMIT HUNT CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES. Amend this regulation as follows:

Horns or antlers of big game, taken under Tier II provisions will be removed from the skull plate (antlers) or cut through horn material (horne) before transported from kill site.

ISSUE: To eliminate trophy recognition of any big game animals taken on Tier II hunts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will apply for Tier II permits to harvest large antlered animals and enter in record books. Currently, animals taken on subsistence permits are being entered in trophy record books.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who apply for Tier II permits with primary interest in harvesting game animals for meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those individuals who apply for “late hunt” Tier II permits with the purpose of harvesting a trophy class animal.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? To require all Tier II hunters to turn in the horn/antlers of their kill. Impractical to manage.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska’s Kenai Peninsula Chapter of Safari Club International (HQ-00W-G-010)

PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC 92.052. DISCRETIONARY PERMIT HUNT CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES. Amend this regulation to delete the following condition.

The department may apply any or all of the following additional conditions to a permit hunt, when necessary for management of the species hunted:

...

[(16) A HUNTER PARTICIPATING IN A PERMIT HUNT THAT ALLOWS ONLY THE USE OF A BOW AND ARROW MUST HAVE COMPLETED A DEPARTMENT-APPROVED BOWHUNTER EDUCATION COURSE;]

PROBLEM: This is a housekeeping proposal. This discretionary hunt condition was necessary prior to the regulation in 5 AAC 92.085 which states that a hunter must have successfully completed a department-approved bowhunter education course prior to hunting in any hunt restricted to the taking of big game by archery only. The discretionary condition is no longer needed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The regulation will continue to exist in two separate areas of the regulations, and conceivably cause confusion with future amendments.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone will benefit from clearer regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-00W-G-117)

PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC 92.068. PERMIT CONDITIONS FOR HUNTING BLACK BEAR WITH DOGS. Repeal this regulation.

Black bears should not be hunted with the aid of dogs. There are plenty of people who catch bears without dogs. There is no sport in using dogs to tree bears.

ISSUE: Alternatively, do not allow people to send dogs after bears they do not intend to harvest. That is an idea. If this regulation is not repealed, so more restrictions need to be explored because this is an unfair discrimination against bears. Why can you use dogs to get bears and not deer? Aren’t there more deer than bears?

Hunters who use dogs to get black bears can adapt, or evolve to catch bears through alternative means. This is inhumane.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone would benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Dogs and their hunters would suffer the loss of seeing the chase occur. The can adapt though.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Repeal 5 AAC 92.068.

PROPOSED BY: Melissa Gonzalez (HQ-00W-G-058)

PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC 92.070. TIER II SUBSISTENCE HUNTING PERMIT POINT SYSTEM. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

The Alaska Board of Game should request the department to incorporate the term “winter population” wherever any one of the moose hunts in Unit 16B are mentioned on the supplement and application.

Example: “TM565 Unit 16B Upper Yentna – Winter population
Or = “Unit 16B South Beluga – Winter population”

Also, in the supplement on page 3, the green shaded “moose header”, incorporate the following: “In Unit 16B, your years of hunting the fall population general hunt do not apply to your score.”

ISSUE: Over 1,000 people are applying for a hunt that most have never used until recently, and do not know that “this population” as used on the application may refer to a population that they have no history of using.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Thomas Payton (HQ-00W-G-068)

PROPOSAL 27 - 5 AAC 92.070. TIER II SUBSISTENCE HUNTING PERMIT POINT SYSTEM. Amend this regulation as follows:

One Tier II permit per household, per species.

ISSUE: Too many permit applicants for number of available animals.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Tier II program will continue as is.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Households that are not now eligible to receive Tier II permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Households that now take more than one animal.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Modifying the point system would have to abolish Tier II.

PROPOSED BY: Paxon Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-019)

PROPOSAL 28 - 5 AAC 92.070. TIER II SUBSISTENCE HUNTING PERMIT POINT SYSTEM. Amend this regulation as follows:

All persons who answer the population reliance questions the same should be scored the same. The scores given to the cost of food and gas questions should be awarded points identical to the percent higher or lower. For example, an area where gas costs 25% higher, get 25% greater points than a person who lives where gas is 25% less costly.

Currently, places where gas or food is only 10 to 20% higher may receive 2 to 3 times as many points. Totally an arbitrary system.

ISSUE: Current illegal scoring system. Currently, persons who answer the Tier II questions exactly the same are awarded different amount of points. Also, the gas cost and food costs questions are not scored proportional to cost differences. Locations where gas and food costs are 20% higher may receive 2 or 3 times more points. Also, persons who indicate the exact same reliance on the game population are scored differently.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-00W-G-013)

PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 92.070. TIER II SUBSISTENCE HUNTING PERMIT POINT SYSTEM. Amend this regulation as follows:

The point system used by Alaska Department of Fish and Game to determine eligibility for subsistence should insure Alaskans living year-round in game management units be given priority, and then any remaining permits be distributed to hunters who score high on the remaining criteria.

ISSUE: Many permits are issued to individuals who just have a P.O. Box number in designated areas and/or just own land and live primarily outside subsistence areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Needy hunters who in the past have qualified on the Tier II point system, but with reduced permits issued, no longer qualify because they cannot afford to play the system. Plus, continued abuse of the point system.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans that need the meat and are subsistence users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Caribou trophy hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Barbara Broadwater (HQ-00W-G-039)

PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 92.070. TIER II SUBSISTENCE HUNTING PERMIT POINT SYSTEM. Amend this regulation to include the following:

The point system for Tier II should include a need base. Alaskans who earn more than \$25,000 - \$30,000 per year should have points subtracted off eligibility.

ISSUE: Alaskans that are need based should be given priority over those who earn excess of the aforementioned amount, then the remaining permits can be issued to qualified Tier II users with accordance to the system administered by ADF&G.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Tier II will turn into trophy hunting not subsistence as it was designed.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans that need the meat will continue to be self-reliant.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trophy hunters that can afford to buy their meat.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Barbara Broadwater (HQ-00W-G-040)

PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 92.070. TIER II SUBSISTENCE HUNTING PERMIT POINT SYSTEM. Amend this regulation to include the following:

Alaska Board of Game to adopt a definition of the term “game population” as it applies to the Tier II hunt application.

ISSUE: The state has no definition of “population.” The term population as it is used on questions 14, 15, and 16 is ambiguous. Because of that the intent of the subsistence law, i.e., Tier II has been circumvented in the Unit 16B moose hunt area. The Board of Game has recognized at least two populations of moose in Unit 16B. Only the winter population has a

C&T finding. The Department of Law has concurred. Applicants are inadvertently using their history of hunting the fall population in Unit 16B to score higher, therefore, the entire results are skewed. Of more than 1,000 applications for Unit 16B Tier II moose, only 37 permits went to residents in the hunt area. The Board of Game is incumbent to define population. This would also make intensive management more specific in other areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Thomas Payton (HQ-00W-G-070)

PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 92.070(b). TIER II SUBSISTENCE HUNTING PERMIT POINT SYSTEM. Add measurement of cost of fuel as follows:

Add the following questions to the Tier II application, and score it up to 10 points, with 2 points for each percent box. The grand total would then be up to 110 points. Question: over the past year what percentage of your cooking and home heating fuel is solid fuel, such as wood or coal? Check one box.

- 0%
- 20%
- 40%
- 60%
- 80%
- 100%

ISSUE: Although questions 17 and 18 may or may not be relevant, they are not as defining a question as the proposed question. The use of solid fuels by families or a known group of people has long been considered by anthropologists world wide as a key component of a subsistence culture or lifestyle. Therefore, it would seem reasonable, if not important, to include such a question in order to recognize those users in Alaska who are being protected by the subsistence law under Tier II.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Thomas Payton (HQ-00W-G-069)

PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 92.070(b)(2) and (3). TIER II SUBSISTENCE HUNTING PERMIT POINT SYSTEM. Amend this regulation as follows:

Delete 5 AAC 92.070(b)(2) and (3).

ISSUE: Revoke the cost of gas and cost of food as factors considered for issuing Tier II permits. Both are actually residence questions and neither is rationally related to an applicant’s reliance on a game population for sustenance. The Alaska Statute 16.05.258(b)(4)(B)(iii) questions “the ability if the subsistence user to obtain food...” 5 AAC 92.062(a)(3) contains the same language. The “cost price index” for gas and food have not been shown to relate to the ability of a subsistence user to obtain food.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levengood (I-00W-G-012)

PROPOSAL 34 - 5 AAC 92.080. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

Airboats may be used for access to a hunting area and for the retrieval and transport of game. Taking of game within 30 minutes of being on an airboat is prohibited: with this provision in place let airboats back into all areas.

ISSUE: The use of an airboat as a mobile hunting platform. One airboat on the move covers mile and miles of an area. No other all terrain vehicle can go where an airboat does. Conventional hunting methods cannot fairly compose with airboat mounted hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Every year the airboats claim more and more of the remaining areas they have not been regulated out of. By prohibiting them in some areas, the remaining areas are getting more pressure from them.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? If airboat drive-and-shoot hunting is restricted, there will be a lot more area available to conventional hunting means. Many hunters who take long trips to get away from the airboats would hunt closer to home if they knew the quality of the hunting experience was comparable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who drive their airboats around until they find a moose to harvest.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Limiting airboats in one area just relocates them to another. A distance limit from an airboat would encourage bail offs, and would not address the ceaseless cruising.

PROPOSED BY: David J. Miller (I-00W-G-007)

PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 92.080. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation to add the following:

(11) with a longbow, flatbow, recurve bow or compound bow, unless:

(A) the device for launching an arrow derives its propulsive energy solely from the bending and recovery of two limbs;

(i) the bow is hand drawn by a single and direct, uninterrupted pulling action of the shooter. The bowstring must be moved from brace height to the full draw position by the muscle power of shooter. The energy used to propel the arrow shall not be derived from any other source such as hydraulic, pneumatic, mechanical or similar devices. These limitations shall not exclude the mechanical leverage advantage provided by eccentric wheels or cams so long as the available energy stored in the bent limbs of the device is the sole result of a single, continuous, and direct pulling effort by the shooter;

(ii) the bow must be hand-held. One hand shall hold the bow and the other hand draw the bowstring. The bowstring must be moved and/or held at all points in the draw cycle entirely by the muscle power of the shooter until release. The bowstring must be released as a direct and conscious action of the shooter's either relaxing the tension of the fingers or triggering the release action of a hand-held or wrist strap release aid;

(iii) no portion of the bow's riser (handle) or any track, trough, channel or other device that attaches directly to the bow's riser contacts, supports, and/or guides the arrow from a point rearward of the bows brace height;

(iv) the bow does not have a gun-type stock or incorporating any device or mechanism that holds the bowstring at partial or full draw without the shooter's muscle power;

(B) the bow shooter is physically handicapped in which case they may be exempted from the requirements of holding or shooting the bow with their hand;

(C) the arrow is a minimum of:

(i) 20 inches in length when measured from the rearward point of the nock to the tip of the arrowhead

(ii) 300 grains in weight with the arrowhead attached.

(D) the hunter has successfully completed a department-approved bowhunter education course before hunting with a bow and arrow in any "Certified Bowhunters Only" hunts or areas and any "Restricted-Weapon" hunts or areas that incorporate a bow and arrow as a weapon for taking game.

(12) with the following equipment, devices and methods while hunting with a bow and arrow:

(A) barbed arrowhead with any portion of the rear edge of the arrowhead forming an angle less than 90 degrees with the shaft or ferrule, with the exception of mechanical/retractable arrowheads having blades that are easily retractable/moveable after deployment and arrowheads used when bow fishing;

(B) any type of electronic or battery-powered device or any type of light on, in or attached to the bow, arrow or arrowhead, with the exception of unlighted video or still cameras;

(C) scopes or other devices attached to the bow or arrow and designed or used for optical magnification or enhancement;

(D) any bow capable of shooting more than one arrow at a time;

(E) using any explosive, poison, chemical, expanding gas, substances that are deadly or temporarily incapacitate wildlife on, in, or attached to the arrow or arrowhead.

ISSUE: Because of technological advances in archery equipment, varying interpretations of the legality of certain devices and difficulty within the field enforcement of equipment regulations we believe that there is a need to rewrite the regulations relating to bowhunting equipment. This is an attempt to clearly define legal bowhunting equipment. The regulations should be clear and easy to understand, should be easy to measure and enforce in the field, should ensure minimum standards so that a well-placed arrow will be humanely lethal and should allow participation by a maximum number of people while preserving the short range, low impact aspects of bowhunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to have regulations, which prevent small stature individuals from shooting balanced effective bowhunting equipment. We will continue to have regulations which are subject to different interpretations and are difficult to measure and enforce. We will continue to see numerous out of state bowhunters come to hunt in Alaska with arrows and equipment that are illegal although they may be effective at harvesting game.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Small stature individuals like women and young bowhunters. All bowhunters and enforcement personnel, as a result of clearly defined legal bowhunting equipment.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There are many details and many individual potential areas of variations of these suggested new regulations.

PROPOSED BY: Alaskan Bowhunters Association (HQ-00W-G-076)

PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC 92.080(7). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

With the aid of a pit, fire, artificial light, any electrically [ELECTRONICALLY] operated or enhanced [NIGHT VISION] scope or sight, radio communication, cellular or satellite telephones, artificial salt lick, explosive, expanding gas arrow, barbed arrow, bomb, smoke, chemical, or a conventional steel trap with an inside jaw spread over nine inches; however, the "conibear" style trap with a jaw spread of less than 11 inches may be used;

ISSUE: This paragraph should be amended to reflect the use of current technology to gain an undue advantage over game animals when hunting/taking game. These restrictions would not affect other uses of cellular phones, etc. for safety and navigation purposes.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There is likely to be increased use of electronic equipment and electrically enhanced scopes to unfairly take game. Unrestricted use of this technology in the taking of game animals betrays the spirit, if not the letter, of “fair chase” ethics.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All legal and ethical hunters will benefit from continued hunting opportunities and the entire hunting community will benefit from eliminating unfair hunting tactics and taking undue advantage of game animals.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who wish to use modern electronic technology to increase their chance of hunting success.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-00W-G-108)

PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC 92.085. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation as follows:

Bear baiting of any kind is illegal.

ISSUE: In light of growing concern over the danger that human food habituated bears pose as potential danger to humans, black bear baiting should be abolished.

Bear baiting stations teach bears to habituate to human food, and educates them to check out bear baiting stations on a regular basis. The goal is to increase hunter opportunity. However, given that it is illegal to kill either female black bears with cubs or brown bears at bait stations, what bear baiting does for these bears is contribute to the likelihood of them becoming nuisance bears as well as increases the risk of human injury and death being caused by such bears.

Bear baiting has been banned in almost all states.

In Alaska there has been an ongoing campaign by various agencies and organizations to teach people not to habituate bears to human food because of the potential danger that this creates. Bear baiting does just the opposite, and clearly sends the wrong message.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People may be killed or injured by human food habituated bears.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All people who travel, camp or live near bear baiting stations. Those bear hunters who acknowledge that bear baiting contributes to food habituated bears, and do not employ bear baiting as a technique.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those bear hunters who employ bear baiting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There are none.

PROPOSED BY: Dr. Paul Joslin/Alaska Wildlife Alliance (HQ-00W-G-103)

PROPOSAL 38 - 5 AAC 92.085. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

Allow use of range finders including “laser” range finders. Under general hunting restrictions “methods and means” say electronic range finders may be used.

ISSUE: Alaska regulations are not specific regarding the use of laser range finders. Different interpretations of regulations can be made. Laser range finders were not even invented when the current regulations were written.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A) People may inadvertently violate our law; B) Variable interpretations by enforcement officers will be a hardship on hunters; C) Precise knowledge of range will allow hunters to choose to avoid certain long shots and be more certain of a good hit and humane kill on other shots. Animals may be wounded more often if hunters do not have range finders.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? A) Hunters – because they can be more precise in their shoot, no-shoot decisions and more accurate when they choose to shoot. B) Game animals – because there will be times when hunters will choose not to shoot knowing that the range is too great and therefore, there is less chance of wounding or unnecessarily disturbing the animal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Chapter Safari Club International (HQ-00W-G-080)

PROPOSAL 39 - 5 AAC 92.085. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

Allow disabled hunters who require a wheelchair for mobility and are at least 70% disabled to shoot caribou the same day they are airborne as outlined in AS 16.05.940.

ISSUE: Difficult access to areas and mobility at camp sites in remote areas for wheelchair bound hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Disabled hunters will continue to miss out on hunting opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Disabled hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow moose and sheep also.

PROPOSED BY: Jill Sidmore Erickson

(HQ-00W-G-034)

PROPOSAL 40 - 5AAC 92.085. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulations to include the following:

A rural resident, or a nonresident, or any resident if hiring a registered guide, and they name the guide service being hired, may apply for and receive a bait site(s)/registration permit by mail. The guide/assistant, guide/outfitter may perform the duties of establishing and removing a bait site on behalf of the client without the client being present.

ISSUE: Fish and Wildlife Protection has told me it is illegal for anyone, including a guide, to establish (place bait) at a permitted bait site unless the permittee is present, and that the permittee must personally be present to remove the bait. I respectfully disagree with their decision. As a guide and outfitter, I consider it my job to be sure the bait is placed in a legal site with legal material in accordance with the regulations/law and is ready and hopefully active when the client arrives to hunt and to be sure the bait is removed before the baiting closure deadline and the site left clean. There is a paper trail on a guided hunt. This trail currently includes the client and guide's names and addresses, dates of contact, dates in the field, species hunted, location of hunt, species taken, date of taking, hunting license number, method of transportation used, estimated pounds of meat salvaged, sex of the bear, assistant guides names, and all of much the same information on the "temporary/sealing certificates", plus color phase and bear baiting permit number. If a bait is found to be illegal in any way there is a sufficient paper trail to establish responsibility. (Please consider additional proposal addressing applying for the permit by mail particularly for non-residents hiring a guide when addressing this proposal.) Therefore it would only be prudent to allow guides/outfitters to take on this responsibility for a resident and particularly a non-resident less familiar with the laws or land status. It is our job and what they wish to pay us for.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Residents and nonresidents will be deprived of taking full advantage of guide/outfitter services. Needless restrictions will continue to hamper the hunt for all involved.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Rural residents by not having to come to town to register a bait site, suffer transportation costs or continue to establish illegal sites; urban residents hiring a guide service to prepare a legal bait site, and non residents hiring a guide to establish and have ready a legal site. By allowing this proposal to pass; less hunting pressure would be put on individual sites by guides and their clients. Fish and Wildlife Protection by dealing with fewer sites.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Fish and Wildlife Protection has a better paper trail to follow and more than one person to hold responsible for a violation.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow registered guides and their assistant to register more baits than 2 each. This would still not address the rural hunters. Did not reject. It may be unconstitutional to allow guides to have more bait sites than any resident. Removing bait station registration requirements all together. Rejected: because a minimal change in registration requirements will continue to provide legitimate biological data to the Department of Fish and Game.

PROPOSED BY: Don Duncan (I-OOW-G-023)

PROPOSAL 41 - 5 AAC 92.085. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS; and 5 AAC 92.095. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR BEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Amend these regulations as follows:

Allow any rifle scope, electric lights and mechanical calling devices for predator hunting/trapping, and bear hunting.

ISSUE: To increase moose and sheep populations, predators must be decreased.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-OOW-G-019)

PROPOSAL 42 - 5 AAC 92.085. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation as follows:

Allow baiting of all types for bears in Unit 13.

ISSUE: Bear predation control. Predation on moose, sheep and caribou.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-00W-G-014)

PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 92.085. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME.

Amend this regulation as follows:

Nonresidents should not be able to hunt big game when there is road and ATV accessibility. Their only access should be boat or plane.

ISSUE: Stricter hunting regulations along with improved infrastructure has created an increase and a more concentrated hunting pressure in accessible area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Closed seasons, shorter seasons, reduced bag limits, or permit hunts only. Basically, restrictions on Alaskans which will allow AS 16.055.255(d).

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans who are dependent on game for personal and family use for sustenance.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresidents that are trophy hunters will have access to game only by boat or plane.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Barbara Broadwater (HQ-00W-G-038)

PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 92.085. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME;

EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation as follows:

Black bear hunters hunting over a permitted bait site may hunt the same day airborne, but may not spot and stalk away from the bait site.

ISSUE: Same-day-airborne restrictions on baited black bear hunts in the spring. Flying to spot bears at a bait during the daytime would be unproductive if even possible since the bears come out in the evening

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to be restricted unnecessarily and lose most of the first night of hunting. The additional cost of flying and the loss of hunting time will continue to concentrate hunters near towns and roads.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters wishing to fly out to a bait site at more remote areas and hunt the day they arrive at their bait site without having to wait. Air taxis also benefit. One more needless regulation is removed from the books for Fish and Wildlife Protection to enforce.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Placing a time limit such as 7:00 p.m. for hunters to be on the ground. Rejected because of the logistics and scheduling with air taxis and weather, and I felt it was unnecessary.

PROPOSED BY: Don Duncan (I-00W-G-009)

PROPOSAL 45 - 5 AAC 92.085(1)(B). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation as follows:

Remove black bear from the list of big game animals which may not be hunted with muzzleloaders smaller than .54 caliber.

A .50 caliber is the most common caliber produced in both historically authentic muzzleloading rifles and so-called “modern muzzleloaders” manufactured today. A .45 caliber is the second most popular. Many Alaska muzzleloader enthusiasts would like to hunt black bear with their relatively smaller, historically authentic rifles, but the rifling of these guns is cut with a slow rate of twist designed to stabilize the flight of patched round balls. Elongated bullets (slugs) are not historically authentic projectiles for these rifles, and are not effectively stabilized by the slow rate of twist.

Alaska’s black bear are not large and are not particularly difficult to kill. In the Interior, a 400 lb. black bear is considered extremely large and rare. Muzzleloaders in the .45 to .50 caliber range have proven very effective at making humane, one-shot kills on black bear, often of much greater size, in many of the Lower 48 States in which black bear are hunted place no caliber restriction on this species and those which do generally place a minimum restriction of either .45 or .50 caliber.

The author of this proposal has personally killed a Colorado black bear in the 180 – 200 pound range with a .50 caliber patched round ball fired from a historically authentic muzzleloader. The projectile entered just behind the animal’s left shoulder. It passed through both lungs, both atria (upper chambers) of the bear’s heart, clipped the top of the bear’s liver and came to rest against the hide on the opposite of the animal’s body, delivering all available energy into the vital organs and killing the animal almost instantly.

There are no cases on record in which a hunter during modern times has lost a black bear due to wounding it with a smaller caliber muzzleloader. It is expected that alleged cases of muzzleloader wounding losses of all species will be reduced in the near future due to increased efforts in muzzleloader hunter education by the Division of Wildlife Conservation (see associated proposals).

ISSUE: Some muzzleloader hunters, especially those who are interested in preserving the historical and traditional culture of hunting in the same manner as our ancestors, are prohibited from hunting black bears (and other big game) with historically authentic muzzleloaders because most such guns are designed to shoot a patched round ball of .45 or .50 caliber.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters wishing to hunt black bear with muzzleloaders will continue to be inappropriately restricted to extremely large-caliber

muzzleloaders or to so-called “modern” muzzleloaders in circumstances where the more common .50 caliber guns are sufficiently effective.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Muzzleloader enthusiasts in hunting black bear, but unwilling or unable to afford the cost of bigger caliber muzzleloader rifles. This is especially true of those who are most interested in hunting with historically authentic muzzleloaders versus so-called “modern” in-line ignition rifles.

Beginner muzzleloader hunters would benefit from a hunting opportunity in which they can use moderately priced muzzleloaders manufactured in the most common caliber available today. By judging the quality of their experience on black bear, such hunters can decide whether or not they are interested in spending the money necessary to purchase larger caliber guns to hunt other species.

Wildlife managers in areas where black bear populations are high and who wish to encourage increased harvest of this species.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Eliminate caliber restriction for all species – Rejected as inappropriate.

PROPOSED BY: Thomas Swan (HQ-00W-G-014)

PROPOSAL 46 - 5 AAC 92.085(1)(B). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Change the current regulation to read as follows:

“You may not hunt brown/grizzly bear, black bear, moose, bison, elk, muskox or mountain goat with a muzzleloading firearm unless it fires an unjacketed lead projectile measuring .490 inches in diameter or larger.”

By using the term “muzzleloading firearm,” this proposal covers pistols and shotguns in addition to muzzleloader rifles.

Using the term “unjacketed lead projectile” excludes the use of jacketed or lightweight alloy pistol bullets in sabots.

By measuring projectile diameter instead of the firearm’s nominal bore size or bullet weight, no distinction between historically authentic round-ball and modern elongated projectiles or slugs is necessary. This eliminates the appearance of favoritism.

Restricting the projectile diameter excludes the use of small caliber pistol bullets in sabots. Although such rounds have the advantage of being very accurate at long range (greater than 100 yards) the terminal performance of small caliber pistol bullets at those longer ranges (i.e. penetration and expansion) is not particularly good. At reasonable muzzleloader hunting ranges (100 yards or less), those sabot rounds which use projectiles which meet this proposed minimum diameter restriction should perform as well as any other lead projectile of this size. It should be

noted that the International Hunter Education Association and the National Muzzleloader Rifle Association recommend against the use of pistol bullets in sabots.

Although slightly smaller than the current .54 caliber restriction, .50 caliber is the most common size muzzleloader in production today and has been used to cleanly harvest all big game species in North America. A .490 pure-lead ball weighs 180 grains, and is the size of round ball most commonly used in historically authentic muzzleloaders of .50 caliber (some shooters prefer the slightly larger .495 ball). Any lead bullet (elongated projectile) used in a .50 caliber gun will weight considerable more than round ball of the same diameter. For example, the lead bullet designed by Lyman for use in .50 caliber rifles (#504617) is a tapered projectile with a maximum diameter of .503 inches, and weighs 370 grains.

Restricting the projectile diameter results in easier law enforcement than does restricting projectile weight. To determine if a projectile is underweight, the wildlife protection trooper would need a very precise scale which is somewhat bulky, expensive, requires precise calibration and must be operated on a perfectly level surface to ensure accuracy. To measure projectile diameter requires only a common micrometer, or even a simple template made by drilling a hole of the appropriate size into a piece of metal.

The increased emphasis on Muzzleloader Hunter Education by the Division of Wildlife Conservation (which is hoped will soon be a mandatory requirement for those hunting with muzzleloaders) should serve to reduce alleged wounding losses as hunters learn the limitations of their equipment. It is doubtful that many educated hunters would choose to use a .490 round ball on very large or dangerous species (i.e. brown/grizzly bear, moose, bison) and the few who would make such a choice would do so knowing they must stalk within extremely close range for those projectiles to be effective. Therefore we believe any increase in wounding losses due to allowing a slightly smaller round ball would be negligible and in fact will be considerably less than the current practice allowing for small projectiles in sabots.

Birds are unlikely to ingest lead balls that measure almost inches in diameter and there is no case on record of waterfowl dying from lead poisoning due to a lead object of this size.

ISSUE: The current regulation restricts the bore size of rifles used to hunt some big game species with muzzleloading rifles, but does not restrict the bore size of muzzleloading pistols or shotguns. The current bore-size restriction is larger than commonly manufactured, and does not restrict the size of the projectile fired from the gun which allows the use of small bullets contained in a plastic cup (sabot) in order to fit within the larger bore of a muzzleloader. The current regulation makes a distinction between round-ball and elongated projectiles which may be construed as showing favoritism toward modern, smaller caliber projectiles over the round-ball or mini-ball (large caliber bullets) fired in historically authentic muzzleloaders.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The number of hunters using small caliber, jacketed and/or very light weight alloy pistol bullets to harvest game will almost certainly increase and will just as certainly result in increased losses of wounded big game animals.

The current weight restriction of elongated projectiles in muzzleloaders is not effectively enforced because law enforcement troopers do not carry an appropriate scale, properly calibrated

and have not been trained to use such scales accurately. If nothing is done, this lack of effective law enforcement will continue.

Some inexperienced or poorly educated and trained muzzleloader hunters may elect to use muzzleloader pistols or shotguns with projectiles which are inadequate for the humane harvest of big game animals. If so, then loss of wounded big game animals is an inevitable result.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Muzzleloader hunters who use historically authentic muzzleloaders would benefit by having a little greater variety of authentic firearms available for hunting the listed game species.

Big game animals listed in the proposal would benefit because the potential for loss due to inadequate projectile performance of under-sized projectiles (especially pistol bullets in sabots) would be minimized.

Wildlife protection troopers would benefit as this proposed regulation would be easier to enforce than a restriction based on nominal caliber or projectile weight.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters using so-called “modern” muzzleloaders designed to shoot only “sabots” loaded with small or lightweight pistol bullets. This is a very small, perhaps nonexistent group because most “modern” muzzleloaders are designed to shoot elongated projectiles of .490 inches in diameter or greater and only incidentally shoot sabots accurately. I know of no muzzleloader in production today that is designed specifically to shoot sabots to the exclusion of elongated bullets or slugs.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Elimination of caliber restriction. Rejected as inappropriate. Restrict projectiles solely on the basis of their weight. Rejected due to law enforcement difficulties. Restrict projectiles to those of .440 or larger (to accommodate those using elongated bullets or slugs with 45 caliber muzzleloaders). Rejected as being too small to humanely kill animals weighing more than about 400 lb. unless the shooter is very expert. Restrict muzzleloader hunts to only “historically” authentic side-lock firearms firing a patched round ball. Rejected as too restrictive, it would eliminate the use of historically authentic rifled-muskets of the Civil War era, which fire an elongated, hollow-based “mini-ball”, and are extremely effective hunting tools.

PROPOSED BY: Thomas Swan (HQ-00W-G-016)

PROPOSAL 47 - 5 AAC 92.085(2) and (3)(A), (B), (C), (D), and (E). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation as follows:

...

(2) with a crossbow in any area restricted to hunting by bow and arrow only or in any area restricted to hunting by bow and arrow and blackpowder only;

(3) with any bow that is hand-held and hand-drawn [A LONGBOW, RECURVE BOW, OR COMPOUND BOW], except that [UNLESS THE];

(A) deer, caribou, black bear, wolf, wolverine, and Dall sheep may be taken with such a bow having a minimum draw weight of 40 pounds, using an arrow no less than 20 inches in length, and tipped with a non-barbed broadhead having a minimum cutting diameter of 7/8" before or after impact; [WEAPON IS CAPABLE OF CASTING A BROADHEAD-TIPPED ARROW AT LEAST 175 YARDS HORIZONTALLY]

(B) elk, moose, and mountain goat may be taken with such a bow having a minimum draw weight of 50 pounds, using an arrow no less than 20 inches in length and tipped with a fixed, non-barbed broadhead having a minimum cutting diameter of 7/8" before impact; [ARROW IS TIPPED WITH A BROADHEAD OF AT LEAST 7/8" WIDTH, AND ARROW AND BROADHEAD TOGETHER WEIGHT AT LEAST ONE OUNCE (437.5 GRAINES)]

(C) brown/grizzly bear, muskox, and bison may be taken with such a bow having a minimum draw weight of 60 pounds, using an arrow no less than 20 inches in length tipped with a fixed, non-barbed broadhead having a minimum cutting diameter of 7/8" before impact; [BROADHEAD IS NOT BARBED; AND]

(D) the non-barbed broadhead and arrow together must weigh at least 300 grains; [HUNTER HAS SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED A DEPARTMENT-APPROVED BOW HUNTING COURSE FOR ANY HUNT RESTRICTING THE TAKING OF BIG GAME TO ARCHERY ONLY OR TO ARCHERY AND MUZZLELOADERS ONLY IN UNIT 8] and

(E) hunter has successfully completed a department-approved bowhunter education course for any hunt restricting the taking of big game to archery only or to archery and muzzleloaders only;

PROBLEM: Current technological developments in archery and bow hunting have rendered the current regulations out of date. Many of the technological developments are intended to make bows shoot an arrow faster, capable of shooting at game at longer ranges, and increasing bow hunter's harvest efficiency. A number of technological developments, such as ceramic and mechanical broadheads have not been adequately tested on game to insure quick and reliable takings, particularly on larger game.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Some bowhunters will use equipment which has not been proven reliable on larger game. Some bowhunters, without proper education, will exceed their capability to judge range accurately and place arrows in the vital zone of big game. Some bowhunters will use technology to increase the efficiency of bows and increase harvest of big game; the result will eventually be loss of hunter opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaskan bowhunters who wish to increase their hunting opportunity through the use of limited efficiency tools such as bows. Hunters will continue to benefit by having archery only seasons and archery-blackpowder seasons by limiting some use of advanced technology.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A few hunters who wish to use the latest technology and take longer shots at big game with bows.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Specific prohibition of technological advances such as graphite and cellophane arrows, mechanical broadheads, ceramic broadheads, and “bolt” arrows.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-00W-G-109)

PROPOSAL 48 - 5 AAC 92.085. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation as follows:

(1) with the use of a firearm other than a shotgun, blackpowder [MUZZLE-LOADING] rifle, or rifle or pistol using a centerfire cartridge, except that

(A) In Units 23 and 26, swimming caribou may be taken with a firearm using rim fire cartridges;

(B) the use of a muzzle-loading rifle or rifle capable of containing only a single centerfire cartridge loaded with blackpowder or a blackpowder substitute is prohibited for hunting brown/grizzly bear, moose, bison, elk, muskox, and mountain goat unless such a firearm is at least 45 [54] caliber or larger, [OR AT LEAST 45 CALIBER] and a 400 [250] grain or larger elongated non-jacketed bullet [SLUG] is used or is at least 54 caliber or larger and a round lead ball is used;

(C) the use of a muzzle-loading rifle or rifle capable of carrying or containing only a single centerfire cartridge loaded with blackpowder or blackpowder substitute is prohibited from taking black bear, deer, Dall sheep, caribou, wolf, and wolverine, unless such a firearm is of 45 caliber or larger and a 300 grain or larger elongated non-jacketed bullet is used or is at least 50 caliber or larger and a round lead ball is used.

~~(D)~~[(C)]the use of a blackpowder [MUZZLE-LOADING]rifle equipped with a scope exceeding 2 power magnification [DURING ANY PERMITTED, REGISTERED, OR SPECIAL SEASON HUNT FOR MUZZLE-LOADING RIFLES ONLY,] is prohibited;

...

PROBLEM: Modern technological developments in muzzle-loading rifles have made present regulations out-of-date. Without new regulations present muzzle-loading technology makes some muzzle-loading rifles as efficient as centerfire rifles. Current regulations also exclude hunters who may wish to use traditional blackpowder cartridge rifles, which have identical ballistics to muzzle-loading rifles.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Muzzle-loading hunters’ success rate may approach that of centerfire rifle hunters. Greater harvest efficiency may lead to loss of muzzle-loading only hunts and a decrease in hunting opportunity for Alaska hunters. By using traditional blackpowder loads and bullets, blackpowder hunters’ success rate will be kept below that of centerfire rifles and result in increased hunter opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskan hunters who wish to expand their time in the field through the use of blackpowder propelled firearms.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who wish to use advanced technology in blackpowder seasons to increase their chances of a successful taking.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Modern technological developments such as sabot bullets, pelletized blackpowder substitutes, and the use of sub-caliber handgun bullets in muzzleloaders could be specifically prohibited.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-00W-G-114)

PROPOSAL 49 - 5 AAC 92.085(1)(C). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME: EXCEPTIONS. Change this regulation to read as follows:

“You may not use a muzzleloading firearm equipped with a scope.”

The current regulation prohibits the use of telescopic sights on muzzleloaders used only in hunts restricted to the use of muzzleloaders or “primitive weapons” only. It does not forbid the use of scope-sighted muzzleloaders during other hunting seasons or in other hunting areas.

Muzzleloaders are close range firearms suitable for hunting animals that are less than 100 yards from the shooter. Many experienced muzzleloader hunters consider the effective range of a muzzleloader on very large animals such as moose or bison to be less than 75 yards. Telescopic sights offer no significant advantage at these close ranges.

In range estimation exercises conducted as part of some hunter education classes in Alaska, instructors have observed that even experienced muzzleloader and archery hunters find it difficult to estimate the range of targets beyond 30 to 50 yards, and most err by underestimating the range at which the target is located. A telescopic sight which magnifies the target animal makes the animal appear much closer than it actually is. This compounds the difficulty of range estimation and is likely to result in hunters underestimating the actual range to the animal and attempting to kill the animal at longer ranges beyond the effective range of muzzleloader.

Hunters with poor vision can compensate through the use of prescription eye glasses or by using a simple pinhole diopter attached to their normal eye glasses which makes it possible to focus clearly on both front and rear iron sights. Any hunter whose vision is so poor that it can not be corrected adequately to allow the use of iron sights is probably dangerously blind and should not be encouraged to use any firearm.

This proposed regulation would not prohibit the use of scope-sighted muzzleloaders to hunt small game, fur animals, unclassified game or deleterious exotic wildlife. These are generally smaller species and the use of a scope may be helpful to hunters who wish to salvage the greatest amount of meat or fur through extremely accurate bullet placement.

ISSUE: Muzzleloaders equipped with telescopic sights may encourage hunters to attempt long range shots at big game animals, resulting in the loss of wounded animals.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? An increasing number of hunters will use telescopic-sighted muzzleloader rifles and will continue attempting long-range shots, and the loss of big-game animals die to wounding will almost certainly increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Big game animals will benefit by being harvested in a cleaner, more humane manner and which will suffer fewer losses due to wounding.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Muzzleloader hunters who prefer telescopic sights.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Thomas Swan

(HQ-00W-G-015)

PROPOSAL 50 - 5 AAC 92.085. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

(3) with a longbow, flat bow, recurve bow or compound bow, unless the

(A) minimum bow peak draw weight is not less than

(ii) 40 pounds when hunting blacktail deer, wolf, wolverine, black bear, Dall sheep and caribou.

(iii) 50 pounds when hunting mountain goat, moose, elk, brown/grizzly bear, muskox and bison.

(B) a broadhead is mounted on the fore end of the arrow and

(ii) possess as two or more sharp cutting edges that can be sharpened or replaced

(iii) has a minimum of 7/8 inch cutting diameter before or after impact

(C) the type of broadhead used is:

(iv) a fixed, replaceable or mechanical/retractable type broadhead for the taking of blacktail deer, wolf, wolverine, black bear, Dall sheep and caribou

(v) only a fixed or replaceable blade-type broadhead for the taking of mountain goat, moose, elk, brown/grizzly bear, muskox and bison.

ISSUE: Because of technological advances in archery equipment, varying interpretations of the legality of certain devices and difficulty within the field enforcement of equipment regulations we believe that there is a need to rewrite the regulations relating to bowhunting equipment. This is an attempt to clearly define legal bowhunting equipment. The regulations should be clear and easy to understand, should be easy to measure and enforce in the field, should ensure minimum standards so that a well-placed arrow will be humanely lethal and should allow participation by a maximum number of people while preserving the short range, low impact aspects of bowhunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to have regulations, which prevent small stature individuals from shooting balanced, effective bowhunting equipment. We will continue to have regulations, which are subject to different interpretations

and are difficult to measure and enforce. We will continue to see numerous out of state bowhunters come to hunt in Alaska with arrows and equipment that are illegal although they may be effective at harvesting game.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Small stature individuals like women and young bowhunters. All bowhunters and enforcement personnel as a result of clearly defined legal bowhunting equipment.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There are many details and many individual potential areas of variations of these suggested new regulations.

PROPOSED BY: Alaskan Bowhunters Association (HQ-00W-G-079)

PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 92.085(4). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME: EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

...except that brown bears may be taken with the use of bait in Unit 13 with the same restrictions and season dates as baiting for black bears in Unit 13.

ISSUE: There are too many bears in Unit 13. Low calf survival due to bear predation is resulting in the depletion of the moose population which will result in a significant reduction in the allowable human harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will likely crash.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose and moose hunters have the most to gain from reversing the predator induced decline in the moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Bears and bear hunters will be most affected.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered allowing the sale of bear hides, the taking of cubs and females with cubs, as well as a department bear predation control program. There may be many tools needed to deal with the problem.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-030)

PROPOSAL 52 - 5 AAC 92.085(4). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME: EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation as follows:

You may fly and shoot same-day-airborne when baiting for black bear.

ISSUE: Black bear baiting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bear baiting hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Ronald R. Hull (HQ-99S-G-015)
(HQ-00W-G-003)

PROPOSAL 53 - 5 AAC 92.085(4)(B)(ii). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

A person may not use bait within one-quarter mile of a publicly maintained road, trail, the Alaska Railroad, or ...

ISSUE: Not including the Alaska Railroad in this regulation was an oversight that needs correcting. The one-quarter mile restriction relates to public safety. In the roadless flagstop area of the Alaska Railroad between Talkeetna and Hurricane especially, the railroad tracks are used by railroad personnel and passengers, homesteaders, recreationists.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Cabin owners, hikers, fishermen and others. This area is inhabited by both black and brown bears. Allowing bait stations adjacent to the railroad is inviting a brown bear mauling on an unsuspecting pedestrian.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The public will be safer.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The bear baiter will have to transport his bait a little further.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Daniel Elliott (HQ-00W-G-045)

PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 92.085(4)(B)(iv). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation as follows:

Make it unlawful for someone to hunt over, alter or disturb a bait station that is not registered to them without written permission from the owner of the bait station.

ISSUE: Currently, anyone wishing to hunt over a bait station, that belongs to someone else, may do so by simply writing their hunting license number on the bait station permit. This is unfair to the guy or gal who spent their hard-earned money, time and sweat to put the bait station in (especially in areas where motorized vehicles are prohibited). It also makes the bait station owner liable for any trash, mess or illegally placed stands left by other hunters. It takes a lot of work to put in a productive bait station and maintain it. It is not right that someone else can hunt and take bears over your site without your permission. They should have to do their own scouting and hard work. By placing a bait station in the area you are not precluding others from

hunting that same bear population. If they decide they must hunt in the same general area then the least they can do is move a reasonable distance away and establish their own bait station. Then let the bears decide where they are going to eat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be potential for conflicts between bait station owners and people who are too lazy to put in their own stations. This could get ugly considering both parties will be carrying weapons. This is like putting up a sign at the grocery store that says “If you want someone else to pay for your groceries you must first put them in their cart before you check out” (and it is lawful to do this so they cannot legally stop you).

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Ethical hunters who are willing to put in the time and effort to establish a productive bait station. The unethical hunters who are no longer allowed to mooch off of someone else’s hard work will also benefit in the long run because if they shoot a bear in their own, then they will at least be able to be proud of their accomplishment.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unethical hunters that are not willing put forth the effort to take a bear on their own but would rather rob someone else of the trophy that they have rightfully earned.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other viable solutions considered.

PROPOSED BY: Steve Kemper (HQ-00W-G-062)

PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 92.085(4)(B)(viii). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME. Amend this regulation as follows:

Allow a guide to submit an application for a bait registration site on behalf of any booked and licensed hunter.

- (1) Allow guided hunters and rural residents to apply by mail for a permit.
- (2) The hunter may only apply for a permit in an area that requires a baiting class if the hunter is guided that has taken the class and has a baiting class card.
- (3) Allow the guide to place the bait in the field before the hunter arrives in any area not required to have a baiting class permit

ISSUE: Baiting permit requirements for black bear baiting classes for certain units. Currently, rural residents cannot travel to attend the classes economically so they can be employed by a guide or hunt on their own. Nonresidents traveling to the state cannot take the class at all due to time constraints and class schedules. Guides wishing to guide these out-of-state clients must use only their bait permits and guides are not allowed any extra permits (only 2). Currently, the regulations do not permit guided or non-guided hunters to register by mail. Fish and Wildlife Protection says guides cannot put out their clients’ baits even if the client has a permit. Out of state nonresidents on a guided hunt should be able to register a bait station/s by mail and be able to register it in an area that requires the class if the guide, assistant is physically present at the bait during the hunt. Guides should be able to place clients’ baits out before the client arrives if the client has obtained a permit by mail. The department would need to draw up a permit request

form asking with whom the hunter is being guided by or request the rural/out of town location of the resident hunter requesting to register a bait site.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Rural residents will continue to either bait without a permit or spend hundreds of dollars to travel to town to get a site permit. Nonresidents and guides will continue to suffer needless business interruption and complication.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow registered guides and their assistants to register more baits than two each. This would still not address the rural hunters. Did not reject.

PROPOSED BY: Don Duncan (I-00W-G-010)

PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 92.085(5). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

...with the aid or use of a dog, except that a dog may be used to pack game from the field and...

ISSUE: Use of dogs for packing when hunting large game.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to miss the enjoyment and efficiency of using a working dog.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who like to use their dogs as pack animals. Hunters who may not be strong enough to pack all their meat alone. Those who might otherwise hunt alone. Those with health conditions that may prohibit them from packing much weight. The dog – otherwise might stay at home.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A (HQ-00W-G-098)

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Advisory Committee (I-00W-G-024)

PROPOSAL 57 - 5 AAC 92.085(6). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Amend to add the following:

...with the use of a trap or snare, except in Unit 13.

ISSUE: Legalize the trapping of bear in Unit 13.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A) High moose/calf mortality. B) Continued extremely dense bear populations. C) High caribou/calf mortality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunter's, caribou hunter's, trappers, and others interested in building a higher ungulate population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who want higher predator presence.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Same-day-airborne hunting of sows and cubs and increasing hunting bag limit on bears in Unit 13.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-089)

PROPOSAL 58 - 5 AAC 92.085(8). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

All occupants traveling in an airboat shall be prohibited from hunting the same day they traveled outside of a navigable waterway until 3:00 a.m. the following day.

ISSUE: Considerable increase of airboat hunting in large swampy drainages which were inaccessible during moose hunting season previous to new technology, i.e., bottom coatings, multi blade variable pitch propeller, increased horsepower, etc. The new airboats can motor far beyond the limits of the best tract rigs to areas even a float plane cannot utilize.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Over harvest in these areas resulting in lower moose populations there and in more accessible hunting areas which rely on surplus animals from healthy, previously unhuntible populations in these swampy flats.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All big game hunters who access their hunting areas by conventional means.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Possibly the airboater on waters where a stern-driven boat could travel.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Prohibiting airboats in specific areas or drainages during moose season. Would probably also have to prohibit float planes, tract rigs, etc., to have equality.

PROPOSED BY: Jack E. Windsor (I-00W-G-002)

PROPOSAL 59 - 5 AAC 92.085(10)(A). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

Electronic devices, including any type of light attached to the bow or arrow, with the exception of an unlighted video, SLR cameras, or holographic sight system;

ISSUE: Senior citizens and sight-impaired bowhunters facing difficulty focusing on a pin sight that is in their near vision and in low light conditions.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Senior citizen and sight impaired bowhunters that wear eyeglasses (particularly tri-focal lenses) may be less accurate placing that once-only available shot opportunity into a vital kill zone area using a peep sight.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters, but particularly bow-hunters as the improved accuracy using holographic sights will allow for a more humane and quicker kill and hopefully no critically wounded game animals wandering through archery-only mostly urban areas for the non-hunting public to view.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Wolves will have less prey to feed on and there will be less odds of game-animal road kills from motorists in archery-only hunt areas.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other technology available that I am aware of.

PROPOSED BY: Karl Schroeder (I-OOW-G-029)

PROPOSAL 60 - 5 AAC 92.090. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR ANIMALS.
Amend this regulation to make snaring unlawful.

Problems associated with snaring wolves: 1) Snaring wolves is inhumane. 2) Inefficient means of reducing a wolf population sustainable. 3) The popular tool for poachers, such as in Africa. 4) Perpetuates the reportedly unknown amount of non-target species injured or killed. 5) The same as snaring a black lab or German Shepherd in the sense of feeling pain and suffering.

ISSUE:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The problems listed will continue needlessly.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Our state management system. All who accept responsibility for their actions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The wolves won't anymore, people who snare will have to visit the ADF&G office more often.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Ban snaring. 2) Registration of all snares. 3) Mandate attendance to a course of ethics for snaring. 4) Limit number of snares a person can use per season. 5) Only allow wildlife biologists of the state and the feds to snare. 6) A person using a snare shall remove snare/trapping equipment from the area when trapping is completed.

I listed all the ideas I thought were reasonable.

PROPOSED BY: Melissa Gonzalez (HQ-00W-G-056)

PROPOSAL 61 - 5 AAC 92.090(3). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR ANIMALS and 5 AAC 92.095(8). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR BEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Amend these regulations to include the following:

...A person may, however, use a firearm to take or assist in taking an arctic fox, red fox, coyote or lynx called in by predator calling after having arrived at the area by aircraft.

ISSUE: Taking a fox or lynx by firearm after use of predator calling when having arrived at the area by aircraft. The intent of the same day airborne prohibition was to restrict hunters from harvesting wolves by spotting from the air, landing and shooting. Using an airplane to gain access for predator calling is no different than using a motor vehicle or snowmachine. It allows a hunter to access more remote country without jeopardizing the health of furbearer populations in areas closer to the road system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If not solved, will not be able to harvest animals lured by predator calls the same day airborne.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those skillful at predator calling and those who do not have a trap line, but would like to harvest furbearers. General benefit will dissipate some of the pressure on furbearers at or near the road system.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Mary-Beth Gardner (HQ-00W-G-048)

PROPOSAL 62 - 5 AAC 92.090(3). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR ANIMALS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

A person who has been airborne may not take or assist in taking a fur animal until after 3:00 a.m. following the day in which the flying occurred; this paragraph does not apply to the taking of wolves, coyote or squirrel if the person is at least 300 feet from the airplane at the time of the taking.

Provide greater recreational opportunities for harvesting wolves with the use of firearm while using predator calling methods on days when they have been same day airborne, if they are at least 300 feet from the airplane (the taking of coyotes by such methods is already allowed if 300 feet from the plane). Such harvest would occur under a valid hunting license. Seasons and bag limits would remain the same.

ISSUE: In many remote areas of Alaska, the only feasible method of access in early to mid-winter is by bush plane on skis and even access by this method is limited, especially in years where there is a late freeze or below average snowfall. Temperatures in November, December and January can reach 40 degrees below zero, daylight is limited to just a few hours (4-6), and weather can be unflyable for days and weeks at a time. Camping overnight is not impossible but

is extremely difficult and not without risk. Current regulations prohibit hunters and trappers from harvesting wolves that they call in on the same day that they have used an airplane to access a remote area, and as a result, a limited but very challenging, fulfilling and sporting method of harvesting wolves, and helping to manage predator populations, has been lost in areas of Alaska that are distant from the road system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wolf populations in much of Alaska are healthy while ungulate populations are declining. The limited but very challenging, fulfilling and sporting method of using prey distress and varying predator sounds to call wolves into shooting range, will continue to be lost to hunters and trappers during much of the winter in areas that are accessible only by air, unless they have access to permanent camps and structures. Such accommodations do not exist in many remote locations. The current level of hunting and trapping wolves has not resulted in a sufficient harvest level in recent years that will maintain a healthy wolf/prey ratio. Ungulate populations will continue to decline.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and trappers that do not have permanent places to stay or do not have the time and resources to spend several days, who want to call and harvest wolves in remote areas that are often times only accessible by aircraft. Even though the harvest by these methods probably would not be large, ungulate populations might benefit from a slight reduction in predation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A few more wolves would be harvested, but certainly not enough to threaten wolf populations. The current harvest of most, if not all, canine populations are well below sustained yield.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Retain the status quo which is unacceptable, especially in areas where ungulate populations are receiving heavy predation from wolves. 2) Use a distance of 600 feet for wolves. Public perception of "land-and-shoot" and "aerial hunting" of wolves has not been good. A distance of 600 feet from the plane for taking wolves might help to show the public that we are only trying to get back a very legitimate method of hunting wolves (by predator calling) in remote areas; we are not trying to create a loop hole in which to allow "land-and-shoot" or "aerial hunting."

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-022)

PROPOSAL 63 - 5 AAC 92.090(3). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR ANIMALS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

A person who has been airborne may not take or assist in taking a fur animal until after 3:00 a.m. following the day in which the flying occurred; this paragraph does not apply to the taking of coyote or squirrel if the person is at least 300 feet from the airplane at the time of the taking, or wolves while predator calling, if the person is at least 300 feet from the airplane at the time of taking.

Provide greater recreational opportunities for harvesting wolves by allowing hunters and trappers to harvest wolves with the use of a firearm while using predator calling methods on days when they have been same-day-airborne, if they are at least 300 feet from the airplane (the taking of

coyotes by such methods is already allowed if 300 feet from the plane). Such harvest would occur under a valid hunting license. Seasons and bag limits would remain the same.

ISSUE: In many remote areas of Alaska, the only feasible method of access in early to mid winter is by bush plane on skis and even access by this method is limited, especially in years where there is a late freeze or below average snowfall. Temperatures in November, December and January can reach 40 degrees below zero, daylight is limited to just a few hours (4-6), and weather can be unflyable for days and weeks at a time. Camping overnight is not impossible but is extremely difficult and not without risk. Current regulations prohibit hunters and trappers from harvesting wolves that they call in on the same day that they have used an airplane to access a remote area, and as a result, a limited but very challenging, fulfilling and sporting method of harvesting wolves, and helping to manage predator populations, has been lost in areas of Alaska that are distant from the road system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wolf populations in much of Alaska are healthy while ungulate populations are declining. The limited but very challenging, fulfilling and sporting method of using prey distress, and varying predator sounds to call wolves into shooting range will continue to be lost to hunters, and trappers during much of the winter in areas that are accessible only by air, unless they have access to permanent camps and structures. Such accommodations do not exist in many remote locations. The current level of hunting and trapping wolves has not resulted in a sufficient harvest level in recent years that will maintain a healthy wolf/prey ration. Ungulate populations will continue to decline.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and trappers that do not have permanent places to stay or do not have the time and resources to spend several days, who want to call and harvest wolves in remote areas that are often times only accessible by aircraft. Even though the harvest by these methods probably would not be large, ungulate populations might benefit from a slight reduction in predation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A few more wolves would be harvested, but certainly not enough to threaten wolf populations. The current harvest of most, if not all, canine populations are well below sustained yield.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Retain the status quo which is unacceptable, especially in areas where ungulate populations are receiving heavy predation from wolves. 2) Use a distance of 600 feet for wolves. Public perception of "land-and-shoot" and aerial hunting" of wolves has not been good. A distance of 600 feet from the plane for taking wolves, might help to show the public that we are only trying to get back a very legitimate method of hunting wolves (by predator calling) in remote areas: we are not trying to create a loop hole in which to allow "land-and-shoot" or "aerial hunting."

PROPOSED BY: Wayne Kubat (HQ-00W-G-071)

PROPOSAL 64 - 5 AAC 92.095. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR BEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

An animal must be killed (dispatched) immediately on site. Example: a wolf alive in a snare must be killed immediately in the most humane way possible.

Include in the exceptions: You cannot step on a wolf in a trap or snare as the way to kill the animal. I'm not sure what the least cruel way is to kill a wolf alive in a snare or trap, but we must set a standard that we can be proud of.

ISSUE:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Wolves will suffer less.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Ban snaring and leg-hold trapping of wolves.

PROPOSED BY: Melissa Gozalez (HQ-00W-G-052)

PROPOSAL 65 - 5 AAC 92.095. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR BEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

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 concentrations lead 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, defacto wolf control programs, moose, caribou, bears, eagles, and other wildlife will continue to be caught and killed in disproportionately high numbers. The integrity of entire ecosystem is threatened by saturation snaring.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska's wildlife, the integrity of ecosystems, and the majority of Alaskans who enjoy viewing wildlife.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trappers will not catch as many wolves in a single set but the more careful placement of snares will benefit wildlife and the ecosystems in the long run.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Alliance (SC-99-G-070)
(HQ-00W-G-001)

PROPOSAL 66 - 5 AAC 92.095(8). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR BEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

A person who has been airborne may not use a firearm to take or assist in taking an arctic fox, red fox, coyote, wolf, lynx, or wolverine until after 3:00 a.m. on the day following the day in which the flying occurred; this paragraph does not apply to a trapper using a firearm to dispatch an animal caught in a trap or snare, or in taking a coyote or wolf, if that person is over 300 feet from the airplane at the time of the taking.

Provide greater recreational opportunities for harvesting wolves by allowing hunters and trappers to harvest wolves with the use of a firearm while using predator calling methods on days when they have been same-day-airborne, if they are at least 300 feet from the airplane (the taking of coyotes by such methods is already allowed if 300 feet from the plane). Such harvest would occur under a valid trapping license. Trapping seasons and bag limits would remain the same.

ISSUE: In many remote areas of Alaska, the only feasible method of access in early to mid-winter is by bush plane on skis and even access by this method is limited, especially in years where there is a late freeze or below average snowfall. Temperatures in November, December, and January can reach 40 degrees below zero, daylight is limited to just a few hours (4-6), and weather can be unflyable for days and weeks at a time. Camping overnight is not impossible but is extremely difficult and not without risk. Current regulations prohibit hunters and trappers from harvesting wolves that they call in on the same day that they have used an airplane to access a remote area, and as a result, a limited but very challenging, fulfilling and sporting method of harvesting wolves, and helping to manage predator populations, has been lost in areas of Alaska that are distant from the road system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wolf populations in much of Alaska are healthy while ungulate populations are declining. The limited but very challenging, fulfilling and sporting method of using prey distress and varying predator sounds to call wolves into shooting range, will continue to be lost to hunters and trappers during much of the winter in areas that are accessible only by air, unless they have access to permanent camps and structures. Such accommodations do not exist in many remote locations. The current level of hunting and trapping wolves has not resulted in a sufficient harvest level in recent years that will maintain a healthy wolf/prey ratio. Ungulate populations will continue to decline.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and trappers that do not have permanent places to stay or do not have the time and resources to spend several days, who want to call and harvest wolves in remote areas that are often times only accessible by aircraft. Even though the harvest by these methods probably would not be large, ungulate populations might benefit from a slight reduction in predation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A few more wolves would be harvested, but certainly not enough to threaten wolf populations. The current harvest of most, if not all, canine populations are well below sustained yield.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Retain the status quo which is unacceptable, especially in areas where ungulate populations are receiving heavy predation from wolves. 2) Use a distance of 600 feet for wolves. Public perception of “land-and-shoot” and aerial hunting of wolves has not been good. A distance of 600 feet from the plane for taking wolves might help

to show the public that we are only trying to get back a very legitimate method of hunting wolves (by predator calling) in remote areas; we are not trying to create a loop hole in which to allow “land-and-shoot” or aerial hunting.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-023)

PROPOSAL 67 - 5 AAC 92.095(8). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FUR BEARERS; EXCEPTIONS: Amend this regulation to provide the following:

A person who has been airborne may not use a firearm to take or assist in taking an arctic fox, red fox, coyote, wolf, lynx, or wolverine until after 3:00 a.m. on the day following the day in which the flying occurred; this paragraph does not apply to a trapper using a firearm to dispatch an animal caught in a trap or snare, [OR IN] taking a coyote[,] if that person is over 300 feet from the airplane at the time of the taking, or taking wolves while predator calling, if a person is at least 300 feet from the airplane at the time of taking.

Provide greater recreational opportunities for harvesting wolves by allowing hunters and trappers to harvest wolves with the use of a firearm while using predator calling methods on days when they have been same day airborne, if they are at least 300 feet from the airplane (the taking of coyotes by such methods is already allowed if 300 feet from the plane). Such harvest would occur under a valid trapping license. Trapping seasons and bag limits would remain the same.

ISSUE: In many remote areas of Alaska, the only feasible method of access in early to mid winter is by bush plane or skis and even access by this method is limited, especially in years where there is a late freeze or below average snowfall. Temperatures in November, December, and January can reach 40 degrees below zero, daylight is limited to just a few hours (4-6), and weather can be unflyable for days and weeks at a time. Camping overnight is not impossible but is extremely difficult and not without risk. Current regulations prohibit hunters and trappers from harvesting wolves that they call in on the same day that they have used an airplane to access a remote area, and as a result, a limited but very challenging, fulfilling and sporting method of harvesting wolves, and helping to manage predator populations, has been lost in areas of Alaska that are distant from the road system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wolf populations in much of Alaska are healthy while ungulate populations are declining. The limited but very challenging, fulfilling and sporting method of using prey distress and varying predator sounds to call wolves into shooting range, will continue to be lost to hunters and trappers during much of the winter in areas that are accessible only by air, unless they have access to permanent camps and structures. Such accommodations do not exist in many remote locations. The current level of hunting and trapping wolves has not resulted in a sufficient harvest level in recent years that will maintain a healthy wolf/prey ratio. Ungulate populations will continue to decline.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and trappers that do not have permanent places to stay or do not have the time and resources to spend several days, who want to call and harvest wolves in remote areas that are often times only accessible by aircraft. Even though the harvest by these methods probably would not be large, ungulate populations might benefit from a slight reduction in predation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A few more wolves would be harvested, but certainly not enough to threaten wolf populations. The current harvest of most, if not all, canine populations are well below sustained yield.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Retain the status quo which is unacceptable, especially in areas where ungulate populations are receiving heavy predation from wolves. 2) Use a distance of 600 feet for wolves. Public perception of “land-and-shoot” and aerial hunting of wolves has not been good. A distance of 600 feet from the plane for taking wolves might help to show the public that we are only trying to get back a very legitimate method of hunting wolves (by predator calling) in remote areas; we are not trying to create a loop hole in which to allow “land-and-shoot” or aerial hunting.

PROPOSED BY: Wayne Kubat (HQ-00W-G-066)

PROPOSAL 68 - 5 AAC 92.110. CONTROL OF PREDATION BY WOLVES. Amend this regulation as follows:

There shall be no more wolf sterilization-translocation programs in Alaska.

ISSUE: No wolf sterilization-translocation program should be applied in Unit 13, and the existing program in the Forty-mile area should be stopped.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If such a program were to occur in Unit 13, it would result in large numbers of wolf deaths, contrary to the popular opinion that it is a “non-lethal” means of controlling wolves. For example, approximately 60 percent of the wolves that were translocated from the Forty-mile area onto the Kenai Peninsula as part of the sterilization-translocation program died during the first year.

Moving most of entire packs into different areas of the state is not advisable for a host of reasons. It runs the risk of introducing diseases, as was the case in the Forty-mile to Kenai experiment. Of the large number of wolves that were moved onto the Peninsula, two returned to central Alaska. One of them showed signs of being infected with lice.

Even though predator control programs are to employ “sound science and management under standards defined by the National Academy of Sciences” (Governor Tony Knowles, August 2), the translocation of wolves in the current program is being handled in a manner that is not scientific. Members of the general public are being asked in print if they would like to have more wolves in their area through introductions from the Forty-mile control program. Wolves are such rarely seen animals by ground based individuals that judgement calls as to abundance by the general public have to be considered as little more than guesses. Moreover, if wolf numbers are down in a given local, there may be good reasons why. Introducing most of entire packs in such circumstances amounts to creating ecological chaos and disruption within the local predator-prey population.

A program of wolf sterilization-translocation is not needed in Unit 13 because the current problems with both the Nelchina herd and the moose population are habitat based.

In the Forty-mile area, the goal in terms of caribou rate of increase has been exceeded more than two years running. The wolf sterilization-translocation no longer meets the criteria that were originally set as the requirements for its continuation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All people who believe that the wolf sterilization-translocation programs currently in practice in Alaska are unsound and ill-advised.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Supporters of wolf sterilization-translocation programs.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Predator control is much overused. More focus needs to be given to looking at habitat carrying capacity issues.

PROPOSED BY: Dr. Paul Joslin/Alaska Wildlife Alliance (HQ-00W-G-102)

PROPOSAL 69 - 5 AAC 92.110. CONTROL OF PREDATION BY WOLVES, 5 AAC 92.125. WOLF PREDATION CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN. Amend these regulations as follows:

There will be no aerial or ground based control of wolves and bears in Unit 13 or in any other game management unit where a biological emergency does not exist.

ISSUE: Without the presence of a biological emergency, shooting of wolves and bears from aircraft by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game should not be considered by the Board of Game (ADF&G) at this time in Unit 13 or any unit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The recommendations of the Governor of Alaska and ADF&G will have been ignored, as will the wishes of the people of Alaska, based on recent polling results.

Aerial predator control of wolves or brown bears or any predator control of these species, in Unit 13 is ill-advised because it could negatively impact the Nelchina Caribou Herd. Agency biologists have determined that the herd has mushroomed beyond its carrying capacity, exhausting both its summer and winter ranges. A combination of ground based predator control and inadequate hunting of the Nelchina Caribou Herd are thought to have played a strong role in contributing to the problem.

Biologists are aware that the moose population in Unit 13 is living in a habitat whose condition is in decline in terms of the number of moose that it can support. Moose in this region depend on fire to create the forage conditions necessary to sustain high populations. The local biologist pointed out at the Board of Game meeting last March that there had not been a substantial fire in the region in two decades. Those biologists who have noted that both the brown bears and the wolves are negatively impacting the recruitment rate of the moose population in Unit 13 should be interpreting this a benefit rather than a detriment to the population. What the predators are doing is helping to bring the moose population more in line with what the declining carrying capacity of the land can sustain.

Predator control in areas where the moose exist could have much the same impact as it had on the Nelchina Caribou Herd over utilization of the existing forage.

While aerial shooting of wolves under non-biological emergency circumstances is bad, the long term damage that can be caused by aerial gunning of brown bears is potentially worse. The National Academy of Sciences (NAS), which completed a \$320,000 two year review of wolf and bear management in Alaska in 1996, identified several reasons for concern over the management of Alaskan brown bears.

- (1) Having evolved as the largest of carnivores, occupying a niche that has shielded them from experiencing any significant adult mortality due to predation for literally hundreds of thousands of years, they are ill adapted to withstand much in the way of hunting pressure. Female brown bears take longer than any other terrestrial mammal in America to produce young. They begin their first litter only when 5-8 years of age. Litter sizes are small, averaging generally two. Brown bears go many years between litters. According to the NAS, 3 to 4 years can be considered as minimal. Some bears go many years between litters. According to the NAS, 3 to 4 years can be considered as minimal. Some bears have been documented taking as many as 9 years. The net effect of these limitations, is that brown bears take a very long time to recover if they are over hunted.
- (2) Knowledge concerning the size of local brown bear populations is often poor compared with that for other large species. Unlike moose, caribou or wolves, they cannot be accurately counted against a background of snow in winter, because they go into hibernation. Without such knowledge, it is very difficult for managers to determine how much brown bear cropping should be permitted.

In summing up its findings, NAS stated, "Wildlife policy makers in Alaska should be more sensitive to signs of overharvest and be more conservative in setting hunting regulations and designing control efforts."

It has also not gone unnoticed by a number of biologists that there are not enough range land ecologists and botanists on staff of those agencies that manage wildlife in Alaska, in contrast to the preponderance of big game and fur bearer biologists. This fact was pointed out by the NAS.

It is hoped that the Board of Game will be vigilant in not letting the natural biases of the older, more traditional biologists lead it into supporting anti-predator solutions the way that it once did. It is also hoped that it will, instead, insist on greater in-depth investigation of the changing habitat dynamics that are increasingly being shown to be the most important driving force that underlines the dynamics of most wildlife populations. What is happening to the Nelchina herd right now is a good lesson in what can happen when a combination of bad anti-predator and inadequate hunting decisions are made.

As Governor Tony Knowles recently pointed out, "We have come a long way since the disgraceful and indiscriminate wolf killings of 1994, which were done in the name of predator control. Since then, we have initiated a new approach based on the following principles: 1) sound science and management under standards defined by the National Academy of Sciences; 2) cost effectiveness; and 3) enhanced public involvement."

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? In the long run the winners will be the hunting community of Alaska, as well as all of those who believe that in a balanced ecological approach that is based on sound science, is cost effective and has adequate public involvement.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who believe that predator control is the answer whenever there is a decline in prey numbers, no matter if it is due to habitat maturation, overgrazing, overbrowsing, overhunting or excessively severe winters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? While no aerial predator control program currently exists, the recent passage of SB 74 by the state legislature makes it likely that great pressure will be placed on the Board of Game to consider such proposals.

PROPOSED BY: Dr. Paul Joslin/Alaska Wildlife Alliance (HQ-00W-G-104)

PROPOSAL 70 - 5 AAC 92.110. CONTROL OF PREDATION BY WOLVES. Amend this regulation as follows:

Private predator controls (absent federal consent) should be entirely prohibited on all federal lands designated in ANILCA as Parks, Preserves, Wildlife Refuges, National Forests, National Conservation Areas, National Recreation Areas, and as part of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. As regards private, state, and other federal lands, no private predator control program should be allowed to operate without pre-approval by the Board of Game and without close monitoring. I would suggest the following language be adopted as a regulation:

No person, association or organization shall engage in a private predator control program without first providing the Board of Game with a complete description of the private predator control program, and without first obtaining approval of the private predator control program from the Board of Game. Approval shall be given only upon a finding by the Board of Game that the program will assist the State of Alaska in realizing objectives of the State of Alaska, and if approval is given, it shall include conditions as deemed necessary by the Board of Game, including conditions which will guarantee that the program will be limited to the smallest area reasonably necessary to realize the State's objectives, and require frequent reporting so that the department may have current information regarding the conduct and progress of the program. No private predator control program which is intended or likely to operate within any area that is part of the National Park system, the National Wildlife Refuge System, a National Conservation Area, a National Recreation Area, a National Forest, or the National Wild and Scenic River System shall be approved unless the express consent of the applicable federal management agency is first obtained. For purposes of this regulation, the term "private predator control program" means the encouragement of any taking of this regulation, the term "private predator control program" means the encouragement of any taking of a wolf or bear for purposes other than defense of life or property, subsistence hunting and trapping, and recreational hunting and trapping. An example of a private predator control program is the provision of financial subsidies obtained from non-governmental sources for the purchase of wolf pelts with the intention of giving hunters and trappers financial rewards greater than those provided by the free market in wolf pelts. The term "private predator control program" does not refer to any program operated by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game or any department of the government of the United States of America.

ISSUE: In 1995-1997 an organization calling itself “ the Caribou Calf Protection Program” offered a subsidized price for wolf pelts allegedly taken from the Fortymile Control Area. The subsidized price was reported in the media to be \$400 for each pelt regardless of the condition of the pelt. The purpose of the program was said to be to reduce wolf numbers in the Fortymile Control Area, and the money for the subsidized price was reported to have been raised from individuals, business, and from national organizations including the North American Foundation for Wild Sheep, the Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturing Association, and others. Discussions off the record with representatives of ADF&G reveal that ADF&G did not know of the program until it had been in operation for a full trapping/hunting season, and that even after the program was revealed no public comment or input was taken by ADF&G regarding this program.

It has been reliably reported that at least one trapper selling wolf pelts to the buyer for the Caribou Calf Protection Program trapped wolves within the Yukon Charley Rivers National Preserve, which was outside the Fortymile Control Area, and in violation of both the Fortymile Caribou Herd Management Plan, and the provisions of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) dealing with wildlife management in National Preserves.

Representatives of the Caribou Calf Protection Program at the conclusion of their program in the Fortymile vicinity announced that they had killed approximately one-half of all the wolves in the Fortymile Control Area. However, there is no way of verifying where the wolves came from. And there is no way of knowing whether the Caribou Calf Protection Program, or other similar programs, have been or are currently operating in other parts of Alaska. No information has been made available by the Caribou Calf Protection Program representatives regarding the methods they used in assuring that wolves came from the Fortymile Control Area.

The Board of Game should address the issue of private predator control programs because it is likely that private predator control programs will operate again in the future. Indeed, one or more may be operating at present. This prediction is based on several things; the clearly expressed desire of some wolf control advocates to kill more wolves; on the comments of a representative of the Alaska Outdoor Council made in his testimony at the Spring 1999 Board of Game meeting; and because the Caribou Calf Protection Program was still in existence as late as the fall of 1998 when it made a substantial campaign contribution in opposition to Ballot Measure 9.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Private predator control programs put private individuals and organizations in the position of providing de facto management of Alaska’s publicly owned wildlife, without any public input. Furthermore, private predator control programs violate the intent of various constitutional and statutory provisions. For instance, the operation of the Caribou Calf Protection Program within the Yukon Charley Rivers National Preserve violated both the Fortymile Caribou Herd Management Plan and also ANILCA. These programs if allowed to operate on federal lands designated as conservation units by ANILCA violate the purposes expressed in ANILCA. In particular, it is a clear violation of ANILCA to allow private predator control programs to operate on lands designated in ANILCA as National Preserves. As regards state lands, private lands, and other federal lands, private predator control programs violate the intent of the common use provisions of the state constitution; that is, unless they are closely monitored and are pre-approved by the State’s public regulating bodies.

Since there is no specific regulation prohibiting private predator control programs, and since wolf control advocates have used a private predator control program in the past, it is likely that the failure of the Board of Game to act will effectively allow wolf control advocates to use private predator control programs to reduce wolf numbers, and bear numbers in the future. In particular, it is likely that incentives above and beyond the fair market value of wolf pelts will be provided to encourage the killing of wolves. Thus, the intent and goals of ANILCA and the State's common use constitutional guarantee will be violated in the future as they have been in the past. Furthermore, it is possible that wolves will be very severely limited in areas of the state where public management authorities would like to see stable or increasing wolf populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Kneeland Taylor

(HQ-99F-G-043)

(HQ-00W-G-008)

PROPOSAL 71 - 5 AAC 92.110. CONTROL OF PREDATION BY WOLVES. Amend this regulation to include the following:

A person shall not accept money or any other thing of value from a private predator control program, and a person shall not contribute money or anything of value to a private predator control program. For purposes of this regulation, the term "private predator control program" means the encouragement by any individual or organization by the use of an incentive having monetary value of any taking of a wolf, bear or coyote for the purpose of influencing the population dynamics of any wildlife species. An example of a private predator control program is the provision of financial subsidies for the purchase of wolf pelts with the intention of giving hunters and trappers financial rewards greater than those provided by the free market, so that wolf populations will be reduced and caribou populations increased. The term "private predator control program" does not refer to a program operated by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game or any department or agency of the United States of America.

ISSUE: Private predator control programs.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Private individuals and organizations will manage Alaska's wildlife outside the public process and in violation of public policy and laws.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The public.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals who wish to exterminate wolves, bears, and coyotes.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Friends of Animals

(HQ-00W-G-084)

PROPOSAL 72 - 5 AAC 92.110. CONTROL OF PREDATION BY WOLVES. Amend this regulation as follows:

If the commissioner or the commissioner’s designee establishes a wolf population regulation program in a given unit, amend the article to include: Only ADF&G qualified personnel to conduct aerial lethal tranquilization of designated wolves in Unit 13.

ISSUE: Aerial control with a shotgun is socially unacceptable.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The advantage of aerial positioning on key target wolves will be less utilized.

The preferred solution is to allow aerial lethal tranquilization of wolves. This is biologically justifiable, economically feasible, and socially acceptable. Why? Because the most humane way we can think of ending our dog’s life is to take it to the vet for a lethal injection that puts the animal to sleep. ADF&G’s trained personnel can efficiently mark and tag a wolf from the air, the animal is dead in seconds without the impact of bullet spray in non-lethal targets on body. Less suffering and a very humane way to efficiently reduce a wolf population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters of moose and caribou since the most efficient means of predator control will have been implemented. Survival of young will increase. More food for hunters and families. Wolves die quickly and humanely.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trappers do not get to participate since they were ineffective in the first place. This is a serious treatment prescription which requires professionals to take control.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Melissa Gonzalez

(HQ-00W-G-050)

PROPOSAL 73 - 5 AAC 92.110. CONTROL OF PREDATION BY WOLVES. Amend this regulation in Unit 13 as follows:

Department-issued permit to allow same-day-airborne taking of wolves; permit shall be for a 10 wolf bag limit valid for seven consecutive days. Renewable at discretion of department.

ISSUE: Excess wolf numbers in Unit 13. Twenty-five percent survival of moose and caribou calves.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Predation will continue to deplete big game herds and will continue to be controlling factor in big game harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Caribou and moose and hunters of moose and caribou, wolves.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A few ground trappers. However by targeting Unit 13A & 13E, remote areas with few major traplines, effect should be minimized.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other effective legal methods.

PROPOSED BY: Paxson Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-018)

PROPOSAL 74 - 5 AAC 92.110(g). CONTROL OF PREDATION BY WOLVES. Amend this regulation to include the following:

To the extent practicable, a person taking wolf under a wolf population reduction or wolf population regulation program must retrieve the wolf and surrender it to the state so that maximum economic and scientific value may be realized from each wolf.

ISSUE: Wolf population reduction or regulation programs can be controversial. To reduce the perception of such programs being vehicles to allow airplane hunting for an elite few, and to emphasize the special remedial nature of the program, there should be no personal gain involved.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It will be harder to achieve public support for such programs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Daniel Elliott (HQ-00W-G-046)

PROPOSAL 75 - 5 AAC 92.125. WOLF PREDATION CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN. Amend this regulation in Unit 13 as follows:

Wolf control by any means, with preference of land-and-shoot, with public participation.

ISSUE: Wolf predation in Unit 13. The population of wolves has increased from the original management goals of 150 to over 500 and increasing, while the moose and caribou populations are decreasing.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The continued decrease of moose and caribou and the ultimate closure of hunting in Unit 13.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? By issuing permits to the general public for wolf control and to allow land-and-shoot with set quotas and required notification of any harvest of wolves the general public would be able to participate in the taking of wolves and the moose and caribou populations should increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow only the department to harvest wolves.

PROPOSED BY: Copper Basin Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-096)

PROPOSAL 76 - 5 AAC 92.125. WOLF PREDATION BY CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN. Amend this regulation in Unit 13 as follows:

Allow the taking of wolves in Unit 13, subunits A, B, C, and E by designated agents of the state using land-and-shoot hunting methods. Each subunit shall have a minimum population objective that will not be exceeded. Once the population minimum has been reached (as in 1990), land-and-shoot hunting will be closed in that subunit.

ISSUE: Same-day-airborne hunting of wolves – Unit 13 only.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose and caribou populations in area may suffer. Decreased hunting opportunity. Possibly increased hunting pressure in adjacent game management units that may not be able to support increased harvests.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose and caribou populations. All hunters/families who depended on these resources for sustenance. Those who harvest the wolves through sale of wolf hides.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who do not support wolf population reduction.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Do nothing. Rejected because Unit 13 moose and caribou populations too important to the state of Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-100)

PROPOSAL 77 - 5 AAC 92.125. WOLF PREDATION CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION PLANS. Amend this regulation in Unit 13 as follows:

Sterilize the alpha pairs who have home ranges in this game management unit.

ISSUE:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Melissa Gonzalez (HQ-00W-G-053)

PROPOSAL 78 - 5 AAC 92.125. WOLF PREDATION CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN and 5 AAC 92.XXX. NEW REGULATION FOR BEAR PREDATION CONTROL. Create a new regulation as follows:

Allow same day land-and-shoot harvest of wolves and bears in Unit 13.

ISSUE: Predation on moose, sheep, and caribou.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levengood (I-00W-G-011)

PROPOSAL 79 - 5 AAC 92.125. WOLF PREDATION CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN. Amend this regulation in Unit 13 as follows:

I propose to aerial lethal injection of wolves as a means of efficiently reducing the wolf population.

This is economically feasible, socially acceptable, and biologically justifiable and sound.

ISSUE:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wolves will. The moose population hunter will harvest more moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Melissa Gonzalez (HQ-00W-G-051)

PROPOSAL 80 - 5 AAC 92.132. BAG LIMIT FOR BROWN BEARS. Amend this regulation statewide as follows:

Eliminate resident brown bear tag fee and change bag limit to one brown bear per regulatory year.

ISSUE:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A continuing growth in the bear population that is dramatically causing a decline on moose and caribou populations thus affecting positive game management. In addition, an increase on possible negative human and bear confrontations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Game population, Alaskan hunters, safety issues, and tourists who want to photograph/view all of our wildlife.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Barbara Broadwater (HQ-00W-G-043)

PROPOSAL 81 - 5 AAC 92.132. BAG LIMIT FOR BROWN BEAR. Amend this regulation for Unit 13 as follows:

Two bear bag limit, one in the spring and one in the fall.

ISSUE: Excessive population of brown bears in Unit 13.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose will continue a steady and rapid decline.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Considered three bear bag limit but considered two as reasonable.

PROPOSED BY: Mike Chapin (I-00W-G-005)

PROPOSAL 82 - 5 AAC 92.132(6). BAG LIMIT FOR BROWN BEARS. Amend this regulation as follows:

In no case may a person take more than one brown bear, statewide, in any regulatory year, except that 3 brown bears may be taken in Unit 13.

ISSUE: There are too many bears in Unit 13. Low calf survival due to bear predation is resulting in the depletion of the moose population which will result in a significant reduction in the allowable human harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will likely crash.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose and moose hunters have the most to gain from reversing the predator induced decline in the moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Bears and bear hunters will be most affected.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We have submitted other solutions.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-029)

PROPOSAL 83 - 5 AAC 92.135(a). TRANSFER OF POSSESSION. Amend this regulation as follows:

(a) Any person in possession of game or game parts shall furnish, on demand by a peace officer, the name, hunting license number, and harvest ticket or hunt permit number of the person taking the game, along with the date of kill. [A PERSON WHO GIVES OR RECEIVES GAME OR A PART OF GAME SHALL FURNISH, UPON DEMAND BY A PEACE OFFICER, A SIGNED STATEMENT DESCRIBING THE FOLLOWING: THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF EACH PERSON WHO GAVE OR RECEIVED THE GAME, WHEN AND WHERE THE GAME WAS TAKEN, AND WHAT GAME OR PART OF GAME WAS TRANSFERRED.]

5 AAC 92.135(a) is much too difficult and burdensome to comply with. Especially in the case of moose and other large game where several ferry trips may be necessary, the constant changes that are necessary with the current transfer form, are just not practical. When operating in logistically difficult to access, remote areas, and especially during inclement weather conditions, filling out a bunch of paper work is the last thing on a persons mind. If Fish & Wildlife and Protections feels that an inadequate amount of meat, etc., has been salvaged, they should investigate further, rather than cite a hunter for a minor oversight of not filling out a burdensome and complicated form, when that hunter has otherwise conducted himself appropriately.

ISSUE: We want Fish and Wildlife Protection officers to have the necessary tools in place to prosecute and enforce serious wildlife violations such as harvesting illegal animals, too many animals, not salvaging the meat, etc. But, in may cases tickets are given to hunters only for minor oversights, when hunters have otherwise complied with the intent of the law. Such actions by Fish and Wildlife Protection has caused them serious criticism and lack of support by much of the hunting public.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Many honest and well-meaning hunters will continue to be prosecuted for minor oversights when they have otherwise complied with the

intent of the law, and Fish and Wildlife Protection will continue to receive increased criticism by the hunting public. Interest in hunting itself will diminish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The hunting public in general by not having to waste time on burdensome and unnecessary paperwork that can take away from the enjoyment of hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Protection officers who like to write trivial tickets.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Have tags issued with each harvest ticket that are similar to stick on tags that airlines use. These tags could be filled out in advance with the name, hunting license number, and harvest ticket or hunt permit number of the person who took the game and the date of kill, and could be affixed to each bag of meat. Six to eight tags would be necessary for large game and two to four for smaller game. 2) Simplify it further by just requiring that the license number of the person who took the game be affixed to each bag of meat and the horns or antlers.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-024)

PROPOSAL 84 - 5 AAC 92.135. TRANSFER OF POSSESSION. Amend this regulation to include the following:

Include two specific parts transferred per section. One labeled “specific parts transferred permanently” and one labeled “specific parts transferred temporarily for transport.” Below each one of those two sections include a space for “expected routing.” For example: expected routing for “temporary for transport” ... to pilot Tom to Koliganek to Pilot Jim of Shaws Air to Dillingham, to Dave to the butcher Lennie.

Expected routing for “transfer permanent”... To pilot Tom to be given to Lee in Koliganek. Eliminate the need for every handler’s name and address and the need for the donor to have a recipient’s signature on the donor’s form if the two are not in the field together.

ISSUE: Having to fill out multiple “transfer of possession” forms for normal routing of meat leaving the field. The form needs to be rewritten to reduce paper work meat does not always go to the same place or to the same person or follow the same routing or at the same time. A recipient in a village cannot sign the form until he gets it (the form and/or the meat).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued waste of time and paper that could lead to a “paperwork violation.” Hunters can suffer “paperwork violations.”

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone. Fish and Wildlife Protection officers have a paper trail and routing to see without having to fill out four forms for each transfer and obtain four signatures of persons not readily available when the meat actually leaves the field. And to have to return the signed form to the hunter still in the field.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Asking the state to provide carbon copy quadruplicate forms so each recipient could retain a copy with out having to fill out all the information over and over and over. I did not reject this idea. 2) Eliminate the paper work requirement all together. Did not reject because wanton waste is already a violation. The hunter should be able to identify verbally what happened to what, who took what where, etc... to any Fish and Wildlife Protection officer upon request.

PROPOSED BY: Don Ducan (I-00W-G-008)

PROPOSAL 85 - 5 AAC 92.135. TRANSFER OF POSSESSION. Revoke this regulation.

ISSUE:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters who routinely assist each other in transporting hunting gear and harvested game are harassed and made criminals for no reasonable purpose. Either the animal was properly tagged, or not, and the transfer regulation is unneeded.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-00W-G-017)

PROPOSAL 86 - 5 AAC 92.150. EVIDENCE OF SEX AND IDENTITY. Amend this regulation as follows:

Drop the evidence of sex requirement for ungulates. It is okay to keep it for bear shins where there is a biologic reason for checking it.

ISSUE: Leaving “evidence of sex” attached to good meat is a nuisance and totally unnecessary regulation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to be harassed by overzealous enforcement agents when their only violation is inadvertently cutting off evidence of sex. Hunters will continue to have the nuisance of preserving and protecting and carrying out portions of the animal’s anatomy which the hunter has no use for.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters – it will remove an unnecessary regulation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Possibly the overzealous enforcement officers who will lose a quick easy “bust.” It should be noted, however, that if they suspect that the meat being brought out is from a different animal than the horns, they could demand sufficient samples of meat to send in for DNA analysis to determine sex and if all the meat come from on animal.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Chapter Safari Club International (HQ-00W-G-081)

PROPOSAL 87 - 5 AAC 92.150(a)(b) and (c). EVIDENCE OF SEX AND IDENTITY.
Amend this regulation as follows:

(a) Anyone who possesses or transports a mountain sheep, must to the extent possible, keep both horns with the animal, but if this is not possible, that person must be able to account for, and/or present by the last load, both horns, if asked to do so by a peace officer of the state or a federal fish and wildlife agent. [NO PERSON MAY POSSESS OR TRANSPORT A MOUNTAIN SHEEP UNLESS BOTH HORNS ACCOMPANY THE ANIMAL]

(b) If the taking of a big game animal, except sheep, is restricted to one sex, no person may possess or transport the carcass of an animal unless sufficient portions of the external sex organs remain attached to indicate conclusively the sex of the animal; however, this section does not apply to the carcass of a big game animal that has been cut and placed in storage or otherwise prepared for consumption upon arrival at the location where it is to be consumed.

(c) If a big game bag limit includes an antler size or configuration restriction, any person possessing or transporting the carcass or its parts, must be able to account for and/or present by the last load, both antlers if asked to do so by a peace officer of the state or a federal fish and wildlife agent. [NO PERSON MAY POSSES OR TRANSPORT THE BIG GAME CARCASS OR ITS PARTS UNLESS BOTH ANTLERS ACCOMPANY THE CARCASS OR ITS PARTS.] A person possessing a set of moose antlers with less that the required number of brow tines on one antler shall leave the antlers naturally attached to the unbroken, uncut skull plate. This subsection does not apply to a big game carcass or its parts that has been cut and placed in storage or otherwise prepared for consumption after arrival at the place where it is to be stored or consumed.

5 AAC 92.150 is much too difficult and burdensome to comply with. Subsection (a) as written, requires a hunter to pack a whole sheep and horns in one trip; most often this is not possible. Subsection (b) and (c) in some cases require both evidence of sex and antlers or horns, when often times just one would be sufficient. Subsection (c) as written would require you to haul moose antlers, and the meat all at once under certain situations. Also, moose antlers have to be flown externally from some remote spike camps and waiting for calm enough wind conditions so antlers can be flown with the meat would cause delay in getting the meat out, with possible spoilage resulting.

ISSUE: 5 AAC 92.150 and 5 AAC 92.220 seem to conflict with each other. We want Fish and Wildlife Protection officers to have the necessary tools in place to prosecute and enforce serious wildlife violations such as harvesting illegal animals, too many animals not salvaging the meat, etc., but in many cases, tickets are given to hunters only for minor oversights. If Fish and Wildlife Protection feels that an illegal animal has been taken, they should investigate further, rather than only cite a hunter for not complying to the exact letter of the law (such as forgetting to leave evidence of sex attached to the meat), on a burdensome and complicated regulation,

when the hunter has otherwise complied with the intent of the law. Such actions by Fish and Wildlife Protection has caused them serious criticism and lack of support by much of the hunting public.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Many honest and well-meaning hunters will continue to be prosecuted from minor oversights and Fish and Wildlife Protection will continue to receive increased criticism by the hunting public. Interest in hunting itself will diminish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The hunting public in general by not having to worry about how to comply with regulations that under some conditions are impossible to comply with.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, and this really should not matter to Fish and Wildlife Protection, because if they think a major law has been broken, they should not be satisfied with only writing a ticket for a minor citation.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? This is a pretty complex and complicated section and there are many variations to hunting terms and conditions for different species and in different areas. Perhaps take a hard look and rewrite or perhaps add other sections that deal with some of the concerns mentioned in paragraph one of this proposal.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-025)

PROPOSAL 88 - 5 AAC 92.150(a), (b) and (c). EVIDENCE OF SEX AND IDENTITY. Amend subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this regulation as follows:

- a) Anyone who possess or transports a mountain sheep, must to the extent possible keep both horns with the animal, but if this isn't possible, that person must be able to account for and/or present by the last load, both horns, if asked to do so by a peace officer of the state or a federal fish and wildlife agent. [NO PERSON MAY POSSESS OR TRANSPORT A MOUNTAIN SHEEP UNLESS BOTH HORNS ACCOMPANY THE ANIMAL.]
- b) If the taking of a big game animal, except sheep, is restricted to one sex, and if the horns or antlers have been salvaged but alone do not indicate conclusively the sex of the animal, no person may possess or transport the carcass of an animal unless sufficient portions of the external sex organs accompany the meat [REMAIN ATTACHED] to indicate conclusively the sex of the animal; however, this section does not apply to the carcass of a big game animal that has been cut and placed in storage or otherwise prepared for consumption upon arrival at the location where it is to be consumed.
- c) If a big game bag limit includes an antler size or configuration restriction, any person possessing or transporting the carcass or its parts, must be able to account for and/or present by the last load, both antlers if asked to do by a peace officer of the state or a federal fish and wildlife agent. [NO PERSON MAY POSSES OR TRANSPORT THE BIG GAME CARCASS OR ITS PARTS UNLESS BOTH ANTLERS ACCOMPANY THE CARCASS OR IT PARTS]. A person possessing a set of moose antlers with less than the required number of brow tines on one antler shall leave the antlers naturally attached to the unbroken,

uncut skull plate. This subsection does not apply to a big game carcass or its parts that have been cut and placed in storage or otherwise prepared for consumption after arrival at the place where it is to be stored or consumed.

ISSUE: 5 AAC 92.150 is much too difficult and burdensome to comply with. Subsection (a) as written, requires a hunter to pack a whole sheep and horns in one trip; most often this is not possible. Subsections (b) and (c) in some cases require both evidence of sex and antlers or horns, when often times just one would be sufficient. If a hunter shoots a 60-inch bull moose and saves the antlers, it shouldn't be necessary to cite him for not leaving evidence of sex attached due to a minor oversight. Subsection (c) as written requires a person to haul moose antlers and the meat all at once under certain situations. Moose antlers have to be flown externally from some remote spike camps and waiting for calm enough wind conditions so antlers can be flown with the meat would cause delay in getting the meat out, with possible spoilage resulting. Also, regulation 5 AAC 92.150 conflicts with 5 AAC 92.220.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Wayne Kubat (HQ-00W-G-067)

PROPOSAL 89 - 5 AAC 92.150(c). EVIDENCE OF SEX AND IDENTITY. Amend this regulation as follows:

If a big game bag limit includes an antler size or configuration restriction, the antlers of any big game animal taken in that hunt must be salvaged. A person possessing a set of moose antlers with less than the required number of brow tines on one antler shall leave the antlers naturally attached to the unbroken, uncut skull plate. This subsection does not apply to a big game carcass, or its parts, that has been cut and placed in storage or otherwise prepared for consumption after arrival at the place where it is to be stored or consumed.

ISSUE: I believe the above regulation strongly contradicts 5AAC 92.220(e). I further believe that together they make it impossible for anyone to legally harvest or salvage a moose (when hunting in an antler-restricted area) who cannot physically transport the entire moose, antlers, and cape, all at once, in one trip. One regulation makes it illegal to move the antlers from the kill site at all before all of the meat has been transported to the fly-out spot, or out of the field etc. The other regulation makes it illegal to transport or possess any part of the animal without physically being in possession of the antlers. A brief inquiry with any wildlife protection officer should confirm that most, if not almost all of these particular hunters, need to relay loads of meat in order to salvage it. Especially if someone was using a small boat or snowmachine, and had to travel a fair distance with each load, he would certainly at times be in possession of parts of an animal without the antlers. I suppose one might say that if the antlers are at the kill site, then he may be in possession of them. However, when we interpret "possession" as it pertains to your

hunting license, harvest ticket, meat transfer of possession forms, etc., I believe we all assume it means that we are in immediate physical possession of them, and that if we are back at the kill site, or at camp, or somewhere else, then we would not qualify as in possession. Many times one must come out of the field with only part of the animal. (Using a supercub or other small craft).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to have laws on the books that contradict one another. Responsible hunters hunting in antler restricted areas, cannot and will not be able to legally move their animal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Obviously everybody.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. The law would not contradict itself.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other reasonable way that I can think of .

PROPOSED BY: George Siavelis (HQ-00W-G-006)

PROPOSAL 90 - 5 AAC 92.160. MARKED OR TAGGED GAME. Amend this regulation as follows:

Remove the requirement of the harvester to turn in the collars. This would allow the state to purchase collars from harvesters who have taken collared animals.

ISSUE: Trappers unable to experience optimum economic return for their harvest of animals collared by ADF&G, Division of Wildlife Conservation, during studies.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Trappers unable to experience optimum economic return for their harvest of animals collared by the Division of Wildlife Conservation during studies.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Harvesters of collared animals. The Alaska Division of Wildlife Conservation could retrieve more of their research equipment and data collection. The enforcement personnel would spend less time in tracking down discarded collars.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The Division of Wildlife Conservation may have some impact on yearly budget.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Legislative changes to provide the Division of Wildlife Conservation to offer a reward for collars turned to the state.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-092)

PROPOSAL 91 - 5 AAC 92.200(b)(2). PURCHASE AND SALE OF GAME. Amend this regulation as follows:

Remove the restriction on the sale of parts from legally taken bear in Unit 13. Any part of a bear, except in Unit 13.

ISSUE: Legalize the sale of parts from legally taken bear in Unit 13.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued decrease of the moose and caribou populations due to bear predation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters and other users who like to see higher moose and caribou populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Same day airborne hunting of sows and cubs and increasing bag limit on bears in Unit 13.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-090)

PROPOSAL 92 - 5 AAC 92.260. TAKING CUB BEAR AND FEMALE BEARS WITH CUBS PROHIBITED. Change this regulation to allow harvest of female bears accompanied by other bears older than 1 year.

ISSUE: Confusion of hunters and high bear population. Currently, adult female bears accompanied by 2, 3, and 4 year old offspring (nearly as large as the sow) are believed not to be able to be harvested.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-00W-G-018)

PROPOSAL 93 - 5 AAC 92.410(b) and (c). TAKING GAME IN DEFENSE OF LIFE OR PROPERTY. Amend this regulation as follows:

(b) Game taken in defense of life or property is the property of the state. A person taking such game shall immediately salvage the meat or, in the case of a black bear, wolf, wolverine, or coyote, shall salvage the hide, and shall immediately surrender the salvaged meat or hide to the department. In the case of a brown bear in Units 1-17, 19-21, 24, 25, and 26B and C, the hide and skull must be immediately delivered to the department. A surrendered hide and skull of a brown or black bear must be completely removed from the carcass and [A SURRENDERED BEAR HIDE] must include attached claws. A person taking game, except brown bear in Units 18, 22,

23, and 26(A), under this section shall notify the department of the taking immediately, and within 15 days after the taking shall submit to the department a completed questionnaire concerning the circumstances of the taking. In the case of a brown bear taken in Units 18, 22, 23, and 26A, the claws and some portion of the skin of the head must be immediately delivered to the department. A person taking a brown bear in Units 18, 22, 23, and 26A under this section shall notify the department of the taking immediately, and explain the circumstances of the taking.

(c) As used in this section, "property" means

- (1) a dwelling, permanent or temporary;
- (2) an aircraft, boat, automobile, or other conveyance;
- (3) a domesticated animal;
- (4) other property of substantial value necessary for the livelihood or survival of the owner, including cut and drying fish, fish drying racks, and fish and meat storage facilities.

PROBLEM: Liberalized hunting regulations address bear populations as a whole, without targeting the specific bears that are involved in an increasing number of bear/human conflicts near fish camps and other similar facilities. People in many parts of the state are hesitant to deal with bears that are invading their camps, due to misunderstanding of the DLP requirements, and fear of prosecution. Relaxation of the current requirements in the north and western part of the state will allow people to deal with bears that no longer fear humans, and have developed a taste for other food sources.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bears will continue to be a problem in the northwestern part of the state, with human/bear conflicts increasing.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who depend upon subsistence meat and fish for their livelihood.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? More liberal bear hunting seasons, which would impact the entire bear population, not just the bears that are causing problems and have become habituated to other food sources.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-00W-G-110)

PROPOSAL 94 - 5 AAC 92.990. **DEFINITIONS:** Change these definitions as follows:

“arrow” means a fletched projectile of not less than 20 inches in length when measured from the rearward point of the nock to the tip of the arrowhead and not less than 300 grains in weight with the arrowhead attached;

“barbed arrowhead” means an arrowhead with any portion of the rear edge of the arrowhead forming an angle less than 90-degrees with the shaft or ferrule, with the exception of, mechanical or retractable arrowheads, and arrowheads used when bow fishing;

“bow” means long bow, flat bow, recurve bow or compound bow, not a crossbow;

“bow peak draw weight” means the peak poundage at which the bow is drawn through or held at full draw by the shooter at the shooters draw length;

“brace height” means the distance measured at a 90 degree angle from the back of the bow’s hand grip to the bowstring when the bow is strung;

“fixed or replaceable blade broadhead” means an arrowhead with two or more sharp cutting edges with fixed or replaceable blades having a minimum cutting diameter of not less than 7/8 inch;

“mechanical or retractable broadhead” means an arrowhead with two or more sharp cutting edges that are retracted during flight and open upon impact to a minimum cutting diameter of not less than 7/8 inch and do not lock open after impact and create fixed barbs.

ISSUE: Because of technological advances in archery equipment, varying interpretations of the legality of certain devices, and difficulty within the field enforcement of equipment regulations, we believe that there is a need to rewrite the regulations relating bowhunting equipment. This is an attempt to clearly define legal bowhunting equipment. The regulations should be clear and easy to understand, should be easy to measure and enforce in the field, should ensure minimum standards so that a well placed arrow will be humanely lethal and should allow participation by a maximum number of people while preserving the short range low impact aspects of bowhunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to have regulation, that are subject to different interpretations and are difficult to measure and enforce. We will continue to see numerous out of state bowhunters come to hunt in Alaska with arrows and equipment that are illegal although they may be effective at harvesting game.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All bowhunters and enforcement personnel as a result of clearly defined legal bowhunting equipment.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There are many details and many individual potential areas of variations of these suggested new regulations.

PROPOSED BY: Alaskan Bowhunters Association (HQ-00W-G-078)

PROPOSAL 95 - 5 AAC 92.990. DEFINITIONS. Provide a definition for antler.

“antler” means the annually cast and regenerated bony growth originating from the pedicle portion of the skull in members of the deer family.

PROBLEM: The Alaska Administrative Code does not provide a definition for the term antler for species in the deer family.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Failure to provide a definition of an “antler” may hamper litigation procedures.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The judicial process will benefit from clearly defined terms.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals that would attempt to avoid prosecution by the lack of a definition of “antler”.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-00W-G-111)

PROPOSAL 96 - 5 AAC 92.990. DEFINITIONS. Amend this regulation to include the definition of antlerless.

“antlerless” means the absence of the annually cast and regenerated bony growth (antlers) originating from the pedicle portion of the skull in members of the deer family.

PROBLEM: The Alaska Administrative Code does not provide a definition for the term “antlerless” commonly used to regulate harvest of moose and caribou. Staff spend considerable amount of time explaining that antlerless hunts include both cows and bulls that have shed their antlers.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Failure to provide a definition of an “antlerless” animal may hamper litigation procedures.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The judicial process will benefit from clearly defined terms. The hunting public will be less confused.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals that would attempt to avoid prosecution by the lack of a definition of “antlerless”.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-00W-G-116)

PROPOSAL 97 - 5 AAC 92.990. DEFINITIONS. Amend this regulation to include the following definitions:

Humane: Dispatch of animal in a timely manner which calls for the animal to die quickly and efficiently.

Inhumane: When an animal is suffering in a trap, and is not dispatched immediately. A trapper must report how the animal was dispatched.

Dispatch: To kill the animal rapidly or efficiently.

ISSUE:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People will have no structure as to what humane or inhumane action is. They can make up their own definitions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? ADF&G will be able to state to anyone that its residents are ethical and humane hunters and trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Animals won't suffer anymore.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Melissa Gonzalez (HQ-00W-G-057)

PROPOSAL 98 - 5 AAC 92.990. DEFINITIONS. Amend this regulations as follows:

Change definition of "cub" for brown bears to be the same definition as for black bears.

ISSUE: Hunter confusion and over population of bears.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-00W-G-015)

PROPOSAL 99 - 5 AAC 092.990(4). DEFINITIONS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

"bait" means any material, not including scent lures, that is placed to attract an animal by its sense of smell or taste; "bait" does not include those parts of legally taken animals that are not required to be salvaged as edible meat if the parts are not moved from the kill site.

ISSUE: Many harvesters have been using scent attractants and have been unknowingly violating state law.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Ambiguity in interpretation of current definitions of "bait" will continue.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunter and trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-088)

PROPOSAL 100 - 5 AAC 92.990(4). DEFINITIONS. Change this regulation to read as follows:

“bait means any material, excluding [INCLUDING] scent lures, that is placed to attract an animal by its sense of smell or taste; ‘bait’ does not include those parts of legally taken animals that are not required to be salvaged as edible meat if the parts are not moved from the kill site;

...

ISSUE: Using scent and scent lures for hunting big game animals is a common practice throughout most of the United States, and very few people are aware that it is illegal to use in Alaska. You can go into almost any sport shop in Alaska and purchase it.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Many people will continue to use scent when hunting big game without knowing that it is illegal to do so.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who are accustomed to and want to use scent, especially those who use primitive weapons and need to get close to game.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who are against hunting in general.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Allow the use of scent and scent lures only for big game prey species. 2) Allow the use of scent and scent lures for all big game except bears.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-026)

PROPOSAL 101 - 5 AAC 92.990(8). DEFINITIONS. Amend this regulation as follows:

"brow tine" means a tine emerging from the first [FORWARD] branch or brow palm on the main beam of a moose antler and projecting forward; the brow palm is separated from the main palm by a a [THE FIRST] wide bay; a tine originating in or after this bay is not a brow tine;

...

PROBLEM: The existing definition of “brow tine” is not adequate to protect some mid-size antlered bulls. Prosecution of illegally taken bulls is also difficult under the existing definition because it does not clearly describe a method to identify the “forward branch” of an antler. Changing “forward” branch to “first” branch will help clarify the intent of the definition.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Mid-sized bulls that are protected under the Selective Harvest Management Program will be killed. Fish and Wildlife Protection will continue to loose cases due to the lack of a clear definition of a brow tine.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Refinement of the brow tine definition will be an improvement in the Selective Harvest Program for the hunter and Fish and Wildlife Protection. Protection of mid-size antlered bulls under the Selective Harvest Program will be increased.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? ? No one should suffer because of an improved definition.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-00W-G-112)

PROPOSAL 102 - 5 AAC 92.990(12). DEFINITIONS. Amend this regulation as follows:

“Cub” bear means a brown (grizzly) bear in its first year [OR SECOND] of life. Same as black bear.

ISSUE: There are too many bears in Unit 13. Low calf survival due to bear predation is resulting in the depletion of the moose population which will result in a significant reduction in the allowable human harvest. The brown bear population objective for Unit 13 is 350 bears, yet the last population estimate is 1,500 bears.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will likely crash.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose and moose hunters have the most to gain from reversing the predator induced decline in the moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Bears and bear hunters will be most affected.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We have submitted other solutions.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-028)

PROPOSAL 103 - 5 AAC 92.990(12). DEFINITIONS. Change this definition as follows:

Change the definition of a brown bear cub to “a bear in its first year of life.”(same as black bear cub definition).

ISSUE: Identifying a legal two year old brown bear when accompanied by other bears.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Opportunities to harvest legal adult sows or legal two or three yr. old bears will be lost.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who are presented opportunities to harvest bears from a group of bears but cannot clearly identify a two year old bear. Subsistence and general use hunters will benefit from increase in moose and caribou numbers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Have the ADF&G provide a clear method of determining what a legal two year old bear looks like in the field.

PROPOSED BY: Mike Chapin (I-00W-G-004)

PROPOSAL 104 - 5 AAC 92.990(20). **DEFINITIONS.** Amend this regulation to include the following:

“fur animal” means a beaver, coyote, arctic fox, red fox, lynx, flying squirrel, ground squirrel, or red squirrel that has not been domestically raised; “fur animal” is a classification of animals subject to taking with a hunting license.

ISSUE: Beaver populations in many areas of the state have been increasing in recent years, as fur prices and trapping effort have been decreasing. Beaver dams and houses impede fish migration and boat navigation, and cause flooding in some areas, and beavers threaten to contaminate village water supplies. In some parts of the state beaver are seasonally taken primarily for food, rather than for their pelt. In an effort to reflect this type of use and allow increased harvest, it has been suggested that allowing beaver to be taken with a firearm under a hunting license would offer additional opportunity without requiring purchase of a separate trapping license.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Beaver populations will continue to increase, along with the associated problems. Hunters wanting to harvest beaver for food will be required to obtain a trapping license.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and subsistence users would have an opportunity to harvest beaver with a firearm and a hunting license.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allowing the use of firearms with a trapping license, but would still require two licenses.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game at Board of Game request (HQ-00W-G-107)

PROPOSAL 105 - 5 AAC 92.990(38). **DEFINITIONS.** Amend this regulation to include the following:

“skin,” “hide,” and “pelt” are all the same thing and mean any [TANNED OR] untanned external covering of any game animal’s body, but do not include a handicraft or other finished product; “skin,” “hide,” or “pelt” of a bear mean the entire external covering with claws attached;

ISSUE: The public, Department of Law, and Fish and Wildlife Protection officers are confused about whether the statutory requirement to possess a license for fur dealing (AS 16.05.330)

applies to the purchase or sale of *tanned* hides. Consequently, the law is being unevenly enforced in different parts of the state, and in some areas, retailers have pulled merchandise from their stores under the threat of a citation.

The current definitions of “fur dealing” (AS 16.05.940(17)) and of “skin, hide, and pelt” suggest that a fur dealers’ license is required sell tanned hides. An Attorney General’s opinion (file no. 661-86-447, July 8, 1986) states that once a skin is tanned “the animal parts’ principal characteristic ceases to be that of an ‘animal skin’ and therefore no fur dealer's license is required....” The AG’s opinion is based on the Board of Game record, when the words “tanned or untanned” were added to the regulatory definition of “skin, hide, or pelt” in 1980. The record shows that the board’s sole intent in amending the definition was to close a loophole that could allow sale of bear hides, not to change fur dealer licensing requirements. [Note: because of other changes in regulation, the above referenced loophole would not be a problem if the words “tanned or” are removed from the current definition.]

The department’s interest in fur dealing records is only to obtain data on the purchase/sale of raw hides (5 AAC 92.200(d)), which provides information on furbearer harvests.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Agencies and the public will continue to disagree on the interpretation of the law, which will continue to be unevenly applied.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone should benefit from a better understanding of the law. Small retailers of tanned hides will benefit by not having to purchase a fur dealing license.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Impose a fur dealing license requirement on everyone who buys or sells hides, regardless of whether or not they are raw or tanned.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-00W-G-113)

PROPOSAL 106 - 5 AAC 92.990(49). DEFINITIONS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

“salvage” means to transport and prepare or to preserve the edible meat of a big game animal or wild fowl so as to save or prevent the edible meat to become unfit for human consumption.

ISSUE: Wanton waste and improper salvage of game meat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued waste of edible meat will increase, and the resources will be heavily impacted by allowing the unguided “transporters” hunters to continue their current practice of harvesting and transporting their game.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence and sport hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Transporter businesses, until they come into compliance with new definition.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Stop sport hunters from harvesting game. Transporters are the main source of this practice, where as sport hunters have guides that will comply with current rules and regulations.

PROPOSED BY: AVCP, Inc. (HQ-00W-G-083)

PROPOSAL 107 - 5 AAC 92.990(58). DEFINITIONS. Amend this regulation as follows:

The definition in the field could be enforced to have meat out of the area in less time and how to care for meat.

ISSUE: The definition of wanton waste needs to be more “defined” to help with the removal of meat and be specific on how this is done.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The removal and disposal of meat are usually not in good shape for consumption. The rotten meat is not very good to eat. More violations for ADF&G to deal with.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The people who eat the meat, airplanes because of smell of rotting meat, airline depo’s because of smell, and villages, which also don’t like smell.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who are lazy to bring in their meat, would rather dispose of meat, and keep horns.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No comment.

PROPOSED BY: Darrell Vent, Sr. (I-00W-G-006)

PROPOSAL 108 – 5 AAC 99.025. CUSTOMARY AND TRADITIONAL USES OF GAME POPULATIONS. Identify customary and traditional uses and amounts reasonably necessary for subsistence uses for furbearers, as follows:

| SPECIES AND UNIT | FINDING | AMOUNT REASONABLY NECESSARY FOR SUBSISTENCE USES |
|------------------|---------|--|
|------------------|---------|--|

Furbearers

| | | |
|---|----------|-------|
| (A) Beaver Units 1-6, 8-9, 11-13, 15C, 16B, 17-26, in areas outside nonsubsistence areas | positive | Range |
|---|----------|-------|

| | | |
|---|----------|-------|
| (B) Coyote Units 1-6, 9-13, 15C, 16B, 17-26, in areas outside nonsubsistence areas | positive | Range |
|---|----------|-------|

| | | |
|---|----------|-------|
| (C) Fox Units 1-6, 8-13, 15C, 16B, 17-26, in areas outside nonsubsistence areas | positive | Range |
| (D) Lynx Units 1-6, 8-13, 15C, 16B, 17-26, in areas outside nonsubsistence areas | positive | Range |
| (E) Marmot Units 1-6, 8-13, 15C, 16B, 17-26, in areas outside nonsubsistence areas | positive | Range |
| (F) Marten Units 1-6, 8-9, 11-13, 15C, 16B, 17-26, in areas outside nonsubsistence areas | positive | Range |
| (G) Mink Units 1-6, 8-13, 15C, 16B, 17-26, in areas outside nonsubsistence areas | positive | Range |
| (H) Muskrat Units 1-6, 8-13, 15C, 16B, 17-26, in areas outside nonsubsistence areas | positive | Range |
| (I) Otter, land Units 1-6, 8-13, 15C, 16B, 17-26, in areas outside nonsubsistence areas | positive | Range |
| (H) Squirrel Units 1-6, 8-13, 15C, 16B, 17-26, in areas outside nonsubsistence areas | positive | Range |
| (I) Weasel Units 1-6, 8-13, 15C, 16B, 17-26, in areas outside nonsubsistence areas | positive | Range |
| (J) Wolf Units 1-6, 9-13, 15C, 16B, 17-26, in areas outside nonsubsistence areas | positive | Range |

| | | |
|--|----------|-------|
| (K) Wolverine Units 1-6, 8-13, 15C, 16B, 17-26, in areas outside nonsubsistence areas | positive | Range |
|--|----------|-------|

ISSUE: The board has never made findings regarding the “customary and traditional uses” of “furbearers”, which are animals subject to taking with a trapping license, including beaver, coyote, fox (arctic, red), lynx, marten, mink, weasel (least, short-tailed), muskrat, land otter, squirrel (red, flying, ground), marmot (Alaska, hoary), wolf, and wolverine (5 AAC 92:990(21)) (partial findings have been made for wolf in certain areas: game management units 2, 6, 9, 10 Unimak Island, 11-13, and 16-26). State regulations for “furbearer trapping” in 5 AAC 84.270 are silent on the question of whether the regulations are “subsistence trapping”, “general resident trapping,” or “nonresident trapping.” State statute (16.05.258(a)) authorizes the board to make customary and traditional use findings in certain areas – “Except in nonsubsistence areas, the Board of Fisheries and Board of Game shall identify the fish stocks and game populations, or portions of stocks or populations, that are customarily and traditionally taken or used for subsistence.”

The board also has never made findings for furbearers regarding the “amount reasonably necessary for subsistence uses”, as authorized in 16.05.258(b) – “If a portion of a stock or population can be harvested consistent with sustained yield, the board shall determine the amount of the harvestable portion that is reasonably necessary for subsistence uses.”

In 1997, the board directed the department to develop a draft proposal to deal with this gap in regulatory findings. The above draft proposal would identify furbearer populations by species and areas, customary and traditional use findings, and the amounts reasonably necessary for subsistence.

In addition to changes in 5 AAC 99.025 identified above, other changes in trapping regulations would be as follows. In 5 AAC 84.270, trapping regulations for populations/areas with positive findings would be identified as “resident subsistence”, “resident general,” and “nonresident trapping”, unless otherwise directed by the board. In 5 AAC 84.270, trapping regulations for nonsubsistence areas (5 AAC 99.015) and populations/areas with negative findings would be identified as “resident general” and “nonresident trapping”, unless otherwise directed by the board.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? State regulations might continue to be silent on the question of whether there are customary and traditional uses of furbearers. Customary and traditional use findings of furbearers might be dealt with by the board on a species by species and area by area basis, depending on proposals received by the board.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers in general may benefit from a clarification of regulations. Trappers who trap under state regulations on federal public lands which are open to “subsistence trapping” will have their pattern of use identified as subsistence trapping in state regulation. Trappers who bring furbearer proposals before the board will not be faced with the uncertainty regarding subsistence findings and the statutes pertaining to their request. The board,

the department, and the public will spend less time in board meetings if comprehensive furbearer findings are made compared with case by case findings made over time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. The regulatory changes are primarily administrative and do not result in a reduction of opportunity for any user. In the future, public proposals may be received requesting differences in trapping regulations for resident subsistence, resident general, and nonresident trapping.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? In 1997, the board considered two other options: (1) doing nothing, and (2) making customary and traditional use findings over a number of years on a species by species and area by area approach as proposals are submitted by the public. In 1997, the board directed the department to develop the comprehensive proposal presented here.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-00W-G-101)

PROPOSAL 109 - 5 AAC 85.020. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BROWN BEAR. (a) (12), 5 AAC 92.090. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. (a) (8), AND 5 AAC 92.165. SEALING OF BEAR SKINS AND SKULLS. (a)(1).

Originally Proposal 173 was amended and adopted at the Spring 1999 Board of Game meeting. Later in the meeting it was brought up for reconsideration and deferred until the January 2000 meeting, so that there would be an opportunity for public review. In addition to the language shown here, the Board requested that the airplane and pilot be registered as apart of the conditions of the hunt; this can be accomplished through the Department's discretionary hunt conditions.

5 AAC 85.020. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR...

(12)

Unit 13(A)

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| <u>1 bear every regulatory year</u> | <u>Aug. 10-June 15</u> | <u>Aug. 10-June 15</u> |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|

OR

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <u>1 bear by registration permit</u> | <u>May 15-June 15</u> | <u>May 15-June 15</u> |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|

Unit 13(E), that portion west of the Alaska Railroad, except within the Denali State Park Management Area

| | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1 bear every regulatory year (General hunt only) | Sept. 10-May 31 | Sept. 10-May 31 |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|

Unit 13(E), that portion within the Denali State Park Management Area

1 bear every 4 regulatory years

Sept. 1-May 31

Sept. 1-May 31

Remainder of Unit 13(E)

1 bear every regulatory year

Aug. 10-June 15

Aug. 10-June 15

OR

1 bear by registration permit only

May 15-June 15

May 15-June 15

Remainder of Unit 13

Aug. 10-June 15
(General hunt only)

Aug. 10-June 15

1 bear every regulatory year

5 AAC 92.090. UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. ...

(8) a person who has been airborne may not take or assist in taking a big game animal until after 3:00 a.m. following the day in which the flying occurred; however, this paragraph does not apply to

(A) taking deer;

(B) repealed 7/1/92;

(C) a person flying on a regularly scheduled commercial airline, including a commuter airline; or

(D) taking caribou from January 1 through April 15, in Units 9(B), 17(B), and that portion of 17(C) east of the Nushagak River, provided the hunter is at least 300 feet from the airplane at the time of taking;

(E) taking of brown/grizzly bear in Unit 13(A) and 13(E); brown bear taken from May 15 through June 15 under a registration permit issued by the department provided that the hunter is at least ¼ mile from the airplane at the time of taking;

...

5 AAC 92.165. SEALING OF BEAR SKINS AND SKULLS. (a) No person may possess, transport, or export from Alaska, the untanned skin or skull of a bear unless the skin and skull have been sealed by an authorized representative of the department within 30 days after the taking, or a lesser time if requested by the department; however

(1) a brown bear taken in Units 8, 12, 13(A) and 13(E) (under a registration permit), 19(D), or 25(D) may not be transported from those units until it has been sealed;

PROBLEM:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Developed by the Alaska Board of Game (including public comment)
(HQ-99S-G-001)
(HQ-00W-G-120)

PROPOSAL 110 - 5 AAC 85.056. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR WOLF.
Amend these regulation in Unit 13 as follows:

Open season dates for wolves: Aug. 10 – June 15. Coincides with “new grizzly” open season as well as black bear season.

ISSUE: The open season dates for hunting wolves.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wolf numbers will continue to increase which puts more pressure on caribou, moose and Dall sheep mortality rates. Greater wolf numbers increases chances of diseases within the species leading to “boom and crash” life cycles.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users of the resource including hunters, photographers, tourists. Everyone who is interested in stability of all game populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who are uneducated about wildlife life cycles and the interaction of wolves and their prey.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Same-day-airborne open season – rejected because of hysterical public outcry.

PROPOSED BY: William Fitzgerald (HQ-00W-G-009)

PROPOSAL 111 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. NEW REGULATION. Establish a new regulation as follows:

It is unlawful to employ someone in order to obtain hunting, guiding or transportation services unless the person providing these services is properly licensed by the State of Alaska.

ISSUE: The transportation and guiding of hunters by unlicensed individuals, companies, corporations, and organizations. There is no regulation or statute making it unlawful to hire an unlicensed guide or transporter to take someone hunting. There are statutes a regulations that prohibit guiding and transporting without a license.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It will continue to be difficult for Fish and Wildlife protection to catch unlicensed guides and transporters. The U.S.F.W.S. Protection will not be able to prosecute the client under the Lacy act.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All game animals and the people of Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unlicensed guides, transporters and fishing lodges that provide illegal hunting guide services.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Virgil L. Umphenour (I-OOW-G-021)

PROPOSAL 112 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. NEW REGULATION. Create a new regulation to limit the take of Dall Sheep.

Bag limit one Dall sheep every other year.

ISSUE: One Dall sheep per year. No wolf control. Some people hunt sheep every year. Poor lamb survival.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Dall sheep at low numbers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The Dall sheep and hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The hunters who take a Dall sheep every year.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? One Dall Sheep every three years.

PROPOSED BY: Virgil L. Umphenour (I-OOW-G-022)

PROPOSAL 113 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. POLICY FOR CLOSING AREAS TO THE HUNTING AND TRAPPING. Create a new regulations to achieve the following:

Policy that areas cannot be closed to hunting and trapping unless a biological emergency exists. Any closure not ending under existing emergency order timelines could not exceed one year in duration. A new biological assessment would be required to continue the emergency closure.

ISSUE: Closing areas to hunting and trapping for other than biological emergencies. AS 16.05.130(d) requires that all expenditures of funds (except general revenue funds) shall be for

programs intended to directly benefit hunting, fishing and trapping license purchasers. Closing areas for other than biological emergencies does not benefit license holders.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Since statehood, approximately 50% of Alaska's Dall sheep hunting area has been closed to general hunting. Nonhunting interests, some with extreme anti-hunter agendas are attempting to close all of Alaska to hunting by restricting access, prohibitions of various types of hunting and by establishing new refuges and sanctuaries.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-011)

PROPOSAL 114 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. POLICY FOR CREATION OF CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Create a new regulation as follows:

No controlled use area can be created statewide unless solely necessary for biological reasons.

ISSUE: Unnecessary restrictions on access in areas where biological restrictions are not justified. In both the Noatak Controlled Use Area and the Nenana Controlled Use Area there exists a super abundance of game, yet access is restricted to favor local hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The creation of more and more special management areas and controlled use area, created strictly to favor local hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? (HQ-99F-G-003)

(HQ-99S-G-096)

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Conservation Association (Lynn Levensood)(HQ-00W-G-036)

PROPOSAL 115 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. POLICY FOR RESTRICTING ACCESS TO AREAS. Create a new regulation as follows:

No area, means of access, or methods of pursuit may be closed or restricted unless there is clear and convincing biological necessity and such condition can be corrected by the specific measure sought.

ISSUE: Denial of access and restriction on consumptive uses of wildlife. Without any biological justification or necessity areas are being restricted from various types of access and/or methods and means of harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaskans who are being told they have to carry on their back, the moose that they need to feed their family, five miles just because someone does not like to hear ATV engines.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levengood

(HQ-99S-G-091)

(HQ-00W-G-002)

PROPOSAL 116 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. NEW REGULATION. Create a new regulation as follows:

Open up a controlled use area to those Alaskan veterans using ATVs, who have a permanent hunting license from the Department of Fish and Game in Juneau, that are 100% unemployable (approx. 125). This would extend the current interpretation of the disabilities act (5 AAC 92.080) thus allowing qualified Alaskans (AS 16.05.940) to hunt other than by proxy.

ISSUE:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Some Alaskans will not have the opportunity to fill the freezers because getting a proxy is not always available.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Disabled veterans and, since there is already existing trails, along with the number of veterans very little impact would be made in the selected controlled use area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Barbara Broadwater

(HQ-00W-G-042)

PROPOSAL 117 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. POLICY FOR CONSUMPTIVE USE PREFERENCE. Create a new regulation to establish the following:

On all refuges during the hunting season consumptive users have priority over other users.

ISSUE: Loss of opportunity for access and consumptive uses of wildlife. Because non consumptive users have a monopoly on refuge use during most of the year, consumptive users should have priority during the hunting season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nonconsumptive users perceive “conflict” when consumptive users are in the field. Because nonconsumptive users have priority during most of the year during the hunting season, consumptive users should have priority over other uses.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Consumptive users who rely on wildlife resources to feed their families.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonconsumptive users who desire to interfere with consumptive users.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levengood (HQ-99S-G-090)
(HQ-00W-G-007)

PROPOSAL 118 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. NEW REGULATION. Adopt a new regulation for predator control in Unit 13 as follows:

Establish a brown bear and wolf predation control implementation plan for the following area within Unit 13: The western portion of Unit 13A (namely that area west of the Lake Louise Road, Lake Louis – Tyone River) and the southeastern portion of Unit 13E, (namely that area east of Prairie Creek, Stephen Lake to the Susitna River and south of the Susitna River). This area basically covers the moose study area of Unit 13 as well as the principal calving area of the Nelchina caribou herd. (Map enclosed in the “public comments” section of the board workbook available at meeting.)

ISSUE: A significant part of Unit 13 is experiencing a very low moose/calf survival. Without predator control action to encourage higher recruitment, the moose population is going to drop rapidly. Because most moose calves are being killed by bears, predator control must deal with the portion of the bear population previously protected. Concurrently, action needs to be taken to control the wolf population. Remove bears to save calves will only turn around the decline if the calves do not then succumb to the wolves.

Predator control plans are difficult to implement unless many diverse public interests are accommodated. Without questions, a control program entailing all of Unit 13 will never get broad public support. The smaller area suggested in this proposal contains key moose range with a statistical history available to support a control program. The area is large enough to serve as a model as well as to have a substantial effect on moose productivity in Unit 13.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will continue to decline to the point that it cannot recover for many years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Daniel Elliott

(HQ-00W-G-047)

PROPOSAL 119 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. NEW REGULATION. Brown bear predation control in Unit 13.

The regulation would require all Unit 13 bear hunters to obtain a Unit 13 brown bear registration permit prior to their hunt and any successful hunter to obtain a special Unit 13 tag for the bear within three days of harvest.

ISSUE: A) Legalize sale of the entire grizzly hide -- would increase harvest by enticing a larger and possibly a different bear hunting clientele. B) Allow the taking of cub bears 1 year and older and female bears accompanied by cubs one year and older -- would target bears known to be an effective predator but currently protected by regulation realizing greater cub mortality will occur if cubs are orphaned. C) Allow shooting brown bears over bait -- should increase harvest and possibly allow hunters to be more effective in harvesting older bears generally more immune to regular harvest. D) If a brown bear is shot in Unit 13, it will not count against a hunter's limit for the year in other units -- possibly may increase harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose and caribou calf predation will remain high. Decreased hunting opportunity will occur in Unit 13. Hunting pressure and problems may increase in other game management units because of a shift of hunters from Unit 13 as hunting opportunity and success decline.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose and caribou populations and subsequently predator and scavenger populations. Hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who do not support increased bear harvest in Unit 13.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A) If possible, a reduction in both wolf and bear population would benefit the moose and caribou populations. B) Nothing; rejected because Unit 13 has been designated to receive intensive management.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Advisory Committee

(HQ-00W-G-099)

PROPOSAL 120 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. NEW REGULATION. Create a new regulation as follows:

Allow same-day-airborne harvest of all bear in Unit 13.

ISSUE: Predation on moose, sheep and caribou.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-00W-G-016)

PROPOSAL 121 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. NEW REGULATION and 5 AAC 92.015. BROWN BEAR TAG FEE EXEMPTIONS. Bear predation control in Unit 13. Create a new regulation.

No bear tag fee for nonresidents in Unit 13. No guide required for Unit 13. Nonresidents must register at local ADF&G office, and attend orientation course.

ISSUE: Predation by brown/grizzly bears in Unit 13. No effective way to reduce high bear numbers. Recent department study shows 75% of our successful hunters would not shoot another bear even if they could.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose and caribou calf survival is as low as 25%. This is far too low. Predation will continue at an all-time high.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose and caribou herds and all who hunt them. Nonresident bear hunters, for a chance to take an economical bear.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Bear hunting guides in Unit 13, but trophy bear populations will not be affected much.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Paxson Advisory Committee (HQ-00W-G-020)

ADF&G DISCUSSION ITEM

REVIEW OF PREDATOR/PREY STATUS IN UNIT 13

and Management Options

Background information

Description of Area - Unit 13 encompasses over 23,000 square miles and is generally bounded by the Alaska Range, the Talkeetna Mountains, and Chugach Mountains, and the Copper River. About 31 percent of the area is above 4000 ft. elevation and is considered to be poor year-round wildlife habitat. Habitats include bare rock, glaciers, and snowfields in the mountains and dense spruce forests interspersed with lakes, ponds and muskegs in the lowlands. Intermediate habitats, important to wildlife include alpine tundra and shrub lands. Wildfires create and maintain seral vegetation important to wildlife. No major fires have occurred in Unit 13 within the last 40 years due primarily to government sponsored fire suppression.

Major land owners/managers in Unit 13 include the State of Alaska, Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, Matanuska-Susitna Borough and Native corporations. Denali State Park and Denali National Park comprise about 7 percent of the total acreage of the unit. The human population of Unit 13 is about 2,800. Most residents live in the Glennallen-Copper Center-Kenny Lake area. While much of the area is remote and roadless, it is crossed by four major highways and is readily accessible from the major population centers in southcentral and interior Alaska. Many remote areas are accessible by all-terrain vehicles, snowmachines, or light aircraft.

Wolves – Wolf populations have been monitored in Unit 13 by aerial surveys during winter, opportunistic field observations, reports from the public, and through trapper questionnaires. Harvest data are obtained through a mandatory pelt-sealing program that has been in place since 1971.

Wolf abundance in Unit 13 was very low in the mid-1950s because of federal wolf control activities conducted between 1948 and 1953. The population recovered rapidly after wolf control stopped and the season was closed. Wolf populations in Unit 13 peaked in the mid-1960s, mid-1970s, and have increased through the 1990s. Spring population estimates indicate wolf numbers have been increasing at approximately 3 percent per year since the early 1980s. The spring 1999 population estimate was 350 wolves. The fall 1998 population estimate was 500 wolves. The spring estimate equates to an overall density of one wolf per 65 square miles or one wolf per 45 square miles of area below 4,000 feet elevation. Annual wolf harvest over the past five years has averaged 146 animals. Trappers accounted for approximately 95 percent of the wolves taken each year during the same period. Aircraft and snowmachines were the primary means of transportation for successful wolf hunters and trappers over the past five years.

Trapping has been the primary factor controlling wolf abundance in Unit 13 in recent years. Prior to autumn 1992 land-and-shoot trapping and hunting played major roles in regulating wolf abundance. Future wolf abundance will largely depend on the level of harvest by humans if the

prey species remain abundant. Currently, the estimated wolf population in Unit 13 exceeds the population objective of 135-165 wolves at the end of hunting and trapping seasons.

Brown Bear – Brown bears in Unit 13 were probably reduced to low numbers by the mid-1950s, a result of a federal wolf control program that included the use of nonselective poison baits. When this program was discontinued, the population recovered and brown bears were considered numerous by the mid-to-late 1970s. Data collected in the 1980s suggested bear numbers declined in the more accessible, heavily-hunted portions of the unit. However more recent data indicate this was not the case and it now appears there are an estimated 1,500 bears in Unit 13.

Average annual harvests for the periods 1970-79 and 1980-90 were 58 and 99 brown bears, respectively. Harvests increased to an average of 133 bears annually between 1983 and 1986, when seasons were lengthened and the bag limit was increased to one bear every year. More restrictive hunting regulations that returned the bag limit to one bear every four years between 1987 and 1994 lowered the average annual harvest to 85 bears. In the fall of 1995, the season was lengthened, the bag limit increased to one bear every year, and residents were not required to purchase a bear tag. Bear harvests increased to an average of 132 bears annually since the regulatory changes adopted in 1995. Using the current population estimate and a harvest rate of 5-6 percent, the annual sustainable harvest of bears in Unit 13 is 75-90 bears. However harvest rates in excess of 5-6 percent have been sustained in portions of the unit without evidence of population decline. Possible explanations are underestimation of population size, immigration of bears into the unit, and higher than expected bear productivity.

The management objective for Unit 13 is to reduce the brown bear population until there is a consistent and statistically significant increase in moose calf survival. Brown bear numbers should be reduced until the moose calf:cow ratio is 30 calves:100 cows and the yearling bull:cow ratio is 10 bulls:100 cows on a consistent basis. However, to maintain a viable brown bear population, the population must not be reduced below 350 animals.

Moose – There are about 22,000 moose in Unit 13; an overall density of 0.9 moose per square mile or a density of 1.4 moose per square mile of area below 4,000 ft. elevation. This is a relatively high-density moose population for interior habitats. Moose numbers in Unit 13 increased during the 1950s and peaked in the mid-1960s following wolf control. This was followed by a decline that continued through 1975. Moose numbers then increased until 1987 or 1988, followed by a moderate decline. Moose populations now appear comparable to levels observed in the early-1980s. Calf survival for the 10-year period, 1979-88, was reasonably high with calves averaging 18 percent of the fall population. Concurrent with increasing wolf numbers and severe winter weather, calf survival declined to 13 percent of the fall population from 1989 through 1991. Calf survival has remained low since 1991, fluctuating between 11 percent (1998) and 18 percent (1996), averaging 16 percent. Research indicates brown bears take the majority of moose calves produced every year. Increased mortality of calves in recent years may be due to the increasing number of wolves in the unit but brown bears remain the principal agent of calf mortality in Unit 13. During the last five years a moderate decline in moose numbers seems to be underway primarily in Subunits 13A and 13E. The unitwide bull:cow ratio declined from 25 bulls:100 cows in 1992, to 18 bulls:100 cows by 1994, and has remained relatively stable since. This decline was precipitated by the liberalization of the bag limit in Unit 13A West where hunters had been restricted to spike/fork bulls only. The limit was changed to include 50-inch bulls beginning in 1993, and many large, adult bulls were taken.

Annual moose harvests averaged 1,011 (range 521 to 1,259) for the five-year period 1986-90, approximately 12 percent of the statewide total. The harvest declined dramatically from 1990 through 1993 ranging between 500 and 600 animals. This decline was probably due to more restrictive seasons that were mandated by low recruitment and declining moose numbers. Since 1993, the harvest has ranged between 900 and 1,300, averaging just over 1,000 animals. Population objectives in Unit 13 are: to slightly increase the unitwide population to about 25,000 moose with a minimum of 25 bulls:100 cows, with a wide range of age classes (including a minimum of 10-15 bulls:100 cows older than yearlings), and a minimum of 30 calves:100 cows. Moose population size in Unit 13 is currently 12 percent below the management objective. The human use objective is to achieve, and maintain an average annual harvest of between 1,200 and 2,000; the harvest will include both sexes if appropriate to achieve the population objective.

Caribou – The Nelchina Caribou herd calves and summers in Unit 13, although a few animals range into Unit 14B. Nelchina animals winter in Units 11, 12, 13, and 14. Much of the herd has wintered in Unit 12 during the past few years. The core of the Nelchina range is the foothill of the northeastern Talkeetna Mountains between Tsis Creek and the Little Oshetna River, where most calving occurs. The Nelchina is a medium-sized herd that has ranged between 10,000 and 71,000 caribou over the past 40 years. The herd reached peak size in the early to mid-1960s and then declined to 10,000 animals in the early-1970s. Since then the herd has increased to over 50,000 animals in the mid-1990s due to high recruitment and subsequently declined over the last four years to an estimated 32,000 caribou.

The Nelchina herd has been particularly important to hunters and wildlife viewers because of its accessibility and proximity to Anchorage and Fairbanks. In 1991, the Nelchina caribou hunt changed from drawing permits to Tier II subsistence permits. The number of Tier II subsistence permits issued over the past nine years has ranged between 2,800 and 12,000 permits. Since 1991-92, the annual harvest has ranged between 1,728 to 4,738 caribou. Nelchina caribou are currently harvested in state and federal hunts in both Units 12 and 13. Small numbers are also taken when Nelchina animals migrate into Canada.

The population objective established by the Board is to stabilize the herd at about 35-40,000 animals, with a minimum of 40 bulls:100 cows and 40 calves:100 cows; and to maintain body condition parameters similar to other Interior caribou herds. Herd size and bull and calf:cow ratios are presently below population objectives. The fall 1999 population estimate is 32,000 caribou with a fall calf:cow ratio of 23 calves:100 cows and a bull ratio of 30 bulls:100 cows. The fall calf:cow ratio is the lowest recorded for the Nelchina herd since 1972. In recent years calf:cow ratios have fluctuated between 26 to 40 calves per 100 cows with poor productivity in two of the last three years. The poor fall recruitment is attributed to lower production and higher predation rates during the spring/summer. Poor productivity may reflect nutritional constraints and a deterioration of caribou range conditions in Unit 13.

The human use objective is to maintain an annual human harvest of 3,000 to 6,000 caribou. Since the early-1970s, when the Nelchina herd was severely depressed, management objectives for the herd have been to limit harvest to allow herd growth. The population objective was exceeded during a number of years during the mid-1990s and harvests were directed at reducing herd size and productivity. Because the population size is now below the objective levels, the current harvest strategy is to reduce harvests to allow for stabilization of the population size within the objective range.

Management options

Unit 13 is the most heavily used area in Alaska for hunting of moose and caribou. Since statehood, the primary management goal for this unit has been to produce high harvests of moose and caribou. The Board of Game will discuss management options for Unit 13 at its January 2000 meeting. Options to regulate the wolf population that will be discussed include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Maintain the current trapping and hunting seasons.
2. Lengthen the trapping and hunting seasons and increase the hunting bag limit.
3. Increase trapping effort on selected areas of the unit.
4. Authorize ADF&G to conduct an aerial wolf control program.

Options to reduce the grizzly bear population in Unit 13 include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Maintain the waiver of the \$25 tag fee for resident hunters.
2. Maintain the long season for grizzly bears.
3. Maintain the bag limit of 1 bear per year.
4. Allow the harvest of grizzly bears during their second year of life.
5. Allow the harvest of female bears accompanied by 2 year old cubs.
6. Allow hunters to hunt grizzly bears the same day they have been airborne.
7. Allow big game guides a fourth guide area limited to grizzly bear hunting in Unit 13.
8. Allow baiting of brown bears in Unit 13 during the spring.

The Board may decide, after receiving public comment and deliberating, to develop an implementation plan to reduce the wolf and or grizzly bear population in Unit 13 under regulations 5AAC 92.110 and 5 AAC 92.125.

(HQ-00W-G-119)

CALL FOR PROPOSALS

SPRING 2000 BOARD OF GAME MEETING March 3-13, 2000 Fairbanks, Alaska

The Alaska Board of Game is accepting proposed changes to its regulations pertaining to hunting, trapping and the use of game in the Interior Region to be considered at the Spring 2000 board meeting. The Interior Region is composed of Game Management Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, 26C.

DEADLINE FOR PROPOSALS: 5 PM, DECEMBER 13, 1999

For ALL SPECIES in Game Management Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, 26C:

GENERAL AND SUBSISTENCE HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS

TRAPPING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS

CUSTOMARY AND TRADITIONAL USE FINDINGS

(Chapters 84, 85, and 99 of the Alaska Administrative Code)

For statewide regulations applicable to Game Management Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, 26C:

5AAC 92.046 Permit to take Stranded Muskoxen

5 AAC 92.053 Permit to take Moose for Nuchalawoyya Potlatch

5 AAC 92.055 Stickdance Permit

5 AAC 92.108 Identified Big Game Prey Populations and Objectives

5 AAC 92.125 Wolf Predation Control Implementation Plans

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

The following topics also will be considered for ALL Game Management Units:

5 AAC 92.015 Brown Bear Tag Fee Exemption

Reauthorization of Antlerless Moose Hunts

MAIL OR DELIVER PROPOSALS TO THE FOLLOWING OFFICES:

Margaret Edens, ADF&G
P O Box 25526
Juneau, AK 99802-5526
459-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

Sherry Wright, ADF&G
333 Raspberry Road
Anchorage, AK 99518-1599
PHONE: 267-2354
FAX: 267-2489

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. 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 make a proposal, please call 465-2027 (1-800-478-2028 text telephone) no later than two weeks before the proposal deadline.*

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
TENTATIVE FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE
as of November 10, 1999

| | <u>Dates & Location</u> | <u>Topic</u> |
|-------------|---|---------------------|
| WINTER 2000 | January 14 - 19, 2000 Anchorage, AK (WestCoast International Airport Inn) Proposal Deadline: October 29, 1999 Comment Deadline: December 31, 1999 | Statewide Issues |
| SPRING 2000 | March 3 – 13, 2000 Fairbanks, AK (Wedgewood Resort) Proposal Deadline: December 13, 1999 Comment Deadline: February 18, 2000 | Interior Region |
| FALL 2000 | Nov. 3 – 9, 2000 <u>Juneau, AK</u> Proposal Deadline: August 4, 2000 Comment Deadline: October 13, 2000 | Southeast Region |
| SPRING 2001 | March 2 - 12, 2001 <u>Anchorage, AK</u> Proposal Deadline: December 8, 2000 Comment Deadline: February 16, 2001 | Southcentral Region |

**For information about the Board of Game, contact:

Boards Support Section, Alaska Department of Fish and Game
P.O. Box 25526, Juneau, Alaska 99802-5526
Phone: (907) 465-4110 Fax: (907) 465-6094
Email: margaret_edens@fishgme.state.ak.us

ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES AND ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
REGULATION PROPOSAL FORM

P.O. Box 25526, JUNEAU, ALASKA 99802-5526

BOARD OF FISHERIES REGULATIONS

- Fishing Area _____
 Subsistence Personal Use
 Sport Commercial

JOINT BOARD REGULATIONS

- Advisory Committee Regional Council Rural

BOARD OF GAME REGULATIONS

- Game Management Unit (GMU) _____
 Hunting Trapping
 Subsistence Other _____
 Resident
 Nonresident

Please answer all questions to the best of your ability. All the answers will be printed in the proposal packets along with the proposer's name (addresses and phone nos. will not be published). Use separate forms for each proposal.

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| 1. Alaska Administrative Code Number 5 AAC _____ Regulation Book Page No. _____ | |
| 2. What is the problem you would like the Board to address? | |
| 3. What will happen if this problem is not solved? | |
| 4. What solution do you prefer? In other words, if the Board adopted your solution, what would the new regulation say? | |
| 5. Solutions to difficult problems benefit some people and hurt others: A. Who is likely to benefit if your solution is adopted? B. Who is likely to suffer if you solution is adopted? | |
| 6. List any other solutions you considered and why you rejected them. | DO NOT WRITE HERE |

Submitted By: Name _____
Individual or Group

Address: _____ Zip Code _____ Phone _____

