

**SUMMARY OF ACTIONS
BOARD OF GAME
JANUARY 18-23, 2002
Anchorage, Alaska**

RECEIVED
JUN - 3 2002
**BOARDS
ANCHORAGE**

DESIGNATED REPORTER: Susan Bucknell

This summary of actions is for information purposes only and not intended to detail, reflect or fully interpret reasons for Board actions.

PROPOSAL NO. 1

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Remove the reference to magpies and ravens from the codified regulations.

DISCUSSION: The board agreed that federal law precluded hunting for magpies and ravens and they noted the possible value of continuing to list these birds in the hunting regulation booklet. They supported the proposal in part because defense of property provisions still apply and because permits could be issued on a case-by-case basis if needed.

PROPOSAL NO. 2

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Require small game guides to register with department.

AMENDMENT: Apply to only migratory bird hunting and not remaining small game hunting.

DISCUSSION: The board heard from the department that guiding migratory bird hunts is a growing industry in Alaska and that registering guides would allow for better information exchange, harvest assessment, and help avoid resource problems. The board cautioned against creating a new registration burden, but recognized that commercial bird guiding is focusing hunting pressure on sea ducks and other resources. The department explained that the proposed registration is modeled on the sport fishing guide regulations which does not set standards or criteria.

PROPOSAL NO. 3

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Require sealing of sheep horns statewide.

DISCUSSION: Board heard that plugging is an expensive process and that sheep management would benefit more from improving surveys, hunter education, or enforcement. The board failed the proposal because sealing is not likely to provide the department with useful information, sheep sealing does not usually involve interaction between hunters and management biologists, and because hunters would not likely bring in sub-legal sheep for sealing.

PROPOSAL NO. 4

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Statewide bag limit of one sheep every 4 years and require sealing of sheep horns.

DISCUSSION: The board acknowledged declines in sheep populations across the state and noted that the one-in-four-years bag limit has been a standard in brown bear management for distributing harvest opportunity. In considering the bag limit for sheep, the board looked at whether it would result in an allocation away from resident hunters in

favor of non-resident hunters. They expressed concern that a more restrictive bag limit would fail to provide reasonable opportunity for a number of subsistence hunts. They also noted most advisory committees opposed the change. The sealing requirement was discussed in Proposal 3.

PROPOSAL NO. 5**ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Require sealing of sheep horns statewide.**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action due to the action taken on Proposal 3 and Proposal 4.**PROPOSAL NO. 6****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Prohibit taking moose calves or cows with calves.**DISCUSSION:** The board heard that this proposal was intended for Unit 21D only and concluded it was more appropriate to address the topic around a similar proposal submitted for the March 2002 meeting so it could be discussed in region.**PROPOSAL NO. 7****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Prohibit taking bull moose calves in Units 12 and 20E.**AMENDMENT:** Prohibit taking of moose calves statewide except on a case by case basis for conservation concerns.**DISCUSSION:** Board members noted advisory committee support for the proposal and they recognized that in biological terms calves are the most expendable part of a herd. They balanced making regulations consistent between areas with the need for regulations flexible enough to suit various management situations. They discussed whether taking a cow accompanied by a calf should be prohibited.**PROPOSAL NO. 8****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Require hunter education for shotgun hunters in restricted hunts.**AMENDMENT:** Clarified that the requirement only applies to big game hunts.**DISCUSSION:** The board heard a description of the program by which muzzleloader courses are offered, and considered the safety concerns regarding allowing people to qualify using their own weapons.**PROPOSAL NO. 9****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Restrict harvest tickets to hunters at least 10 years of age and allow younger hunters with hunter education to hunt on someone else's harvest ticket.**AMENDMENT:** Change the restriction to bag limit by specifying a hunter who is younger than ten years of age may take big game only under the direct, immediate supervision of an adult who is at least 18 years of age or older, and is licensed. The adult is responsible for insuring that all legal requirements are met. The animal taken must be counted against the adult's bag limit. This section does not relieve individuals from complying with big game tag requirements, but does require adults to validate their harvest tickets or permits immediately following a taking of big game under this section. Change harvest tickets and reports by specifying a hunter who is younger than 10 years of age may not be issued a big game harvest ticket.

DISCUSSION: Board members heard that harvest tickets must be issued if requested for children too young to conceivably hunt such as one or two years of age. The board also heard that hunters under 16 years of age are disproportionately involved in hunting accidents. The board discussed setting an age of 12 years for issuing a harvest ticket but acknowledged that some 10 year olds are capable and that hunting traditions vary throughout the state. The board agreed this measure allows young people to participate in hunting.

PROPOSAL NO. 10**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit same day hunting from ATVs.

DISCUSSION: The board heard public comments on increased use of all terrain vehicles (ATV) in many popular hunting areas and on problems associated with noise, hunt quality, fairness between hunters, and stress on wildlife populations. The board viewed the proposal as too broad and considered applying the restriction only within a three-mile corridor along roads the road throughout the railbelt system. This idea was discarded for still being too broad possibly concentrating ATV traffic or penalizing areas without problems. Board members recommended a more localized approach to address specific problems.

PROPOSAL NO. 11**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Require deer harvest reports.

DISCUSSION: The board was satisfied that the department obtains better information for a lower cost through the current system of a mail-out survey. The board noted that 22,000 deer harvest reports would be needed annually and that harvest report response rates are poor, especially over long hunting seasons.

PROPOSAL NO. 12**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Include wounded animals in bag limit.

DISCUSSION: The board heard that current law is already more restrictive than what is proposed here. They discussed whether the public is sufficiently aware of the law, and if the wording in the hunting regulation booklet is adequate.

PROPOSAL NO. 13**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Establish unit-specific moose harvest tickets.

DISCUSSION: Board members recognized that this would be a very different model for management and explored whether the same result could be accomplished through a registration permit system. They considered the merits of forming a committee to address hunter crowding issues but chose not to. The board concluded that considerable thought and public participation would be needed before making a change along the lines of the proposal.

PROPOSAL NO. 14**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Tighten proxy loopholes.

DISCUSSION: Board members noted the proposal did not identify specific problems to address.

PROPOSAL NO. 15**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Require beneficiary to show prior and traditional use of resource in the area for proxy hunting.

DISCUSSION: The board heard from Department of Law that a statutory change would be required to adopt this proposal.

PROPOSAL NO. 16**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Allow proxy hunting for more than one person at a time for Tier II permits.

DISCUSSION: The board heard that people are allowed to hold several proxy permits but that they can only hunt for a single proxy at a time due to a statutory requirement.

PROPOSAL NO. 17**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Allow proxy hunting without beneficiary license in possession.

DISCUSSION: The board heard that this proposal is contrary to the proxy hunting provisions in statute, thus it would require legislative action in order to change.

PROPOSAL NO. 18**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Restrict proxy to hunting to only one animal at a time and require harvest report.

DISCUSSION: The board noted that this proposal would not solve the primary complaint that proxy hunts are being misused as a way to get several trophy hunts. The Department of Law commented that the first part of the proposal contradicts statute. The board found that the reporting requirement was unnecessary because the department is already getting harvest data.

PROPOSAL NO. 19**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Clarify big game populations allowed for use in religious ceremonies.

DISCUSSION: The board examined how customary and traditional determinations are made. The board used the example of bison, a non-subsistence species, and concluded that it was reasonable to add a requirement of a positive customary and traditional finding before a species could be taken under the provision for taking big game for religious ceremonies.

PROPOSAL NO. 20**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Require that big game taken for religious ceremonies be taken by means in existence when ceremony was established.

DISCUSSION: Board members rejected the premise that Alaska traditional hunting practices can not adapt over time. They also noted that certain traditional methods were more efficient than current legal methods.

PROPOSAL NO. 21**ACTION: Deferred to March 2002**

DESCRIPTION: Require reporting of cultural animal hunt prior to hunting.

DISCUSSION: Board members heard from the Department of Public Safety that unreported potlatch hunting is difficult to distinguish from poaching from an enforcement standpoint and that prior notification would greatly reduce enforcement problems. The

board appreciated that prior notification runs counter to practices in some parts of the state. They deferred action until the March 2002 Board of Game meeting in order to allow more time for the Department of Fish and Game and the Department of Public Safety to work with the public in crafting a solution.

PROPOSAL NO. 22**ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Prohibit sale of wolf-dog hybrids.**AMENDMENT:** It is unlawful, without the necessary permit, for a person to possess, sell or advertise for sale a wolf hybrid, as well as any animal represented to be a wolf or part wolf by any name or description. For purposes of this regulation a wolf hybrid includes the result between the mating of a wolf or wolf hybrid with a dog or another wolf hybrid. It is an affirmative defense to a prosecution for illegal possession under this subsection 1) that the person possessed the animal as a pet prior to January 23, 2002 and 2) that the animal was registered with a national registry approved by the Department by implantation of a microchip by July 1, 2002, and 3) that the animal was properly spayed and neutered by July 1, 2002, and 4) that the owner has kept accurate licensing, vaccination and neutering records, and made them available for inspection by animal control officers and other enforcement officers, and 5) that since January 23, 2002 has not been transferred to any person outside the immediate family of the person who owned it on January 23, 2002, and 6) that, if the animal has bitten anyone, the animal was immediately surrendered to the local authorities for any treatment deemed appropriate by the authorities.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted considerable public support for this proposal and they discussed how best to solve problems with the current law. The amended language was adopted because it effectively addressed concerns while placing the least impact on responsible current owners of wolf-hybrids.**PROPOSAL NO. 23****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify the use of live game for shooting preserves and for training dogs.**DISCUSSION:** The board heard department comment that this practice is already legal. The board recommended the department provide more information to the public for understanding current regulations.**PROPOSAL NO. 24****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Allow the issuance of cultural permits for taking migratory birds and eggs.**DISCUSSION:** The board heard that migratory birds and eggs are not currently included on the state's list for which permits can be issued. Board members discussed what defines "cultural" and whether cultural permits would result in unconstitutional discrimination between state residents. The Department of Law clarified that when the provision is a federal action, the state can authorize harvest in accordance with federal law such as for Round Island walrus or reindeer grazing. Board members noted advisory committee opposition to the proposal. The board adopted the proposal to broaden the permit authority and for consistency with federal regulations.**PROPOSAL NO. 25****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Include American peregrines on falconry list and allow take.

AMENDMENTS: Elements of Proposals 26, 29, 30, 32, and 60 were included in amendments. An 8-year performance standard for propagation permits was also included.
DISCUSSION: The board heard a review of falconry regulations. They amended the proposal to allow harvest only where peregrines are abundant, and to protect nests near human activity. The board sought consistency with federal regulations and permit standards.

PROPOSAL NO. 26**ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Remove capture permit requirements for arctic peregrines.**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action due to the action taken on Proposal 25.**PROPOSAL NO. 27****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify time frame reference for capture of raptors.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted that this was a department proposal which the department no longer supports. They discussed the complications of crafting a regulation to mesh with federal regulations which will be reviewed in the near future, possibly changing from a revolving year to a calendar year.**PROPOSAL NO. 28****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Remove banding requirement for certain raptors.**DISCUSSION:** Board members noted that falconry is a business as well as a sport. They heard that merlins, kestrels and sharp-shinned hawks are not illegally traded and that federal regulations no longer require banding these small birds. The board considered whether a lost bird would be encumbered by bands of different sizes. They chose to keep the banding requirement for identification purposes.**PROPOSAL NO. 29****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Eliminate restriction on annual take of Peale's falcons.**DISCUSSION:** Parts of this proposal were included in amendments to Proposal 25. The board discussed allowing the imprinting of a hybrid raptor as a substitute for surgical sterilization and whether the technique is effective. The board expressed concern over the possibility of hybrids escaping and breeding with wild birds and the prospects for verifying if a bird is imprinted.**PROPOSAL NO. 30****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Include American peregrines on falconry list and allow take.**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action due to the action taken on Proposal 25.**PROPOSAL NO. 31****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Allow selling of propagated falcons.**DISCUSSION:** Board members noted that the Alaska Board of Game and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game have consistently opposed commercialization of wildlife. They further noted that captive-bred raptors are intended to take pressure from wild take of Alaska raptors and that allowing export from the state would diminish this effect.

PROPOSAL NO. 32**ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Allow capture of passage peregrine falcons.**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action due to the action taken on Proposal 25.**PROPOSAL NO. 33****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Change dates allowed for taking of raptors used in falconry.**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed whether allowing earlier harvest for resident species would have any negative impact, and why only a ten-day change is requested. They referenced department comments that there would be no adverse biological impact.**PROPOSAL NO. 34****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Require radio collar removal and include funding in telemetry permit.**DISCUSSION:** The board agreed with department information that the recapture of animals to remove collars would be expensive and could cause mortality.**PROPOSAL NO. 35****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Limit moose registration permit to one per household in some hunts.**AMENDMENT:** The proposal was changed to include any big game.**DISCUSSION:** The board chose allow department discretion to limit the number of registration permits for any big game species to one per household. They noted that the limit would help insure a broader distribution of permits when a limited number are available. They discussed whether to include Tier II permits and drawing permits.**PROPOSAL NO. 36****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Designate distance to determine definition of rural for Tier II scoring.**DISCUSSION:** The board found that this proposal would discriminate on the basis of residency which would be inconsistent with current law.**PROPOSAL NO. 37****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Base Tier II scoring determination on personal use; restrict residents of one unit from other units.**DISCUSSION:** The board heard that the state cannot restrict federally qualified users from state subsistence hunts. They noted that young people can build Tier II history through household scoring or harvesting under their parents' Tier II permit.**PROPOSAL NO. 38****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Base Tier II scoring determination on household personal use, not community use.**DISCUSSION:** The board agreed that community caps, although controversial, have the merit of verifiability. They noted that the current system satisfies the intent of statute but has generated complaint with rural and urban users are equally. The board discussed whether to remove the 150 mile radius from the community cap for scoring Tier II applications but opted to keep it given the variables and possible unintended consequences of the changes. A change to the 150 mile radius individual cap was made under Proposal 40.

PROPOSAL NO. 39**ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Change Tier II point scoring so all scores vary by community.**DISCUSSION:** The board concluded that changes made to scoring criteria made under Proposal 40 addressed key issues identified in this proposal.**PROPOSAL NO. 40****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Change the Tier II application questions referencing household and individual use of meat.**AMENDMENT:** Increase from 30 years to 50 years the scoring cap on length of use and remove the 150 mile radius cap on individual harvest while retaining the 150 mile radius cap for community harvest.**DISCUSSION:** The board reviewed background on Tier II scoring and various possibilities for improving the system. The board chose to remove the 30-year cap to add weight for greater longevity. The board eliminated the 150 mile cap for individuals to account for harvest over a wider area. They also discussed how young people can get into the system; by household use, by hunting their parents permit or proxy hunting for older people.**PROPOSAL NO. 41****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Include marine mammals in total big game harvest for Tier II scoring.**DISCUSSION:** The board considered including all alternate protein sources, but chose not to because of difficulty in meshing state and federal systems, the lack of adequate data on marine mammal use, and difficulty in calculating dual community scores for based on differing eligibility for harvesting marine mammals.**PROPOSAL NO. 42****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Adjust Tier II scoring for muskox hunts on Seward Peninsula.**AMENDMENT:** Suspend for 10 years the inclusion of hunt history in the Tier II scoring formula for Unit 22 and 23 muskox hunts.**DISCUSSION:** The board recognized that because the Seward Peninsula hunt was recently opened hunters have not developed a history of participation in the hunt. Consequently, permit was essentially a random draw. Successful applicants would quickly develop an advantage over unsuccessful applicants in terms of their hunt history. The board also considered employing a multiple-year bag limit to spread hunting opportunity among more applicants but favored the suspension of the hunt history question.**PROPOSAL NO. 43****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Adjust Tier II scoring to reflect periods when a hunt was closed or no permits issued.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted that the current scoring system already takes into account times when hunting was precluded due to closures.**PROPOSAL NO. 44****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Eliminate references to community of residence for Tier II scoring.**DISCUSSION:** The department explained that food and fuel costs were chosen to measure availability of alternate sources. The board noted how volatility in fuel prices is reflected in the index and considered how closely food and fuel indexes track each other.

PROPOSAL NO. 45**ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify when aircraft-based viewing is considered disturbance of game.**AMENDMENT:** Add a definition of harass to mean repeatedly approaching an animal in a manner which results in the animal altering its behavior.**DISCUSSION:** The board recognized that under current regulations harassment is hard to define or enforce. The board sought to craft a regulation to effectively protect wildlife from repeated disturbances but not impinge on harmless activities. They noted examples of increased wildlife flightseeing operations and instances of biological harm.**PROPOSAL NO. 46****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Allow taking of wolves with snowmachines in intensive management areas or where Tier II ungulate hunts occur.**DISCUSSION:** Board members noted that not all big game populations identified for intensive management need wolf control. They also found that Tier II status of a prey population is not necessarily caused by wolf predation. The board agreed that snowmachines can be an appropriate tool to harvest wolves in certain areas where known to be needed, but concluded that this proposal is too broad. They also noted that a large percentage of wolves in a pack would need to be killed in order to have a significant impact on wolf predation**PROPOSAL NO. 47****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Allow taking of wolves with aircraft under permit.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted that regulations to allow permits are already in effect.**PROPOSAL NO. 48****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Simplify and clarify sealing requirements for bears.**DISCUSSION:** The board heard that this was a housekeeping proposal to better clarify and differentiate between bear species for sealing requirements.**PROPOSAL NO. 49****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Eliminate sealing requirements for black bears.**DISCUSSION:** The board reviewed complaints that sealing is cumbersome, that in some instances the hide is required to be sealed when it isn't even required to be salvaged, and that the current requirements may discourage harvest or lead to unreported harvest. The board weighed those factors against the reliance on black bear sealing data for management purposes in some areas. The board noted that area specific proposals can be submitted for regional meetings.**PROPOSAL NO. 50****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify parts of game legal for trapping bait.**AMENDMENT:** A person may not use game as food for a dog or furbearer, or as bait, except the hide, skin, viscera, head or bones of game legally taken or killed by vehicles, after salvage of edible meat.**DISCUSSION:** The board agreed with the intent to allow use of the same parts from road-killed animals as from legally taken animals. The department noted that use of game for

trapping bait is found in several sections of regulations and that clarification could be brought to the board at a future date.

PROPOSAL NO. 51**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify parts of game legal for trapping bait.**DISCUSSION:** The board considered this a housekeeping proposal to clarify the salvage requirements for bear meat and what may be used for animal food or bait.**PROPOSAL NO. 52****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Prohibit permits for using road kill as bait in Healy-Cantwell area.**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed area trapping patterns, reviewed state and federal protections for the Toklat wolf pack, and examined the seasonal range of Toklat wolves. The board heard department comment that removing this regulation would create a disposal problem for inedible meat from road-killed animals since this regulation relieves staff from dealing deal with carcasses, which landfills won't accept or only reluctantly.**PROPOSAL NO. 53****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Change salvage requirements for big game and require salvage of quarters and backstrap only.**DISCUSSION:** Board members noted that if adopted the regulation would violate the wanton waste statute. They also failed the proposal because it improperly distinguishes between users by specifying sport hunting, it exacerbates an already divisive issue, and it lacked support from advisory committees.**PROPOSAL NO. 54****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify the prohibition on feeding of game.**AMENDMENT:** Amended to include coyotes.**DISCUSSION:** Board members recognized that current regulations did not adequately discourage people from leaving out "attractive nuisances" such as garbage or pet food. They discussed the meaning and implications of "intentionally" versus "negligently" and concluded that negligently leaving human or pet food more defined the problem. The board noted the value of public education on the issue.**PROPOSAL NO. 55****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Create a controlled use area on the Kobuk River in Unit 23.**DISCUSSION:** This proposal was deferred from the November 2001 meeting. The board reviewed several issues associated with increased hunting activity on the upper Kobuk area in recent years. These included displaced hunting pressure due to access restrictions in nearby hunting area, increased commercial activities, declines in moose populations elsewhere in Unit 23, reduced seasons elsewhere in the state, and the appeal of concurrent hunts for different species. Board members considered hunting congestion in the area and what boundary might alleviate to reduce traffic in the most impacted areas, especially near the mouth of the Pah River. In opposing, board members noted the liberal seasons and bag limits in Unit 23, the concerns over hunters being restricted from many rural areas, and a lack of biological basis for creating a controlled use area. The board also considered if there were methods other than regulating transporters to address crowding such as requiring permits to camp, controlling the number of permits, or

implementing a dual-permit system such as the one in effect for moose hunting on the Koyukuk River.

PROPOSAL NO. 56**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Clarify the Game Management Unit boundaries for Units 13, 14, and 15.

DISCUSSION: The board noted support by advisory committees and public and recognized that this change would result in boundaries more easily identified in the field.

PROPOSAL NO. 57**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Establish a definition for calf.

DISCUSSION: The board agreed with the department that a definition for a calf would clarify which animals are available for harvest when the taking of calves is prohibited.

PROPOSAL NO. 58**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Establish a definition for possession limits.

DISCUSSION: The board agreed regulations need to be clarified to remedy confusion among bird hunters regarding daily limits, possession limits and in some cases season limits.

PROPOSAL NO. 59**ACTION: No action**

DESCRIPTION: Establish a definition for bag limit that includes wounded animals.

DISCUSSION: The board noted that wounding an animal already constitutes take and does count toward a bag limit. Also see discussion on Proposal 12.

PROPOSAL NO. 60**ACTION: No action**

DESCRIPTION: Clarify the take and acquisition standards for wild birds.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action due to the action taken on Proposal 25.

PROPOSAL NO. 61**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Allow the taking of deer from a boat in Unit 4.

DISCUSSION: The board noted mixed public testimony and advisory committee recommendations on this proposal. They heard from federal staff that this proposal was intended to align state regulations with the federal regulations allowing this practice in Unit 4. Interpretations of state and federal jurisdiction limits were reviewed. The board noted that hunting big game from boats is allowed in other areas of the state, but that those areas differed in geography, access, water conditions, and conditions for retrieving animals. Board members explored ways to modify the proposal by limiting boat size, setting season dates in the fall, specifying daylight use only, and by limiting the practice to protected inside waters. They also considered whether allowing shooting from boats if beached sufficiently to provide stable platform would satisfy the intent of the proposal. The board failed the proposal due to concern over high wounding loss rates, use by inexperienced hunters, and the vulnerability of deer during winter concentrations.

PROPOSAL NO. 62**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Modify Off-Road-Vehicle (ORV) policy to include wildlife food sources such as fish and fish streams.

DISCUSSION: Board members considered deferring this to the Board of Fisheries or a Joint Board meeting, but concluded that protecting habitat for aquatic mammals such as mink and otter and protecting fish habitat for mammals that feed on fish are within their scope of authority. They noted the policy addresses using ORVs for hunting and transport of game. Board members inquired about Division of Habitat long-term planning and noted previous board requests to the Department of Natural Resources to work with the Department of Fish and Game on reducing adverse impacts to habitat.

Other board actions

Unit 16B Intensive Management

The board heard a report on moose and predator populations in Unit 16 B. The board requested that the department develop options for intensive management for presentation at the March 2002 Board of Game meeting.

Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee request for resolution on abolishing the state subsistence law

The board noted that the subsistence law protects a number of important uses throughout the state and that it would be inappropriate to act on the request without the benefit of broader statewide input.

Joint Board Task Force

The board selected six members of the public to serve with the six members selected by the Board of Fisheries on a task force to identify a broad range of options for making the advisory committee system more effective.