

**BOARD OF GAME
SUMMARY OF ACTIONS
Fairbanks, Alaska
MARCH 8 - 18, 2002**

DESIGNATED REPORTER: Justin Crawford

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: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Extend bison season in Unit 20D to June30.

DISCUSSION: The department explained how a small number of bison are remaining in the Delta Agncultural Project instead of migrating to the bison range in the spring. The board rejected this proposal after citing the need to study this issue further and revisit it at the next cycle with the department providing a series of options. Concern was raised about changing the regulations to accommodate a relatively recent problem.

PROPOSAL NO. 2

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Eliminate brown bear tag fee in all of 20D.

DISCUSSION: The department explained how eliminating the brown bear tag fee would likely result in an excessive harvest. The board took no action based on the action taken and discussion on proposal 3.

PROPOSAL NO. 3

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Unit 20D Resident Brown Bear Tag Fee Reauthorization.

DISCUSSION: The department explained that harvest objectives for brown bear are currently being met, however moose and caribou calf survival remains low. The board discussed how the fee exemption is consistent with the board's authorized intensive management program to reduce bear predation on moose and caribou calves to increase the moose and caribou populations in 20D.

PROPOSAL NO. 4

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Establish drawing hunt in Unit 20D Bison Range Youth Moose Hunt.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that crop damage in the bison range was attributable to the recent increase in motorized vehicles used by moose hunters. This hunting activity may also be displacing the bison from the field. A safety issue was raised with staff working in the field while moose were actively being hunted. By creating a drawing hunt the department hopes to reduced bison forage damage and reduce competition in a crowded area while providing a good chance to see and harvest a moose. The board discussed other possible solutions including the creation of trails and noted that the bison range is a unique and artificial situation. The board determined that permit hunts would accommodate for the bison herd and legislative intent while reducing the harvest of moose in this small area.

PROPOSAL NO. 5**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Increase number of permits for moose hunt in Delta Junction MA.**DISCUSSION:** The department explained that the moose population in this area has a low recruitment rate. The department's intent is not to issue any more permits until the populations recruitment reaches desired levels. Hunting pressure and success has increased in recent years. The board considered this increase and asked the department to monitor the population further before increasing the number of permits issued.**PROPOSAL NO. 6****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Establish nonresident moose season in Tok MA in Unit 20D.**AMENDMENT:** Change location to the Robertson River drainage south of East and West Forks and within one mile west of West Fork.**DISCUSSION:** The department described how the moose migrate south to the mountains in the fall and winter making them unavailable during the Tier II hunt. The department further explained how this hunt has become less common for local hunters in recent years. Board members discussed recent population and hunting trends, noting that this season could lead to a higher success rate, but not substantial enough to hinder the population.**PROPOSAL NO. 7****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Change bag limit from 4 brow tines to 3 in southwest 20D.**DISCUSSION:** The department explained that this proposal would likely further reduce the recruitment rate and the population density while increasing the harvest success rate. This manipulation of the population would therefore make it necessary to bring about further restriction in the near future. The board expressed concern that liberalizing the restrictions would allow for the take of many younger bulls, further weakening the age class structure.**PROPOSAL NO. 8****ACTION: Tabled****DESCRIPTION:** Liberalize coyote season in 20D.**DISCUSSION:** The board tabled this proposal because the issue was considered and discussed at a region wide level in Proposal 149.**PROPOSAL NO. 9****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Establish wolf control plan for Macomb caribou herd.**DISCUSSION:** The board expressed concern over a predator control plan where little work has been done to determine the affect of predation on the caribou herd. The department recognized that relocating efforts and sterilization programs are expensive and are not entirely effective. Board members recognized the increasing hunting pressure on brown bears. The board further noted that the potential for growth of the caribou herd is limited making this endeavor very expensive per animal available for harvesting.**PROPOSAL NO. 10****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Eliminate Macomb Plateau Controlled Use Area in 20D.**DISCUSSION:** The board reviewed numerous letters opposing this proposal. The department explained that by allowing motorized traffic in the area that habitat degradation

would increase. Additionally, hunting pressure would increase on a population that is below its desired objective. The board was concerned that allowing motorized hunting opportunities in this area would lead to a possible over harvest of Macomb herd.

PROPOSAL NO. 11**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Modify boundary of Delta Controlled Use Area.

DISCUSSION: The department indicated their intent to maintain a sustainable harvest without having to manage the hunt by emergency order, in turn making the season more predictable for hunters. The department also noted that changing the boundary would eliminate incidental harvest by moose hunters. The board determined that changing the boundary of the DCUA would not negatively affect the caribou population in the expanded area and would simplify the hunting opportunity.

PROPOSAL NO. 12**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Restrict use of airboats for moose hunting in portions of Units 20B and 20D.

DISCUSSION: The department described how the airboat use in the concerned areas has increased in recent years while moose taken by hunters has only slightly increased. The board expressed concern over precluding a mechanized user to the area if there is not biological concern or substantial user group conflict to be considered.

PROPOSAL NO. 13**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Extend brown bear season in Unit 12 and align with 20E.

AMENDMENTS: Extend the season for residents and nonresidents to Sept. 1-June 30.

DISCUSSION: The department explained their intent to align season dates with the rest of the state, reduce the number DLPs, and eliminate incidental take by sheep hunters. The board recognized that different season dates can lead to confusion. Board members also noted that hide quality in August tends to be poor, while the June season is a good opportunity to take a high quality hide. The department stated that the brown bear harvest in Unit 12 is currently lower than the objective and that an increase in harvest would not be detrimental to the population. The board recognized the chance to expand hunting opportunities where biologically feasible.

PROPOSAL NO. 14**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Eliminate brown bear tag fee in Unit 20E.

AMENDMENT: To change the area affected to that portion of Unit 20E outside of Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve.

DISCUSSION: The department stated their goal to reduce brown bear numbers to increase moose calf survival. The department noted that although the moose population is currently stable, the calf survival is lower than desired. Board members expressed concern with further increasing the brown bear harvest without a response in moose calf survival. The board stated that moderate reduction of all predators would have the greatest affect on the moose population. The department explained that moose and caribou hunters are more likely to harvest a brown bear incidentally due to tag fee exemption, thus brown bear harvests will increase to a level that is more likely to cause the bear population to decline. Board members stated that federal land mandates not taking one species to benefit another. The board also noted that tag fee exemptions need to be

reviewed giving the department time to study this proposals affect on the moose and brown bear populations.

PROPOSAL NO. 15**ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Eliminate brown bear tag fee in Unit 20E.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 14.**PROPOSAL NO. 16****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Expand Tier II Nelchina caribou hunt to include Units 12 and 20E during winter season.**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action in this proposal after accepting the request by the author to withdraw the proposal.**PROPOSAL NO. 17****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Allocate winter harvest of Fortymile caribou among subunits.**DISCUSSION:** The department stated that fixed harvest quotas do not match well with caribou movements during the winter. The department expressed that it is more efficient, and creates more hunting opportunity, to have floating quotas taking into account the location of the wintering herd. The board commented on the positive intent of the proposal but determined this regulation would not be consistent with the current harvest plan.**PROPOSAL NO. 18****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Align northern Unit 20E moose season with remainder of 20E**DISCUSSION:** The department expressed concern with the current season dates that allow hunting to take place later than other areas on the road system. The department explained how the harvest and number of hunters in northern 20E has increased in recent years. The board discussed how quickly increasing hunting pressure can negatively affect the moose population and sex ratios. The department stated that if the season dates are not changed, more severe restrictions will be necessary to manage to moose population. Board members clearly stated a preference to being proactive instead of reactive to a declining moose population. The board also noted its preference to align hunting seasons for simplicity.**PROPOSAL NO. 19****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Shorten grouse season in Unit 20E by starting ten days later.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 117.**PROPOSAL NO. 20****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Open beaver hunting season in Units 12 and 20E.**AMENDMENTS:** Only a firearm may be used to take 6 beaver per season in Units 12 and 20E during September 20 to October 31 and April 16 to May 15 provided that the meat is salvaged for human consumption.**DISCUSSION:** The department recommended the amendment to ensure that the harvest does not become excessive during the open water period. The board discussed the need to increase trapping opportunity but was concerned about excessive harvesting and

waste. Board members noted most harvested beavers are used locally as food source and handicrafts. The board expressed concern over a later spring closing date do to the possibility of abandoning the kits of harvested beavers.

PROPOSAL NO. 21**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Restrict types of traps and snares for coyote in Units 12 and 20E.**DISCUSSION:** This was a housekeeping action to simplify trapping regulations and minimize non-target catch. Board members stated their intent to clarify regulations wherever possible.**PROPOSAL NO. 22****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Allow same day airborne predator calling for red fox and lynx in Units 12 and 20E.**DISCUSSION:** No action was taken on this proposal because the same day airborne taking of specific animals, including fox and lynx, is currently illegal under state law.**PROPOSAL NO. 23****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Make permanent the Units 12 and 20E snare identification requirement.**DISCUSSION:** The department explained how the number of violations concerning phantom sets declined as did non-target catch of other big game animals or pets. The department stated that trappers found compliance easy and trapping success was not affected. The board agreed with the need to label sets and not individual snares.**PROPOSAL NO. 24****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Change snare registration to include area within one mile of road in Units 12 and 20E.**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action in this proposal after accepting the request by the author to withdraw the proposal.**PROPOSAL NO. 25****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Remove sunset clause to allow continued snare registration in Units 12 and 20E.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 23.**PROPOSAL NO. 26****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Liberalize 19D black bear limit and establish registration hunt.**AMENDMENT:** Bag limit changed to 5 black bear**DISCUSSION:** The department expressed interest in evaluating the current situation before implementing a community harvest. The board discussed how a community harvest could be less restrictive, allowing for a hunter who would specialize in hunting black bears. Board members were optimistic that this hunt would attract local people to change their minds about eating bear. The department stated that black bears have the highest impact on moose calf mortality in this area. The board discussed how hunting for black bear in this area would serve to control the predator population.**PROPOSAL NO. 27****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Liberalize brown bear season and bag limit in Units 19C and 19D.

DISCUSSION: The department explained that liberalizing the bag limit for brown bear would slightly increase the harvest but would be in sustainable limits according to recent population estimates. The department stated that the sealing requirement would remain in place. The board discussed potential difficulties enforcing differences in yearly bag limits between units but agreed that increased harvest of brown bears is necessary to reduce the impact of predation on the moose population.

PROPOSAL NO. 28**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Unit 19D Brown Bear Tag fee exemption reauthorization.

DISCUSSION: The department explained that brown bear populations are currently within sustainable limits. Board members noted that tag fee exemptions help to increase the take on brown bears. The board also commented on hunters preference to pay a sealing fee instead for a tag fee.

PROPOSAL NO. 29**ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Close nonresident moose season in Unit 19.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 40.

PROPOSAL NO. 30**ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Close nonresident moose season in Unit 19.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 40.

PROPOSAL NO. 31**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize antlerless moose hunt in Lime Village, eliminate in remainder of Unit 19A.

AMENDMENTS: Change the winter season dates to February 1-5 for a bull only hunt upstream of the Kolamkof and Holokuk Rivers of 19A.

DISCUSSION: The department recommended not allowing cow harvests due to currently low recruitment rates and low population estimates. The board heard testimony from the local advisory committee who volunteered cut backs in local hunting to help maintain the moose population. The department reported a greater than normal wolf population in 19A. Board members decided that completely removing the February hunt was unnecessary. Additionally, the board determined the moose population could not sustain a winter cow hunt.

PROPOSAL NO. 32**ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Close nonresident moose season in Unit 19A.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 40.

PROPOSAL NO. 33**ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Close nonresident moose season in Units 19A and 19B.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 40.

PROPOSAL NO. 34**ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Change nonresident moose drawing hunt to registration hunt.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 40.

PROPOSAL NO. 35**ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Change nonresident moose drawing hunt back to general season.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 40.**PROPOSAL NO. 36****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Change nonresident moose drawing hunt back to general season.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 40.**PROPOSAL NO. 37****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Establish moose antler restrictions in Unit 19C and increase existing restrictions for nonresidents.**AMENDMENTS:** Change the resident and nonresident seasons to September 1-20.**DISCUSSION:** The department reported a slow decline in the moose population in Unit 19C. Hunter pressure and success has declined slightly in recent years. The department anticipates a stabilization of the bull:cow ratio in the moose population when the season is decreased 5 days. Board members recognized the potential decline in the moose population and stated their preference to act proactively. The department noted that subsistence and general hunt antler restrictions would reduce the harvest more than warranted at this time and limits placed on nonresidents will not likely affect the harvest rate. The board determined that reducing the season length benefits the moose population without adding antler restrictions.**PROPOSAL NO. 38****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify Unit 19D moose hunt boundary.**DISCUSSION:** The department reported that the current moose hunt boundary in Unit 19D is confusing for local hunters using the Kuskokwim River. The department stated that expanding the boundary is not likely to increase harvest. The board determined that this proposal would simplify the regulations and would not result in any increase harvesting of moose.**PROPOSAL NO. 39****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Close December moose season in portion of Unit 19D and shorten in the remainder of 19D.**DISCUSSION:** The department reported moose populations are currently at low densities and are no longer able to sustain a December hunting season. The winter hunt has been closed by emergency order the last 5 years. The board discussed potential season closings in August and December that would allow for a sustainable harvest in September. Board members determined that closing the December season would still provide local hunters a reasonable opportunity to harvest a moose. The department stated that in situations where populations are anticipated to be vulnerable, and that a season will not occur, the department prefers the language in the codified regulations. Emergency orders take time and create added expenses. The board expressed concern with extending the September season and allowing further take of more vulnerable bulls.**PROPOSAL NO. 40****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Create river corridor controlled use area along certain rivers in Unit 19.

AMENDMENTS: Create a controlled use area that is closed to nonresident moose and caribou hunting within two miles of the major water ways in Unit 19A & B, add the Aniak River drainage to the Holitna-Hoholitna management area, and return the general hunting season dates in 19A to September 1-20 and in 19B to September 1-25 for both resident and nonresident hunters.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that the moose population in Unit 19A & 19B is declining and recruitment levels are below objective. The board noted the need to resolve the conflicts among users while providing for the subsistence needs of the local people. The department supports reducing conflicts between user groups and reducing meat spoilage. Board members decided that meat spoilage would be reduced if the nonresident hunters were required to be picked up in the same unit in which they were dropped, not allowing them to float down river with the harvest animal. The department suggested that these restrictions would be difficult to enforce, and by extending the season in Unit 19B, could encourage hunting by nonresidents. The board stated its intent to support the suggestions made by the Unit 19 stakeholders while considering the customary and traditional determination for this area.

PROPOSAL NO. 41

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Align nonresident moose seasons along the Nowitna in Units 21A and 21B.

DISCUSSION: The department explained that this proposal creates a consistent harvest opportunity by aligning season in an area that is hunted predominantly by nonresidents. The department reported a stable moose population based on trend surveys and that this proposal is not likely to increase harvest. Board members discussed any guiding activity that would be affected by this proposal and determined that the majority of hunters in this area are using air taxis. The board supports consistency between areas unless there is an underlying biological reason not to do so.

PROPOSAL NO. 42

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt in Unit 21E.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that trend data suggests the moose population is stable and recruitment is healthy. The department noted that conditions for population counts have not been available in three years, however, estimated the winter harvest is within sustainable limits. Board members expressed concern about reauthorizing a hunt with modest population counts. The board did note local advisory committee support for the proposal in addition to the department's recommendation.

PROPOSAL NO. 43

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Issue surplus moose drawing permits for Unit 19 as registration permits.

DISCUSSION: The board reviewed actions taken on Proposal 40 and noted that there are no more drawing permits existing in Unit 19.

PROPOSAL NO. 44

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Extend wolf season and allow same day airborne hunting by reclassifying wolves.

DISCUSSION: The department stated that wolves are a valuable resource to a wide range of users and should not be removed from the big game list. The board acknowledged that they do not have the authority to authorize same day airborne hunting of game.

PROPOSAL NO. 45

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit use of snowmachines for taking wolves in wolf control areas.

DISCUSSION: The board stated that the use of snowmachines for taking of wolves in wolf control areas is a tool to reach management objectives. The wolf control areas were based on considerable evidence and board discussion. Board members noted that this proposal ignores the point of a control area. The board noted their intent that a report be submitted by the department when a wolf control area comes near expiration date to make a proper decision to reauthorize. The board did discuss the importance of public input in the planning process. Board members referenced discussion of issues addressed in proposal 46.

PROPOSAL NO. 46

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Establish wolf control plan in all of Unit 19 and allow use of snowmachines for taking wolves.

AMENDMENT: A snow machine may be used to take wolves provided that animals are not shot from a moving snowmachine in Unit 19. An area expansion of the current Unit 19D wolf control plan was not approved

DISCUSSION: The department stated that moose populations in Unit 19 are important for high levels of consumptive and the large population of wolves is likely responsible for the decline in the moose population. By expanding legal efforts to hunt wolves, the moose population should recover. The board stated that the use of snowmachines for taking of wolves in wolf control areas is a tool to reach management objectives. Board members noted the role of hunter ethics and the perception of general public. The department reported that the use of snowmachines when hunting wolves is primarily necessary to gain a distance advantage on the wolf. The department stated that wolves are a valuable local resource, not commonly sold out of unit. The board agreed with the department's goal of reducing wolves in this area and that any reasonable management tool that would facilitate that goal is rational. The department noted that much of Unit 19 is state owned land providing more options for active management. The board stated that by requiring the hunter to shoot from a stationary snowmachine this proposal is more acceptable to more people and gives the local people the opportunity to make a difference in controlling the wolf population in regards to maintaining moose populations. Board members discussed the option of removing the stipulation requiring shooting from a stopped snowmachine but concluded that stopping is far more efficient and affective while it does not impede with the intent of using a snowmachine to take a wolf.

PROPOSAL NO. 47

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Suspend wolf control plans until base of solid science is established.

DISCUSSION: The department stated that wolf control implementation plans are a direct response to intensive management areas where predation has been determined to be a

substantial hindrance in the ungulate population that is necessary for subsistence and other uses. Furthermore the department is already held to high level science standard. The board agreed that the department is conducting sound science currently and the standards suggested by this proposal are impractical.

PROPOSAL NO. 48**ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Require moose hunters using aircraft to obtain permit.**DISCUSSION:** The department explained that limiting hunters by permitting the access method is not efficient. The board noted the impracticality of enforcing this proposal and attempting to separate moose hunters from non-moose hunters.**PROPOSAL NO. 49****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Expand Holitna-Hoholitna Controlled Use Area.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 40.**PROPOSAL NO. 50****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Include aircraft in the vehicles prohibited in the Holitna-Hoholitna Controlled Use Area.**DISCUSSION:** The department stated that this proposal would compromise Proposal 40 and the existing controlled use area. Board members referenced discussion on Proposal 40 and mentioned that nonresident hunters can no longer hunt within 2 miles of the river system. The board noted that many concerns of the local people were addressed in Proposal 40.**PROPOSAL NO. 51****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Eliminate cow hunt in Unit 21.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 53.**PROPOSAL NO. 52****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Restrict guiding and trophy moose hunting in Unit 21E.**DISCUSSION:** The department reported that the moose population is stable and sex ratios are optimal in Unit 21E. Board members noted that if subsistence requirements are met, and there is a harvestable surplus remaining, the state must provide for other residents and hunters. The board concluded they did not have grounds to close the hunting season and needed to continue to provide reasonable opportunity.**PROPOSAL NO. 53****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Reauthorize winter antlerless moose hunt in Unit 21D.**AMENDMENTS:** A person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf. Change the fall antlerless moose season of September 21-25 outside the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area to be closed by emergency order when necessary.**DISCUSSION:** The department mentioned that once an antlerless moose hunt is removed from the codified language it is difficult to get reinstated. It is the departments intent to close the fall antlerless hunt by emergency order when biologically appropriate. The board recognized the need to closely monitor the moose population in Unit 21D, but determined it was appropriate to allow the department to close the season by emergency order when biologically necessary.

PROPOSAL NO. 54**ACTION: No action**

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit harvest of moose calves or cows accompanied by calves in Unit 21D.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 53.

PROPOSAL NO. 55**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Remove one half mile moose hunting restriction along the Yukon River in Unit 21D.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that there are difficulties identifying the 1/2 mile closed area making it difficult to enforce. Additionally, with the Air Force base closing in Galena there have been fewer people hunting the river corridor. Board members noted that the corridor was created due to concerns over hunter traffic where moose were gathering during the winter. The Federal Subsistence Board considered removing the restriction but didn't want to create a difficult situation varying from state regulations. The board determined that large amounts of traffic are no longer a concern along the Yukon River in Unit 21D.

PROPOSAL NO. 56**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Allocate Koyukuk moose drawing permits according to number of wolves killed.

DISCUSSION: The department stated that reallocation of a limited number of permits would be difficult. Board members noted that the wolf harvest would not likely increase. The department indicated that the wolf harvest would need to significantly increase, more than the proposal would likely generate, to have an impact on the wolf population. The board addressed administration concerns with accurately knowing that wolves harvested were from the Koyukuk area. Board members did discuss possibly changing the percentage of drawing permits to be allocated but concluded that this proposal would be too difficult to accurately administrate and ultimately would not affect predation.

PROPOSAL NO. 57**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt in Unit 24.

AMENDMENTS: Create a drawing permit hunt along the Dalton Highway Corridor. Include the fall antlerless moose season to be closed by emergency order when necessary.

DISCUSSION: The department mentioned that once an antlerless moose hunt is removed from the codified language it is difficult to get reinstated. It is the department's intent to close the fall antlerless moose season by emergency order when biologically appropriate. The department reported a recent decline in moose populations and recruitment rates. The department is taking an active role in trying to educate locals to preserve cows. Board members recognized the need to closely monitor the moose population in Unit 24, but determined it was appropriate to allow the department to close the season by emergency order when biologically necessary. The department further indicated a decline in moose numbers along the Dalton Highway Corridor. The board felt it necessary to establish a drawing permit hunt along the corridor in light of recent population estimates.

PROPOSAL NO. 58**ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Close antlerless moose season in portion of Unit 24.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 57.**PROPOSAL NO. 59****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Require all meat to remain on the bone for moose in Unit 21 and salvage of head.**AMENDMENT:** The boars removed the requirement to salvage the head.**DISCUSSION:** The department stated that this proposal would bring consistency to the regulations by making it easy to determine if all the meat has been salvaged. The board debated the existence of a wanton waste concern in this area. This proposal does address a goal in the management plan to reduce waste in the area. Board members noted that this proposal discourages other users who want the opportunity but who are not interested in the meat. Public Safety noted that a statewide approach to meat on the bone would provide consistency in the regulations. The board referenced public testimony that argued the recovery of the head was not an essential provision to this proposal. Board members determined the salvage requirement for hunters would require them to take the meat from field to the place where it will be processed or consumed, either home or commercial point of process. This condition will give hunters added incentive to care for meat. The board debated the need to salvage rib meat and concluded that it is still part of the edible meat from the animal. The board discussed the physically demanding requirements of carrying the meat but determined that most people hunt in groups, aiding the recovery process.**PROPOSAL NO. 60****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Require meat on bone for moose in Unit 21B.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 59.**PROPOSAL NO. 61****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Require meat on bone for moose in Unit 24, and include ribs.**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed the importance of including a stipulation for retaining meat on the bone for harvested caribou. The department noted that current regulations don't require taking of ribs of caribou. Caribou issues have been discussed before concerning meat on bone in river corridor hunts. Board members discussed the potential economic impacts this proposal would bestow on hunters who utilize both airplane and boating access. The board referenced their discussion on Proposal 59, giving hunters added incentive to care for meat.**PROPOSAL NO. 62****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Establish wolf control plan for Unit 24.**DISCUSSION:** The department reported that the moose population in Unit 24 is declining and calf survival is lower than desired. However, the impact of the wolf population in this area has not been studied thoroughly enough to determine their impact on the moose population. Board members noted that the majority of land in Unit 24 is federally managed and that there is not broad support for the implementation of predator control. The department mentioned that without positively determining the wolf populations role in

controlling the Unit 24 moose population, a predator control plan would not be feasible considering current funding restraints. The board discussed the likely involvement of other predators. Board members noted that the legislature has built in triggers for implementing intensive management that have not be established in Unit 24. The board stated that the rural communities are losing trappers who have traditionally trapped wolves.

PROPOSAL NO. 63**ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Establish controlled use area in Huslia/Dakli river drainage.**DISCUSSION:** The department expressed concerns about the clarity of the proposed boundaries and the problems likely to develop if the permits issued were increased. The board decided that this proposal contradicts the current management plan that both local and non-local hunters have agreed to.**PROPOSAL NO. 64****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Modify portion of Koyukuk Controlled Use area to allow aircraft.**DISCUSSION:** The department expressed concern about the potential affect this proposal could have on the current management plan and the working relationship that has developed with the local people. The department noted the potential for an increase in the number of hunters using the subsistence permit option to hunt. Board members heard testimony from local people who would prefer there to be a non-hunting area where moose can find sanctuary. The board did not want to undermine the current management plan.**PROPOSAL NO. 65****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Redefine boundaries of the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area.**AMENDMENTS:** Backup the original language with latitude and longitude coordinates.**DISCUSSION:** The department stated that they are looking to improve the language of boundary by including latitude and longitude coordinates. The department further noted that coordinates on the existing boundary will significantly help to prevent aircraft hunters from entering the controlled use area, considering that physical descriptions are hard to identify and define from the air. Board members stated that most local people do not use a G.P.S. unit, they understand the local landmarks. The board agreed that the proposed boundary is easily discernable and more recognizable on the ground. The board noted the importance of accommodating the most people by having descriptions of discernable landmarks in addition to latitude and longitude coordinates.**PROPOSAL NO. 66****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Establish controlled use area to prohibit airboats in upper Koyukuk drainage.**DISCUSSION:** The department mentioned that boat type information in this area is not collect on harvest tickets. The board expressed concern with precluding airboat use without evidence of biological impact or user conflicts in this area.**PROPOSAL NO. 67****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Eliminate Koyukuk Controlled Use Area.

DISCUSSION: The board heard testimony from locals concerned about the increasing use of hunters flying in. The department stated that currently many moose hunters are accessing the area relying on the subsistence permit option. Board members expressed concern that by eliminating the controlled use area more hunters would be attracted to the area

PROPOSAL NO. 68

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Establish moose check station at Huslia.

DISCUSSION: The board expressed concern with the unavailability of funding for an additional check station and noted the lack of public support.

PROPOSAL NO. 69

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Redefine boundaries of the Kanuti Controlled Use Area to decrease size.

DISCUSSION: The board expressed concern about expanding hunting pressure on a declining moose population. This proposal would force the federal government to change the subsistence boundaries for the Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. The department described the area to be excluded by this proposal, Todatonten Lake, to be shallow, providing poor or unsafe access for hunters. The department stated that the impact of adopting this proposal could compromise the delicate relationship with the local planning group. Board members recognized that changing this controlled use area boundary will likely negatively impact effort to continue the Kanuti Management Plan. The board noted the value in the compromises worked out among users.

PROPOSAL NO. 70

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Expand the boundaries of the Kanuti Controlled Use Area.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that harvests in proposed expansion is 1 moose per year. The board discussed how the controlled use area topic is contentious among the local planning group. Expanding or contracting the area has major implications to causing frustration and possible detrimental affects on the stakeholder views of the management plan.

PROPOSAL NO. 71

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Establish a black bear Community Harvest Permit hunt and season in Unit 25D

DISCUSSION: The department reported that Unit 25D has an abundant black bear population that receives limited hunting pressure. A small number of people in the local communities take a disproportionate amount of resource. The department stated that a community harvest permit would be more efficient than applying for a harvest permit and would establish a reporting system for harvests. Board members discussed the importance of trying to recognize a local cultural need and accommodating it with the department's reporting system. The board noted this proposal would open communication and reporting efforts of local hunters without putting the resource at risk.

PROPOSAL NO. 72

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Open a Unit 25D fall black bear bait season.

DISCUSSION: The department reported an abundant black bear population, receiving limited hunting pressure in Unit 25D. The board recognized that additional harvesting of

black bears would be within sustainable limits. Board members noted that hunting from a bait station allows a bear to enter a controlled area where the observer can determine if the bear is legal. The board mentioned that giving fair opportunity to take a legal animal can also be a management tool to reduce bear predating on moose calves.

PROPOSAL NO. 73**ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Extend brown bear season in Unit 25A to June 15.**AMENDMENTS:** Include Subunits 25B and 25D for June 15 closure.**DISCUSSION:** The department stated that extending the spring season provides more opportunity and aligns season with adjacent GMUs, having little effect on the total harvest. Board members stated their desire to gain consistency in the regulations and concluded that a season extension would not negatively affect the black bear population. The board discussed including Subunit 25C but determined that good road access would lead to an increase in hunting pressure.**PROPOSAL NO. 74****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Extend brown bear season in Unit 25D to year-round season for resident hunters.**AMENDMENTS:** Change the resident brown bear season to March 1-November 30, and the nonresident season to September 1-November 30 and March 1-May 31.**DISCUSSION:** The department reported an abundant brown bear population that receives limited local hunting pressure. The board recognized that additional harvesting of brown bears would be within sustainable limits and supported changing the brown bear season in Unit 25D. However, the board did not want convey the perception that they do not value bears. Board members expressed concern with hunting at the den locations during the winter. The board did discuss the lower trophy value of brown bears harvested during the spring but determined that the significance of local people being able to teaching traditional ways to harvest bears was of significant importance. The department recognized that the principle affect of this proposal is to increase harvest reporting. Board members discussed the likelihood of wasteful taking during the summer seasons but concluded that incidental harvesting would be minimal due to the limited accessibility of the area.**PROPOSAL NO. 75****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Reauthorize Unit 25D brown bear tag fee exemption.**DISCUSSION:** The department reported an abundant brown bear population that receives limited local hunting pressure. The board recognized that additional harvesting of brown bears would be within sustainable limits and could also be a management tool to reduce bear predation on moose calves.**PROPOSAL NO. 76****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Lengthen brown bear season in Unit 26B and eliminate permit requirement for nonresidents.**DISCUSSION:** The department stated that drawing permit season has been found necessary to regulate bear populations. Board members noted that hunters in this area enjoy relatively easy access and few restrictions on guides. The department reported that most bears taken in Unit 26B are the incidental harvests of caribou hunters. With current

regulations the brown bear population is at sustained yield. The board expressed concerns that without nonresident permits the harvest has historically increased dramatically due to incidental taking.

PROPOSAL NO. 77**ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Align brown bear season in Unit 26B with remainder of Unit 26.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the action taken and discussion on bear densities and hunting pressure on Proposal 76.**PROPOSAL NO. 78****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Establish antler restriction for nonresident moose hunters in Unit 25A and align season.**DISCUSSION:** The department reported that moose densities in Unit 25A are declining and have a patchy distribution. Having no antler restrictions misinforms hunters to believe that moose are abundant and hunting pressure is low. The board determined that reducing the harvest of moose through antler restrictions would likely allow moose densities to recover. Board members also noted that most nonresident hunters are trophy hunting and would not be greatly affected by this proposal.**PROPOSAL NO. 79****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Change moose seasons dates in Unit 25B to align with Unit 25D along the Porcupine River.**DISCUSSION:** The department reported that existing moose seasons in 25B center on the moose rutting season. The board discussed the benefits of aligning the hunting seasons with the neighboring subunits by creating regulation consistency in upper and lower sections of the Porcupine River. The department noted that harvest rates will not be significantly altered as a result of this proposal.**PROPOSAL NO. 80****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Close nonresident moose season and establish registration permit hunt in Unit 25D for resident hunters.**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action in this proposal after accepting the request by the author to withdraw the proposal. The department stated that creating a registration permit hunt could improve harvest reporting but would be difficult to manage.**PROPOSAL NO. 81****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Open moose season in portion of Unit 26B (West).**DISCUSSION:** The department reported that the north slope moose population and recruitment rates have declined dramatically in recent years. In addition, the habitat is marginal for moose in this area. The board expressed concern with opening a moose season in this area, and concluded that a season should not be made available until moose densities recover.**PROPOSAL NO. 82****ACTION: Tabled****DESCRIPTION:** Establish sheep drawing permit for portion of Unit 25A.

DISCUSSION: The department reported a decline in sheep population in conjunction with an increase in nonresident sheep hunting pressure. Also noted was a decline in hunt success rates. The department stated their management goals as providing a harvest of full curl or larger rams, an aesthetic hunting, subsistence uses, viewing and photography opportunities. The department further stated their current intention is to limit harvesting. The board stated that drawing permits would put smaller guides out of business, leaving only large guides putting pressure on the sheep population. Board members discussed the creation of an allocation permit hunt, allowing each guide 6 permits. The department noted this permit hunt would be very complex and may have ramifications not yet thought of. Board members decided to direct letters to land managing agencies that require permits for big game guides to step up their diligence of getting these permits. The board decided to table this proposal and invite a more suitable option in the future.

PROPOSAL NO. 83**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Increase wolf bag limits in Units 25A, 25B and 25D.

DISCUSSION: The department reported a decreasing harvest of wolyes in recent years despite having an abundant and wide spread population. If bag limits are changed, a small increase in the wolf harvest is anticipated. Board members discussed the relatively few hunters who maximize their current bag limit of 5 wolves. The board noted that with the currently low fur prices, this proposal is not likely to dramatically diminish the wolf population.

PROPOSAL NO. 84**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Extend Prudhoe Bay Closed Area to include portion of Dalton Highway Corridor within 1/4 mile of the highway.

AMENDMENTS: Establish a new North Slope Closed Area closed to the taking of big game. This closed area consists of the area within 1/4 mile from each side of the Dalton highway, including the drivable surface of the Dalton Highway, from the Unit 26(B) boundary at Atigun Pass north to the southern boundary of the Prudhoe Bay Closed Area.

DISCUSSION: The department described changes roadside hunting patterns along the Dalton Highway. The department further noted that overall harvests amounts and number of hunters have increased in recent years. The board stated their objective to prohibit shooting directly from the road. Board members noted that hunters who walk into an area usually are more selective in the animal they harvest. By prohibiting hunting within a 1/4 mile from the road the board is hoping to eliminate overly crowded bow hunting along road and address problems of wasteful hunting practices identified by the public.

PROPOSAL NO. 85**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Create controlled use area for sheep bowhunting in Atigun drainage in Unit 26B.

DISCUSSION: The department reported an increase in the number of sheep hunters in this area. Additionally, hunter success rates have decreased in recent years. Board members expressed concern that an increase in hunting pressure would increase the frequency of illegally harvested sheep. The board determined that creating a controlled use area would not alleviate the hunting pressure on the sheep population.

PROPOSAL NO. 86**ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Redefine the boundary between Unit 26A and 26B.**DISCUSSION:** The department expressed concern that by redefining the boundary a traditional hunting area near Anaktuvuk Pass would be split, creating a more restrictive caribou hunt closer to the community. Board members recognized the difficulty in distinguishing the current boundary from the ground. The board discussed how the current boundary arrangements are located on drainages and that changing these boundaries would change department data sets when comparing information from previous years.**PROPOSAL NO. 87****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Extend brown bear season in Unit 20A, start Sept. 5**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 88.**PROPOSAL NO. 88****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Lengthen Unit 20A brown bear season, open Sept. 5.**DISCUSSION:** The department stated that brown bears in Unit 20A are managed on a sustained yield basis and not to reduce predatory impacts on an ungulate population. The department noted that this proposal will provide increased hunting opportunity while maintaining the bear population. Current bear harvests have been slightly lower than the harvestable surplus. Board members noted that opening the bear season after the moose season can offer bears a time period to adjust to hunter presence in field. The board determined that by increasing hunting opportunity the brown bear population will not be dramatically lessened and therefore concluded that this harvest will be sustainable.**PROPOSAL NO. 89****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Extend brown bear season in Unit 20A, start Sept. 1.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 88.**PROPOSAL NO. 90****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Extend brown bear season in Unit 20A, start Sept. 1.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 88.**PROPOSAL NO. 91****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Liberalize brown bear bag limit, one every year in Unit 20A controlled use areas.**DISCUSSION:** The department stated that this proposal would create less incentive to hunt brown bears in other areas where brown bears have been determined to be a significant predator on ungulates. Board members expressed concern with diluting the affect of hunters on predator populations of concern. The board also discussed problems with creating different bag limits within Unit 20A. The department noted that brown bears are not major predators in Unit 20A.**PROPOSAL NO. 92****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Align brown bear season in portion of Unit 20A with Unit 20D, and eliminate tag fee.

DISCUSSION: The department expressed concern that opening the brown bear season this early would allow for the number of brown bears taken to far exceed the harvestable population. Board members discussed the paying of a fee when the bear is sealed but determined that paying a tag fee is not a significant financial burden. The board determined that liberalizing the brown bear season would unnecessarily increase the number of bears harvested.

PROPOSAL NO. 93

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Allocate Unit 20A caribou drawing permits according to number of wolves killed.

DISCUSSION: The department expressed concern that trap line conflicts could increase as a result of this proposal. Board members stated that competition for these permits would be intense. The department noted the difficulty in determining where a wolf is trapped and that bootlegging would be a concern. The board decided that by allocating permits a bias would be generated against hunters who currently apply for a permit.

PROPOSAL NO. 94

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Establish a winter season for Fortymile caribou in Units 20B and 20D.

DISCUSSION: The department established that increasing hunting opportunity is outlined in the Fortymile caribou herd harvest plan. The board determined that with a growing herd the average harvest quota should be determined by the herd trend.

PROPOSAL NO. 95

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Change bag limit for White Mts. Caribou from any caribou to any bull and shorten season.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that this proposal would not decrease the population. Board members stated that hunting opportunity would not decrease significantly as a result of this proposal. The board also noted the opportunity to align hunting seasons.

PROPOSAL NO. 96

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Establish Take a Child Hunting (TACH) seasons in Units 20 and 25.

DISCUSSION: The board addressed the establishment of TACH seasons in Proposal 148. They concluded based on department recommendations that listing TACH hunts under general statewide provisions was a better option than listing them in the seasons and bag limits provisions. The board chose to not add Unit 25 to the list for TACH hunts at this time because of low density moose populations and the opposition of the local fish and game advisory committee to concept of TACH seasons. The board noted that nothing precludes hunters from taking children during the general hunt and that most school districts consider this an excused absence.

PROPOSAL NO. 97

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Shorten bull moose season in Unit 20A and reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt.

AMENDMENTS: One antlerless moose by registration permit only during the season to be announced by emergency order. Recipients of this permit are prohibited from taking an

antlered bull moose in Unit 20A. Retain the current resident and nonresident hunting seasons of September 1-20. Change requirement for resident hunters within the Nenana Controlled Use Area to 1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side.

DISCUSSION: The department reported high moose densities but a low bull:cow ratio in Unit 20A. The department stated that if the harvest level of the bull population is not changed the moose population would likely decline. The department also reported a recent increase in hunting pressure in Unit 20A. Board members noted that reducing the harvest of bulls and providing a minimal antlerless hunt would maintain a stable population and possibly increase recruitment. The board stated that hunting opportunity would not be diminished and that cow harvests will be substitutable to bulls when considering subsistence. Board members considered eliminating the calf permit but concluded that the moose population is nutritionally stressed due to competition for limited resources. The department further noted that the harvest of calves would most likely be compensatory and is biologically sustainable. Board members noted the unlikelihood of a permitted hunter to harvest a cow accompanied by a calf. The board did discuss possible reservations by the public to accept a calf hunt and considered a sunset clause.

PROPOSAL NO. 98**ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Shorten nonresident moose season in Unit 20A.**DISCUSSION:** Take no action based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 97.**PROPOSAL NO. 99****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Lengthen moose season in Unit 20A.**DISCUSSION:** Take no action based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 97.**PROPOSAL NO. 100****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Liberalize moose antler restrictions for nonresidents from 4 to 3 brow tines.**DISCUSSION:** The department expressed concern that liberalization of hunting restrictions would increase the harvest of bull moose in 20A. Board members noted that the majority of nonresident hunters are trophy hunters, unlikely to take a 3 brow tine moose. The board also discussed the low bull:cow ratio and its affects on the moose population as mentioned in Proposal 97.**PROPOSAL NO. 101****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Liberalize moose antler restrictions for nonresidents from 4 to 3 brow tines.**DISCUSSION:** Take no action based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 100.**PROPOSAL NO. 102****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Implement antler restrictions in Unit 20A, except Healy Lignite Management Area.**DISCUSSION:** Take no action based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 97.

PROPOSAL NO. 103**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Allow 2 hunters to harvest any bull, single hunters have antler restrictions in Unit 20A.

DISCUSSION: The department expressed concern that this proposal would likely result in an increase in the harvest of bull moose, contradicting the need to limit the bull moose harvest. Board members noted that harvest success rates will likely increase in the absence of antler restrictions. The board referenced their discussion on Proposal 97 and Proposal 111.

PROPOSAL NO. 104**ACTION: No action**

DESCRIPTION: Establish antler restrictions in all of Unit 20A.

DISCUSSION: Take no action based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 97.

PROPOSAL NO. 105**ACTION: No action**

DESCRIPTION: Open muzzleloader season for moose in Wood River Controlled Use Area.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action on this proposal because this hunt is currently in the codified regulations, but has not been issued recently due to biological concerns. The board further noted that creating a late season hunt of moose would contradict other decisions to shorten the moose season for biological purposes.

PROPOSAL NO. 106**ACTION: No action**

DESCRIPTION: Establish antler restrictions in Wood River Controlled Use Area.

DISCUSSION: Take no action based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 97.

PROPOSAL NO. 107**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Unit 20B cow moose reauthorization.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that the Minto Flats moose population is in good condition and is fully capable of sustaining moderate hunting pressure. Board members noted the opportunity to provide harvesting of a relatively abundant cow moose population.

PROPOSAL NO. 108**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Establish any bull drawing hunt for Minto Flats.

DISCUSSION: The department reported a healthy moose population and availability of a harvestable surplus in Minto Flats. The department further stated that this proposal would likely generate a higher hunting success rate by eliminating antler restrictions to those permitted hunters, but would require a shorter season because more bulls would be available. The board commented that they do not want to limit the number of hunters in an area to accommodate one user group. Board members expressed concern about restricting the number of hunters in an area with a healthy moose population. The board did discuss Tier II implications in Minto Flats.

PROPOSAL NO. 109**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Establish late season any bull bowhunt in remainder of Unit 20B.

AMENDMENT: Late season in Unit 20B East only.

DISCUSSION: The department expressed concern with adding to the bull harvest where bull:cow ratios are currently low. Board members noted that this late season would provide for increased opportunity in hunting bulls. The board decided that a late season hunt was acceptable in Unit 20B East because there are no biological concerns for bull:cow ratios in this area and the boundary description is already identified in the hunting regulations.

PROPOSAL NO. 110

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Modify bag limit for moose in Minto Flats from 4 to 3 brow tines.

DISCUSSION: The department expressed concern that changing bag limits substantially would increase the harvest of moose and therefore lower the bull:cow ratio. Board members were uncomfortable accommodating an increase in harvest on a population that currently is decreasing in density.

PROPOSAL NO. 111

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Create a 3 party hunt for any bull moose in Minto Flats for residents.

DISCUSSION: The department expressed concern with increasing the bull harvest and potentially hunting pressure in this area. The board noted that liberalizing antler restrictions would increase hunting success. Board members also stated that communication within the hunting party would be difficult and could lead to an illegal moose harvest. The board concluded that this proposal could be detrimental to the population and would be difficult to enforce.

PROPOSAL NO. 112

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Create a 3 party hunt for any bull moose in Minto Flats.

DISCUSSION: No action based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 111.

PROPOSAL NO. 113

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Align resident and nonresident moose seasons in Unit 20C by lengthening nonresident season.

DISCUSSION: The department expressed concern that lengthening the nonresident season would attract more hunters to the area because of its proximity to an urban area and the lack of antler restrictions. Board members noted that increasing the number of hunters would likely decrease their success rates. The board stated that Unit 20C does share season dates with surrounding subunits and that extending the nonresident season could have detrimental effects on a population that is not harvested maximally.

PROPOSAL NO. 114

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Clarify boundaries for Unit 20F moose season.

DISCUSSION: The department stated that this is a housekeeping proposal that clarifies the codified and regulation booklet, making them one in the same. The board stated its record for clarifying wording wherever possible to simplify regulations.

PROPOSAL NO. 115

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Establish late season any bull archery hunt in Unit 20F.

DISCUSSION: The department expressed concern with increasing hunting pressure on a low density moose population near the road system. The department further noted that

the bow hunting community in the interior has increased in recent years, creating more hunting pressure. Board members stated that late season hunts are typically more successful and have the potential of eliminating a large number of bulls that could have lived through the winter season. The board finally noted that locals are very dependent on the moose population for subsistence.

PROPOSAL NO. 116**ACTION: No action**

DESCRIPTION: Align moose season on both sides of the Steese Highway in portion of Unit 25C.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action in this proposal after accepting the request by the author to withdraw the proposal.

PROPOSAL NO. 117**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Modify ptarmigan and grouse seasons in Units 12, 20B, and portions of 20D, and 25C; tracking strategy.

DISCUSSION: The department noted that winter harvest is additive and has the greatest affect on these populations. High winter harvests can prolong population recovery. Board members noted the need to adapt hunting seasons to the cyclic nature of populations where reasonable. The department stated that population trends are being monitored throughout the proposed area. Board members determined that a harvestable surplus could be established during population peaks that would not demise the bird population. The board made a positive customary and traditional finding for use of ptarmigan and grouse in Units 12, 20, 21, 24, and 25

PROPOSAL NO. 118**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Modify zones and seasons for waterfowl and establish spring hunting season.

DISCUSSION: The department stated that changing the hunting zones is done at the federal level with the USFWS. The department further noted that the federal migratory bird treaty prohibits waterfowl hunting March 10-September 1. Board members determined that Alaska has the largest possible season allowable by federal law. The department explained that recently allowable spring hunts are only authorized in rural areas and for subsistence use by federal regulation, thus these hunts can only be authorized by federal approval. Board members did acknowledge that the majority of birds have left the Interior region hunting areas by early September. The department explained that attempting to modify the regulations to allow Alaskan resident hunters a spring hunt would require a new treaty process. The board concluded that they do not have the authority to approve these modifications.

PROPOSAL NO. 119**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Allow the use of aircraft for taking beaver in the Minto Flats Management Area.

AMENDMENT: Allow the use of aircraft from March 1-April 15 only.

DISCUSSION: The department reported no biological concerns with beaver populations in the Interior region. Board members noted that pelt prices are currently low making beaver trapping unattractive. The board recognized the potential conflict between local

trappers and those using aircraft and wanted to avoid those problems as were reported in the past. The board heard that aircraft access for trapping would expand pressure to areas not commonly accessed and would increase trapping opportunity. Board members decided that by allowing local ground trappers to establish traplines early in the season prior to March 1, trappers using aircraft access would not impede on visibly existing trap lines. The board concluded that this amendment would allow local and aircraft trapping to continue while expanding the range of trapping activity.

PROPOSAL NO. 120**ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Eliminate beaver sealing requirement in Unit 20.**AMENDMENTS:** Eliminate beaver sealing requirements in Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B & C.**DISCUSSION:** The department stated that sealing information is not currently being used to make biological decisions. The department further reported no population concerns with Interior region beaver populations due the low trapping pressure and low fur prices. Board members expressed concern with eliminating the collection of previously important biological information, but concluded that eliminating beaver sealing requirement was prudent at this time.**PROPOSAL NO. 121****ACTION: Tabled****DESCRIPTION:** Increase the size of the area closed to wolf hunting and trapping near Denali National Park.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted that sufficient discussion has taken place concerning this issue at previous board meetings.**PROPOSAL NO. 122****ACTION: Tabled****DESCRIPTION:** Repeal the sunset clauses for the area closed to wolf hunting and trapping near Denali National Park.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted that sufficient discussion has taken place concerning this issue at previous board meetings.**PROPOSAL NO. 123****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify the Fairbanks Management Area (FMA) boundary description.**DISCUSSION:** The department stated that this proposal clarifies the existing boundaries of the FMA but does not change the location. The board stated their intent to provide consistent and definable boundaries by clarifying written code whenever possible.**PROPOSAL NO. 124****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Expand the Fairbanks Management Area to include additional portions of Cripple Creek Subdivision.**DISCUSSION:** Board members indicated that the proposed addition to the FMA is clearly defined and easily found in the field. The board concluded that adding this tract of land should alleviate local public safety concerns.**PROPOSAL NO. 125****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Expand the Fairbanks Management Area to include Fox.

AMENDMENTS: Expand to include the Fox residential area and reduce by the elimination of two areas: Esro Road to Steel Creek (per Proposal 128) and the Nordale Road to Steel Creek (per Proposal 127).

DISCUSSION: The department stated that there are no biological problems with minor adjustments to the FMA boundary. The department indicated the need to make boundaries as clear as possible. Board members decided to include Fox after considering the development density, public safety concerns, and favorable public comments. The board concluded that reductions along the western portion of the FMA as recommended by the local advisory committee were lacking public support. The deletion of the Esro Road area (per Proposal 128) was based on public testimony and concern over private road use. The deletion of the Nordale Road area (per Proposal 127) was based on public comment. The board indicated that hunting opportunity has not been eliminated within the new FMA boundaries because the use on bowhunting only regulations allows for a longer season.

PROPOSAL NO. 126

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Decrease the size of the Fairbanks Management Area.

DISCUSSION: No action based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 125.

Board members stated that the braided Goldstream Creek would be a difficult border to enforce. Additionally, the board expressed concerns about rifle hunting in a densely inhabited area.

PROPOSAL NO. 127

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Decrease the size of the Fairbanks Management Area.

DISCUSSION: No action based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 125.

PROPOSAL NO. 128

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Decrease the size of the Fairbanks Management Area.

DISCUSSION: No action based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 125.

PROPOSAL NO. 129

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Restrict trapping methods in portions of Fairbanks Management Area.

AMENDMENT: Require the labeling of traps and snares within the FMA.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that there is no biological reason to eliminate trapping in the Fairbanks Management Area. Board members discussed the local borough's authority to take action against pet owners who do not comply with the local leash laws. The board debated the usefulness of labeling traps and concluded it would discourage setting of traps in irresponsible locations and would establish ownership. Board members noted a growing urban area in Fairbanks and the likelihood of increasing conflicts between trappers and pet owners. Board members addressed public concern about marked equipment being used against a trapper or being stolen and they recognized that tagging traps does not eliminate the potential conflict.

PROPOSAL NO. 130

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Allow use of shotguns and muzzleloaders in Fairbanks Management Area.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that allowing firearms would reduce opportunity of current bowhunters. Board members expressed concern over the potential conflict in residential areas with firearms users. The board acknowledged that using muzzleloaders increases hunting efficiency and would likely increase the moose harvest in the FMA. The department noted that in creating a more efficient hunting opportunity the total number of permits would be reduced to maintain the population objective. Board members determined that access of hunters is not currently limited, therefore the use of firearms is not necessary.

PROPOSAL NO. 131**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Allow use of motorized vehicles in portion of Wood River Controlled Use Area.

DISCUSSION: The department stated that with the passing of Proposal 97 creating antler restrictions in the Wood River Controlled Use Area that liberalizing access would not create any biological concerns with the bull moose population. Board members expressed concern about the potential higher success rate of harvesting a moose with the use of a motorized vehicle in the WRCUA. The board considered the potential biological impact through the use of motorized vehicles to be significant if allowed in the WRCUA.

PROPOSAL NO. 132**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Clarify boundary of Wood River Controlled Use Area.

AMENDMENT: Define the east boundary as the east bank of the Wood River.

DISCUSSION: The department reported user conflicts in the north east section of the WRCUA due unclear boundary definitions on the Wood River. The board heard that habitat damage is currently a concern with motorized vehicles crossing sand bars and the river. Board members determined that the boundary clarification would significantly help hunters in the field and reduce habitat disturbance.

PROPOSAL NO. 133**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Allow use of airboats in Nenana Controlled Use Area.

DISCUSSION: The department stated that the NCUA was created to protect subsistence users and other hunting opportunity. Board members questioned the reasonable opportunity for subsistence users would be provided for if airboat access was increased. The department reported an overall low bull moose density in Unit 20C. The department further noted that airboat use is currently allowed in the main river corridors. Board members noted that subsistence hunters are apprehensive about competing with airboat users. The board concluded that allowing airboats in the NCUA would generate greater hunting pressure thereby reducing the reasonable opportunity for subsistence users. The board did not want to create a contentious user conflict.

PROPOSAL NO. 134**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Increase number and size of controlled use areas in Unit 20.

DISCUSSION: The board stated that this proposal is too broad and sweeping a concept to be implemented.

PROPOSAL NO. 135**ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Prohibit trapping on specified RS2477 trails in Unit 20.**DISCUSSION:** The public safety department stated that violations on specified trails could not be enforced because the trail's exact location has not been established. Board members noted that in the absence of a survey, identifying some sections of the trail may be a problem from a legally standpoint. The board questioned whether the actions concerning a few individuals justified taking action.**PROPOSAL NO. 136****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Establish archery-only drawing hunt for brown bears within Unit 26B, the Dalton Highway Corridor.**AMENDMENTS:** Exclude shooting distance and allow up to 10 permits to be issued.**DISCUSSION:** The department stated the current Unit 26B brown bear management objectives are to limit the brown bear harvest, reduce opportunistic hunting, and reduce wounding loss. Board members determined that enforcing a shooting distance requirement would be unattainable. The department stated that by issuing 10 permits the number of bears harvested could increase, however not significantly enough to create population concerns. The department further noted that in the absence of a nonresident permit hunt the number of harvested bears would increase significantly. Board members decided that a drawing permit would limit the type of archers that would apply to those who have prepared for the hunt while discouraging opportunistic hunters and reducing the potential for wounding loss. They understood that the department would reduce the number of permits issued if biologically necessary.**PROPOSAL NO. 137****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Shorten caribou season in Unit 26B, the Dalton Highway Corridor, by starting Aug. 10.**DISCUSSION:** The department reported an increase in bowhunting pressure and harvests in recent years. Board members discussed concerns over meat spoilage and decided that wanton waste are not serious problems for caribou harvested in July. The board decided that the proposed opening is unnecessarily late and has the potentially to crowd hunting activity later in the season. The board further stated that tourist activities in this area are not limited by hunting and should not supercede hunting opportunity.**PROPOSAL NO. 138****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Establish drawing hunt for moose in Unit 24, within the Dalton Highway Corridor.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 57.**PROPOSAL NO. 139****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Include wounded animals as bag limit in the Dalton Highway Corridor.**DISCUSSION:** The department noted that current regulations state that when wounding an animal or bird, it does count against your bag limit, and if it completes your limit you must stop hunting. The department also noted the intent to use stronger language on the topic in future hunting regulation booklets. Board members recognized the difficulty in enforcing the wounding of an animal as taking and stated that personal hunter ethics

apply. The board expressed agreement with the proposal's intent but recognized that the wounding of, or attempting to take game, is considered take under statutory law.

PROPOSAL NO. 140**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Establish new proficiency requirements for bowhunters in Dalton Highway Corridor.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that the proficiency test required was shaped by bowhunting organizations and is currently very stringent. The department further noted the standards used are recognized internationally making certification for nonresident hunters uncomplicated. Board members recognized that current proficiency requirements are adequate and that the hunting concerns in the corridor could stem from poor judgment. The board noted that the bowhunting community has done a lot on their own to improve their standards and competence in hunting. The board discussed the difficulty with enforcing shooting distances in the field.

PROPOSAL NO. 141**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Extend the Dalton Highway Corridor through the Prudhoe Bay Closed Area and clarify prohibition on use of highway vehicles.

DISCUSSION: The department stated that the proposed changes are consistent with the original legislation. The board decided that by expanding the controlled use area snowmachine access would be restricted, closing the loophole that currently allows access to areas outside the corridor. Board members stated that allowing motorized vehicle use to continue could contribute to habitat degradation, as well as increase hunting pressure, potentially allowing for an over harvest. The board noted that this area is growing increasingly popular with hunters and expressed concern for potential user group conflicts.

PROPOSAL NO. 142**ACTION: No action**

DESCRIPTION: Clarify use of highway vehicles in Dalton Highway Corridor.

DISCUSSION: No action based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 141.

PROPOSAL NO. 143**ACTION: Deferred**

DESCRIPTION: Modify legal archery equipment allowed in Dalton Highway Corridor.

DISCUSSION: The board deferred this proposal to the next statewide meeting based on the action taken and discussion on Proposal 144.

PROPOSAL NO. 144**ACTION: Deferred**

DESCRIPTION: Modify legal archery equipment allowed in Dalton Highway Corridor.

DISCUSSION: The department expressed concern that the proposed grain minimums are unnecessarily high and would cause confusion having different standards in the DHCMA than are found statewide. Board members recognized the concern over potential wounding loss rates but determined that they did not have available at the meeting the technical background to fully explore the concepts involved in bow trajectories. The department stated that archery manufacturers plan to test the magnitude of impacts generated from different arrow weights and types to help hunters when choosing equipment. The board decided to defer further discussion until the department can provide additional technical background at the next statewide meeting.

PROPOSAL NO. 145**ACTION: No action**

DESCRIPTION: Allow shotguns and small caliber rifles for small game hunting within Dalton Highway Corridor.

DISCUSSION: The board once again noted that Alaska Statute 16.05.789 prohibits hunting with firearms north of the Yukon River in the area within five miles on either side of the Dalton Highway and that regulatory action on this proposal is beyond the board's purview.

PROPOSAL NO. 146**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Require registration permit, fee, and marking of arrows for hunters in Dalton Highway Corridor.

AMENDMENT: Hunters must mark their bowhunter education certification card number in permanent ink on the fletching or shaft of each arrow in their possession.

DISCUSSION: The department stated that registration permits in the Dalton Highway Corridor would be inefficient, expensive, and time intensive for staff. The department further noted that bowhunter education is currently required. Board members noted that the variance of archery shots are major issues with all archery hunts. The board stated that marking arrows provides incentive for more hunters to hunt deliberately and ethically. Board members did address public concern about marked equipment being used against a hunter or being stolen. The board noted that bow hunters proposed the marking requirement and believed it would alleviate current problems.

PROPOSAL NO. 147**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Align mink, weasel and otter seasons in Region III.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that this proposal corrects an error in the season opening currently in the codified regulations. The department stated that currently an emergency order would be necessary to align the seasons of mink and weasel with that of otters. Board members recognized the opportunity to align seasons and simplify regulations.

PROPOSAL NO. 148**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Establish Take a Child Hunting (TACH) seasons for all big game in Region III.

AMENDMENTS: Restrict TACH seasons to moose in Unit 20B (excluding the Fairbanks Management Area). The open season shall be four consecutive days beginning the first Saturday of August.

DISCUSSION: The department explained that a recent change in state statute allowed the board to provide opportunities for adults to take children (age 8-17) big game hunting before school starts. The board concluded based on department recommendations that listing TACH hunts under general statewide provisions was a better option than listing them one at a time in the seasons and bag limits provisions. The board determined that fewer than four days is not a reasonable amount of time to provide a hunting opportunity. Board members expressed concern that TACH seasons could foster abuse problems leading to significant increases in harvests for game populations currently at low levels. The board heard limited support for these hunts during public testimony, and they noted the opposition to the hunts from rural areas. Board members felt it inappropriate to

establish these seasons in areas that opposed the concept. The board chose to add these early season hunts only in areas where there was indication of local support, such as Unit 20B. The action was designed to allow additional hunting areas to be added. The board noted that nothing precludes hunters from taking children during the general hunt and that most school districts consider this an excused absence. Also see Proposal 96.

PROPOSAL NO. 149**ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Liberalize coyote season in Region III, no closed season, no bag limit.**AMENDMENTS:** Establishes an August 10-April 30 season with a bag limit of 10 coyotes.**DISCUSSION:** The department noted the opportunity to align season and bag limits with wolf and sheep seasons, and to simplify region-wide season dates. The department reported that coyotes are relatively common throughout the Interior Region and play a considerable role in the predation of lambs. Board members noted that a year round season and unlimited bag limit would be too liberal an approach to minimizing lamb mortality and discussed the need to close the season when fur is at low quality and pups are in the den. The board recognized the value in increasing the opportunity to take of coyotes and simplifying region-wide regulations**PROPOSAL NO. 150****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify brown bear bag limits and eliminate in-unit sealing requirements for specific units.**AMENDMENTS:** Retain in-unit sealing requirements.**DISCUSSION:** The department reported that additional harvest brought on by this proposal should not negatively affect the bear populations. The department stated this proposal would simplify the brown bear regulations and standardize the codified language. Board members expressed concern that eliminating in-unit sealing requirements would eliminate the collection of important biological and sociological information, and could foster bootlegging among some hunters. The board recognized in-unit sealing could provide additional difficulties for some hunters but indicated that it also gives the department a better understanding of hunting pressure.**PROPOSAL NO. 151****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Authorize department to restrict snowmachine access based on snow depth.**DISCUSSION:** The department stated that the board cannot restrict motorized access unless it involves hunting, trapping, or the harassing of wildlife. The board recognized that recreational activities involving off road vehicles could potentially be harmful to the general health of wildlife populations. Board members stated the value of a more comprehensive approach that involves landowners and agencies developing land use plans with respect to off road vehicles and wildlife. The board noted that snowmachines are used as vital transportation tools for many people and any restrictions could be detrimental for rural villages. The board determined that a solution is unreachable through this particular proposal.**PROPOSAL NO. 152****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Prohibit all bear baiting in Interior Alaska.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that baiting is the primary method of take for black bears. The department stated that improper trash disposal, not bear baiting, is likely responsible for creating nuisance bear problems and subsequent defense of life or property (DLP) situations. The department further noted that harvesting of black bears from a baiting station is currently within sustained yield harvest levels. Board members indicated that DLP bears near Fairbanks, and most of the Interior region, are infrequent. The board also noted that hunting from bait stations allows a more careful harvest of certain portions of the bear population. The board discussed the role of baiting as a management tool for controlling bear predation on moose calves. Board members discussed limiting the closure to the Chena River State Recreation Area based on heavy recreational use, but determined that the public did not have an adequate opportunity to consider this specific area apart from a the broadly-written initial proposal.

PROPOSAL NO. 153**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Establish areas closed to hunting and trapping for viewing purposes.

DISCUSSION: The board noted that hunting, trapping, and viewing wildlife are generally compatible uses and that user conflicts are best addressed on a case-by-case basis. The board also commented that the viewing public is usually separated temporally and spatially from hunters and trappers. The department reported that they are formulating a statewide viewing plan for wildlife and educational purposes. The board noted the generality of this proposal citing the lack of specific lands recommended.

PROPOSAL NO. 154**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Allow exportation of live-trapped wolverines for breeding purposes.

DISCUSSION: The department stated that this proposal would contradict current state statutes prohibiting the transportation of non domestic species across state borders. Currently a permit is given for educational purposes only. Board members were unsure of the objective in transporting live furbearers. The board firmly opposes the commercialization of Alaska wildlife through exporting.

PROPOSAL NO. 155**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize antlerless moose hunt in Unit 7, Placer and 20-Mile Rivers.

DISCUSSION: The department reported the moose population to have reached objective but is currently experiencing low recruitment rates. The board carried this proposal to keep the regulation in the codified language with the understanding that the department will not issue permits until the population is at proper levels.

PROPOSAL NO. 156**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize antlerless moose hunt in Unit 9C.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that moose recruitment in Unit 9C is low. The department further indicated public and advisory committee opposition to the reauthorization. Board members determined that by rejecting this proposal, reasonable hunting opportunity would not be affected due to the low hunting levels in Unit 9C. The board stated that eliminating this hunt would be in the best interest due to the declining population.

PROPOSAL NO. 157**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Reauthorize antlerless moose hunt in Unit 14A.

DISCUSSION: The department indicated that the moose population is currently above the objective resulting on increased stress on the habitat. Board members emphasized the need to develop population objectives that take into account public concerns, hunting pressure and watchable users. The department expressed the intent to divide Unit 14A into seven permit hunt areas, allocating permits based on habitat and cow utilization. The department stated that these cow hunts help to avert vehicle accidents. Board members expressed caution when trying to correlate cow harvests with decreasing number of road kills. The board concurred with the need to retain this antlerless moose hunt.

PROPOSAL NO. 158**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Reauthorize antlerless moose hunt in Unit 14C, Elmendorf AFB.

DISCUSSION: The department reported a healthy moose population on Elmendorf that has historically experienced massive die-offs following population peaks. The department noted that maintaining the population is difficult given restrictions on the number of permits allowed on military installations. Board members stated the importance of controlling this moose population through retaining this antlerless moose hunt.

PROPOSAL NO. 159**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Reauthorize antlerless moose hunt in Unit 14C, Birchwood and remainder of 14C.

DISCUSSION: The department reported an historically low hunting effort on the Birchwood cow population. The department further indicated that this population regularly fluctuates in response to harsh winters. Board members decided to retain this cow hunt because of its importance as a managing tool.

PROPOSAL NO. 160**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Reauthorize antlerless moose hunt in Unit 14C, Ft. Richardson.

DISCUSSION: The department reported a healthy moose population on Ft. Richardson that has historically experienced massive die-offs following population peaks. The board referenced their discussion of Proposal 158 in regards to the importance of controlling a healthy moose population on military installations through maintaining a cow harvest

PROPOSAL NO. 161**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Reauthorize antlerless moose hunt in Unit 15A, Skilak Loop.

DISCUSSION: The department reported a large moose population in Unit 15A that has negatively impacted the habitat quality in the Skilak Loop. The department expressed interest in keeping this regulation on the books because the highway system experiences a high number of road kills during harsh winters. Board members expressed caution when trying to use cow harvests as a management tool to decreasing the number of road kills. The board agreed that retaining this cow harvest in the regulations is necessary.

PROPOSAL NO. 162**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Reauthorize antlerless moose hunt in Unit 15C.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that cow permits have been issued in the past with advisory committee input. The department indicated that the moose population is currently above the management objective. Board members cited support from the local advisory committee to reduce moose numbers through the antlerless and general hunt.

PROPOSAL NO. 163

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize antlerless moose hunt in Unit 16B, Kalgin Island.

DISCUSSION: The department indicated that habitat quality on Kalgin Island is in poor condition in response to an overstocked moose population. Reducing the moose population on the island will allow for the habitat to recover. The board noted that access to the island is difficult. Board members determined that reauthorizing the antlerless hunt will play a key role in regulating the moose population level.

PROPOSAL NO. 164

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize brown bear tag fee exemption in Unit 13.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that current brown bear estimates are significantly higher than the management objective. Since implementing the tag fee exemptions on brown bears the harvest patterns have increased steadily resulting in a younger age structure in the bear population. The board expressed their commitment to maintain the intensive management plan for reducing the brown bear population to aid moose survival. Recognizing that bear populations change slowly, board members determined that continuing efforts to reduce the brown bear population are necessary.

PROPOSAL NO. 165

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize antlerless moose hunt in Unit 22C and 22D.

DISCUSSION: The department indicated that moose populations are at carrying capacity in their winter range. The department further noted that additional bull harvests would be unwise due to a low bull population. Cow harvests are currently low and would not adversely affect the population. The board recognized that additional harvests are necessary to maintain the moose population, noting that cow hunts are popular in this area.

PROPOSAL NO. 166

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize antlerless moose hunt in Unit 23.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that the cow harvest is currently low and would not affect moose population trends. Board members noted that cow harvests were recently restricted in Unit 23. The board agreed that maintaining this cow harvest is necessary, citing an probable low take of cows.

PROPOSAL NO. 167

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize brown bear tag fee exemption in Unit 22.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that the brown bear population in Unit 22 is greater than biologically desired. Brown bear predation on moose calves and is believed to be having a detrimental affect on the ungulate population in this area. The department further indicated that in the absence of a tag requirement, brown bear harvest has increased in Unit 22. Board members discussed concerns that tag exemptions could pose a bootlegging problem between units with differing sealing requirements.

PROPOSAL NO. 168**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize brown bear tag fee exemption in brown bear management areas.

DISCUSSION: The department indicated that these management areas were designated to allow for the subsistence take of brown bears without sealing requirements unless taken for trophy value. The board referenced discussion from Proposal 167 and determined maintaining a tag fee exemption creates incentive for local peoples to harvest a bear from a currently stable population.

PROPOSAL NO. 169**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize antlerless moose hunt in Unit 1C, Berners Bay.

DISCUSSION: The department reported the moose population in Berners Bay to be nearing carrying capacity. The department further emphasized the need to harvest evenly among all age and sex classes so as not to bias the population composition. Board members recognized that reauthorizing cow harvests is necessary to promote population stability

PROPOSAL NO. 170**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize antlerless moose hunt in Unit 1C, Gustavus area.

DISCUSSION: The department indicated that an emerging moose population is forming near Gustavus due to receding glaciers providing new habitat. This population is forced against the coast during hard winters causing overuse and deterioration of coastal habitat. Board members expressed concern for reauthorizing a cow hunt without local community support. The department stated their intent to hold public meetings concerning explaining the importance of this cow hunt. The board determined that reauthorizing this cow harvest is necessary to maintain a healthy moose population and prevent a biased sex ratio.

PROPOSAL NO. 171**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize antlerless moose hunt in Unit 5A, Nunatak Bench.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that reauthorizing the cow harvest on a healthy moose population in Nunatak Bench would not significantly affect the herd. The department further noted that hunting effort on this population is historically limited due to poor weather conditions. Board members recognized that this hunt provides a hunting opportunity for local residents who did not harvest a moose during the general season. The board cited a healthy moose population when deciding to reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt.

PROPOSAL NO. 172**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize antlerless moose hunt in Unit 6A.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that current calf populations are low in Unit 6A. The department further indicated their desire to retain cow hunts in the codified regulations with the intent of not issuing permits until the population is capable of withstanding hunting pressure. Board members accepted the intent of the department in deciding to reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt in Unit 6A.

PROPOSAL NO. 173**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Reauthorize antlerless moose hunt in Unit 6B.

DISCUSSION: The department indicated the moose population in Unit 6B is currently experiencing poor calf survival. The department further stated their desire to retain the antlerless moose hunt in the codified regulations with the intent of not issuing permits until the population is capable of withstanding hunting pressure. Board members referenced Proposals 172 and 169 in deciding to reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt to insure the hunts availability as a management tool for when the moose population in Unit 6B stabilizes.

PROPOSAL NO. 174**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Reauthorize antlerless moose hunt in Unit 6C.

DISCUSSION: The department reported a lower than optimal moose population in Unit 6C. The department further stated that cow permits would be issued only in the event of a cancellation of the antlerless season held through the USFS. Board members accepted the departments intent, citing the need to promote population stability through cow harvests.

PROPOSAL NO. 21D**ACTION: Deferred to Fall 2002****DESCRIPTION:** Require reporting of cultural animal hunt prior to hunting.

DISCUSSION: This proposal was previously deferred from the January 2002 meeting. The board reviewed numerous letters and public comment concerning this proposal and determined that further communication among affected interests was necessary. The board recognized the cultural and religious sensitivity of this issue and expressed their intent to address this issue at their next meeting. The Department of Public Safety indicated that the purpose of this proposal is not to influence religious ceremonies, rather to catch poachers who use this ceremony as defense. The board noted that villages are aware of abuse and violations, they want to be responsible for the resource. Board members further insisted that villages and tribal people must be comfortable with this concept and should not be afraid to perform their cultural activities.

Other board actions**Moose calves**

The board adopted "Proposal A" which delineates specific areas where harvest of moose calves is allowed. This clarified the board action taken at the January 2002 meeting limiting the taking of moose calves except in areas where biologically justified.

Use of game as bait

The board adopted "Proposal B" which clarifies the types of game allowed as bait. This clarified the board action taken at the January 2002 meeting addressing the use of game as bait. Board members decided that clarifying the system would alleviate confusion in the field without posing a threat to wildlife populations.

Unit 16B intensive management

The board considered an outline of a draft predator control implementation plan for Unit 16B as presented by the department. Board discussion points included the significant role

of snow depth related winter mortality, the role of black bears and brown bears, the causes for low moose recruitment rates, the insignificant role of hunting on population levels, the possibility of continued declines coupled with increased hunter demand, and the difficult land access and ownership patterns in Unit 16B. The board determined that more discussion with the public is necessary before a plan could be implemented. Board members further noted that advisory committees and local stakeholder groups need to assimilate ideas and discuss opinions for the board to consider. The board encouraged the department to assess the feasibility of actions and formulate a specific proposal.

Amount necessary for subsistence finding for moose in Unit 19 (outside Lime Village Management Area)

The board increased the amount necessary for subsistence for Unit 19 (outside the Lime Village Management Area) to 400-700 moose. The board reviewed recent harvest levels in Unit 19 and concluded the increase was justified. Board members considered the Lime Village Management Area a separate moose population from the rest of Unit 19 .

Intensive management finding for moose in Unit 19A & 19B

The board lowered the intensive management harvest objective for moose in Units 19A and 19B to 750-950 moose after reviewing current population estimates and harvest trends.

Customary and traditional finding and amount necessary for subsistence finding for black bears in Unit 25

The board made a positive customary and traditional finding for use of black bears in Unit 25. The board further established that the amount reasonably necessary for subsistence in Unit 25 to be 150-250 black bears.

Customary and traditional finding for grouse and ptarmigan

The board made a positive customary and traditional finding for use of ptarmigan and grouse in Units 12, 20, 21, 24, and 25. The board found that ptarmigan and grouse use patterns are similar and that these birds are widely hunted and utilized throughout the area.

Emergency order to open caribou hunt in Unit 9

The board received a petition for an emergency opening for caribou hunting in Unit 9. The board approved the opening with a three caribou bag limit for the remainder of March 2002. The board based the decision on the availability of Mulchatna Herd caribou and an interest in reducing the take of Northern Alaska Peninsula Caribou Herd caribou which is in a state of decline and is limited to subsistence hunt only.