

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

FIRST CLASS  
POSTAGE  
PAID  
PERMIT 131  
JUNEAU, AK



**THE ALASKA BOARD OF GAME  
FALL 2002 MEETINGS**

**OCTOBER 10-11, 2002  
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA**

**NOVEMBER 1 – 7, 2002  
JUNEAU, ALASKA**

**FIRST CLASS MAIL**

**This publication was released by the  
Department of Fish and Game,  
produced at a cost of  
\$1.75 per copy,  
and printed in Juneau, Alaska**

**The Alaska Department of Fish and Game administers all programs and activities free from discrimination based on race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, marital status, pregnancy, parenthood, or disability. The department administers all programs and activities in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, and Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.**

**If you believe you have been discriminated against in any program, activity, or facility, or if you desire further information please write to ADF&G, P.O. Box 25526, Juneau, AK 99802-5526; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 4040 N. Fairfax Drive, Suite 300 Webb, Arlington, VA 22203 or O.E.O., U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington DC 20240.**

**For information on alternative formats for this and other department publications, please contact the department ADA Coordinator at (voice) 907-465-4120, (TDD) 907-465-3646, or (FAX) 907-465-2440.**

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY  
**REVIEWER LETTER**

August 2002

DEAR REVIEWER:

The Alaska Board of Game will consider the attached book of regulatory proposals at its **Fall 2002** meetings. Those meetings will be held **October 10 - 11, 2002**, at the West Coast International Inn in Anchorage and **November 1 - 7, 2002**, at the Centennial Hall in Juneau, Alaska. The proposals generally concern changes to the hunting and use of game regulations in the Southeast Region. Members of the public, organizations, advisory committees, and staff timely submitted these proposals. The proposals are published essentially as they were received.

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

You are encouraged to read all proposals presented in this book. Some regulations have statewide application and/or may affect other regions of the state. Also, some proposals recommend changes to multiple areas or regions.

In this book the proposals generally are grouped by the resource to which they pertain (see Table of Contents). This proposal list is not in roadmap order for the meeting. The board will generate a roadmap for deliberations prior to the meeting, and will be available to the public. The roadmap may be changed up to and during the meeting.

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

After reviewing the proposals you may send written comments to:

**ATTN: BOG COMMENTS**  
**Alaska Department of Fish and Game**  
**Boards Support Section**  
**PO Box 25526**  
**Juneau, AK 99802-5526**  
**Fax: 907-465-6094**

Comments may be submitted at any time until the public testimony period for that proposal and/or its subject matter is closed at the meeting and deliberation by the board begins. As a practical matter, you are encouraged to have your written comments presented to the above Juneau address at least two weeks before the appropriate scheduled meeting to insure inclusion in the board workbook. All comments received after that time will be presented to board members at the time of the meetings, but will not be printed in the board workbook. Written comments will also be

accepted during the board meeting, and of course, public testimony during the meeting is appreciated.

When making written comments regarding these proposals, list the PROPOSAL NUMBER to which your comment pertains and specifically whether you favor or oppose the proposal. This will insure that your comments are correctly noted for the board members in relation to the proper proposal(s).

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

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

If you plan to testify, a written copy of your testimony is helpful, but is not required. Twenty-five copies of your written testimony are also helpful, but not required. Written testimony must be officially stamped and logged in, and will be distributed by the secretary. See page **viii** for "GUIDELINES: PUBLIC TESTIMONY, ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY." This document has additional information on presenting oral testimony.

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

Additional copies of this proposal book may be obtained at most offices of the Department of Fish and Game and on our website at: <http://www.state.ak.us/adfg/boards/gameinfo/boghome.htm>.

You are encouraged to send your written comments to the above Juneau Boards Support Section address. If you send comments directly to a board member, please send a copy to the above Juneau Boards Support Section address so your comments can be copied and distributed to all board members.

Tentative agendas for the Fall 2002 Board of Game meetings are shown on pages **xii - xv**. A roadmap showing the tentative order in which proposals will be considered will be available in October 2002. During the meetings, a recorded telephone message is available, with current updates on the board's agenda and schedule. That phone number is (800) 764-8901 (in Juneau call: 465-8901).

If you are a person with a disability who may need a special accommodation in order to comment on the proposed regulations, please contact the Boards Support Section at 907-465-4110 no later than two weeks prior to the meeting.

# ALASKA BOARD OF GAME FALL 2002 PROPOSAL BOOK

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page Number</u>
Reviewer Letter.....	i - ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
Board of Game Meeting Cycle .....	iv - v
2002/2003 “Tentative” Meeting Schedule .....	vi
Board of Game Membership Roster.....	vii
Boards Support Section Staff.....	viii
Guidelines for Public and Advisory Committee Testimony .....	xi
Draft Agendas .....	x - xiii
Draft Public/Legal Notice .....	xiv - xv
Proposals .....	1 - 60

### **PROPOSAL TOPICS**

### Page Number

#### Southeast Region

Fur bearer trapping.....	1 - 6
Brown bear seasons and bag limits.....	6 - 10
Deer seasons and bag limits.....	10 - 15
Elk seasons and bag limits .....	15 - 22
Goat seasons and bag limits.....	22 - 25
Moose seasons and bag limits .....	25 - 32
Wolf seasons and bag limits .....	32 - 33
Harvest tickets, reports, tag fees .....	33 - 35
Methods and means.....	35 - 43
Possession and transportation.....	43
Restricted areas.....	43 - 52
Unit 17	
Moose seasons and bag limits .....	52 - 53
Unit 20	
Denali wolf buffer .....	53 - 57
Statewide	
Permits for falconry .....	58
Taking of big game for certain religious ceremonies.....	59 - 60

## ALASKA BOARD OF GAME MEETING CYCLE

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

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

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

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

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

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Cycle</u>		
<b>SOUTHEAST-REGION I</b> Game Management Units: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	Fall 2002	Fall 2004	Fall 2006
<b>SOUTHCENTRAL-REGION II</b> Game Management Units: 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 All GMUs: Brown Bear Tag Fees Reauthorization of Antlerless Moose Hunts	Spring 2003	Spring 2005	Spring 2007
<b>ARCTIC AND WESTERN-REGION V</b> Game Management Units: 18, 22, 23, 26A	Fall 2003	Fall 2005	Fall 2009
<b>INTERIOR-REGION III</b> Game Management Units: 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, 26C All GMUs: Brown Bear Tag Fees Reauthorization of Antlerless Moose Hunts	Spring 2004	Spring 2006	Spring 2008
<b>STATEWIDE REGULATIONS (Chapter 92)</b> Cycle "A" and Cycle "B" addressed in alternating two year periods	Winter 2004	Winter 2006	Winter 2008

## Alaska Board of Game Winter Meeting Schedule

STATEWIDE REGULATIONS: 5 AAC 92

### CYCLE “A”: Winter 2006, 2010, 2014, 2018, etc.

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

STATEWIDE REGULATIONS: 5 AAC 92

### CYCLE “B”: Winter 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016, etc.

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

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME  
TENTATIVE MEETING SCHEDULE  
as of May 2002**

	<u>Dates &amp; Location</u>	<u>Topic</u>
Fall 2002	October, 10-11, 2002 Anchorage, West Coast International Inn  Comment Deadline: Sept. 26, 2002	Denali wolf buffer
Fall 2002	November 1 – 7, 2002 Juneau, Centennial Hall  Proposal Deadline: Aug. 9, 2002 Comment Deadline: Oct. 18, 2002	Southeast (Region I)
Spring 2003	March 7 – 17, 2003 Anchorage, Sheraton Hotel  Proposal Deadline: Dec. 6, 2002 Comment Deadline: Feb. 21, 2003	Southcentral and Southwest (Region II)
Fall 2003	November 2003 (Tentative) Kotzebue (Tentative)	Arctic and Western (Region V)
Winter 2004	January 2004 (Tentative)	Statewide
Spring 2004	March 2004 (Tentative) Fairbanks (Tentative)	Interior (Region III)

\*\*\*\*\*

For information about the Board of Game, contact:

Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
Boards Support Section  
PO Box 25526  
Juneau, Alaska 99802-5526  
Phone: (907) 465-4110  
Fax: (907) 465-6094  
Email: Jim\_Marcotte@fishgame.state.ak.us

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

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

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME**



(Revised August 2002)

<b>NAME AND ADDRESS</b>	<b>TERM EXPIRES</b>
Joel Bennett 15255 Point Louisa Road Juneau, Alaska 99801	3/1/2005
Ben Grussendorf 1221 Halibut Point Rd. Sitka, AK 99835	3/1/2004
Rob Hardy Bucking Horse Ranch PO Box 876485 Wasilla, Alaska 99687	3/1/2003
Jack Lentfer P.O. Box 2617 Homer, Alaska 99603	3/1/2005
Julie A. K. Maier 2140 Twin Flower Dr. Fairbanks, AK 99709	3/1/2003
Tim Towarak P.O. Box 1008 Nome, Alaska 99762	3/1/2004
Victor Van Ballenberghe 8941 Winchester Street Anchorage, Alaska 99507	3/1/2005

**NOTE:** All written comments to proposals published in this proposal booklet must be sent to the ADF&G Boards Support Section at the address below in order to be included and published in the Board of Game's Fall 2002 board workbook. Written comments regarding the proposals in this proposal booklet may not be published if the comments are sent to individual board members.

**Alaska Board of Game members may also be reached at:**

ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME  
Boards Support Section  
PO Box 25526  
Juneau, AK 99802-5526  
(907) 465-4110  
(907) 465-6094 FAX

**Boards Support Section**  
Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
PO Box 25526  
Juneau, AK 99802  
(907) 465-4110  
(907) 465-6094 Fax

**HEADQUARTERS**

**Board of Fisheries**

**Diana Cote**, Executive Director 465-6095  
**Art Hughes**, Publication Tech. 465-4111  
**Trina Nguyen**, Admin, Clerk 465-4110

**Board of Game**

**Jim Marcotte**, Acting Ex. Director 479-7215  
<**Vacant**>, Regs. Specialist 465-6097  
**Jean Lowe**, Publication Tech. 465-2027

**Lori VanSteenwyk**, Administrative Assistant 465-6096

**REGIONAL OFFICES**

**Arctic Region**

**Vacant**

P O Box 689  
Kotzebue, AK 99752  
Phone: (907) 442-3420  
Fax: (907) 442-2847

**Western Region**

**Trim Nick**

P O Box 1789  
Bethel, AK 99559-1789  
Phone: (907) 543-4467  
Fax: (907) 543-4477

**Southwest Region**

**Joe Chythlook**

P O Box 1030  
Dillingham, AK 99576  
Phone: (907) 842-5142  
Fax: (907) 842-5514

**Interior Region**

**Justin Crawford**

1300 College Road  
Fairbanks, AK 99701-1599  
Phone: (907) 459-7263  
Fax: (907) 474-8558

**Southcentral Region**

**Sherry Wright**

333 Raspberry Rd.  
Anchorage, AK 99518-1599  
Phone: (907) 267-2354  
Fax: (907) 267-2489

**Southeast Region**

**<Vacant>, Southeast**

PO Box 25526  
Juneau, AK 99802-5526  
Phone: (907) 465-4110  
Fax: (907) 465-6094

-----  
--  
For updated information on the progress of an ongoing Board of Fisheries or Board of Game meeting,  
call: Juneau 465-8901; Outside Juneau 1-800-764-8901  
-----

--  
Website address: <http://www.state.ak.us/adfg/boards/bordhome.htm>

# Alaska Board of Game

## GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC TESTIMONY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY

If you plan to testify at this hearing, please fill out a blue PUBLIC TESTIMONY SIGN-UP CARD and turn it in to the board's staff. If you have written material for the board members, please provide at least **25 copies** to the staff; and **submit with your blue testimony card. Please be sure to have your name and date on the first page of your written material and if you have graphs, identify the source.**

When we call your name, please go to the table; state your name and whom you represent. When you are finished speaking, please wait, we may have questions regarding your comments.

Please be aware that when you testify you may not ask questions of the board members or of department staff. This is your chance to speak and to bring your issues before the board members. If the board members and/or staff need clarification, they will ask you questions.

Generally, the board allows five minutes for oral testimony if you testify for yourself. The board chairman will announce the testimony length of time at the beginning of the meeting.

Advisory Committee representatives are usually allowed 15 minutes to testify, and should restrict their testimony to relating what occurred at the advisory committee meeting(s). Testimony should be a brief summary of the minutes of the meeting and copies of the minutes should be available for the board members. Personal opinions should not be addressed during Advisory Committee testimony.

**PLEASE NOTE:** The time limit on testimony does NOT include questions that the board members may have for you.

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME  
TENTATIVE AGENDA  
Unit 20 Denali Wolf Buffer  
October 10-11, 2002  
West Coast International Inn, Anchorage, AK

NOTE: This Tentative Agenda is **subject to change** throughout the course of the meeting. This Tentative Agenda is provided to give a general idea to the public of the board's anticipated schedule. The board will attempt to hold to this schedule; however, the board is not constrained by this Tentative Agenda. Those of you who wish to testify must sign-up by the deadline. Public testimony will continue until those present at the meeting are heard; the board will continue working through its agenda immediately upon conclusion of public testimony. The following time blocks are only an estimate. Updated agendas will be posted in the meeting room, or call 1-800-764-8901 for a recorded message on daily progression through the meeting.

**Thursday, October 10**

8:30 AM

OPENING BUSINESS

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

STAFF REPORTS

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Oral public testimony, including Advisory Committee Reports

**DEADLINE FOR SIGN-UP TO TESTIFY IS: 3:00 p.m., THURSDAY, OCTOBER 10  
(Public testimony will continue until those who are present at the meeting are heard.)**

**Friday, October 11**

8:30 AM

Conclude public testimony

BOARD DELIBERATIONS, at conclusion of public testimony

ADJOURN

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

AGENDA NOTES:

A. This agenda is TENTATIVE and subject to change during the meeting. A list of staff reports and roadmap will be available at the meeting. Scheduled updates can be obtained on the website at: <http://www.state.ak.us/adfg/boards/gameinfo/boghome.htm> or by calling the board's recorded message phone. Phone Number: **1-800-764-8901** [In Juneau call: 465-8901]

B. Advisory Committee representatives can present their reports either at the beginning or end of the "Oral Public Testimony." The committee representative should notify the board secretary whether they prefer to present their report at the beginning or end of public testimony.

C. The State of Alaska, Department of Fish and Game complies with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). Individuals with disabilities who may need auxiliary aids, services, and/or special modifications to participate in this hearing and public meeting should contact 465-4110 no later than 72 hours prior to the meeting, to make any necessary arrangements.

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME  
TENTATIVE AGENDA  
Southeast Alaska Region  
November 1 - 7, 2002  
Centennial Hall, Juneau, AK

NOTE: This Tentative Agenda is **subject to change** throughout the course of the meeting. This Tentative Agenda is provided to give a general idea to the public of the board's anticipated schedule. The board will attempt to hold to this schedule; however, the board is not constrained by this Tentative Agenda. Those of you who wish to testify must sign-up by the deadline. Public testimony will continue until those present at the meeting are heard; the board will continue working through its agenda immediately upon conclusion of public testimony. The following time blocks are only an estimate. Updated agendas will be posted in the meeting room, or call 1-800-764-8901 for a recorded message on daily progression through the meeting.

**Friday, November 1**

8:30 AM

OPENING BUSINESS

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

STAFF REPORTS

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Oral public testimony, including Advisory Committee Reports

**DEADLINE FOR SIGN-UP TO TESTIFY IS: 3:00 p.m., SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 2  
(Public testimony will continue until those who are present at the meeting are heard.)**

**Saturday, November 2**

8:30 AM

Continue public testimony

**Sunday, November 3**

8:30 AM

Conclude public testimony

BOARD DELIBERATIONS, at conclusion of public testimony

**Monday, November 4 through Thursday, November 7**

BOARD DELIBERATIONS

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, including petitions, findings, resolutions, letters, other

ADJOURN

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

---

AGENDA NOTES:

A. This agenda is TENTATIVE and subject to change during the meeting. A list of staff reports and roadmap will be available at the meeting. Scheduled updates can be obtained on the website at:

<http://www.state.ak.us/adfg/boards/gameinfo/boghome.htm> or by calling the board's recorded message phone. Phone Number: **1-800-764-8901** [In Juneau call: 465-8901]

B. Advisory Committee representatives can present their reports either at the beginning or end of the "Oral Public Testimony." The committee representative should notify the board secretary whether they prefer to present their report at the beginning or end of public testimony.

C. The State of Alaska, Department of Fish and Game complies with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). Individuals with disabilities who may need auxiliary aids, services, and/or special modifications to participate in this hearing and public meeting should contact 465-4110 no later than 72 hours prior to the meeting, to make any necessary arrangements.

**DRAFT**  
**NOTICE OF PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE**  
**REGULATIONS OF THE ALASKA BOARD OF GAME**

The Alaska Board of Game proposes to adopt regulation changes in Title 5 of the Alaska Administrative Code, dealing with trapping seasons and bag limits, hunting seasons and bag limits, and statewide provisions, including, but not limited to, the following:

- A. **TRAPPING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS:** Bag and possession limits and seasons for beaver and wolf in game management units 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5; wolf in unit 20.
- B. **HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS:** Bag and possession limits and seasons for black bear, brown bear, deer, elk, goat, and moose, wolf in units 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5; caribou in unit 17; wolf in unit 20.
- C. **LICENSES, HARVEST TICKETS, HARVEST REPORTS, TAGS, FEES, AND PERMITS:** Harvest tickets, reports, and tags for deer in units 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5; conditions of falconry permits in all units; reporting requirements for taking of big game for certain religious ceremonies in all units.
- D. **METHODS AND MEANS:** Prohibiting use of snares, identification and checking requirements for traps and snares, restriction of hunting to daylight hours, and black bear baiting in units 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5; trapping methods and means in unit 20, and hunter education requirements .
- E. **POSSESSION, TRANSPORTATION, AND USE OF GAME:** evidence of sex and identity in units 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.
- F. **RESTRICTED AREAS:** Areas closed to hunting, closures and restrictions in state game refuges, management areas, and areas closed to trapping in units 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5; areas closed to taking wolves in unit 20.

Notice is also given that anyone interested may present oral or written comments relevant to the subjects in this notice, including the potential costs to private persons of complying with the proposed changes, by submitting written comments to the Alaska Board of Game, Boards Support Section at P.O. Box 25526, Juneau, AK 99802-5526. Comments may also be submitted by fax to (907) 465-6094. Written comments received are public records and are subject to public inspection. Written comments may be submitted to the Board of Game any time before the proposal is taken up by the board in deliberations. As a practical matter, written comments should be submitted to the Boards Support Section office, at the above address or fax number, at least two weeks before the appropriate scheduled meeting to ensure inclusion in the board workbooks.

There will be two separate meetings. The public hearing portion for each meeting will begin immediately after staff reports and continue until everyone has been given the opportunity to be heard. Additional public hearings may be held throughout the meeting just before consideration and adoption of proposed changes in the regulations. An agenda will be posted daily during the meeting. The board will take oral testimony from those who register before the cut-off time announced by the board chair. The length of oral statements may be limited to three to five minutes, or less.

Individuals with disabilities who may need special accommodations in order to participate in this process, should contact Jim Marcotte at (907) 459-7215 no later than October 18, 2002 to ensure that any necessary accommodations can be provided.



For a copy of the proposed regulation changes, contact Boards Support Section at the above address, or visit the website at: <http://www.state.ak.us/adfg/boards/gameinfo/boghome.htm>.

Anyone interested in or affected by resident (subsistence and general) hunting or trapping and non-resident hunting or trapping regulations is hereby informed that, by publishing this legal notice the Board of Game may consider any or all of the subject areas covered by this notice. **THE BOARD IS NOT LIMITED BY THE SPECIFIC LANGUAGE OR CONFINES OF THE ACTUAL PROPOSALS THAT HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED BY THE PUBLIC OR STAFF.** Pursuant to AS 44.62.200, the board may review the full range of activities appropriate to any of the subjects listed in this notice. The board may make changes to the resident and nonresident hunting and trapping regulations as may be required to ensure the subsistence priority in AS 16.05.258.

After the public comment period ends, the Alaska Board of Game may adopt these or other provisions dealing with the same subject, without further notice, or reject, supplement, or decide to take no action on them. The language of the final regulations may be different from that of the proposed regulations. Anyone interested in, or affected by, the subject matter contained in this legal notice should make written or oral comments if they wish to have their views considered by the board.

**Statutory Authority:** AS 16.05 – AS 16.20

**Statutes Being Implemented, Interpreted, or Made Specific:** AS 16.05; AS 16.20

**Fiscal Information:** The proposed regulation changes are not expected to require an increased appropriation.

**PROPOSAL 1 – 5 AAC 84.270(1). Fur bearer trapping.** Expand the season for beaver as follows:

Unit	Open Season	Bag Limit
(1) Beaver		
Units 1 (except Unit 1(D)), 2, 3 [(EXCEPT MITKOF ISLAND)], and 4 (that portion east of Chatham Strait)	Dec. 1–May 15	No limit.
Unit 1(D)	Dec. 1-May 15	5 per season.
[UNIT 3, MITKOF ISLAND]	[DEC. 1–APR. 15]	[NO LIMIT.]

...

**ISSUE:** Except for Mitkof Island, where the season ends on April 15, the Unit 3 beaver trapping season extends from December 1–May 15. The Mitkof Island season was shortened in 1982 due to concerns about local extirpation. Wildlife biologists believe there is no reason to maintain this discrepancy in the Unit 3 beaver trapping season.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The Mitkof Island beaver trapping season will remain unnecessarily restrictive.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Mitkof Island beaver trappers would enjoy one more month of trapping season.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Beaver trappers on Mitkof Island, those interested in simplifying the regulations by unifying the Unit 3 season, and those interested in reducing problems associated with nuisance beaver activity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who prefer to see the Mitkof beaver trapping season remain more restrictive.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02F-G-055)  
 \*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 2 - 5 AAC 84.270(13). Fur bearer trapping.** Amend the trapping season and bag limits for wolves in Unit 1A as follows:

<b>Units</b>	<b>Open Season</b>	<b>Bag Limit</b>
<b><u>Unit 1A</u></b>	<b><u>Nov. 1 – Apr. 30</u></b> [NOV. 10 – APRIL 30]	No limit.

**ISSUE:** Predation by wolves

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued excess predation on what is left of our blacktail populations in many areas of Unit 1A.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes – even one more blacktail doe is a plus.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** None.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** This proposal, no matter how insignificant, was in place before.

**PROPOSED BY:** Robert Jahnke (HQ-02F-G-016)  
 \*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 3 - 5 AAC 84.270(13). Fur bearer trapping, and 5 AAC 85.056(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf.** Close portions of Unit 1C to taking wolves as follows:

Unit 1C, Douglas Island only, is closed to the hunting and trapping of wolves. When the population of wolves on Douglas Island reaches sustainability and can stand a hunting and trapping season, while continuing to provide for other user groups, as determined by the ADF&G, those seasons will be reopened.

**ISSUE:** The extinction of a pack of wolves in an island ecosystem where the establishment of a pack of wolves is rare or extremely unlikely to occur, i.e., no pack has been recorded there for 20 to 25 years. A single trapper eliminated the only pack of seven wolves in January 2002. The value of this wildlife resource was extraordinary as it established itself in proximity to Juneau, a large population center with a diversity of user groups. There is a problem of discrimination when all user groups of a wildlife resource are not represented. As stated in the ADF&G’s mission statement, “The primary goals are to ensure that Alaska’s renewable fish and wildlife resources and their habitats are conserved and managed on the sustained yield principle, and the use and development of these resources are in the best interest of the economy and well-being of the people of the state.” The ADF&G will resolve the problem of one user group being allowed to take a wolf pack on Douglas Island by managing a future pack for sustainability.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Other user groups of wildlife will be deprived of the enjoyment and use of an important wildlife resource, especially since it is a species

that is rarely seen. Activities of other user groups would include wildlife viewing, educational activities, research and field study, and tourism-related opportunities. Another problem is that the code of ethics cited in the official Alaska Trapping Regulation handbook will continue to be violated. Number 9 says, "Concentrate trapping in areas where animals are overabundant for the surrounding habitat."

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. A sustainable population of wolves on Douglas Island would ensure a wildlife resource of long term benefit for a greater diversity of user groups.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All user groups of the wildlife resource.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Hunters and trappers may suffer initially as they will not be able to take wolves on Douglas Island until a sustained population is established. They should, however, benefit in the long run because they will have an opportunity to hunt or trap wolves over a sustained number of years rather than having just a one-time opportunity, as was the case this past winter. Until that sustainability occurs, however, they will have the mainland to hunt and trap wolves, a huge area where wolf populations are more abundant.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1) Considered restricting bag limits regarding wolf hunting and trapping throughout Unit 1C, where wolf populations are statistically lower than other areas of the state, but felt that this did not specifically address the situation that occurred on Douglas Island where an entire pack of wolves was trapped-out, therefore depriving other user groups the use of this wildlife resource. 2) Considered limiting hunters and trappers to one wolf each, per year, on Douglas Island but failed to see how that would address the problem of population sustainability. It is only through population sustainability that all user groups will be represented, thus ensuring that the wildlife resource will be shared by all. 3) Considered creating a new controlled use area as follows: Create the Douglas Island Controlled Use Area. This area is closed to the harvesting of wolves until a sustainable population becomes established. Once sustainability occurs seasons may be opened to hunting and trapping. A limit on the number of wolves allowed to be harvested will be contingent upon maintaining a sustainable population so that other user groups are ensured of the use of this wildlife resource. The reason that we rejected this resolution was because we were apprehensive that the entirety of Douglas Island would not be included within a new controlled use area and that wolves would be vulnerable to hunting and trapping should they travel outside of the controlled use area. Another reason we rejected this resolution was due to our apprehension that a large enough area would not be designated to sustain a wolf population.

**PROPOSED BY:** Voices for Douglas Island Wildlife (HQ-02F-G-031)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 4 - 5 AAC 84.270(13). Fur bearer trapping, and 5 AAC 85.056(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf.** Change trapping and hunting seasons for taking wolves in Units 1, 3, 4, and 5 as follows:

Make the hunting and trapping season for wolves uniformly limited to December 1 through March 31 in all of Southeast Alaska.

**ISSUE:** Wolves are not harvested for human consumption. They are not considered valuable as a trophy animal. The only recognized consumptive value they have is for their fur. Except in those instances where active management of predator populations is considered an essential need in maintaining the health of ungulate populations, harvesting of wolves outside the time of year when their pelts are considered prime makes no sense. There are no areas of active management of predator populations in southeast Alaska. This being the case, taking of wolves in Units 1, 3, 4, and 5 should be restricted from the present August 1 through April 30 season to coincide with that currently in existence for Unit 2, which is December 1 through March 31, when the fur is prime.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Wolves will continue to be taken for no purpose at all outside the normal season when pelts are considered prime.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** It would reduce the wanton waste of wolves as a harvestable consumptive resource.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaskans who value wolves as a harvestable resource. All Alaskans interested in viewing wildlife in southeast Alaska, visitors from outside Alaska, Alaskans whose jobs depend on wildlife viewing directly or indirectly, and others.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Wildlife Alliance (HQ-02F-G-032)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 5 - 5 AAC 84.270(13). Fur bearer trapping, and 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf.** Combine hunting and trapping bag limits and season dates for taking wolves in Units 1-5 as follows:

Hunting and trapping seasons: open uniformly on October 15 and close uniformly on March 31.

Bag limit: uniform hunting and trapping bag limit of 10 wolves per year.

**ISSUE:** Excessive bag limits and excessively long seasons for hunting and trapping wolves.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued excessive takes, excessive wolf pup orphans, poor quality pelts.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, this proposal would result in higher quality pelts for hunters and trappers, less waste of quality pelts, fewer orphans, more stable and healthier populations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** We would all benefit by having less waste and having a healthier wolf population through a conservation-based management system.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Some, but not all, trappers

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Don Muller (HQ-02F-G-029)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 6 - 5 AAC 84.270(13). Fur bearer trapping, and 5 AAC 85.056(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf.** Combine hunting and trapping bag limits and season dates for taking wolves in Units 1-5 as follows:

Uniform hunting and trapping season opening in Units 1-5 on October 15. Uniform closure on March 15. Uniform bag limit of ten wolves.

**ISSUE:** Wolf hunting and trapping seasons in southeast Alaska are too long and bag limits are too large.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Hides taken early and late are not prime and pups are not independent (early in season) or not yet born (late in seasons). Wolves are managed as varmints rather than valuable furbearers.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Better hides, better monetary return to hunters and trappers, better management of a valuable resource.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters and trappers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. Those who hunt and trap can shift their effort to occur later and cease earlier with little reduction in total harvest.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Retain current seasons and bag limits and continue to harvest poor quality pelts and reduce recruitment of wolves by taking pregnant females or adults with dependent pups.

**PROPOSED BY:** Dorothy Keeler (HQ-02F-G-035)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 7 – 5 AAC 85.020(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.** Amend this regulation as follows:

**Resident**

Units and Bag Limits	Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(1)		
<b>Unit 1, <u>except Unit 1(D)</u></b>	Sept. 15–Dec. 31 (General hunt only) Mar. 15–May 31 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15–Dec. 31 Mar. 15–May 31

1 bear every 4 regulatory years  
by registration permit only

**Unit 1(D)**  
**RESIDENT HUNTERS:**  
**1 bear every 4 regulatory years**  
**by registration permit only**

**Sept. 15–Dec. 31**  
**(General hunt only)**  
**Mar. 15–May 31**  
**(General hunt only)**

**NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:**  
**1 bear every 4 regulatory years**  
**by drawing permit only; up to**  
**12 permits may be issued**

**Sept. 15–Dec. 31**  
**Mar. 15–May 31**

**ISSUE:** Population data for Unit 1D brown bears is not available, but our understanding of mainland brown bear habitat and food sources suggests that bears occur in low densities. Permit registration and harvest ticket data point to increasing hunter effort and harvest in this population. Unit 1D is predominantly state-managed land. This area experienced an immediate increase in guide activity when additional restrictions on brown bear guides were established on Tongass National Forest lands elsewhere in the region. This commercial use is not currently controlled through land management authorizations on state land, making hunting regulations the only feasible method for stabilizing nonresident bear harvest. Nonresident brown bear harvest has increased at an annual rate of 7.7 percent, from 1990–2001, with a high of 15 brown bears being harvested in 2000. Additionally, DLP mortality has increased in recent years. As proposed, the resident season would not be affected.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The integrity of Unit 1D brown bear populations could be jeopardized.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, by taking a cautious approach at this time, bear conservation will be enhanced and future management options are more flexible.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Brown bear hunters and other wildlife enthusiasts.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Some big game guides would likely lose guiding opportunities, and some nonresident hunters would have to postpone brown bear hunts.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1) Status quo; this decision was discarded due to the increasing harvest of bears by nonresident hunters, and biologists' concern with what appears to be low-density brown bear populations. 2) Include residents in the drawing hunt; this was not favored because of the relatively low take by resident hunters. 3) Restrict nonresident hunters to one bear per lifetime; this was discarded due to the low number of repeat nonresident brown bear hunters and our belief that this would not be a solution to the problem.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02F-G-050)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 8 - 5 AAC 85.020(2). Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.** Establish a season for brown bear in Unit 3 as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(2)		
Unit 2 [AND 3]	No open season.	
Unit 3	<u>Sept. 15 – Dec. 31</u> <u>(General hunt only)</u> <u>Mar. 15 – May 31</u> <u>(General hunt only)</u>	<u>Sept. 15 – Dec. 31</u> <u>Mar. 15 – May 31</u>
<u>1 bear every 4 registration years by registration permit only</u>		

**ISSUE:** Brown bear have been becoming more numerous in Unit 3. It is time to establish a season.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** We will continue to forego harvest of brown bear and continue to put more pressure on Unit 1B.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** No.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Brown bear hunters in Unit 3.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?**



**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Establish a drawing permit hunt. Too costly.

**PROPOSED BY:** Wrangell Advisory Committee

(HQ-02F-G-013)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 9 – 5 AAC 85.020(3). Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.** Reopen a portion of Unit 4 as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(3)		
Unit 4, Chichagof Island south of a line that follows the crest of the island from Rock Point (58° N. lat., 136° 21' W. long.) to Rodgers Point (57° 35' N. lat., 135° 33' W. long.), including Yakobi and other adjacent islands; Baranof Island south and west of a line that follows the crest of the island from Nismeni Point (57° 34' N. lat., 135° 25' W. long.) to the entrance of Gut Bay (56° 44' N. lat., 134° 38' W. long.), including the drainages into Gut Bay and including Kruzof and other adjacent islands	Sept. 15-Dec. 31 Mar. 15-May 31	Sept. 15-Dec. 31 Mar. 15-May 31
1 bear every 4 regulatory years by registration permit only		
[UNIT 4, THAT PORTION IN THE NORTHEAST CHICHAGOF CONTROLLED USE AREA NORTH OF THE SPASSKI TRAIL	[SEPT.15-DEC. 31] [MAR.15-MAY 20]	[SEPT.15-DEC. 31] [MAR.15-MAY 20]

AND THE GARTINA HIGHWAY  
AND EAST OF PORT  
FREDERICK]

[1 BEAR EVERY 4 REGULATORY  
YEARS BY REGISTRATION  
PERMIT ONLY]

Unit 4, [REMAINDER OF THE] Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area	<u>Sept.15-Dec. 31</u> [MAR.15-MAY 20]	<u>Sept.15-Dec. 31</u> [MAR.15-MAY 20]
--	---	---

1 bear every 4 regulatory years  
by registration permit only

...

**ISSUE:** Recent findings by wildlife biologists have revealed that the northeast Chichagof Island (NEC) brown bear population is significantly higher than previously estimated. The Unit 4 Brown Bear Management Team recommended that no more than 4 percent of the bear population be removed annually. The prior density estimate, generated in 1992, of 0.8 bears per square mile dictated that no more than 14 bears be removed annually from NEC by human-caused mortality (sport and subsistence harvest, illegal take, defense of life and property killings, and any other human causes). The 2002 NEC population estimate indicated that the brown bear population is about 731 bears (at 90 percent CI, 545–1023 bears; 1.7 bears per square mile). Using these current numbers, the allowable human-caused mortality is 29 bears.

This proposal would reopen a portion of Unit 4 that currently does not have a fall season. It is important to note that this proposal is not designed as a population reduction technique. By restricting the human-caused mortality to no more than 4 percent of the estimated population, this proposal is designed to stabilize the growth of the population. Additionally, by adopting this proposal the entire Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area would be managed under one regulation.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Opportunity for additional Unit 4 brown bear hunting will be lost. The NEC brown bear population can support additional harvest, and the demand for that harvest exists. Furthermore, allowing additional harvest may reduce the ever-increasing mortality of bears in Hoonah, Mt. Bether, and Tenakee Springs through defense of life and property provisions.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal, if adopted, would increase the quantity of harvest and may reduce the number of bears taken under defense of life and property provisions, thus improving the quality of the hides taken. This proposal does not affect the restriction on the use of any motorized land vehicle for brown bear hunting in 5 AAC 92.540(1)(A).

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Additional hunters will be afforded the opportunity to hunt Unit 4 brown bears. Because a large proportion of the current Unit 4 harvest is accommodated through the use of guides, existing guides may reap additional guiding opportunity. Residents of northeast Chichagof Island, particularly those in Hoonah, Mt. Bether, and Tenakee Springs, may experience fewer human/bear problems.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those people who are against harvest of brown bears.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1) Maintain status quo; this option would result in lost hunting opportunity and would promote additional bear mortality through defense of life and property provisions. 2) Provide a shorter fall hunting season than suggested in this proposal; this would likely result in lost opportunity to hunt brown bears. The current brown bear population can withstand additional harvest. Without a protracted season there would likely be crowding issues, reducing the quality of the hunting experience.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02F-G-051)  
 \*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 85.030(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.** Change the opening date of hunting season for deer in Units 1A and 2 as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(1)		
Unit 1(A) and 2	<b><u>Aug. 15 - Dec. 31</u></b> [AUG. 1 – DEC. 31]	<b><u>Aug. 15 - Dec. 31</u></b> [AUG. 1 – DEC. 31]

**ISSUE:** I would like to see the deer season in Units 1A and 2 start on August 15 instead of August 1. I am a butcher and have cut game meat in southern Southeast for fifteen years. I see a great deal of meat spoilage during the first two weeks in August. Even responsible deer hunters have a difficult time keeping meat cool and dry in early August.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Game meat will continue to be wasted unnecessarily.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** More meat will be usable from the harvest.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone who depends on deer as a game animal.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Parents wanting to spend all of August in the field hunting deer with their children.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1) Status quo – I see too much waste during early season. 2) Eliminate all of August and start deer hunt September 1.

**PROPOSED BY:** Melvin Krueger (HQ-02F-G-043)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 11 - 5 AAC 85.030(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.** Reduce the bag limit for deer in Unit 2 as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(1)		
Unit 2		
<b><u>2 bucks</u></b>	Aug. 1 – Dec. 1	Aug. 1 – Dec. 31
[4 BUCKS]		

**ISSUE:** Reduce the bag limit of deer to two bucks to all users of Unit 2.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will be an adverse affect on the deer population. With the increased accessibility from the new ferry system (IFA), we will see an increase of nonrural residents coming to hunt Unit 2.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** By reducing the bag limit we will improve the quality of our resource harvested and allow there to be a resource for future generations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Tribal members, tribal landowners, residents of Prince of Wales and subsistence users.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Nonrural residents, Ketchikan, Juneau, Anchorage, and nonresident hunters.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Close down the first ten days of the season to nonlocal residents.

**PROPOSED BY:** Craig Community Association (HQ-02F-G-023)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 12 - 5 AAC 85.030(2). Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.** Change hunting seasons and bag limits for a portion of Unit 3 for bow and arrow only as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
-----------------------------	---	------------------------------------

(2)

**Unit 3, Mitkof Island, north and west of a line from Frederick Point to the highest point in Section 8, T59S, R90E; to the highest point in Section 7, T59S, R80E; to the highest point in Section 13, T59S, R79E; to the highest point in Section 23, T59S, R79E; then due south to the Petersburg city boundary and greater than one-quarter mile from any of the following areas within the corporate city limits: airport property, dwellings, businesses, highways, roads or streets**

**1 antlered deer by bow and arrow only      Oct. 25 – Nov. 8      Oct. 25 – Nov. 8**

Note: The bag limit for deer on Mitkof Island would remain at one antlered deer. Any deer harvested during this hunt would still have to be the first deer taken on for the year.

**ISSUE:** Establish an archery-only deer season within the Petersburg city limits where the discharge of weapons other than firearms is allowed.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Bow hunting opportunities independent of general rifle seasons will continue to be very limited.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?**

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bowhunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Unknown.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo.

**PROPOSED BY:** Devil's Thumb Archers (HQ-02F-G-020)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 13 – 5 AAC 85.030(2). Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.** Liberalize the season in Unit 3 as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(2)		
Unit 3, including Mitkof, [ISLAND, THAT PORTION OF KUPREANOF ISLAND ON THE LINDENBERG PENINSULA EAST OF THE PORTAGE BAY/DUNCAN CANAL PORTAGE, AND] Woe- Wodski, and Butterworth islands	Oct. 15–Oct. 31	Oct. 15–Oct. 31
1 buck		
Remainder of Unit 3	Aug. 1–Nov. 30	Aug. 1–Nov. 30
2 bucks		

**ISSUE:** Mitkof, Woewodski, and Butterworth islands and the eastern portion of Kupreanof Island are currently managed under the most restrictive deer season and bag limit in the region. The restrictive seasons and bag limits were initially implemented in the aftermath of a 15-year closure following severe population declines associated with harsh winters and high wolf densities during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Deer populations have rebounded sufficiently to allow liberalization of the season and bag limit for the eastern half of Kupreanof, and unify the entire island under one season and bag limit.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The opportunity to hunt deer on the eastern portion of Kupreanof will continue to be unnecessarily restricted and a harvestable surplus of bucks will go unutilized.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The opportunity to hunt for deer will be increased.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those interested in increased opportunity to hunt deer in the vicinity of Petersburg.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who would prefer to see the current restrictive season and bag limit remain in effect, many who believe that the liberalization of the deer season and bag limit on eastern Kupreanof would lead to population declines.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02F-G-052)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.** Amend the tag requirement for deer in Units 1-4 as follows:

Require the use of tags for deer in Units 1-4.

In Units 1-4 the state shall issue waterproof paper tags that are to be attached to the animal immediately after harvest. If the animal is not taken from the field whole the tag must be attached to the proof of sex.

**ISSUE:** Many deer in Southeast Alaska are being harvested without the proper tag being cut. This results in a number of people taking deer in excess of the limit. There is no easy way for a person to tell if a deer has been tagged by looking at the animal.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Deer will continue to be harvested without being tagged.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?**

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Majority of Southeast hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who now harvest deer without a tag.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Using locking plastic tags. Cost is prohibitive.

**PROPOSED BY:** Wrangell Advisory Committee (HQ-02F-G-011)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 15 - 5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.** Amend the tag requirement for deer in Units 1-4 as follows:

Upon taking a deer in Units 1-4 the hunter shall immediately remove in its entirety only the month and day of the kill and attach the tag in plain sight securely to the game animal. The tag shall be kept attached to such carcass or parts thereof until the meat is processed.

**ISSUE:** Whether true or not there is a perception that deer harvest tags are being used to harvest multiple animals, i.e., by holding onto and not validating a harvest tag it may be used at a later time. By requiring that the hunter attach the validated tag to the deer during transport until processed, this would alleviate such problems.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Not validating a tag will continue to go unchecked. Law enforcement will still have to catch the hunter with an unvalidated tag.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Would help to regulate the illegal taking of game animals in southeast Alaska.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The legal hunters of big game.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The illegal hunters of big game.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** James Baichtal (HQ-02F-G-048)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 16 – 5 AAC 85.035(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk.** Amend this regulation as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
-----------------------------	---	------------------------------------

(1)

Unit 3, that portion bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of Sumner Strait and Clarence Strait, running southeast following the midline of Clarence Strait, down the midline of Snow Passage, then east of the Kashevarof Islands back to the midline of Clarence



Strait down to its intersection with Ernest Sound, then northeast following the midline of Ernest Sound, excluding Niblack Islands, to its intersection with Zimovia Strait, then northwest following the western shoreline of Zimovia Strait to its intersection with Chichagof Passage, then west along the midline of Chichagof Passage to its intersection with Stikine Strait, then northerly along the midline of Stikine Strait, west of Vank Island, to its intersection with Sumner Strait, then northwest along the midline of Sumner Strait back to the point of beginning.

1 bull by drawing permit only  
by bow and arrow only  
 [AS FOLLOWS]; up to  
50 [120] permits  
 will be issued

Sept. 1–Sept. 30

Sept. 1–Sept. 30

[1 BULL BY BOW AND  
 ARROW ONLY  
 or

SEPT. 1–SEPT. 30

SEPT. 1–SEPT. 30]

1 bull by drawing permit only;  
up to 250 permits will be issued

Oct. 1–Oct. 31  
 (General hunt only)

Oct. 1–Oct. 31

...

**ISSUE:** Individuals selected for DE-320 elk drawing permits currently have the option of hunting elk with archery tackle during the one-month archery only season or hunting with a rifle during the one-month late season. Currently, those who choose to bowhunt, if unsuccessful during the September season, can continue to hunt the late season with either archery tackle or rifle, thereby enjoying a two-month season. This proposal would result in two separate drawing hunts; the early hunt would be open for archery only. We believe adoption of this proposal would have the second benefit of increasing hunter effort and harvest, allowing us to reach management goals.

If the board chooses not to separate these into distinct drawing hunts, the department would like the board to consider increasing the total number of permits to 300. The introduced elk herd on Etolin and Zarembo islands continues to thrive. Despite three increases in the number of drawing permits in the past 5 years, hunters have continually failed to take the management plan’s annual target of 25 bulls. Authorizing ADF&G to issue “up to” 300 drawing permits annually would allow the department to increase the number of drawing permits without having to repeatedly approach the board for authorization. A similar approach is currently used in establishing the number of drawing permits for moose hunts in Berners Bay.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The perceived disparity between archery only and any-gear hunters will continue. The level of participation in the hunts will probably remain static and we will fail to reach harvest objectives.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? More hunters afield should result in harvest and hunter participation goals being reached.**

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** More hunters will be able to participate in elk hunts on Etolin and Zarembo islands.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Increase the total number of permits available to all hunters up to 300.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02F-G-053)  
 \*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 85.035(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk.** Amend this regulation as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
Unit 3 (permit hunt portion) ... 1 bull by drawing permit only as follows; up to <b>150</b> [120] permits will be issued; <b>of those, up to 30 permits may be used for bow and arrow</b>	Oct. 1-Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	Oct. 1-Oct. 31

1 bull by bow and arrow only

Sept. 1-Sept. 30

Sept. 1-Sept. 30

**ISSUE:** Establish archery-only permits for elk in Unit 3 in addition to, and independent of, the general rifle season permits.

This proposal would establish two separate permit drawings for Unit 3 elk: one drawing for 120 rifle permits and one drawing for 30 (25 percent of the number of rifle permits) archery only permits. Applicants would be able to apply for one permit, either a rifle permit or an archery permit, but not both.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Bow hunters will continue to be included in the general season permit drawing and hunting opportunities for bow hunters will continue to be very limited.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?**

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bowhunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Unknown.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo. Although there is currently an archery-only elk hunt in Unit 3 it is possible that no bow hunters could be drawn under the current system.

**PROPOSED BY:** Devil’s Thumb Archers (HQ-02F-G-019)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC 85.035(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk.** Allow muzzleloader use during the Sept. 1 – Sept. 30 elk season in a portion of Unit 3 as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
Unit 3 (portion) ... 1 bull by drawing permit only as follows; up to 120 permits will be issued.	Sept. 1 – Sept. 30	Sept. 1 – Sept. 30
1 bull by bow and arrow <b><u>or muzzleloader</u></b> only	Sept. 1 – Sept. 30	Sept. 1 – Sept. 30

or

1 bull

Oct. 1 – Oct. 31  
(General hunt only)

Oct. 1 – Oct. 31

Included in the definition of a muzzleloader would be the requirements of .54 caliber or larger, or at least .45 caliber and a 250 grain or larger elongated slug, sights must be open, peep, or of other open design, telescopic sights are prohibited, the use of sabots are prohibited, the firearm must have an open ignition system. The individual choosing to hunt with a muzzleloader would have to successfully complete a department-approved muzzleloader education course that includes ballistic limitations of muzzle-loading weapons and a proficiency test.

**ISSUE:** Individuals selected for DE-320 elk permits currently have the option of hunting elk with archery equipment during the one-month only archery season or hunting by any means during the one-month late season. Looking for muzzle loading opportunities in the state, I would like to see the archery-only restriction changed to a primitive hunt which includes muzzle-loading and archery as a hunting means. If at some time the September portion of DE320 is divided into a separate drawing, I would like to see this be offered as a primitive weapons hunt, both archery and muzzle-loading.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** This is not necessarily a problem, it is an opportunity.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This regulation change would create opportunities for muzzleloader hunters in the state.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those who choose to hunt with a muzzleloader and are successful in drawing a tag, may be a tool in helping the state achieve their harvest goals.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who choose to hunt by archery methods could perceive this as an encroachment on their current “archery only season.”

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** James Baichtal (HQ-02F-G-046)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 85.035(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk.** Add a fall registration hunt for elk in a portion of Unit 3 as follows:

	<b>Resident</b>	
	<b>Open Season</b>	
	<b>(Subsistence and</b>	<b>Nonresident</b>
	<b>General Hunts)</b>	<b>Open Season</b>
<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>		

Unit 3 (portion)

...

1 bull by drawing permit only as follows; up to 120 permits will be issued.

1 bull by bow and arrow only

Sept. 1 – Sept. 30

Sept. 1 – Sept. 30

or

1 bull

Oct. 1 – Oct. 31  
(general hunt only)

Oct. 1 – Oct. 31

**or**

**1 elk by registration permit only; up to X permits will be issued; by bow and arrow or muzzleloader only.**

**Nov. 15 – Dec. 30**

**Nov. 15 – Dec. 30**

Archery equipment and certification as currently required. Included in the definition of a muzzleloader would be the requirements of .54 caliber or larger, or at least .45 caliber and a 250 grain or larger elongated slug, sights must be open, peep, or of other open design, telescopic sights are prohibited, the use of sabots are prohibited, the firearm must have an open ignition system. The individual choosing to hunt with a muzzleloader would have to successfully complete a department-approved muzzleloader education course that includes ballistic limitations of muzzle loading weapons and a proficiency test.

**ISSUE:** ADF&G biologists have stated that the Etohin and Zarembo elk herds continue to increase despite increasing the number of drawing permits. I am proposing a late season, either sex, registration elk hunt for primitive weapons, archery and muzzle-loading, to be used as a tool in controlling the elk populations if it is determined there is a need. The number of animals to be taken would be set annually by the area biologist(s).

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** This is not necessarily a problem, it is an opportunity.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This regulation change would create opportunities for muzzleloader and/or archery hunters in the state and give the state another management tool.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those who choose to hunt with a muzzleloader or bow and arrow and are successful in drawing a tag, may be a tool in helping the state achieve their harvest goals.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who wish to see the elk herd increase as rapidly as possible and spread to other islands in southeast Alaska.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Muzzleloading Association (HQ-02F-G-047)  
 \*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 20 - 5 AAC 85.035(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk.** Amend the elk drawing hunt in Unit 3 as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
Unit 3...		
1 bull by bow and arrow only	<u><b>Aug. 13 – Sept. 13</b></u> [SEPT. 1 – SEPT. 30]	<u><b>Aug. 13 – Sept. 13</b></u> [SEPT. 1 – SEPT. 30]
or		
1 bull	<u><b>Sept. 15 – Oct. 15</b></u> [OCT. 1 – OCT. 31] (General hunt only)	<u><b>Sept. 15 – Oct. 15</b></u> [OCT. 1 – OCT. 31]

**ISSUE:** Increase harvest in Unit 3.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Current practices will continue not meeting 25 bull harvest level.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** An earlier rifle season will allow access to elk on the summer range before snowfall. Increases access during bugle.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** We have enough permits to harvest elk; just need better time window.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Establish three or more separate hunts. While many people feel the hunt would be of a higher quality, the cost would be prohibitive. It is the future intent of the Wrangell Advisory Committee to propose a general hunt in the next cycle.

**PROPOSED BY:** Wrangell Advisory Committee (HQ-02F-G-010)  
 \*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 21 - 5 AAC 85.040(1) Hunting seasons and bag limits for goats.** Amend this regulation as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(1)		
...		
<b><u>Units 1(A) and 1(B) that portion on the Cleveland Peninsula south of the divide between Yes Bay and Santa Anna Inlet</u></b>	<b><u>No open season.</u></b>	<b><u>No open season.</u></b>
Remainder of Units 1(A) and 1(B)	Aug. 1–Dec. 31	Aug. 1–Dec. 31
<b><u>1 goat</u></b> [2 GOATS] by registration permit only		
...		

**ISSUE:** This is a two-issue proposal. The first issue is the goat bag limit in that portion of Southeast defined as the remainder of Units 1A and 1B. Currently all of Unit 1B south of Bradfield Canal and mainland Unit 1A has a two-goat bag limit. For reasons of goat conservation and consistency, we believe it is time to change to a one-goat bag limit regionwide. Although some discrete areas, particularly in the Unit 1A mainland, could support a limited two-goat bag limit, the relative interest as well as hunter harvest is low enough to suggest that significant hunter opportunity would not be lost.

The second issue relates to the Cleveland Peninsula mountain goat population. Goats in that area are distributed over a large area and occur in small, geographically isolated groups. Harvest in recent years has contributed to reduced goat numbers. Low counts observed during surveys in fall 2001, as well as during the past four years have raised concerns about the health and viability of this goat population. Between 1995 and 2000 hunters harvested a total of 15 goats from this area, including six females. Biologists believe that the current low number of goats will not continue to support a registration permit hunt in this area.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The two-goat bag limit would remain in place, conflicting with conservation goals. The goat population on the lower Cleveland Peninsula may be reduced to such a low level that herd recovery would be jeopardized.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Long-term goat conservation goals would be better sustained. The Cleveland Peninsula goat population should experience recovery from low numbers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Wildlife enthusiasts who care about the long-term conservation goals and the viability of goats on the Cleveland Peninsula.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Hunters who prefer to see retention of the two-goat bag limit. Some big game guides and hunters targeting trophy mountain goats and/or mixed bag hunts would be restricted.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1) Status quo; this option was discarded due to a) conservation concerns, particularly on the Cleveland Peninsula, b) a desire for consistent bag limits across the region, and c) the relatively low interest in the two-goat bag limit. 2) Reduce the Cleveland Peninsula bag limit from two goats to one and retain the registration permit hunt; we believe that this solution does not go far enough to protect this herd. 3) Reduce the two-goat bag limit in the entire area and change the Cleveland Peninsula season to a drawing hunt; this option was not selected due to the low number of goats in this herd which we believe needs total protection at this time. 4) Use discretionary permit hunt regulation (5 AAC 92.052) to not open this portion of RG001; this option was discarded because we believe it will be some time before the goat herd on the Cleveland Peninsula rebounds to where a limited hunt is an option.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02F-G-056)  
 \*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 85.040(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat.** Amend this regulation as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(1)		
...		
Unit 1(C), that <u>mainland</u> portion draining into <u>the south bank of Little Sheep Creek, Gastineau Channel south of Little Sheep Creek,</u> Stephens Passage, and Taku	Sept. 1–Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1–Nov. 30



Inlet between the mouth of Little Sheep Creek [POINT SALISBURY] and Taku Glacier

1 goat by registration permit by bow and arrow only

...

**ISSUE:** Over the past two years only two goats have been harvested in the RG014 hunt area. This change in the hunt area boundary would allow more opportunity to harvest goats in an area that is readily accessible to hunters, and routinely used by goats.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The harvest will likely remain well below our guideline harvest level of five goats.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** **There will be more opportunity to hunt goats in this area.**

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Archery hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those people who do not want to this archery hunt area expanded.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02F-G-057)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC 85.040(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat.** Amend this regulation in Unit 1D to provide for the following:

Open the goat season in Unit 1D on August 15 instead of September 15.

**ISSUE:** Rapidly deteriorating weather makes goat hunting difficult for alpine hunters.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The narrow window for alpine goat hunting would remain.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Billies and nannies are sometimes easier to distinguish in the alpine.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The alpine hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The later season hunters.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Rodney Magee (HQ-02F-G-003)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC 85.045(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Increase the length of the Unit 1B and 3 moose hunt as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(1)		
Unit 1(B) and 3	<b><u>Sept. 1 – Oct. 31</u></b> [SEPT. 15 – OCT. 15] (General hunt only except in Stikine Drainage)	<b><u>Sept. 1 – Oct. 31</u></b> [SEPT. 15 – OCT. 15]

1 bull with spike-fork antlers  
or 50-inch antlers or antlers with  
3 or more brow tines on one  
side by registration permit only.

**ISSUE:** There appears to be more than sufficient number of mature bull moose to maintain first estrus breeding. Many of these bulls will not become legal during their lifetime. If a way can be found to protect the main breeding population we could increase the harvest of bulls, in some cases increased harvest could prevent habitat degradation.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Loss of opportunity to harvest moose and possible habitat loss.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?**

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Unit 1 and 3 moose hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** See other proposals.

**PROPOSED BY:** Wrangell Advisory Committee (HQ-02F-G-008)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC 85.045(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Amend bag limits for moose in Units 1B and 3 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(1)		
Unit 1(B) and 3	Sept. 15 – Oct. 15 (General hunt only except in Stikene Drainage)	Sept. 15 – Oct. 15

1 bull with a spike or fork antler on at least one side, [-FORK ANTLERS] or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 2 [3] or more brow tines on both [ONE] sides by registration permit only.

**ISSUE:** There appears to be more than sufficient number of mature bull moose to maintain first estrus breeding. Many of these bulls will not become legal during their lifetime. If a way can be found to protect the main breeding population we could increase the harvest of bulls, in some cases increased harvest could prevent habitat degradation.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Loss of opportunity to harvest moose and possible habitat loss.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?**

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Unit 1 and 3 moose hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** See other proposals.

**PROPOSED BY:** Wrangell Advisory Committee (HQ-02F-G-009)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC 85.045(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Create an archery season for moose in Unit 3 as follows:

	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>		

(1)

**Unit 3**

<b><u>1 bull, by bow and arrow only</u></b>	<b><u>Oct. 15 - Oct. 31</u></b>	<b><u>Oct. 15 – Oct. 31</u></b>
---	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

**ISSUE:** Establish an archery-only antlered moose season in Unit 3 for any bull with antlers greater than spike-fork.

According to the Department of Fish and Game, mid-range bulls (less than 50 inches, greater than spike-fork) are currently at very high abundance and may be nearing an over abundance. The department has increasing concerns about this situation but are limited in their options to allow a minimal, selective harvest of this size of bull. By allowing for an archery-only hunt by IBEP certified bow hunters a limited number of bulls could be harvested without endangering the overall size and health of the heard.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The department will continue to be limited in options for the harvest of the rapidly increasing number of mid-range bulls.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?**

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bow hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Unknown.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Devil’s Thumb Archers (HQ-02F-G-021)  
 \*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 27 - 5 AAC 85.045(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Increase the number of antlerless moose permits available for a portion of Unit 1C as follows:

	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>		

(1)

Unit 1(C), that portion west of Excursion Inlet and north of Icy Passage.

1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:

1 bull by registration permit only	Sept. 15 – Oct. 15 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15 – Oct. 15
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to <u>35</u> [10] permits may be issued	Nov. 15 – Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	Nov. 15 – Nov. 30

**ISSUE:** Insufficient number of antlerless moose permits to reverse the overpopulation of Gustavus moose.

Moose first showed up in Gustavus in 1966. By 1985 they had established a permanent population and began a rapid increase. ADF&G counted 185 in February 1999 and 276 in January 2002, indicating that this increase has continued up to the present. As moose have increased, their effects on willow browse have become increasingly noticeable. ADF&G willow browse survey data show that in recent years, over 90 percent of the annual crop of twigs is consumed each year. Many willow thickets have declined in vigor already as a result, and we expect many others to follow suit in the near future. The successional trend in the Gustavus area is for willows to be overtaken by forest; weakening the willows by overbrowsing accelerates this trend and hastens the day when our area's capacity to maintain moose will decrease. ADF&G estimates there is less than six square miles of productive willow shrub stands on the Gustavus forelands, and that even during the relatively mild winter of 2001-2002, ADF&G counted about 250 moose in this area. It is clear that there are too many moose in Gustavus for the willow browse available. Moose are beginning to turn to less palatable alternatives to willow, such as sweet gale and jointgrass, but these are not likely to substitute for the coming willow shortage.

We believe that if something is not done soon to reverse the trend in moose numbers, we are going to see a major decline in moose habitat quality, followed by a decline in moose from which they may never fully recover.

Culling only ten cows from the herd will not be sufficient to cap or reverse the upward population trend. Up to 35 per year may need to be harvested to have this effect, at least at first. We want to give ADF&G the authority to do what is necessary to manage this herd properly.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The Gustavus moose herd will continue to degrade its habitat. Willows and other favored moose browse are presently greatly overused. Recent mild winters have favored the moose population, but a return to average snow years, coupled

with existing overbrowsing, will be very likely to precipitate a population crash from which it may never fully recover.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, because if left to continue their increase, the body condition of moose will decrease as a result of poor habitat conditions.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters and viewers who will have more moose to hunt and view in the future if we avoid a population crash. Animals such as many passerine bird species and the moose themselves who are dependent on healthy willow shrublands.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Some who don't want to see active management of the herd, or who are concerned that we will overharvest in combination with predation.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1) Calf season. Not favored for ethical reasons. 2) Increased bull harvest. To reduce the herd by harvesting bulls would take reducing them so much that many cows would not get bred. We prefer a solution that keeps a reasonable sex ratio and maintains herd productivity. Removing calves would not affect the productivity of the moose herd as much as removing additional cows would.

**PROPOSED BY:** Shelly A. Webb (HQ-02F-G-034)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 28 - 5 AAC 85.045(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Increase the number of permits in Unit 1D as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(1)		
...		
Unit 1(D)  1 bull with spike-fork or 50- inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side by Tier II subsistence hunting permit only; up to <b>250</b> [200] permits may be issued	Sept. 15–Sept. 30 (Subsistence hunt only)	No open season.

**ISSUE:** Our guideline harvest for this area is 25 bull moose meeting the spike-fork/50-inch/3 brow tine requirement. The yearly take from 1998 through 2001, was 19, 19, 18, and 17 moose,

respectively. Annually, from 10 to 20 percent of the permittees did not hunt. In 1999, there were 262 applicants, and in 2000 there were 301. Although there were fewer applicants in 2002 (226), increasing the number of permits will allow more opportunity for some of those now applying for the hunt that are not awarded a permit.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The number of permits will continue to be 200, with less opportunity for moose hunters.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** We expect to increase the probability of the guideline harvest level being reached.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those who apply for this hunt and currently are not among the first 200 who qualify for this hunt.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1) Status quo. 2) Change this hunt to a registration permit hunt, eliminating the Tier II hunt; this option was not chosen because of the small size of this moose herd and the high number of local residents who depend upon it.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02F-G-058)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 85.045(3). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Amend this regulation as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(3)		
<b><u>Unit 5(A), that portion south of Wrangell-Saint Elias National Park, north and east of Russell and Nunatak Fiords, and east of the east side of East Nunatak Glacier to the Canadian Border (Nunatak Bench)</u></b>	<b><u>Nov. 15-Feb. 15</u></b>	<b><u>Nov. 15-Feb. 15</u></b>

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

**Remainder of Unit 5(A)**

**Oct. 15-Nov. 15**

**Oct. 15-Nov. 15**

**1 bull by registration permit only; up to 60 bulls may be taken; the commissioner may close the season in that portion west of the Dangerous River when 30 bulls have been taken from that area**

[UNIT 5(A), EXCEPT NUNATAK BENCH]

[OCT. 15-NOV. 15]

[OCT. 15-NOV. 15]

[1 BULL BY REGISTRATION PERMIT ONLY; UP TO 60 BULLS MAY BE TAKEN; THE COMMISSIONER MAY CLOSE THE SEASON IN THAT PORTION WEST OF THE DANGEROUS RIVER WHEN 30 BULLS HAVE BEEN TAKEN FROM THAT AREA ]

[UNIT 5(A), NUNATAK BENCH]

[NOV. 15-FEB. 15]

[NOV. 15-FEB. 15]

[1 MOOSE BY REGISTRATION PERMIT ONLY; UP TO 5 MOOSE MAY BE TAKEN]

...



**ISSUE:** This is a housekeeping proposal. The existing language for a moose hunt at Nunatak Bench does not define the hunt area. The proposal would clarify which part of Unit 5A is open for this extended, late season hunt.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will continue to be confusion over the boundaries of this hunt area.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Accurate information to the public would be accommodated.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Moose hunters, ADF&G wildlife managers, and Fish and Wildlife Protection troopers who need to know the hunt area boundaries.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02F-G-059)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 85.056(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf.** Amend the hunting season and bag limits for wolves in Unit 1A as follows:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
Unit <b><u>1B, 1C, 1D</u></b> [1] <b><u>and</u></b> 3-5	Aug. 1 – Apr. 30 (General hunt only)	Aug. 1 – Apr. 30
<b><u>Unit 1A</u></b> <b><u>No limit</u></b>	<b><u>No closed season.</u></b>	<b><u>No closed season.</u></b>

**ISSUE:** Excess predation by a significant increase in wolf populations in many areas of Unit 1A.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Much damage is already done. We need a more positive attitude by the ADF&G to reduce the wolf predation problem.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes – long term blacktail deer populations will be aided.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** My kids and their kids.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Realistically no one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** These solutions were in place before. They are not a cure but they are a start back in the right direction.

**PROPOSED BY:** Robert Jahnke (HQ-02F-G-015)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets and reports, and 5 AAC 92.130. Restriction to bag limits.** Amend harvest ticket requirements for deer hunting in Units 1-5 as follows:

Deer harvest tickets are issued in groups of six. Tag 1 would be legal in any area, Tag 2 would be legal in any area with a two deer limit or more, Tag 3 would be legal in a three deer area or more, Tag 4 would be legal in a four deer area or more, etc. In other words, you must use a tag with a number of the tag being equal to, or less than the corresponding bag limit in the area where the animal is harvested.

**ISSUE:** Currently, in the Southeast deer hunt a hunter is not allowed to take a deer in a unit with a one or two bag limit if a hunter has harvested deer in a unit with a more liberal bag limit first. Currently you can harvest two deer in Unit 3, then go to Unit 2 and harvest two deer, then harvest two deer in Unit 4; but you cannot do it in the reverse order. If the regulation to attach tags to deer is adopted there is no reason to not allow any order of harvest.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Under present regulation we will continue to not have a handle on number of deer harvested.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?**

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All deer hunters in Southeast, as they can hunt in the different units in the order they prefer and still harvest some deer in each unit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** This may increase the hunting pressure in Unit 3 later in the season as more people would be able to hunt legally.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Tags would have to be used in order. Not a workable solution.

**PROPOSED BY:** Wrangell Advisory Committee (HQ-02F-G-012)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets and reports.** Require an end-of-season harvest report for deer taken in Units 1-4 as follows:

Require a harvest report card for deer taken in Units 1-4 be completed at the end of the hunting season and returned to the state. This would require that these cards be provided by the state with the tags as they are with moose, sheep, goats, caribou, etc.

**ISSUE:** Require a harvest report card be filled out for deer as it is required for nearly all other game species in Alaska. With the deer harvest challenges and subsistence questions facing state and federal biologists, it would be good to have deer harvest data from those who hunt deer in the state.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Not really a problem, just an opportunity for managers to get additional harvest data from all users instead of from random questionnaires.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Would help managers to get additional harvest data from all users instead of from random questionnaires.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Game managers and the public.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who do not want the state and federal government knowing where and how many deer they harvest and their hunting effort.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** James Baichtal (HQ-02F-G-049)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 92.080(8). Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions, and 5 AAC 92.090. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers.** Prohibit the use of snares for trapping in a portion of Unit 1C.

All use of snares is forbidden in the Gustavus area.

**ISSUE:** Snaring needs to be stopped completely. There is no way to target any single species with a snare (#3 on the trappers code of ethics), as was obviously pointed out this spring alone, with three moose getting caught in them and killed in Gustavus alone. Animals can linger for days or weeks, without food or water, being very inhumane (#7 on the trappers code of ethics). Gustavus wants a healthy population of moose, and will not tolerate moose to be killed this way. We could use more predators to help the moose population. (No wolves were even caught this last season, according to ADF&G, and signs of wolves were way down from last year). There have been accounts of people in Gustavus who had a dog caught in a snare. Some were freed after they were found, one's head had swelled so much that the veterinarian said you couldn't remove it without killing the dog, so it had to live with it. Break-away snares do not work as intended, one of the moose that was caught and killed actually was in a break-away snare, but was caught around the nose. Dogs can not break away.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** More moose get caught, and other nontarget animals such as dogs, eagles.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The quality of moose and wolves would be improved, plus there will be less wastage of nontarget animals.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The wildlife population as a whole, all persons who value healthy wildlife, moose hunters, pet owners, families, trappers as a whole. (The snaring of moose, especially in Gustavus, has contributed to a bad name to the trapping industry everywhere.)

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Trappers who use snares, but one of these has already agreed to suspend snaring and has bought other kinds of traps.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Gustavus Community Association (HQ-02F-G-039)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 34 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions, and 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.** Prohibit the use of snares for trapping in Units 1-5 as follows:

All use of snares is forbidden in Units 1-5.

**ISSUE:** Snaring needs to be stopped completely. There is no way to target any single species with a snare, (#3 on the trappers code of ethics), as was obviously pointed out this spring alone, with three moose getting caught in them and killed in Gustavus alone. Animals can linger for days or weeks, without food or water, being very inhumane (#7 on the trappers code of ethics). Gustavus wants a healthy population of moose, and will not tolerate moose to be killed this way.

There have been many accounts of people who had a dog caught in a snare. Some were freed after they were found, one's head had swelled so much that the veterinarian said you couldn't remove it without killing the dog, so it had to live with it.

Break-away snares do not work as intended; one of the moose that was caught and killed in Gustavus actually was in a break-away snare, but was caught around the nose. Dogs cannot break away.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** More moose get caught, and other nontarget animals such as dogs, eagle.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** There will be less wastage of nontarget animals.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The wildlife population as a whole, all persons who value healthy wildlife, moose hunters, pet owners, families, trappers as a whole. (The snaring of moose especially has contributed a bad name to the trapping industry everywhere.)

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Trappers who primarily use snares. (There are other more “ethical” options.)

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Pamela Miedtke (HQ-02F-G-024)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions.** Expand the restriction on using a spotlight in Units 1-4 as follows:

It is unlawful to have an uncased firearm within the cab of the vehicle while either using a spotlight to observe game or for other purposes in Units 1-4.

**ISSUE:** Spotighting as a means of poaching is widespread on the islands of Southeastern Alaska where timber harvest roads provide access. Law enforcement is spread thin and must currently catch the poacher in the act of shooting the game animal to convict. Current regulation does not allow game to be taken by the use of artificial light. However the possession of a spot or flood light may also be legitimately used as safety equipment or observing game. Therefore, a regulation stating that it is unlawful to use a spotlight with an uncased firearm within the cab of the vehicle while either using a spotlight to observe game or for other purposes would give law enforcement a tool to curb spotighting in the field. There are many examples of the appropriate wording for such a regulation from other sates.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Poaching will continue to go unchecked. Law enforcement will still have to catch the poacher in the act of shooting at a game animal.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Would help to regulate the illegal taking of game animals in southeastern Alaska.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The legal hunters of big game.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The illegal hunters of big game.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Muzzleloading Association - James Baichtal (HQ-02F-G-045)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.** Restrict big game hunting to periods of daylight in Units 1-4 as follows:

No person may take big game during the period from one hour after sunset to one hour before sunrise in Units 1-4.

**ISSUE:** Spotlighting as a means of poaching is widespread on the islands of southeast Alaska where timber harvest roads provide access. Law enforcement is spread thin and must currently catch the poacher in the act of shooting the game animal to convict. Southeast Alaska does have sunrise and sunset each day. Provide protection for game animals by regulating that game animals may only be hunted from one hour before sunrise to one hour after sunset.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Poaching will continue to go unchecked. Law enforcement will still have to catch the poacher in the act of shooting at a game animal.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Would help to regulate the illegal taking of game animals in southeast Alaska.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The legal hunters of big game.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The illegal hunters of big game.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** James Baichtal (HQ-02F-G-044)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC 92.085(4)(a). Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.** Prohibit black bear baiting in Units 1-5 as follows:

Prohibit black bear baiting in Units 1-5.

**ISSUE:** Bear baiting (habituating bears to a feeding station for purposes of killing) constitutes unfair chase and a potential source for creating nuisance bears. It should be banned in Units 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.

Bear baiting does not exist or has been banned in 41 states. Both the neighboring Yukon and British Columbia have banned bear baiting. Bear baiting is prohibited in Unit 1C. The vast majority of Alaskans and most hunters are opposed to bear baiting.

Bear baiting provides an unfair advantage over those who hunt using more conventional means. It removes the element of fair chase. Habituating bears to a feeding station so they can be shot is the equivalent of shooting fish in a barrel. It also runs counter to the state’s position on feeding wildlife, which is to prohibit it.

What makes the bear baiting technique especially improper is that it is not species specific, and does not only attract bears that meet culling regulations. No black bears with cubs may be shot. No brown bears may be killed at a bear baiting station. There is no way to prevent black bears with cubs or brown bears from attending feeding stations. Black bears are especially attracted to dog pellets, honey, syrup, bacon grease, donuts and other human related food stuffs that are commonly used. Brown bears are more attracted to carcass remains which are also widely used as bait. Once habituated there is no reason to think that either species will not search for similar such foods around major campgrounds, cabins, and wilderness campers over an area equal to the size of territory that the habituated bears utilize. (A quarter mile from a publicly maintained trail or a mile from a house or permanent dwelling is an insignificant distance compared to the typical home range diameter for a black or brown bear). The potential for creating nuisance bears and subsequent kills being made in defense of life and property (DLP) problems is obvious. The Yukon banned bear baiting because of the nuisance bear potential.

Bear baiting also results in the creation of dangerous sites for people to accidentally wander into. The problem is exacerbated by the number of bear baiting sites that are inadequately cleaned up after the bear baiting season and the bear baiting signs have been removed. Some foods stuffs, such as bacon grease, are particularly difficult to clean up.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Unfair chase killing of bears will continue. Habituating of bears to food stuffs that can lead to nuisance bear problems will continue. Bear baiting stations will continue to be sources of potential hazard.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Hunting of bears will be carried out in a manner that is more in line with acceptable sport hunting practices. Fewer black bears with cubs and fewer brown bears will become nuisance bears. Fewer DLP kills will be likely to occur. Public safety will be less of an issue.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All Alaskans who respect fair chase and/or object to the habituating of bears to feeding stations on grounds of public safety and the creation of nuisance bears.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Bear baiting has been eliminated in Unit 1C for many years. It appears to be working fine as a precedent for considering elimination of bear baiting elsewhere in southeast Alaska. No other solution would appear to be necessary.

**PROPOSED BY:** Jennifer White (HQ-02F-G-033)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 38 - 5 AAC 92.085(4)(A). Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.**  
Prohibit black bear baiting in Unit 1D as follows:

It should be illegal to bait black bear or use scent lure for harvesting bears in Unit 1D. Neighboring Unit 1C and other units elsewhere in Alaska have already addressed this same problem by eliminating bear baiting.

**ISSUE:** Black bear baiting in Unit 1D conditions both brown and black bears to relate human presence to a food reward. The rural population of the Haines area has outgrown the practicality of baiting bears.

It is my understanding that up to 40 registered bait stations have been permitted within the Haines area at one time. Some of these bait stations do not have properly erected signs to inform the public of their location. Brown bear as well as black bear frequent these bait stations, which puts an unsuspecting hunter in an illegal situation of taking a brown bear over bait. These bait stations in effect alter the natural range of both species of bears, which concentrates some of the bear in the area of the bait stations.

The one Fish and Wildlife Protection officer based in Haines can't possibly properly check all bait stations for compliance.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Both black and brown bears will continue to be destroyed as nuisance animals and/or threats around homes and campgrounds because of this conditioning.

The potential for brown bears to be taken in the area of bait stations will continue to be a reality.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?**

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** People that like to live without having bears walking into their yards, remote camp areas or public campgrounds looking for a handout. Also, the ADF&G has recently expressed a concern that the maximum guideline harvest level of brown bears has been met or exceeded in recent years.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Responsible hunters that sincerely enjoy hunting over bait, especially hunters who enjoy watching bear from an elevated platform with young hunters present.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Using scent only which would not condition bears to an actual food source. Rejected because it could be abused by individuals taking brown bear illegally (either purposely or mistakenly) over scent because people would use oil or sugar-based products soaked in rotting wood or soil, which could not be detected as bait.

**PROPOSED BY:** Al Gilliam (HQ-02F-G-022)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 39 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.**  
Require identification on traps and snares used for trapping in a portion of Unit 1C as follows:



All trappers must mark their traps/snares with identification, using either a permit number and/or contact number/driver's license in the Gustavus area.

**ISSUE:** If there is a problem, say a nontarget animal is caught, or if there is a question about a trap, perhaps on private property, one cannot now easily find out who the owner is and resolve the issue quickly and legally. This makes it difficult to help prevent illegal trapping, promote more responsible trapping, and facilitate accountability.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Illegal or negligent trapping practices will continue to be difficult to trace to an individual trapper, with consequent difficulty in contacting that person for education, warning or punitive action.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Improved, by controlling better the illegal taking of wildlife.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trappers, Board of Game, law enforcement, and the general public by being able to quickly find the owner of the trap in question.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Only illegal trappers.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Gustavus Community Association (HQ-02F-G-040)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 40 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.**  
Require identification on traps and snares used for trapping in Units 1-5 as follows:

All trappers must mark their traps/snares with identification, using either a permit number and/or contact number/driver's license in Units 1-5.

**ISSUE:** If there is a problem, say a nontarget animal is caught, or if there is a question about a trap, perhaps on private property, one can easily find out who the owner is and resolve the issue quickly and legally. It will also help prevent illegal trapping and promote more responsible trapping, by facilitating accountability.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Illegal or negligent trapping practices will continue to be difficult to trace to an individual trapper, with consequent difficulty in contacting that person for education, warning or punitive action.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Improved, by controlling better the illegal taking of wildlife.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trappers, Board of Game, law enforcement, and the general public by being able to quickly find the owner of the trap in question.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Only illegal trappers.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Pamela Miedtke (HQ-02F-G-025)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 41 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers.** Require traps and snares to be checked every 24 hours for portions of Unit 1C.

All traps/snares must be checked within 24 hours of setting them, and within each 24 hours thereafter in the Gustavus area.

**ISSUE:** (#2 on the trappers code of ethics). If someone is trapping they need to be active at it. Traps need to be checked within 24 hours of setting them. This increases the chance of a nontarget animal to be freed and is more ethical. Gustavus is a very easy area to travel in and around and rarely would there be a time this could not be done. Just this spring someone came across a line of traps, after the season had ended, with animals in the traps. If someone says they need the income from trapping, then they must work the lines as a job. Trapping books even say check them twice a day.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Nontarget animals (including pets) that get caught, linger and possibly die; target animals linger longer.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Improved. By checking traps more frequently, the chance of freeing a nontarget animal so it may live is higher, plus the quality of the target animal is better, too, by preventing self-mutilation, or predation by other species.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Nearly everyone: most trappers, wildlife advocates, wildlife, pets.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Negligent trappers.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1) Adding a clause that reads “if weather, a life threatening situation, or other emergency situation prevents the trapper from checking them, then the trapper must alert the local fish and wildlife protection officer,” so that the traps will be checked as soon as physically possible by someone else. 2) Consider 36-48 hours checks, but because of the size and ease of getting around Gustavus, 24-hours was considered preferable.

**PROPOSED BY:** Gustavus Community Association (HQ-02F-G-038)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 42 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.**

Require traps and snares to be checked every 24 hours in Units 1-5 as follows:

All traps/snares must be checked within 24 hours of setting them and within each 24 hours thereafter in Units 1-5.

**ISSUE:** (#2 on the trappers code of ethics) If someone is trapping they need to be active at it. Traps need to be checked within 24 hours of setting them. This increases the chance of a nontarget animal to be freed and is more ethical. If someone says they need the income from trapping, then they must work the lines as a job. Trapping books even say check them twice a day. To have NO time checks is not right. Besides being unethical, the land people are trapping on is primarily state or federal land which basically belongs to all, so anyone using that land must be “responsible” for what belongs to all.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Nontarget animals (including pets) that get caught, linger, and possibly die, target animals linger longer, irresponsibility continues.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Improved. By checking traps more frequently, the chance of freeing a nontarget animal so it may live is higher, plus, the quality of the target animal is better too, by preventing self-mutilation, or predation by other species.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone; trappers, wildlife advocates, wildlife, pets.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Negligent trappers.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1) Adding a clause that reads “if weather or a life threatening situation, or other emergency situation prevents the trapper from checking them, then the trapper must alert the local fish and wildlife protection officer,” so that the traps will be checked as soon as physically possible by someone else. 2) Considered 36-48 hour checks, but if someone is working a line, they need to work it, and should adjust their areas within a more “ethical” time frame.

**PROPOSED BY:** Pamela Miedtke (HQ-02F-G-026)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 92.150. Evidence of sex and identity.** Allow antlers as evidence of sex and identity for deer taken in Units 1-5 as follows:

In Units 1-5, antlers are proof of sex when attached to the whole dressed deer.

**ISSUE:** Antlers not being proof of sex.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Edible meat degradation will continue. Unsuspecting hunters will continue to be ticketed.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Very definitely. The sexual organs and surrounding hide of a rutting buck does impart a different flavor to the meat.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All hunters who salvage the meat.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Tom Sims and Tony Guggenbickler (HQ-02F-G-005)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 92.510(a)(3)(B). Areas closed to hunting.** Amend this regulation as follows:

(B) in the Juneau area, that area between the coast and a line one-fourth mile inland of the following road systems is closed to the taking of big game: Glacier Highway from Mile 0 to Mile 23.3 [24] at Peterson Creek, Douglas Highway from the Douglas city limits to Milepost 7 on the North Douglas Highway, Mendenhall Loop Road, and Thane Road;

**ISSUE:** This is a housekeeping proposal. The Department of Transportation recently changed the highway mile marker at Peterson Creek from 24 to 23.3. This proposal would match regulatory language with conditions in the field. The physical location of the boundary at Peterson Creek would not change.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The regulation as stated in the codified will be inaccurate, the public would be misled, and enforcement actions would be confusing.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Accurate information to the public would be accommodated.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02F-G-060)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 45 - 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting, and 5AAC 92.520. Closures and restrictions in state game refuges.** Close portions of the Mendenhall Wetlands in Unit 1C to hunting as follows:

There must be a safety buffer between hunting areas and private residential property. Example: “Hunting in the Mendenhall Wetlands is not permitted within ¼ mile of any private property or home.” Or, to simplify boundary identification for users, I recommend a natural features boundary following drainages and prominent landmarks. If this is viewed as too great an impact on available hunting lands, then perhaps the boundaries need only be adjusted around problem areas that have had repeated incidents. These areas likely have topographical features that promote the conflicts.

**ISSUE:** Conflicting land uses resulting in gunshot in residential neighborhoods. Historically, waterfowl hunting in the Mendenhall Wetlands State Game Refuge in Juneau has not caused extensive problems, but those times have changed. The private property surrounding the wetlands has undergone extensive development in recent years and serious issues are arising from this uncomplimentary use of adjoining lands. In 2000 my family built a home bordering the Mendenhall Wetlands State Game Refuge and we were shot three times. The first hunter claimed he did not see our home (though every hunter should know not to shoot where you cannot see) so we put up signs in the wetlands advertising houses nearby. The second hunter was in plain view and when I spoke to him to point out that he shouldn’t fire toward us at such close range, he told me, “lady, you’re wasting your time, I’ve been hunting here longer than your house has been here and there isn’t a thing you can do about it.” The third hunter we were not able to confront.

In 2001 not only was our house shot numerous times, but also my husband was hit while working in our yard. The Juneau Police Department and city have shown a hesitancy to get involved and have taken a “no harm, no foul” stand regarding each of our incidents. Whether from inattention or blatant disregard, unfortunately we cannot always rely on people to act responsibly while hunting in the wetlands. The protection of all persons and property from gunfire is critical enough to justify reducing the area allowed for waterfowl hunting by a small percentage. I ask the Alaska Board of Game to implement this change.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** A resident on his or her own private property will be injured. Please take a moment and ask yourself: Would you let your children come play in my backyard during waterfowl hunting season? My husband was just hit last year. Firearms discharge and residential areas cannot safely coexist. Hunters from as close as 70 yards and as far as 260 yards have hit us. People can legally hunt just 50 feet from our house or 1 inch from our property line. Without question, shot can break windows or put out eyes and eventually these things will occur. In the year 2000 alone, five new homes were built in a ¾ mile stretch bordering the wetlands. This is a residential area within the city of Juneau and quickly becoming densely populated. To have the state allow hunting right next to residents’ homes and families is an enormous conflict and the local government appears to be under too much pressure to rationally protect residents.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Adjusting the current boundaries now will provide for the continued use of the

Mendenhall Wetlands for waterfowl hunting. Preventing conflicts by protecting residents' private property will assure that injury and liability issues will not necessitate greater restrictive measures in the future.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Residents whose homes border the wetlands will be protected from errant gunfire. Children will be able to safely play in their own backyards. Homeowners won't come home and immediately check to make sure no windows were broken while they were away. The community and state will not have to deal with these two conflicting land uses that will only continue to create liabilities.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The negative impact would be a slightly smaller area in the Mendenhall Wetlands permitted for waterfowl hunting.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Any solution that does not provide a physical safety buffer between homes and hunters will not work. Hunter education is always beneficial. We posted 4x4 signs in the wetlands advertising homes nearby. The city also posted new signs. This did not help either. In fact, most of our incidents have been with hunters firing toward our house in plain view. We cannot legislate responsibility, attention or intelligence. Laws must be imposed to prevent conflicts altogether.

**PROPOSED BY:** Melissa Green (HQ-02F-G-004)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 46 - 5 AAC 92.510(6). Areas closed to hunting.** Close a portion of Unit 4 to hunting as follows:

Idaho Inlet is off-limits to hunting within 1 mile of the estuary/river system at the head of the bay.

**ISSUE:** Hunting should not be allowed near the river estuary at the head of Idaho Inlet. Idaho Inlet is the only place in this area that tourists and the general public have a reasonably good chance of seeing brown bears any given day, safely from a boat. The inlet is used, probably, every single day during the tourist season, by kayakers, small charter boats and larger tour-vessels. It is not right, to the species nor to people who go there with only the wishes to view brown bears in their own habitat, to have hunting in the same place. Currently this acclimates bears to boats and people all summer long then come September, an easy kill for the hunter. (We have actually been in there during September to watch bears when a boat with hunters showed up, loaded their skiff and headed to shore.) Hunting is supposed to be a "sport," where a fair chase is listed as important, if not more important than the kill. This area in Idaho Inlet is not a fair chase. Hunters can access a fair(er) chase by utilizing many other areas, including miles of roads, or a mile down the bay; tourists cannot from a boat.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continual acclimation of bears to people for easy killing, continual lowering the quality of viewing wildlife for nonhunters, degradation of the species by not allowing the larger male bears free access to the best salmon areas.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Improved, by allowing all bears to freely use the rivers for salmon, instead of being kept away by hunters. Fishing and wildlife viewing, if done respectfully, have little or no effect on larger bears, as witnessed daily in Glacier Bay National Park, Katmai, Kodiak, Denali, etc. (We have been running trips into Glacier Bay and Idaho Inlet for many years. The bears we see in Glacier Bay are very different from the ones in Idaho Inlet. We see bigger brown bears in Glacier Bay, even where there have been hikers and/or fishermen. In Idaho, the bears you see are small, young bears, and this is at the prime fishing spots. The bears in Idaho Inlet tend to be a lot more skittish also, whereas Glacier Bay bears are more tolerant of new smells and sounds, and will stick around feeding and doing what they want to do, instead of running off.)

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Brown bears as a whole, tourists and the general public who want to see brown bears with a reasonable chance of probability safely from a boat, visitors to the area that don't want to be part of witnessing and/or attributing to hunting. Tour boat operators, charter boat operators, kayakers, wildlife advocates, and hunters who want bigger bears. (1,405 commercial tourists in the year 2000.) Permits for Glacier Bay are very limited and actually does not even have a river system that can pretty much guarantee a bear sighting as Idaho Inlet does.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Hunters who want an easier kill, who aren't in it as much for the sport of tracking, and the chase, or those who don't care about the species as a whole (six chartered hunting trips were there in the year 2000).

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Have a two-mile or more "no hunting" zone around this area. Have no hunting buffers around all salmon streams. (This actually is the best idea to protect the species as whole.)

**PROPOSED BY:** Pamela Miedtke (HQ-02F-G-028)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 47 - 5 AAC 92.510(6). Areas closed to hunting.** Close a portion of Unit 4 to hunting for brown bears as follows:

An area approximately eight miles east southeast of the City of Sitka in the vicinity of Medvejie Salmon Hatchery, including all of Bear Cove in Silver Bay, from the mouth of the unnamed creek exiting Bear Lake (approximately 1/2 mile southeast of BM "Virgo") along the coast to the point of land at BM "Ranus," including the entire shoreline of Bear Cove, will be closed to the taking of brown bears. This area encompasses approximately one mile of beach, and extends 1/4 mile upland from the beach.

**ISSUE:** In 2001, bear hunters harvested a bear on the tidelands near Medvejie Hatchery within 200 feet of two residences. The bear was accustomed to being around humans, although it had not caused problems. The bear was killed in close proximity to dwellings where children live and play. This situation posed a safety risk to the occupants when 1) the weapon was discharged, and 2) the bear did not die immediately. Further, the carcass was left on the beach, enticing other animals to

scavenge upon the carcass. This situation could have, and should have, been avoided. Bear hunters were again present in the spring of 2002.

Northern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (NSRAA) takes great care to eliminate human refuge and food smells at the Medvejie residential area to diminish bear/human habituation. We would like a small closed area in the vicinity of the hatchery to avoid similar situations in the future. In the interim the City of Sitka has issued illegal discharge of firearms within a half-mile radius of Medvejie Hatchery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Hatchery personnel and family are more likely to be endangered by stray bullets or wounded bears if the situation remains unchanged. Currently there are a few unscrupulous hunters taking advantage of bears which have been conditioned to being around humans at Medvejie Hatchery. Potentially, a tourist (thousands visit Medvejie from May to September) or bystander may get injured from an errant shot. Bears may become conditioned to scavenging other bear carcasses on the beach close to human habitations.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** No.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Residents, staff and tourists at the hatchery will not be subjected to potentially dangerous situations from errant firearms discharge or wounded bears. Further, brown bears will not be enticed to scavenge close to human habitations, diminishing the potential for further human-bear encounters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** A few hunters who might harvest a bear near the hatchery.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Allow the situation to continue as in the past – this is unacceptable because of the endangerment of people at Medvejie Hatchery. The hunting of bears in the proximity of the hatchery is not sportsman-like and shouldn't be encouraged.

A total ban on discharge of firearms – deer hunting in the area, if done responsibly, is acceptable. Deer are not habituated to humans at Medvejie and we have not had problems with hunters shooting deer in the confines of Medvejie Hatchery. Seals are also hunted by Sitka Tribe of Alaska members at Bear Cove, which NSRAA does not want to eliminate.

**PROPOSED BY:** Northern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (HQ-02F-G-017)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 48 - 5 AAC 92.520(a)(1). Closures and restrictions in state game refuges.**  
Amend the regulation in Unit 1C as follows:

- (a) Unit 1
- (1) The Mendenhall Wetlands State Game Refuge, as described in AS 16.20.034, is closed to hunting, except for waterfowl (including snipe and crane) during established seasons. No person may use any off-road or all-terrain vehicle, motorcycle, or other motorized vehicle (except a



boat) within the refuge. Hunters 15 years old or younger must be accompanied by an adult, **or must have successfully completed a certified hunter education course. All hunters must register annually with the department and demonstrate an understanding of informational materials provided at the time of registration; a person convicted of a hunting violation within the Mendenhall Wetlands State Game Refuge is not eligible to register to hunt in the refuge the following year; a hunter on the refuge shall present in the field, upon request, proof of registration.** [, OR DEMONSTRATE, UPON REQUEST, COMPLETION OF A CERTIFIED HUNTER SAFETY AND WATERFOWL IDENTIFICATION COURSE BEFORE HUNTING IN THE REFUGE.]

**ISSUE:** The Mendenhall Wetlands State Game Refuge is surrounded by development, including residential areas and the Juneau airport. Local waterfowl hunters and others frequently use the refuge. During 2000 and 2001, residents bordering the refuge had shot hit their house on several occasions; the homeowner was actually hit by shot once. On at least one occasion, a hunter was rude to the homeowner. There are concerns about safety as well as ethical hunting practices.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Homeowners will continue to be at risk of having homes hit with shot and some hunters will still hunt irresponsibly. The long-term future of hunting on this refuge will be jeopardized.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This will not affect resource quality but should result in a higher standard of hunting on the refuge, which will reflect positively on the hunting community. Refuge neighbors may perceive an increased level of concern by the department for their property and personal well-being.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Homeowners with property adjacent to the refuge should see an improved standard of hunting on the refuge. Hunters will benefit by having a greater level of acceptance by the public for their hunting practices on the refuge.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** ADF&G will need to spend more time registering hunters. Hunters will need to dedicate a short period of time to register for this hunt.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1) Close the refuge to hunting; this was discarded because it is unfair to restrict all hunters for the bad judgment of the few. One of the primary reasons for creation of this refuge was because of the long history of waterfowl hunting there. 2) Change the boundaries of the hunting area (e.g., close hunting within ¼ mile of the boundaries); this would result in a very small area open to hunting. 3) Create a restricted access hunt with assigned hunt locations similar to many other states and federal refuges; this option was not selected due to the drastic reduction in hunter opportunity that would result and the cost required (both in staff time and operational/construction dollars).

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02F-G-061)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 49 - 5 AAC 92.530. Management areas.** Create a new management area in a portion of Unit 3 for hunting by bow and arrow only, as follows:

**The Petersburg Management Area**

- (A) **the area consists of that portion of Unit 3 on Mitkof Island north and west of a line from Frederick Point to the highest point in Section 8, T59S, R90E; to the highest point in Section 7, T59S, R80E; to the highest point in Section 13, T59S, R79E; to the highest point in Section 23, T59S, R79E; then due south to the Petersburg city boundary and greater than one-quarter mile from any of the following areas within the corporate city limits: airport property, dwellings, businesses, highways, roads or streets;**
- (B) **the area is open to hunting by bow and arrow only.**

**ISSUE:** Establish an archery-only hunting area on Mitkof Island in the area within the Petersburg city limits where the discharge of weapons, other than firearms is allowed (Petersburg Municipal Code 10.20.021). Note: Passage of this proposal would require setting archery-only hunting seasons for all legally hunted species within this area that are consistent with current hunting seasons for those species.

In October, 2001 the Petersburg City Council passed an ordinance which delineated areas within the corporate city limits where the discharge of all weapons is prohibited. This ordinance was recommended by the Petersburg Public Safety Commission and supported by the Devils Thumb Archery Club primarily as a safety issue. The intent was to eliminate the possibility of injury or property damage from errantly discharged arrows resulting from the hunting of deer that reside within the populated area of Petersburg. One additional result of this action was the implicit creation of an archery-only hunting area.

Because the new law essentially created an archery-only hunting area, we would like the board to make this area archery-only in regulation so that only IBEP certified bow hunters would be allowed to hunt with archery tackle within this area. This would increase hunting safety and decrease the possibility of wounding animals. If this is not done, hunting will continue to be allowed by untrained, inexperienced bow hunters.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Bow hunting will be allowed within this area by non-IBEP certified hunters.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?**

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Both bow hunters and the general public.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Unknown.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo was the only other alternative. We did not entirely reject status quo because to do so would be construed as support for totally eliminating

hunting within this area, which is not our intent. It is our ultimate goal to require IBEP certification for all hunters using archery tackle for hunting within Alaska.

**PROPOSED BY:** Devil’s Thumb Archers (HQ-02F-G-018)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 50 - 5 AAC 92.550. Areas closed to trapping.** Close a portion of Unit 1C to trapping as follows:

Trapping/snaring is forbidden within ¼ mile of any public or private street, road, highway, designated trail, or private building, or the high tide line in the Gustavus area.

**ISSUE:** Gustavus has become too populated to allow any kind of trapping right next to trails, roads, houses, or the beach. The population of Gustavus is continually growing and therefore expanding into previously unoccupied areas. More families with children and pets are moving in. Remote areas are being developed and utilized plus the beaches here are constantly being used by people and their pets.

A lot of people use the roads, trails, and beaches, alongside with dogs and children. No one should have to worry that if a dog or child runs a few feet into the woods off the trail or road, that they might get caught or hurt in any kind of trap. Plus this area sees around 45,000 non-cruise ship visitors every year, most of whom use the roads, beaches, and/or trails.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** More pets being caught, worries about children, continual negative support of trappers and trapping.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Improved. By lowering chances of pets being caught in traps, therefore lowering incidents of those non-target animals being caught.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** General public, families, pets, trappers’ rapport with the general community and visitors.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** This is admittedly a burden on trappers, who will be deprived of a considerable amount of trapping opportunity. We regret this, but feel that the community has come to a point in its development where such action is necessary for the general welfare.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Gustavus Community Association (HQ-02F-G-041)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 92.550. Areas closed to trapping.** Close portions of Units 1-5 to trapping as follows:

Trapping/snaring is forbidden within ¼ mile of any public or private street, road, highway, published trail, or public or private building; or the high tide line in Units 1-5.

**ISSUE:** Trapping/snaring needs to be kept away from places that are more apt to see people and pets. The land people are trapping on is primarily state or federal land which basically belongs to all. Everyone, including children and pets, should have the right to travel safely near roads, trails, beaches, buildings etc. No one should have to worry that if a dog or child runs a few feet into the woods off the trail or road or skiff brought to shore, that they might get caught or hurt in any kind of trap. Nor should someone be forced to witness an animal caught in a trap, if they so wish. Anyone using public land must be “responsible” for what belongs to all. Alaska is no longer a vast frontier of land that no one touches. There are a lot more people living and visiting here than ever before, and all need to be considered when making rules on public lands.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** More pets being caught, worries about children, continual negative support of trappers and trapping.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Improved. By lowering chances of pets being caught in traps, therefore, lowering incidents of those nontarget animals being caught.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** General public, hikers, boaters, families, pets, trappers’ rapport with the general community and visitors.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Several trappers.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Trapping/snaring is banned from ¼ mile from any paved road or trail, or published hiking trail, public or private building (excluding the trappers own), ¼ mile from high tide at sandy beaches, 100 yards from other high tide lines, 200 yards from all other public or private roads or driveways. (Most of the land used belongs to everyone. Areas that have the higher likelihood of being used needs to be protected more. )

**PROPOSED BY:** Pamela Miedtke (HQ-02F-G-027)

\*\*\*\*\*

**Note:** The Board accepted an agenda change request to consider this proposal during the October 2002 meeting. It is included here to provide an opportunity for public comment.

**PROPOSAL 52 - 5 AAC 85.045(15). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Establish a December moose hunting season in Unit 17A as follows:

	<b>Resident</b>	
	<b>Open Season</b>	
	<b>(Subsistence and</b>	<b>Nonresident</b>
<b>Seasons and Bag Limits</b>	<b>General Hunts)</b>	<b>Open Season</b>

(15)

Unit 17(A)

**RESIDENT HUNTERS:**

1 bull by registration  
permit only

Aug. 25-Sept. 20  
**Dec. 1-Dec. 31**  
(Subsistence hunt only)

**NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:**

No open season.

...

**ISSUE:** Moose management planning efforts for Unit 17A began in 1996 at the request of the Bristol Bay Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. In March 1996, the department and the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge (TNWR) prepared a draft moose management plan for Unit 17A. The goal of the management objectives was to allow continued growth and immigration of moose into Unit 17A while providing for a limited harvest. On April 15, 1999, the draft moose management plan was reviewed and discussed at a public meeting in Togiak. The key objectives of the plan included:

1. Maintain a minimum resident moose population of 300
2. Increase the Unit 17A moose population to its carrying capacity
3. Allow a fall harvest of bulls when the moose population is greater than 300
4. Liberalize harvest opportunity when the moose population exceeds 600

Since that time, several proposals have been submitted to the Board of Game and the Federal Subsistence Board to open a winter moose hunt in Unit 17A. Both boards have not approved proposals for a winter hunt because the moose population had not reached the 600 moose threshold identified in the draft plan.

Surveys conducted by department and TNWR staff in February 2002 found a minimum of 652 moose in Unit 17A. The next Board of Game meeting, which would address Unit 17 proposals, is scheduled for March 2003. Waiting until the Spring 2003 meeting to consider a proposal will not allow a winter moose hunting season in Unit 17A to occur this coming winter. The moose population in Unit 17A has finally reached the level generally agreed upon by the parties involved when a winter hunt can be considered.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Resident hunters will lose an opportunity to hunt moose in Unit 17A.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** N/A.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Resident hunters will benefit from an additional hunting opportunity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Submit the proposal for the March 2003 Board of Game meeting

**PROPOSED BY:** Bristol Bay Native Corporation

(HQ-02F-G-064)

\*\*\*\*\*

**Note:** The Board accepted an agenda change request to consider this proposal during the October 2002 meeting. It is included here to provide an opportunity for public comment.

**PROPOSAL 53 - 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting, and 5 AAC 92.550(7). Areas closed to trapping.** Amend these regulations to eliminate the sunset clauses as follows:

**5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting.**

Unit 20(C): (A) all lands west of the Savage River bounded by Denali National Park are closed to the taking of wolves[; THE PROVISIONS OF THIS PARAGRAPH DO NOT APPLY AFTER MARCH 31, 2003].

**5 AAC 92.550(7). Areas closed to trapping.**

Unit 20(C): all lands west of the Savage River bounded by Denali National Park are closed to the taking of wolves[; THE PROVISIONS OF THIS PARAGRAPH DO NOT APPLY AFTER MARCH 31, 2003].

**ISSUE:** The Stampede Trail Closed Area was enacted in 2000 and modified in 2001 in order to protect the East Fork wolf pack when it ranged onto state-managed lands outside Denali National Park. The closure to hunting and trapping of wolves was implemented with a sunset clause which will cause this provision to expire at the end of March 2003.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Regulations closing the Stampede Trail area west of the Savage River to the taking of wolves will expire at the end of March 2003. Wolves in the highly-viewed East Fork wolf pack will become vulnerable to harvest.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** By abolishing the sunset provision the chances of members of this highly-viewed wolf pack being killed will be reduced.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** People interested in providing some protection for a wolf pack that has high value for wildlife viewing within the national park.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Hunters and trappers wishing to take wolves in this area.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None. This proposal is the result of an agenda change request filed by the department.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02F-G-063)

\*\*\*\*\*

**Note:** The Board accepted an agenda change request to consider this proposal during the October 2002 meeting. It is included here to provide an opportunity for public comment.

**PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting, and 5 AAC 92.550(7). Areas closed to trapping.** Eliminate sunset clause and expand area closed to taking wolves outside Denali National Park in Unit 20 as follows:

Remove the sunset clause on the currently protected lands in the Stampede area west of the Savage River. Expand the size of the protected area to include an additional 89 square miles east of the Savage River.

**ISSUE:** Removal of the sunset clause currently in force to protect the Toklat wolves when they venture into the Stampede area west of the Savage River, and increasing the size of the area over which they are afforded protection.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Reliable wolf viewing sites are extremely rare anywhere in North America. There exists only one such site in the entire state of Alaska, located in the northeastern portion of Denali National Park. Here two wolf packs, Toklat and Margaret, provide viewing for about 20,000 visitors each year. Each contributes to the viewing program in different ways. The Toklat pack is the most famous, most viewed, most photographed, oldest known pack in existence. The Toklat pack is also the first group of wolves to have ever been studied in the wild, which makes it unique, and of special historic interest. The Margaret wolves provide the only wolf viewing opportunity that visitors traveling by car can expect to have, which is of particular benefit to the elderly, people traveling with small children, those with special needs and those with limited time.

Both packs have ranges that extend outside the park where hunting and trapping of wolves is acute. In 1998 the Toklat pack was reduced to just two individuals. The Margaret pack is substantially more at risk. It is the fourth group of wolves known to have colonized the area, the previous three having been eradicated. The Savage pack was destroyed by hunting in 1983, the Headquarters pack by trapping in 1995, and the Sanctuary pack by trapping in the spring of 2002 after the last Board of Game meeting. The Sanctuary pack suffered trapper losses several years in a row before finally succumbing.

In 2001 the Board of Game took the unprecedented step of setting a zero bag limit on the taking of wolves on 90 square miles of state land in the Stampede area west of the Savage River known to be frequented by the Toklat wolves. That was a very positive move that was much appreciated.

No protection was granted for the Toklat wolves west of the Savage River, even though there was good documentation on their occasional frequenting of the area. The Board of Game decided at the time not to provide any protection for the Sanctuary wolves, which then occupied the area that is today utilized by the Margaret wolves. The lands that were shared with the Toklat wolves in the Stampede area west of the Savage River were not included in the protective zone for the Toklat wolves partly because it was perceived as benefiting the Sanctuary wolves. One member of the Board of Game went so far as to express on the record that granting protection for Toklat wolves on lands cohabited by Sanctuary wolves would confuse the issue, and should not be granted. Failure to provide protection for the Sanctuary wolves ultimately lead to the pack's demise. The Toklat

wolves should not meet a similar fate no matter what portion of the Stampede area they may choose to utilize.

The Toklat wolves depend to some extent on the Denali caribou herd for their survival. The Denali caribou herd utilizes the Stampede area from time to time in winter as well as lands further east. It should be noted that the Denali caribou herd has been protected from hunting outside the park since 1976.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Removing the sunset clause and expanding the size of the area of protection for the Toklat wolves on state land would improve the consistency of wolf viewing by the public, which is a significant resource. Wolves, while inherently cautious, are capable of learning that visitors are not a threat, and so allow themselves to be seen. Even though Denali National Park offers the best wolf viewing opportunity in the world based on sightings per number of visitors, the chances of seeing a wolf is only about 12 percent. Wolves that have learned to accept numbers of people viewing them provide the bulk of the viewing resource. The Toklat wolves are the most seen, which in some measure is undoubtedly a function of the pack's much longer history in learning to accommodate to visitors. Protecting the Toklat pack from harvesting would allow this learned experience to continue to be passed on.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** These wolves serve as potential viewable wildlife for literally hundreds of thousands of park visitors each year.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** There are an estimated 1,500 wolf packs in Alaska, all of which are available for harvesting over all or part of their ranges. To forego harvesting of the Toklat and Margaret and packs because of their unique wildlife viewing value would not harm the consumptive industry. At the local level hunting and trapping of wolves is a recreational activity on state land. The few people involved all have other jobs, and in some cases are actually benefiting from the visitors that come to the park to see its wildlife. It also needs to be pointed out that the closure would only impact the taking of wolves. All other forms of existing hunting and trapping would continue.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The Alliance has indicated to the Middle Nenana Advisory Committee that it is prepared to offer compensation worth more than the lost value in wolf pelts to the effected trappers if they will agree not trap Denali's viewable wolves. No interest has ever been expressed in our offer.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Wildlife Alliance (HQ-02F-G-065)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**Note:** The Board accepted an agenda change request to consider this proposal during the October 2002 meeting. It is included here to provide an opportunity for public comment.

**PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting, and 5 AAC 92.550. Areas closed to trapping.** Expand area closed to taking wolves outside Denali National Park, Unit 20 as follows:



Set the bag limit for wolves in the area of state land frequented by the Margaret pack to zero. The area of recommended closure to the taking of wolves encompasses a minimum of 146 square miles west of Denali National Park as well as an additional 89 square mile area in the Stampede region that is also shared with the Toklat wolves.

**ISSUE:** The urgent need to protect the Margaret wolves.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Reliable wolf viewing sites are extremely rare anywhere in North America. There exists only one such site in the entire state of Alaska, located in the northeastern portion of Denali National Park. Here two wolf packs, Margaret and Toklat, provide viewing for about 20,000 visitors each year. Each contributes to the viewing program in different ways. The Toklat pack is the most famous, most viewed, oldest known pack in existence. The Margaret wolves provide the only wolf viewing opportunity that visitors traveling by car can expect to have. Car traffic is limited to that portion of the park road east of Savage River that also happens to coincide with the area utilized most by the Margaret wolves. Travel west of the Savage River is limited to bus traffic.

Both packs have ranges that extend outside the park where hunting and trapping of wolves is acute. In 1998 the Toklat pack was reduced to just two individuals. The Margaret pack is substantially more at risk. It is the fourth group of wolves known to have colonized the area, the previous three having been eradicated. The Savage pack was destroyed by hunting in 1983, the Headquarters pack by trapping in 1995, and the Sanctuary pack by trapping in the spring of 2002 after the last Board of Game meeting. The Sanctuary pack suffered trapper losses several years in a row before finally succumbing.

Failure to provide protection for the Sanctuary wolves on state land ultimately lead to the pack's demise, just as it did in the case of the Headquarters and Savage packs. The Margaret pack will almost certainly come to a similar end, unless the Board of Game institutes protective action.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Limiting the harvest of Margaret wolves to zero would improve the consistency of wolf viewing by the public, which is a significant resource. Wolves, while inherently cautious, are capable of learning that visitors are not a threat, and so allow themselves to be seen. Even though Denali National Park offers the best wolf viewing opportunity in the world based on sightings per number of visitors, the chances of seeing a wolf is only about 12 percent. Wolves that have learned to accept numbers of people viewing them provide the bulk of the viewing resource. Protecting the Margaret pack from harvesting would allow this trait to develop to its fullest potential.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** These wolves serve as potential viewable wildlife for literally hundreds of thousands of park visitors each year. Visitors to the park who are limited to car travel as tends to be the case for the elderly, those with very young children, those requiring special needs, those with limited time, and those who cannot afford to take a tour bus have only this pack to experience.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** There are an estimated 1,500 wolf packs in Alaska, all of which are available for harvesting over all or part of their ranges. To forego harvesting of the Margaret and

Toklat packs because of their unique wildlife viewing value would not harm the consumptive industry. At the local level hunting and trapping of these wolves is a recreational activity. The few people involved all have other jobs, and in some cases are actually benefiting from the visitors that come to the park to see its wildlife. It also needs to be pointed out that the closure would only impact the taking of wolves. All other forms of existing hunting and trapping would continue.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The Alliance has indicated to the Middle Nenana Advisory Committee that it is prepared to offer compensation worth more than the lost value in wolf pelts to the effected trappers if they will agree not trap Denali's viewable wolves. No interest has ever been expressed in our offer.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Wildlife Alliance (HQ-02F-G-066)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**Note:** The Board accepted an agenda change request to consider this proposal during the November 2002 meeting. It is included here to provide an opportunity for public comment.

**PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 92.037. Permits for falconry.** A new requirement for falconers holding birds under propagation permits to produce offspring within eight years was added to the Alaska Falconry Standards in January, 2002 and is shown below as bolded, underlined text.

**Alaska Falconry Standards**

...

- 24. The purpose of captive propagation of raptors is to reduce the take of wild Alaskan raptors by providing a source of captive-bred raptors for Alaskan falconers. Unless a person holds a propagation permit issued by the department, the person may not breed raptors in captivity for falconry. The department may issue a propagation permit under the following conditions:
  - a. The department may issue a propagation permit only to a person who holds a federal raptor propagation permit and an Alaska Master Class falconry permit. **A propagation permit may not be reissued to or renewed by a permittee who has not successfully produced and provided captive-bred raptors to other Alaskan falconers within 8 years of being issued a propagation permit.**

**ISSUE:** At the statewide meeting in January 2002 the board adopted changes to the regulation affecting permits for falconry and to the *Alaska Falconry Standards*, which are referenced in that regulation. Some falconers felt that there was inadequate discussion of one aspect of those changes; namely, the section of the standards relating to propagation permits.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Under the rules adopted in January 2002 falconers holding birds under propagation permits are obligated to produce young birds within an eight year period. Propagation permits were created to provide young captive bred birds to Alaskan falconers and are not meant to be a way to possess raptors for other than that purpose.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** N/A.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** N/A.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Individuals who hold birds under propagation permits and who do not produce young birds within eight years.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None. This proposal is the result of an agenda change request filed by the department in response to discussions with interested members of the public.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02F-G-062)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**Note:** This proposal was deferred from previous meetings to the November 2002 meeting. It is included here to provide additional opportunity for public comment.

**PROPOSAL 21D - 5 AAC 92.019(d). Taking of big game for certain religious ceremonies.**  
Amend this regulation statewide as follows:

(d) **prior to taking big game under this section, a person shall report to the nearest office of the department or Department of Public Safety, the time frame when and location where the taking will occur. The report will include the hunter or hunters' names, addresses, and the species of big game animal to be hunted.** A person who takes big game under this section shall, as soon as practicable, and not more than twenty days after the ceremony, submit or insure submission of a written report to the nearest office of the department, specifying the persons name and address, the number and sex of big game animals taken, the dates and locations of the taking, and the identity of the decedent or decedents for whom the ceremony was or will be held.

**ISSUE:** Since the inception of the current potlatch regulation, the Division of Fish and Wildlife Protection has experienced problems with the reporting of big game animals taken for religious ceremonies (potlatch). The current wording in 5 AAC 92.019 does not address a reporting requirement PRIOR to the taking of a big game animal under this section. Fish and Wildlife Troopers have started numerous criminal investigations after a big game animal has been reported as taken illegally. Many investigative hours, which include evidence gathering, interviews, crime scene searches, and equipment usage have been expended only to find out that the big game animal was taken under this section. Often times the investigation stretches out for weeks with no conclusive outcome.

Illegal taken animals have been wrongly claimed as taken under this section as an excuse to circumvent prosecution for taking during a closed season (poaching).

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Enforcement personnel will continue to investigate legally taken animals and interfere with religious ceremonies. Poachers will continue to illegally take animals and avoid prosecution.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?**

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Both enforcement personnel and those hunters who are harvesting big game for a traditional Alaska Native funerary or mortuary ceremony.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those people who do not wish to report prior to the taking of a big game animal under this section.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

- 1) No change; this option was rejected because the problem will continue to exist.
- 2) Look at the possibility of having a village or regional coordinator as the point of contact for the reporting requirement instead of the departments. This option is desirable but must be fashioned into the regulatory/ legal scheme.
- 3) Look at the consensus from the various meetings and amend the final language of the proposal prior the board deliberating on the issue.

**PROPOSED BY:** Fish and Wildlife Protection

(HQ-02F-G-042)

\*\*\*\*\*