

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY
REVIEWER LETTER

December 2003

DEAR REVIEWER:

The Alaska Board of Game will consider the attached book of regulatory proposals at its **Spring 2004** meeting, to be held **February 26-March 10, 2004**, at the Wedgewood Resort in Fairbanks, Alaska. The proposals generally concern changes to the regulations governing Statewide Regulations “B” Cycle and hunting and the use of game in the Interior Region (Region III). Members of the public, organizations, advisory committees, and staff submitted these proposals, which are published essentially as they were received.

The proposals in this book are presented as brief statements summarizing the intended regulatory changes. In 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 proposals are grouped first by the area of the state, and then 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, which will be made 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 send your written comments to the above Juneau address at least two weeks prior to the meeting to ensure inclusion in the board workbook. All comments received after that time will be presented to board members at the time of the meeting, but will not be

printed in the board workbook. Written comments will also be accepted during the board meeting, and public testimony during the meeting is always appreciated.

When making written comments regarding these proposals, list the PROPOSAL NUMBER to which your comment pertains and state specifically whether you favor or oppose the proposal. This will ensure 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 not required. Twenty 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 **ix** for "GUIDELINES FOR 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 consisting of 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.boards.adfg.state.ak.us>.

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 that your comments can be copied and distributed to all board members.

A tentative agenda for the Spring 2004 Board of Game meeting is shown on pages **x**. A roadmap detailing the tentative order in which proposals will be considered will be available in **February** 2004. During the meeting, a recorded telephone message will be 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
 SPRING 2004 PROPOSAL BOOK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page Number</u>
Reviewer Letter.....	i - ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
Tentative Meeting Schedule	iv
Board of Game Meeting Cycle	v-vi
Board of Game Membership Roster.....	vii
Boards Support Section Staff	viii
Guidelines for Public and Advisory Committee Testimony	ix
Draft Agenda.....	x
Draft Public/Legal Notice.....	xi-xii
Proposals	1 - 274
<u>PROPOSAL TOPICS</u>	<u>Proposal Number</u>
Statewide Topics	1 – 87
Regions I, II, and V	88 – 107
Region III	
Delta Area	108 - 115
Fairbanks Area	116 - 172
Fort Yukon/North Slope Area	173 - 182
Galena Area	183 - 212
McGrath Area	213 - 238
Tok Area	239 - 249
Regionwide Proposals	250 - 268

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
TENTATIVE MEETING SCHEDULE
as of November 2003**

	<u>Dates & Location</u>	<u>Topic</u>
Spring 2004	February 26 - March 10, 2004 Fairbanks, Wedgewood Resort Proposal Deadline: Dec. 5, 2003 Written Comment Deadline: Feb. 13, 2004	Statewide "B" list and Interior (Region III)
Fall 2004	November 2 - 5, 2004 Juneau, Westmark Baranof Proposal Deadline: Aug. 6, 2004 Written Comment Deadline: Oct. 19, 2004	Southeast (Region I)
Spring 2005	March 4 - 13, 2005 Anchorage, Westcoast International Inn Proposal Deadline: Dec. 10, 2004 Written Comment Deadline: Feb. 18, 2005	Southcentral (Region II)
Fall 2005	Date to be announced Location to be announced Proposal Deadline: Dec. 10, 2004 Written Comment Deadline: two weeks prior to meeting	Arctic/Western (Region V)

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.boards.adfg.state.ak.us>

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

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

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

(Revised August 2003)

NAME AND ADDRESS

TERM EXPIRES

Ron Somerville, Vice-Chair
4506 Robbie Road
Juneau, Alaska 99802

3/1/2005

Ben Grussendorf
1221 Halibut Point Rd.
Sitka, AK 99835

3/1/2004

Cliff Judkins
PO Box 874124
Wasilla, Alaska 99687

3/1/2006

Ted Spraker
33350 Skyline Drive
Soldotna, Alaska 99669

3/1/2005

Sharon McLeod-Everette
PO Box 81213
Fairbanks, Alaska 99708

3/1/2006

Mike Fleagle, Chair
PO Box 33
McGrath, Alaska 99627

3/1/2004

Pete Buist
PO Box 71561
Fairbanks, Alaska 99707

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 Spring 2004 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

Board of Game

Jim Marcotte, Acting Ex. Director 459-7215

Jean Lowe, Publication Tech. 465-2027

Lori Van Steenwyk, Administrative Assistant 465-6096

Richard Glass, Administrative Clerk III 465-4110

REGIONAL OFFICES

Arctic Region

Charlie Gregg

PO Box 689

Kotzebue, AK 99752

Phone: (907) 442-1717

Fax: (907) 442-2420

Southeast Region

Art Hughes

PO Box 25526

Juneau, AK 99802-5526

Phone: (907) 465-4111

Fax: (907) 465-6094

Interior Region

Justin Crawford

1300 College Road

Fairbanks, AK 99701-1599

Phone: (907) 459-7263

Fax: (907) 474-8558

Southwest Region

Joe Chythlook

PO Box 1030

Dillingham, AK 99576

Phone: (907) 842-5142

Fax: (907) 842-5514

Southcentral Region

Sherry Wright

333 Raspberry Road

Anchorage, AK 99518-1599

Phone: (907) 267-2354

Fax: (907) 267-2489

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.boards.adfg.state.ak.us>

Note, Bethel area advisory committees were assigned to Boards Support Section staff as follows:

Central Bering Sea A.C. – Dillingham

Lower Kuskokwim A.C. – Dillingham

Central Kuskokwim A.C. – Fairbanks

Lower Yukon A.C. – Anchorage

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 **20 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. A person using derogatory or threatening language to the board will not be allowed to continue speaking.

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
Statewide Topics and Interior Region
February 26 – March 10, 2004
Wedgewood Resort, Fairbanks, AK
TENTATIVE AGENDA

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, February 26, 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 12:00 NOON, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 28
(Public testimony will continue until those who are present at the meeting are heard.)

Friday, February 27, 8:30 AM

Continue public testimony

BOARD DELIBERATIONS ON PROPOSALS, at conclusion of public testimony

Saturday, February 28 through Wednesday, March 10

BOARD DELIBERATIONS ON PROPOSALS

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.boards.adfg.state.ak.us> or by calling the board's recorded message phone at **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 the use and taking of game. Regulations subject to board action are in 5 AAC 84, 85, 92, and 99. The subject matter areas to be addressed concern Game Management Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B and 26C, and statewide provisions including but not limited to the following.

- A. **TRAPPING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS:** Bag and possession limits and seasons for arctic fox, coyote, beaver, muskrat, and wolf in Game Management Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B and 26C.
- B. **HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS:** Bag and possession limits and seasons for black bear, brown bear, caribou, Dall sheep, moose, wolf small game and fur animals in Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B and 26C and antlerless moose reauthorizations in all units statewide.
- C. **LICENSES, HARVEST TICKETS, HARVEST REPORTS, TAGS, FEES, AND PERMITS:** Take a child hunting permits and proxy in Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B and 26C and Tier II subsistence permits, brown bear tag fee exemptions, permit procedures, permit conditions, tag for deer, falconry, bear baiting permit, nuisance wildlife control in all units statewide.
- D. **METHODS AND MEANS:** Hunting and trapping methods and means in Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B and 26C, use of rangefinders, artificial light, vehicles, helicopters, communication equipment, and dogs, archery equipment, same day airborne, bear baiting, trapping and hunting methods in all units statewide
- E. **INTENSIVE MANAGEMENT:** Population and harvest objectives in Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B and 26C, predator control in Units 16, 19, and 20.
- F. **POSSESSION, TRANSPORTATION, USE OF GAME, AND EMERGENCY TAKING:** Salvage, meat on the bone in Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B and 26C, transport of game, transfer of game, sale of bear parts, taking of sow and cub bears, taking moose calves, emergency taking, defense of life or property, sheep sealing, and salvage in all units statewide.
- G. **RESTRICTED AREAS:** Areas closed to hunting, areas closed to trapping, closures in state game refuges, management areas, controlled use areas in Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B and 26C.

You may comment on the proposed regulations, 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 scheduled meeting to ensure inclusion in the board workbooks.

Oral or written comments may be submitted at a hearing to be held at the board meeting. The public hearing portion for the 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.

TENTATIVE MEETING SCHEDULE

Wedgewood Resort, 212 Wedgewood Drive, Fairbanks, AK 99701

February 26 – March 10, 2004

Statewide Topics and Interior Region

Any changes to meeting locations, dates or times, or rescheduling of topics or subject matter will be announced by news release. Please watch for these announcements in the news media or call (907) 465-4110.

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 two weeks before the applicable meeting is scheduled to begin to ensure that any necessary accommodations can be provided.

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

Anyone interested in or affected by resident (subsistence and general) hunting or trapping and nonresident 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. You should comment during the time allowed if your interest could be affected.

Statutory Authority: AS 16.05.255 – AS 16.258

Statutes Being Implemented, Interpreted, or Made Specific: AS 16.05.255 – AS 16.30.030

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

DATE: December 19, 2003

_____/s/
Jim Marcotte, Acting Executive Director
Alaska Board of Game

STATEWIDE TOPICS

Note: This proposal was deferred from the November 2002 Board of Game meeting so that it could be considered for application on a statewide basis.

PROPOSAL 1 - 5 AAC 92.012. Licenses and tags. 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-04S-G-114)
(Was Proposal 14 in November 2002 meeting book) (HQ-02F-G-011)

PROPOSAL 2 - 5 AAC 92.037. Permit for falconry. Increase quota for peregrine falcon take as follows:

All three populations of peregrine falcons in Alaska are healthy. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has determined that a take of up to 10 percent of the annual production of young falcons would have no negative effects on the population.

We propose: The take of eyas peregrine falcons be allowed statewide, for general and master class falconers, with the stipulation that the take for any one subspecies must not exceed five percent of

the annual production of that subspecies and that at least two young must be left in any Tundrius or Anatum nest.

Now that the monitor period has ended, the Colville River and the upper Yukon River should be added to the other areas where peregrine take is allowed.

A passage peregrines take should also be allowed, when it is allowed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

ISSUE: The peregrine harvest quotas are unnecessarily restrictive in numbers and areas where harvest is allowed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The present take numbers will continue and harvest areas will remain the same.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska Falconers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: William R. Tilton for the Alaska Falconers Association (I-04S-G-119)

PROPOSAL 3 - 5 AAC 92.037. Permit for falconry. Add conditions for raptor propagation permits as follows:

Captive Breeding

24. The purpose of captive propagation of raptors is to provide captive bred raptors for qualified falconers and to contribute to the economic well being of the state of Alaska and the United States of America and to allow Alaskan raptor propagators to participate in commerce allowed by the United States Department of the Interior. Unless a person holds a propagation permit issued by the department, the person may not breed raptors in captivity for falconry or captive breeding.

The department will issue a propagation permit under the following conditions:

- a. The department will issue a propagation permit only to a person who holds a federal raptor propagation permit and an Alaska master class falconry permit.
- b. A propagation permittee may have no more than four individual birds originally taken from the wild. A raptor held under a propagation permit does not count as one of the three raptors that may be held under a falconry permit.
- c. Fifty percent of first generation captive bred progeny will be available to Alaska falconers and Alaska captive propagators to reduce the take from the wild. Fifty percent of first generation progeny may be sold, bartered, or given to falconers or propagators outside Alaska.

d. Within a calendar year, a propagation permittee may not acquire, for raptor propagation purposes, more than two raptors that originated from the wild.

e. A propagation permittee may not possess a raptor produced by interspecific hybridization unless the raptor has been surgically sterilized.

f. A raptor that originated from the wild in Alaska and is held under a propagation permit may not be exported from the state.

ISSUE: The captive breeding regulations are twenty years old. Because of philosophical differences with the department, we would like to update the regulations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will continue to oppose change and stifle the positive changes in the captive breeding regulations we propose.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska falconers, raptor breeders and the economies of the United States and Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: William R. Tilton for the Alaska Falconers Association (I-04S-G-120)

PROPOSAL 4 - 5 AAC 92.049. Permits, permit procedures, and permit conditions. The proposal would eliminate the requirement for the department to produce a separate supplement for the registration hunts. Registration hunt information would be included in the hunting regulations, consolidating details for hunters.

5 AAC 92.049. Permits, permit procedures, and permit conditions. a) ...

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

ISSUE: Current codified regulation requires the department to produce a registration supplement. Over the last few years, more and more of those details have been included in the hunting regulations in an attempt to clarify various hunt types and requirements. An internal review by department staff found that including the remaining details in the hunting regulations would add very little, and would consolidate the information in one place, making it easier for public and staff to find the information necessary.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will continue to produce a registration supplement that few hunters use or need.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will have fewer places to look to find details of the hunt they are interested in.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Continue to produce an unnecessary publication.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-088)

PROPOSAL 5 - 5 AAC 92.049. Permits, permit procedures, and permit conditions. Base number of registration permits issued on historical harvest data as follows:

Registration hunt estimates must be zero in areas of drawing permit hunts based on historical harvest data.

ISSUE: Biologists setting drawing permit harvest levels below desired harvest level.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Drawing permit applicants will lose opportunity.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All drawing hunt applicants.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who use extortion to mandate state game management.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Cancel the registration hunt. Rejected because of the threat of federal takeover.

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (HQ-04S-G-016)

PROPOSAL 6 - 5 AAC 92.049. Permits, permit procedures, and permit conditions. Eliminate the requirement to obtain registration permits in person as follows:

I prefer the solution of eliminating the in-person requirement of obtaining permits in small remote villages and going to a drawing system. Or at a minimum, making the permits available in larger

cities like Anchorage, Kodiak, or Juneau and extending deadlines into the hunting season so that all will have equal, fair and reasonable access to obtaining a permit.

ISSUE: The issue I would like to have addressed is the requirement to have individuals obtain registration permits in person in small remote villages like Larsen Bay, Old Harbor, Akhiok, and Port Lions. This is a requirement for several different hunts. The ones I am specifically referring to are RG471 to RG479 for goats. I feel the requirement to have interested applicants show up in person in some small remote village by some specified date before the hunt even opens to obtain a permit is blatantly unfair, overly restrictive and favors the local community members. This type of requirement does not afford the majority of Alaskan residents with fair and equal access to obtain a permit for a specified game population. It is unreasonable to expect an individual to take time off work and spend hundreds of dollars to fly to Larsen Bay to get a registration goat permit, return home and then fly back a month later to hunt. I understand the need to regulate the number of permits issued for specific hunts, but this is a very poor and unfair way of doing so.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If this problem is not solved the world will not come to an end. But it certainly leaves a bad taste in one's mouth when they are denied fair and equal access to obtain a permit. I am not asking for any special treatment, just a system that is fair and reasonable. The requirement of making folks obtain permits in person in small remote villages is flawed and should be fixed. It's just a poor way of doing business. Holding drawings for a specified number of permits would seem more logical and abundantly fairer. At a minimum, applicants should be able to obtain the permits in larger cities that they must have to travel through to get to the hunting area, i.e. Anchorage, Kodiak, Juneau, etc. The application period should remain open throughout the hunt. If harvest quotas are filled, then the hunt can be curtailed. These types of registration hunts can be successfully managed without the requirement to have folks show up in person in remote villages to obtain the permits. We can do better than that.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, just the access to obtaining the permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Many Alaskan residents will benefit from the elimination of the in-person requirement to obtain permits in small remote villages since they will now be afforded a reasonable opportunity to get a permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The local residents of villages like Larsen Bay, Old Harbor, and Point Lions are likely to suffer since they will now have to compete in a fair and reasonable fashion like the rest of Alaska's residents for permits that once were held pretty much exclusively for their use.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Flying to Larsen Bay to get my goat permit in person, but it was cost prohibitive.

PROPOSED BY: Adam Kurzejeski (HQ-04S-G-041)

PROPOSAL 7 - 5 AAC 92.049. Permits, permit procedures, and permit conditions. Base number of drawing permits issued on historical harvest data as follows:

The number of drawing permits issued in a hunt must be expected to harvest 100 percent of the harvestable surplus based on historical harvest data.

ISSUE: Biologists purposely restricting drawing permits to allow for a registration hunt after the general season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Individuals applying for drawing permits will be denied opportunity to draw.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Applicants will have a better chance of drawing.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All drawing permit applicants.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Very few registration hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Closing registration hunt. Rejected because the Federal Subsistence Board is attempting to mandate state management with a threat of trying to close federal lands.

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-04S-G-003)

PROPOSAL 8 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures. Amend these regulations as follows:

...

(8) a person who has been issued a permit, or that person's proxy under 5 AAC 92.011, shall return the permit harvest report to the department within the time period stated on the permit; in addition to other penalties provided by law for failure to report harvest, and except as provided in (c) of this section, if a permittee or the permittee's proxy fails to provide the required report for a drawing permit, **registration permit**, a Tier I subsistence permit, or a Tier II subsistence permit, the permittee might not be issued a drawing, **registration**, a Tier I subsistence, or a Tier II subsistence permit during the following regulatory year.

...

ISSUE: Most registration hunts are managed in season and timely reporting by hunters is necessary so that harvest objectives are not exceeded. In the case of a drawing or Tier II permit hunt, hunters may be penalized (in addition to a citation) for not returning their harvest reports, and they typically lose the opportunity to apply for a drawing or Tier II permit the following year. The department would like to extend this penalty to hunters who fail to return their hunt reports for registration hunts. Specifically, hunters who do not return their hunt reports for registration hunts may lose their

opportunity to apply for any permit the following year. The threat of this penalty should encourage more registration hunters to report in a timely manner.

Currently, area offices send out postcards, followed by phone calls, and finally a certified letter in an attempt to obtain the information. At that point, they are turned over to Alaska Bureau of Wildlife Enforcement (ABWE). If there are several hundred non-reporters on the list, this is a time consuming and expensive process.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Department staff will continue to spend time tracking down hunters that failed to turn in their reports.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The department would have more accurate and timely information to issue emergency orders for hunts and make sound management decisions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who fail to report will lose their opportunity to apply for any permit hunt the following year.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Raise citation amount to encourage better reporting.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-087)

PROPOSAL 9 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures. Implement a point system for drawing permit hunts so that long-term applicants have increased chance of success as follows:

Some design where applicants applying for a particular hunt from year to year will accumulate points, thereby increasing their chance of winning a permit.

ISSUE: Applicants applying for a particular hunt from year to year do not have an advantage over applicants applying for the first time.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Long-term applicants will not accumulate any advantage in the drawing process.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Long-term applicants.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Applicants who don't apply every year.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Harry Forquer (HQ-04S-G-023)

PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures. Implement a point system for drawing permit hunts so that long-term applicants have increased chance of success as follows:

A points accumulation system favoring applicants consistently applying for specific hunts, i.e. bison etc. The longer a hunt is applied for, year after year, the more likely an individual is to be drawn.

ISSUE: Drawing permit hunts for bison, moose, goat, sheep, and caribou should be changed from random to a points system as in other states.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who have applied for many hunts without drawing a tag.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People new to the state and those not willing to consistently apply for hunts.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Tom Young (HQ-04S-G-034)

PROPOSAL 11 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures. Implement a point system for sheep and bison drawing permit hunts so that long-term applicants have increased chance of success as follows:

Drawing permits for sheep and bison should be awarded by a “modified preference point” system. All applicants would be required to be 16 years of age, and first purchase a hunting license. Unsuccessful applicants would receive one point for each species. An applicant could also opt to purchase a point for each species without making a hunt choice. A person may apply for only one hunt (not the current three) per species.

Nonresident applicants could opt to receive a refund of the hunting license fee. Drawing applications should cost \$10-20 per species/hunt choice. The department would set up a database to track each hunter’s points, which would be funded by the license and higher applications fees. Points should be awarded to unsuccessful applicants for the previous five years to begin the database.

How the system would work:

80 percent (rounded up) of the permits would be awarded to the highest point holders. If there are more highest-point holders than permits available, the permits will be awarded by random drawing

among these holders. The remaining 20 percent (rounded down) would be awarded with the current random drawing method. This would provide an opportunity for first-time/lucky applicants to receive a permit.

Example:

There are eight permits for a hunt. Thirty-five applicants have five points and 1,220 applicants have zero to four points. Six permits are available to point holders. A random drawing of the 35 applicants will determine who gets the six permits. The remaining 29 applicants will be included with the other 1,220 applicants in a random drawing for the other two permits.

ISSUE: A “point“ system should be implemented for low-odds drawing permit hunts like sheep and bison. Most other states have bonus or preference point permit award systems (or combinations thereof) especially for hard-to-get permits. Unsuccessful applicants are awarded points which may be applied at the next drawing for that species. The longer the applicants is not successful, the better the chances of getting a permit.

A “weighted” drawing method will reward persistent applicants and provide a better resource allocation system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Long-time applicants will still not receive permits, and interest will wane (lowering the department’s budget).

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It will better allocate limited permits, and increase income to the department from application and license fees. There will be more interest in point-system award programs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone, like me, who has applied for a permit for 28 consecutive years without being drawn.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Very lucky people who seem to get drawn whenever they apply.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? (1) A preference point system would not be unconstitutional, based on “equal protection”, since everyone has an equal opportunity to accumulate points; (2) a total preference point system would not create the same interest for low-point holders; and (3) eliminating the drawing permit system would create management/enforcement problems.

PROPOSED BY: John Zimmerli (HQ-04S-G-052)

PROPOSAL 12 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures. Implement a point system for drawing permit hunts so that long-term applicants have increased chance of success as follows:

The Department of Wildlife Conservation will create a bonus point/preference point system for all drawing permit hunts. Twenty percent of permits based on preference and 80 percent on bonus. One bonus/preference point for each year of applying. Brought up at each Board of Game meeting until finished.

ISSUE: Lack of a drawing permit preference, bonus point system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunities will be denied to those who continually do not draw.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Individuals can draw quality hunts by other than just luck.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who participate.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The lucky people who are drawn frequently.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Preference only is bad, bonus only is bad. A combination works best.

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-04S-G-008)

PROPOSAL 13 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures. Implement a point system for drawing permit hunts so that long-term applicants have increased chance of success as follows:

Change the current hunting drawing permit system to a preference/weighted point system (with a “buy a point” option).

ISSUE: The current drawing permit hunt system is unfair. The current system does not recognize past participation in the drawing permit hunt process.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continuation of an unfair drawing permit hunt system.

Solution: Many of the ideas contained in this proposal are currently being used in the State of Washington and Montana permit hunt point systems. The new point system should include all the current drawing permit hunts offered by the State of Alaska. Participants would continue the same hunt choice procedure and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game would continue the same method for drawing applicants (random number selection by computer). In addition, applicants will be identified using their hunter education identification number or current drivers license number. Applicants will be notified by mail using the address on the application. The notification will indicate successful or unsuccessful for each species the applicant applied for and, current total points accumulated per species. It is the responsibility of the applicant to report any discrepancies.

Each person who applies for a drawing permit hunt receives a point per species. If that person is awarded a drawing permit hunt for that species the persons point total for that species drops to zero. A person not awarded a drawing permit hunt for that species retains his or her points. A single point is built up each consecutive year the person applies. A person must continue to apply each year for each species or the person is purged from that species system and their point total for that species is zero.

The State of Washington permit hunt system does not require continuous yearly participation to maintain points. The State of Montana allows the applicant to skip two concurrent years of participation without forfeiting accumulated points.

To facilitate persons who will not be able to hunt for a species for a given permit year (for whatever reason) but wants to continue to build points and not lose their current points, a method to buy points for that year shall be offered. A special hunt choice number will be provided per species for that person to use. A person applying for these hunts using the special number cannot be awarded a permit and will automatically accrue their point for each species that year. In addition the person must do everything else normally required to do.

An option to buy points offers the applicant a method to better plan for hunts.

A multiplier shall be used on the persons species point total. The number of points for each species is then cubed and it is this number of random numbers that are issued to the application for a given species.

Placing a multiplier of cubed on the points more noticeably increases the chances of being selected over someone who is a new applicant or was recently awarded a permit.

The State of Washington squares the total number of accumulated points per species. The State of Alaska uses random number system: however as the system is today, every year each person, no matter how many times they have applied, receives only one random number per species.

(1) A person can apply the following year of being selected for a drawing permit hunt. All waiting periods shall be eliminated; (2) only one point is received per year per species; (3) points are not transferable to other species or hunters; and (4) no group or party applications would be offered.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quality of the resource will not change: however this system will produce a more positive attitude by hunters thus increasing a person's interest in game management.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone who participates in the drawing permit hunt system.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A person who does not apply for a drawing permit hunt and does not buy points in any given year will lose their accumulated points for that species.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? (1) Point system without a multiplier. This would be an improvement to the current system but offers only a limited increase of chance over a new applicant or recently awarded applicant; (2) A system that does not require any kind of yearly participation to retain their points. Persons could still buy points; (3) A system that does not offer the option to buy points. This would create the scenario in which individuals are selected for hunts and are not able to hunt for that species that year. Therefore the following year the person would be back to zero points for that species. Buying points offers the applicants control and opportunity to better plan hunts; (4) Include group or party hunt applications. There are some people that like the party hunt concept in which each group member receives a permit. Using the point system the group's points would be an average of the total points of the group members. Another option to group/party hunt applications would be that only one permit be issued to the group and that any member of the group could take the animal. Only one animal per permit. The taking of game under such a permit would eliminate any member of that group to take game of the same species that year. Management of such a system may be difficult. Group and party applicants have less of a chance of selection versus applying individually. In addition the process adds one more dynamic to the system with added cost and zero benefit; and (5) Eliminate all permit drawing hunts of game species that can be managed based on antler or horn size and enact a point system for the remaining game when resource numbers are in jeopardy. This issue could be divisive. Many people believe this would create an overabundance of hunters seeking a very limited number of legal game.

PROPOSED BY: Cooper Landing Advisory Committee (SC-04S-G-052)

PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures. Implement a point system for drawing permit hunts so that long-term applicants have increased chance of success as follows:

Provide a system that increases a hunter's odds to be successful for a drawing permit. Require continuous application for a number of years (three to five) thus increasing odds to draw permit. Also increase number of years (three to five) required to lapse before same permit could be drawn again. Since other draw permits require more than one year lapse (buffalo-five years) there should be little opposition.

ISSUE: The process of awarding drawing permit hunts, applicant chance of success, and applicant redraw for same permit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Lower numbers of hunters applying for drawing permits, lower revenue for the department, and unfulfilled management goals.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If hunters knew that by persistence they would receive a permit, larger numbers would apply. Also guides should benefit from successful nonresident hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who continues to support the system knowing they will draw a permit. Larger numbers of different successful hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unable to see who would be hurt, because the number of permits shouldn't diminish.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Tony Lamanna (I-04S-G-026)

PROPOSAL 15 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.
Implement a point system for drawing permit hunts so that long-term applicants have increased chance of success as follows:

If you put in for a drawing hunt and don't get drawn the next year if you put in for the same hunt you would have two chances of being drawn. If you put in three consecutive years, the third year you would have three chances of getting drawn. This would continue until either you were drawn for the hunt or failed to apply one year and in that case you would have to start over.

ISSUE: The yearly random selection of drawing permit hunt winners.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People will continue to lose interest in a hunt after putting in year after year and never getting drawn.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, because after a few years you would know your chances are getting better and better and you would keep applying and plan accordingly.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who put in for a hunt year after year but never get drawn.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who put in for a hunt and get drawn the first year.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? This seemed the simplest solution.

PROPOSED BY: John Krieg (I-04S-G-045)

PROPOSAL 16 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.
Implement a point system for drawing permit hunts so that long-term applicants have increased chance of success as follows:

Resident Preference.

A possible point system for the number of years you've lived in Alaska. Archery/muzzle loader for buffalo.

ISSUE: Drawing permits. Seems some people draw permits every year. Some people put in once in their entire stay in Alaska and draw a buffalo; here one year and draw a cow permit two years in a row.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If people perceive the drawing is unfair they will stop participating.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who are committed to living in Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who are here to take what they can get from the state and leave.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Grady Brown Jr., and Bart W. Colledge (I-04S-G-058)

PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.
Restrict drawing permit holders from hunting in other game management units for the same species as follows:

It is unlawful to hunt a game species the same regulatory year a hunter has drawn a drawing permit for that species other than where the drawing permit is issued from.

ISSUE: Non-use of drawing permits.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued difficulty drawing a permit, and hunter congestion in other areas.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, just increasing opportunity and quality of hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The majority of hunters and those who do not draw permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who draw a permit but choose to hunt somewhere else.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A \$100 fee for all drawing permits. Rejected because it must be done by the legislature. The Board of Game can only send a resolution to the resource committees requesting it.

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-04S-G-009)

PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC. 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures.
Add a new discretionary permit requirement that would require hunters to take an operative GPS unit into the field for specific permit hunts.

5AAC. 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures.

...

(x) a permittee shall carry an operative Global Positioning System (GPS) unit while in the field.

ISSUE: Global Positioning System (GPS) units are becoming more commonly used while in the field for hunting purposes. In some instances, the department could gather important information from hunters if exact harvest locations were known. In other situations, many hunt boundaries and closed areas are referenced by straight lines between specific points. If this proposal passes it would allow the hunt manager to require hunters in specific permit hunts to carry a GPS unit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Like all discretionary hunt conditions this is only a tool that the department can use if the hunt manager feels it is necessary. If this proposal does not pass the department will not have this tool to utilize.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters in the field where hunt boundaries are not easily identified.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People that do not use a GPS while hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-091)

PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 92.062. Priority for subsistence hunting; Tier II permits. Restrict Tier II permit holders from hunting in other game management units the same year as follows:

Tier II permit holders cannot hunt outside of that unit that year.

ISSUE: Tier II qualification: The state subsistence/Tier II law is an obsolete attempt to keep the feds happy. It didn't work. If we must keep this archaic law on the books lets try to keep it from being such a farce.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Tier II applicants who are not subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II permits.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Actual subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonsubsistence hunters who have been qualifying for Tier II and lying and/or cheating and/or poachers who have qualified.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-04S-G-013)

PROPOSAL 20 - 5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system. Change the points system for Tier II permits as follows:

The maximum years required to obtain a Tier II permit in Unit 13 for caribou is 25 years or more.

ISSUE: The lack of Tier II permits in Unit 13, for caribou going to Alaska residents that hunted the Nelchina herd for 25 years or more.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People like myself that have to find another resource to replace their subsistence way of life.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People that have used the resource for 25 years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Michael S. Rosetti (HQ-04S-G-008)

PROPOSAL 21 - 5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system. Require Tier II applicants to have qualified for a low income hunting license for the last five years as follows:

Tier II applicant must have qualified for low income hunting license for the last five years.

ISSUE: Tier II qualification: The state subsistence/Tier II law is an obsolete attempt to keep the feds happy. It didn't work. If we must keep this archaic law on the books lets try to keep it from being such a farce.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Tier II applicants who are not subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II permits.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Actual subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonsubsistence hunters who have been qualifying for Tier II and lying and/or cheating and/or poachers who have qualified.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-04S-G-014)

PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system. Require transfer of possession form, license and harvest ticket for each year of use claimed as follows:

Tier II applicants must provide transfer of possession form for each year they claim use. Also hunter's license number and harvest ticket.

ISSUE: Tier II qualification: The state subsistence/Tier II law is an obsolete attempt to keep the feds happy. It didn't work. If we must keep this archaic law on the books lets try to keep it from being such a farce.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Tier II applicants who are not subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II permits.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Actual subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonsubsistence hunters who have been qualifying for Tier II and lying and/or cheating and/or poachers who have qualified.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-04S-G-021)

PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system. Require harvest ticket number and date of kill for each year of use claimed as follows:

Tier II applicants must list their harvest ticket number and date of kill for each year they claim use.

ISSUE: Tier II qualification: The state subsistence/Tier II law is an obsolete attempt to keep the feds happy. It didn't work. If we must keep this archaic law on the books lets try to keep it from being such a farce.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Tier II applicants who are not subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II permits.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Actual subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonsubsistence hunters who have been qualifying for Tier II and lying and/or cheating and/or poachers who have qualified.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-04S-G-022)

PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system. Require hunting license number for each year of use claimed as follows:

Tier II applicants must list their hunting license number for each year they claim use of resource.

ISSUE: Tier II qualification: The state subsistence/Tier II law is an obsolete attempt to keep the feds happy. It didn't work. If we must keep this archaic law on the books lets try to keep it from being such a farce.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Tier II applicants who are not subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II permits.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Actual subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonsubsistence hunters who have been qualifying for Tier II and lying and/or cheating and/or poachers who have qualified.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-04S-G-023)

PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system.
Disqualify Tier II applicants who have harvested game in another game management unit during preceding 10 years as follows:

You cannot qualify for Tier II if you have harvested game in another unit during the last 10 years.

ISSUE: Tier II qualifications: The state subsistence/Tier II law is an obsolete attempt to keep the feds happy. It didn't work. If we must keep this archaic law on the books lets try to keep it from being such a farce.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Tier II applicants who are not subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II permits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, just quantity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Actual subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonsubsistence hunters who have been qualifying for Tier II and lying and/or cheating and/or poachers who have qualified.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-04S-G-024)

PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system.
Disqualify Tier II applicants who have harvested game out of state during the preceding 10 years as follows:

You do not qualify for Tier II if you have harvested game out of state during the preceding 10 years.

ISSUE: Tier II qualification: The state subsistence/Tier II law is an obsolete attempt to keep the feds happy. It didn't work. If we must keep this archaic law on the books lets try to keep it from being such a farce.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Tier II applicants who are not subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II permits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Not quality but quantity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Actual subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonsubsistence hunters who have been qualifying for Tier II and lying and/or cheating and/or poachers who have qualified.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-04S-G-025)

PROPOSAL 27 - 5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system. Modify Tier II permit point system as follows:

Basically change the form to show the unit and subunit where applicant's PRIMARY and/or TEMPORARY (cabin residence) is located. Change: "Where do you purchase fuel and groceries" to the method of transportation used to purchase same.

Scoring is as follows:

Your Primary Residence Mailing Address (as shown on your Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend Check (APFDC)). 10 points if outside the unit for the Tier II hunt applied for. 20 points if inside the unit for the Tier II hunt applied for, but not in the subunit. 30 points if inside the unit and subunit for the Tier II hunt applied for.

City, Zip code. 10 points if community qualifies as rural. five points if community qualifies as urban.

Primary Residence. Physical address (as shown on your APFDC (street address, if different from mailing address), if remote, also give latitude and longitude, distance from known locations.

Unit and subunit of primary residence. The highest score based on your primary residence or temporary residence will be used (max score 30 points for primary residence and 25 points for temporary residence).

Method to travel to location to purchase groceries: (1) motor vehicle = five points; (2) airplane or boat = 10 points. Method to travel to location to purchase fuel: (1) motor vehicle = five points; (2) airplane or boat = 10 points.

Temporary residence (cabins, log homes) physical address and legal description (lot, block, survey info), if remote give latitude and longitude, distance from known locations. 10 points if outside the unit for the Tier II hunt applied for. 15 points if inside the unit for the Tier II hunt applied for, but not in the subunit. 25 points if inside the unit and the subunit for the Tier II hunt applied for.

Name and distance of closest community to your temporary residence. 10 points if community qualifies as rural. Five points if community qualifies as urban. Method to travel to location to purchase groceries: (1) = five points; (2) = 10 points. Method to travel to location to purchase fuel: (1) five points; (2) = 10 points.

Residency: How long have you lived in Alaska? One point for each year of consecutive residency in Alaska (25 points max). Alaska residents who served in the military or government outside of Alaska but claimed residency and received the APFSC can include those years.

Any area not answered will receive a score of zero points.

ISSUE: The present Tier II application questions are not valid in all subunit management areas and force people within the sub units to stretch the truth in order to qualify. When the truth is more realistic (gas and groceries) and residency is vague, e.g. Unit 16B; food and fuel are purchased in Anchorage and flown or boated out to the remote residence but they must say they buy their food and fuel in the Unit where there are no stores.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People will continue to improvise and be creative in the application.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? People living in subunit have a local knowledge of game habitat and are more likely to have a successful hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Individuals residing within the subunit (rural preference complies with the federal mandate).

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals residing in a designated urban area, but they could still qualify for a permit.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Mark Kelliher (SC-04S-G-030)

PROPOSAL 28 - 5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system. Modify Tier II permit point system as follows:

I would suggest changing (a) to 40 points instead of 60. (a)(1) would need to be changed to reflect the same 40 point number and (a)(2) should be deleted in its entirety.

(a) A Tier II subsistence permit applicant's "customary and direct dependence on the game population by the subsistence user for human consumption as a mainstay of livelihood" may provide up to [60] **40** points. It is measured by the following indicators and points:

(1) the number of years in which the applicant has hunted on or eaten from the game population, plus the number of years in which the applicant would have hunted on or eaten from the game population but did not because state regulations canceled the hunt on the game population during a given year or years, or because the state did not issue the applicant a permit to hunt on the game population for which the applicant applied; one point is given for each year, up to [50] **40** points; and

[(2) THE NUMBER OF YEARS IN WHICH A MEMBER OF THE APPLICANT'S HOUSEHOLD HAS HUNTED ON OR EATEN FROM THE GAME POPULATION, PLUS THE NUMBER OF YEARS IN WHICH THAT MEMBER OF THE APPLICANT'S HOUSEHOLD WOULD HAVE HUNTED ON OR EATEN FROM THE GAME POPULATION BUT DID NOT BECAUSE STATE REGULATIONS CANCELED THE HUNT ON THE GAME POPULATION DURING A GIVEN YEAR OR YEARS, OR BECAUSE THE STATE DID NOT ISSUE THAT MEMBER OF THE APPLICANT'S HOUSEHOLD A PERMIT TO HUNT ON THE GAME POPULATION FOR WHICH THAT MEMBER OF THE APPLICANT'S HOUSEHOLD APPLIED; .2 POINTS ARE GIVEN FOR EACH YEAR, UP TO 10 POINTS.]

(b) The "ability of a subsistence user to obtain food if subsistence use is restricted or eliminated" may provide up to [40] **60** points. It is measured by the following indicators and points:

(1) the relative availability of alternative sources of game to the applicant's household, which may provide up to [20] **30** points, as measured by the formula $\text{Score} = [20] \frac{30(I/J)}$, in which "I/J" is the percent of the applicant's household's wild game that came from the Tier II population over the past five years, in which "I" stands for the amount of game harvested by hunters from the applicant's household from the Tier II population and "J" stands for the amount of game harvested by hunters from the applicant's household from within the state; "I/J" may be a percent up to but not exceeding G/H, in which "G" stands for the amount of game harvested by hunters from the applicant's location from the Tier II population and "H" stands for the amount of game harvested by hunters from the applicant's location from within the hunt area and from all reasonably accessible game hunts within 150 miles, as calculated by the department; before January 1, 2012, the provisions of this paragraph do not apply to Units 22 and 23 musk oxen hunts;

(2) the availability of food for purchase in the community where most of the applicant's household's store-bought food was purchased during the past year, which may provide up to [10] **15** points, as calculated by the department's current Tier II cost-of-food index; the number of points received by an applicant may not exceed the points calculated by the department using the cost-of-food index for the community nearest the applicant's residence; and

(3) the cost of gasoline in the community where most of the applicant's household's gasoline was purchased during the past year, which may provide up to [10] **15** points; the number of points received by an applicant may not exceed the points calculated by the department using the cost of gasoline for the community nearest the applicant's residence.

(c) An applicant's total score is the sum of points given under (a) and (b) of this section, up to a maximum of 100 points.

ISSUE: I feel the current point system does not provide for actual subsistence priority, but in fact is slanted more to residence longevity. By doing this we can put more focus on a person's direct dependence on a particular game population, as a "mainstay of livelihood".

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Newer generations of hunters will never be able to have these opportunities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, it is strictly an allocation issue.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Shorter term residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Longer term residents.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The best solution is to amend the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) and make all Alaskans equal, but this will never happen.

PROPOSED BY: Denny Hamann (SC-04S-G-054)

PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system. Limit the number of Tier II permits for which a person may apply as follows:

Allow Tier II applicants to only apply for one hunt area per species and word questions 14 and 15 on the application form more clearly, so that they are enforceable by protection.

ISSUE: The current Tier II hunt application and point system is worded ambiguously and is hard to enforce.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unfair distribution of permits will continue.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This is an allocation issue.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Truthful applicants.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Untruthful applicants.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Lowering the maximum number of points credited for residency. We plan to pursue this further but haven't reached a consensus yet.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska/Susitna Valley Advisory Committee (SC-04S-G-056)

PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system. Modify Tier II permit point system as follows:

The Priority for Subsistence Hunting Tier II Permits, and Tier II Subsistence Hunting Permit Point System should be changed to provide for an advantage for subsistence users residing in rural Alaska, and to increase points for the subsistence users residing in rural Alaska.

ISSUE: N/A

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The subsistence users in rural Alaska will not have their subsistence needs met, if they are not given an advantage under the Tier II subsistence hunt to hunt for wild game during the fall hunt. The Alaska Code of Regulations should be changed to allow a hunt from August 15 to September 15 under the Tier II subsistence hunt. The subsistence users in rural Alaska will have more opportunity to harvest wild game, if they have a longer hunting season.

The overall points for the Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system should be increased to 180 points to allow for more points for the rural subsistence users, who qualify for subsistence priority due to residing in proximity to the hunt area, and because they depend upon wild game for their livelihood.

The regulatory laws should provide for the subsistence users in rural Alaska to have an advantage in customary and direct dependence on the game population for human consumption as a mainstay of livelihood. The hunters in rural Alaska are at a disadvantage when they hunt for caribou or moose, due to the competition of hunters in the field, and the lack of hunting equipment to hunt off the highway system. The points for the first criterion for “customary and direct dependence on the game population by the subsistence user for human consumption as a mainstay of “livelihood” should be 80 points. The criterion for customary and direct dependence should be kept status quo as eaten or hunted from the game population, and an increase in points for this criterion, because this criterion as it is now written allows all residents in Alaska an opportunity in the point system, and provides an advantage for increase in points for those who have eaten from the game population, if they have more years, in which they have eaten from the game population.

The points for the criterion “ability of a subsistence user in rural Alaska to obtain food if subsistence use is restricted or eliminated” should be increased to 60 points. This will allow for an increase in points for the subsistence users in rural Alaska to gain more points because they reside within 150 miles from the game hunt area.

The points for “availability of food for purchase in the community where most of the applicant’s household store-bought food was purchased, and the “cost of gasoline in the community where most of the applicant’s household’s gasoline was purchased during the past year” should be increased to 20 points for both criterions. The increased point system for those rural subsistence users in Alaska will help them to gain more points because the rural areas in Alaska have a higher cost of living allowance than urban areas.

The 10-day appeal process under AAC 92.062 should be changed to 20 days so that subsistence users in rural Alaska can have more time to appeal the decision, when they are eliminated in hunting under the Tier II subsistence permit hunt.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The subsistence users in rural Alaska will benefit, if they are given an advantage in the Tier II subsistence hunt permits, and given an increase in points in the Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system. They will be able to hunt without competition from other hunts, during an earlier season under the Tier II subsistence hunting regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one is likely to suffer. All resident and nonresident hunters will be able to hunt during the regular fall season hunt. There is ample opportunity for resident hunters and nonresident hunters to hunt and to harvest wild game in Alaska. There are many game units that all resident and nonresident hunters can hunt in for wild game to provide for their needs.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Change the regulatory laws in Alaska to provide for subsistence use priority for the rural areas in Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: Ken Johns, President and CEO of AHTNA, Inc. (SC-04S-G-058)

PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system. Add verification requirements for Tier II permit applications as follows:

Applicants submitting a Tier II application must show up in person with identification showing place of resident and have their Tier II application signed by someone in the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, State Troopers or by a public safety officer before the application can be mailed.

ISSUE: People who no longer live in Alaska are getting Nelchina Tier II permits. They arrive in Alaska for the hunting season, have no permanent resident, yet they claim they are Alaskan residents. This makes it easy for them with the permanent hunting license, 60 plus license. This would force these so-called residents to make two trips to Alaska. This will not solve the problem completely, but will help.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? These so-called residents will continue to receive Tier II permits. This hurts all Alaskan residents.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Not applicable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All real Alaskan residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The so called Alaskan residents living in the lower 48 states, who are only in Alaska for two to three weeks during hunting season.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Allen G. Avinger (I-04S-G-047)

PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system. Modify point system for Tier II subsistence permits as follows:

All prior Tier II questions and scoring criterion should be sunsetted. The Tier II hunt application will ask two questions.

1. For how long have you hunted this game population (including years you applied but were not drawn)?
2. How many big game animals have you harvested from this unit?

ISSUE: Discrimination by the department. Persons who fill out Tier II applications alike receive different scoring based on their town of residence. Tier II preference should be provided based on two factors indicating the applicants historical reliance on the hunted population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? All credibility in the department and the Board of Game will be lost.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All who want fairness and equal scoring to all who demonstrate their reliance on a game population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Persons who benefit under the unfair “community based” scoring system.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I thought of adding the mil rate of school property tax and subtracting the average per capita pull tab sales to the existing questions. I rejected them to get away from residency based criterion.

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-04S-G-106)

PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Expand restriction on helicopter use for hunting related purposes as follows:

The new regulation would read:

5AAC 92.080(3). Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions.

Knowing or with reason to know, with the use of a helicopter in any manor, including transporting to or from the field of any unprocessed game or parts of game, any hunter or hunting gear, or any equipment used in pursuit or retrieval of big game, air strip construction and site preparation including but not limited to the removing of brush, trees, vegetation, rocks or soil, that allows the use of a fixed wing aircraft for big game hunting purposes; and using an area altered by a helicopter by a fixed wing aircraft to hunt big game from.

ISSUE: Request of the Board of Game to create a more comprehensive ban on the use of helicopters for the hunting of big game: to include a ban on the use of helicopters to access a hunting area during a closed season and create or improve an area to create or improve a landing strip for fixed-wing use during the open big game hunting season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? I believe that the Board of Game’s intent is to totally eliminate the helicopter from the big game hunting process except for the case where there is a dire emergency. This ban should include the ban on off-season preparation of landing strips. This procedure has occurred by at least two helicopter operators in Interior Alaska who then use the strips commercially for big game hunting. Numerous air strips have been constructed or improved using the helicopter for access and then the same company has returned during the open hunting season with a commercially operated fixed wing aircraft dropping off big game hunters.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? I believe that the use of helicopters in any way shape or form (except for cases of dire emergency) for hunting big game should be banned. The ban will only be in the best interests of hunters and the future of hunting in Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A.

PROPOSED BY: David Lorring (HQ-04S-G-039)

PROPOSAL 34 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Allow use of artificial light for recovery of wounded big game as follows:

(7) With the aid of a pit, fire, artificial light, electronically enhanced night vision scope, ... **Except that a leashed tracking dog handler who qualifies under the permit conditions established by the department may use artificial light to aid in tracking and dispatching a wounded big game animal by permit issued at the discretion of the department:**

ISSUE: Because use of artificial light as an aid in the taking of big game is prohibited, it is currently illegal to use a handheld or headlamp style flashlight to aid in tracking and recovering mortally wounded big game animals. This proposal would create an exemption to the restriction on the use of artificial light that would allow a leashed tracking dog handler who possesses a department issued, nontransferable permit to use artificial light as an aid in the tracking and dispatch of a wounded big game animal.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Waiting for sufficient natural light to initiate or resume the tracking of a mortally wounded big game animal will unnecessarily delay, and possibly prevent, the dispatch and recovery of wounded big game animals.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Hasty dispatch and recovery of mortally wounded big game animals will preserve meat quality and prevent unnecessary suffering.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who are hindered by nightfall from tracking and dispatching wounded animals.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. The likelihood of abuse is greatly reduced by restricting the use of artificial light to permitted, leashed tracking dog handlers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo – prohibiting the limited use of artificial light for tracking purposes will continue to unnecessarily delay or prevent the dispatch and recovery of wounded game animals.

PROPOSED BY: William Davidson (HQ-04S-G-047)

PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Limit off-road vehicle use in hunting to designated trails as follows:

Off-road vehicles used to transport hunters, game, equipment or supplies for state authorized harvest can only be lawfully operated on state designated and maintained trails.

ISSUE: Habitat destruction by off-road vehicles.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More and continued habitat destruction.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Hunts produced will be much better.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters, wildlife, remote habitat users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Criminals.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Outlaw all off-road vehicles. It would deny access to the few conscientious off-road vehicle drivers.

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-04S-G-002)

PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Require registration of off-road vehicles used in the transportation of harvest game as follows:

All vehicles used for transporting game, hunters, equipment and/or supplies taken or used in a state authorized harvest must be registered with the Alaska Department of Motor Vehicles and show its registration number.

ISSUE: Illegal off-road vehicle use, and not being able to identify off-road vehicles used illegally.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Habitat destruction will continue. Criminals will continue to evade prosecution.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The hunts will be better because the criminals can be prosecuted.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Habitat and lawful users, all hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Criminals.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Outlaw all off-road vehicles.

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-04S-G-004)

PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Allow use of laser range finders as follows:

It is unlawful to harvest game using artificial light including illuminated sights but not including laser range finders.

ISSUE: Artificial light use. New technology means new regulations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Ambiguity is the law.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? General public will know.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Outlaw all artificial light, but range finders are extremely beneficial and create a more humane harvest.

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-04S-G-005)

PROPOSAL 38 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Restrict use of equipment used in a federal subsistence hunt in a state authorized hunt as follows:

It unlawful to use any equipment or supplies used in a federal subsistence hunt for a state authorized hunt.

ISSUE: Federal management of subsistence hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The board will continue to manage less than twenty percent of the state.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It would make the federal law moot, creating state management.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Taxpayers, all wildlife users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anyone paid under the federal subsistence budget and those who believe in inequality and discrimination.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Secession from the Union; tried in the 1860's and didn't work out well.

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-04S-G-011)

PROPOSAL 39 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Prohibit transport of game harvested in a federal subsistence hunt onto state lands and waters as follows:

It is unlawful to transport any game harvested under a federal subsistence season into state jurisdiction including but not limited to: private property, state land, state right of ways, navigable water, municipalities, villages, towns, etc.

ISSUE: Federal management of subsistence hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Board of Game will continue to manage less than twenty percent of the state.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It would make the federal law moot and the state could manage the resources again.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Taxpayers and all residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anyone paid under the federal subsistence budget and those who believe in inequality and discrimination.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Secession from the Union; was tried in the 1860's and didn't work out well.

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-04S-G-012)

PROPOSAL 40 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Prohibit use of a motor vehicle to transport of game harvested in a Tier II hunt as follows:

Game harvested under Tier II permit cannot be transported by motorized vehicle.

ISSUE: Tier II qualification: The state subsistence/Tier II law is an obsolete attempt to keep the feds happy. It didn't work. If we must keep this archaic law on the books lets try to keep it from being such a farce.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Tier II applicants who are not subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II permits.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Actual subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonsubsistence hunters who have been qualifying for Tier II and lying and/or cheating and/or poachers who have qualified.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-04S-G-015)

PROPOSAL 41 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Prohibit the out-of-state transport of game harvested in a Tier II hunt as follows:

Game harvested under a Tier II permit cannot be transported out of the state.

ISSUE: Tier II qualification: The state subsistence/Tier II law is an obsolete attempt to keep the feds happy. It didn't work. If we must keep this archaic law on the books lets try to keep it from being such a farce.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Tier II applicants who are not subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II permits.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Actual subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonsubsistence hunters who have been qualifying for Tier II and lying and/or cheating and/or poachers who have qualified.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson

(SC-04S-G-016)

PROPOSAL 42 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Restrict the transport of game harvested in a Tier II hunt out of the game management unit as follows:

Game harvested under Tier II permit cannot be transported out of the unit where harvested.

ISSUE: Tier II qualification: The state subsistence/Tier II law is an obsolete attempt to keep the feds happy. It didn't work. If we must keep this archaic law on the books lets try to keep it from being such a farce.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Tier II applicants who are not subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II permits.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Actual subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonsubsistence hunters who have been qualifying for Tier II and lying and/or cheating and/or poachers who have qualified.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson

(SC-04S-G-017)

PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Prohibit harvest of big game from a watercraft in marine waters as follows:

It is unlawful to harvest big game off of a watercraft in marine waters.

ISSUE: Shooting big game off a boat on marine/salt waters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Big game will be shot off boats and not recovered.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Decrease of lost game; increase of recovered game.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All who benefit from increased game populations and a higher recovery rate.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? It is important to note this will not affect subsistence hunts on federal lands, in other words, residents of Kodiak Island hunting for deer on the refuge. It will hurt nonresident hunters who want to shoot game off a boat.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-04S-G-026)

PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions; and 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Allow taking of game from motorized vehicles as follows:

Delete restriction to take game from motorized vehicle (not just Units 7 and 15).

Allow “snowmachine to position caribou” statewide not just in Units 22 and 23. Allow snow machine to be used to harvest wolves and bears in all units not just 19. Allow swimming caribou and wolves and bears to be harvested in all units, not just 23 and 26.

ISSUE: Unnecessary differing regulations. Regulations should be uniform statewide. You should be able to take game from a motorized vehicle and/or a boat, and while swimming and with a .22 rifle in all units, not just 7, 15, 22, 23, and 26.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will become more confused over what methods are and are not permitted. Equal protection should mandate uniform methods and means statewide.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who want simple regulations that are consistent statewide.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The police who arrest and attorneys who defend those who are cited for violations of these regulations.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-04S-G-102)

PROPOSAL 45 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Allow hunting of coyote, wolf, and bears from snowmachines as follows:

Allow hunting with snowmachines in all units for coyote, wolf, and bears

ISSUE: Excess predation – increase hunter success by allowing hunting with snowmachines in all units for coyote, wolf, and bears.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? N/A

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All who want prey populations to increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who want the continued decline of moose and sheep (predator pit situation) to continue.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-04S-G-104)

PROPOSAL 46 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Allow use of artificial light and communication equipment as follows:

Delete references to laser sights, artificial lights, and phone and communication equipment from hunting restrictions.

ISSUE: Low harvest success rate and low overall harvest of hunted game animals. Alaskans harvest less than five percent of the harvestable surplus of game animals. Alaskan hunters should be allowed to use phone and radio communications and laser sights (helps individuals with poor eyesight). The deletion of these restrictions will increase success of predator hunting coyote, wolf, and bears which will increase prey species as much as any additional harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The wife who sees the animal on her way home from work and calls her husband to harvest it on his way home to feed their family for the winter should not be a criminal and be subject to jail of one year and a \$5,000 fine.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters (especially those with poor eyesight) who want to increase their success and be able to talk to others on the phone without fear of prosecution.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-04S-G-105)

PROPOSAL 47 - 5 AAC 92.085(3). Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Repeal restrictions on arrow and broadhead weight statewide as follows:

Bow hunters, arrows and broad head weight unlimited, statewide.

ISSUE: Bow hunting, Alaska regulations say we cannot use broad heads, arrows that are over 300 grains in weight, which is wrong.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bow hunters will be breaking the law. More wounded game.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Better clean kills, less wounded game.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Yes, more protection for big game, bow hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The state, the department, and those whom oppose this problem.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Thinking of petition lots of names for bow hunters' rights. Do not have the time at this time.

PROPOSED BY: Michael Todd Williams (HQ-04S-G-009)

PROPOSAL 48 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Clarify restriction against shooting across roads as follows:

I would like to propose that the regulation be amended to state, "It is a violation to shoot on, from or across the driveable surface of a constructed roadway when it is passable by a highway vehicle."

ISSUE: "It is a violation for shooting on, from or across the drivable surface of a constructed road." This regulation, as stated, makes it a judgment call for hunters, trappers and law enforcement as to whether the law is actually being broken. At one time the regulation was, "Shooting on, from or across the drivable surface of a state maintained highway." I am unaware of any approval from the Board of Game to change the definition of a "highway". This regulation was initiated because of safety issues to protect people traveling on roadways and should be enforced, however, the law, as currently stated would make it illegal to shoot on, from or across any constructed road or trail even when not passable by highway traffic.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? As stated now, many access roads and trails, which are seasonal use only to highway vehicles, are illegal to shoot on, from or across. Shooting on, from or across these old roadways and trails is not a safety threat to the general public traveling in their family car or truck, however a person may be fined for doing such at the discretion of the State Troopers. I have been informed by the State Troopers that any constructed road or trail that

can, at any time of the year, be traveled by any type of highway vehicle (including four wheel drives) is considered a constructed road whether passable or not.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal simply clarifies the regulation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone will benefit by having the definition of a “constructed roadway” defined and the hunting and trapping public will understand better as to where they can legally shoot and where they cannot. Even the nonhunting public will be able to distinguish between a legal shooting area and an illegal area without confusion.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There is really no one who loses anything or will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Changing the regulation. There is no need to change the regulation as it is a safety issue. Adding a sentence to clarify when a road or trail should be considered a drivable surface is all that is needed.

PROPOSED BY: Ace Callaway (HQ-04S-G-038)

PROPOSAL 49 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Allow hunting lynx with dogs as follows:

I think hunting lynx with dogs should have the same license laws as the current laws read for the trappers, and the same regulations and rules for hunting bears with dogs.

ISSUE: I would like the board to consider re-evaluating the regulations on hunting lynx with dogs. Allowing local houndsmen to pursue lynx with dogs allows us to work our dogs in the winter, when bear are in hibernation, without leaving the state.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? N/A

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Instead of setting traps and risking injury or catching the wrong game, we can safely catch and release lynx according to size or gender.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local houndsmen can work and train their dogs in the winter.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Kenny L. Smedly (HQ-04S-G-044)

PROPOSAL 50 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Allow use of dogs for recovery of wounded big game as follows:

(5) With the aid or use of a dog, except that a) a dog may be used to hunt black bear by permit issued at the discretion of the department: the department may issue a nontransferable permit to an individual who qualifies under the permit conditions established by the department in 5 AAC 92.068; and **b) except that a leashed tracking dog may be used to aid in the recovery of a wounded big game animal by permit issued at the discretion of the department: the department may issue a nontransferable permit to an individual who qualifies under the permit conditions established by the department**

ISSUE: Despite the best intentions of hunters, each season a significant number of game animals are mortally wounded but not recovered. With the exception of black bears, state law currently prohibits hunting big game with the aid of a dog. This proposal seeks to create an exemption to the prohibition on the use of dogs that would allow a leashed tracking dog handler who possesses a department issued, nontransferable permit, to use a trained, leashed tracking dog to aid in the tracking and recovery of a wounded big game animal.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Despite the best efforts of hunters, many mortally wounded big game animals will continue to go unrecovered.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would increase the recovery of wounded game animals and reduce wounding loss.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? (1) Hunters who might otherwise fail to recover mortally wounded big game animals; and (2) the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo, but many mortally wounded game animals would continue to go unrecovered.

PROPOSED BY: William Davidson (HQ-04S-G-046)

PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 92.085(8). Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Allow the same day airborne harvest for fox as follows:

Exclude fox from same day airborne regulations.

ISSUE: Not being able to hunt fox the same day you fly in to go hunting. The last administration allowed this to happen and it needs to be corrected.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Decreased opportunities to harvest fox.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Some organizations can use this to send out disinformation to increase fundraising. Fox hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The Board of Game, because you will have to listen to the anti-hunting organizations complain about it.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (HQ-04S-G-053)

PROPOSAL 52 - 5 AAC 92.085(3)(C)(ii). Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Modify restriction on archery equipment as follows:

5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions

The following methods and means of taking big game are prohibited in addition to the prohibitions in AAC 92.080:

...

- (3) with a longbow, recurve bow, or compound bow, unless the
 - (A) bow is not less than
 - (i) 40 pounds peak draw weight when hunting black-tailed deer, wolf, wolverine, black bear, Dall sheep, and caribou;
 - (ii) 50 pounds peak draw weight when hunting mountain goat, moose, elk, brown/grizzly bear, musk ox, and bison;
 - (B) arrow is tipped with a broadhead and is a minimum of 20 inches in overall length and is a minimum of 300 grains in total weight;
 - (C) broadhead is
 - (i) a fixed, replaceable or mechanical/retractable blade-type broadhead when taking black-tailed deer, wolf, wolverine, black bear, Dall sheep, and caribou;
 - (ii) [A FIXED OR REPLACEABLE BLADE-TYPE BROADHEAD WHEN TAKING] mountain goat, moose, elk, brown/grizzly bear, musk ox, and bison; and
 - (iii) not barbed;

ISSUE: A possible increase in the 'Wound Loss Rate' as a result of diminished accuracy of bowhunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Animals could die without recovery by the bowhunter. Some bowhunters would then search for another animal until a kill was accomplished and the animal recovered. Also animals could be seen by nonhunters that have been wounded which would negatively affect hunting in general.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The net affect will be that the ‘wound loss rate’ will be decreased and therefore fewer animals will be lost. By loosing fewer animals bowhunters will have less incentive to shoot more animals.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All consumptive and nonconsumptive users of animals.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? All hunting will suffer especially if the ‘wound loss rate’ increases.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Keith Lindsey (SC-04S-G-027)

PROPOSAL 53 - 5 AAC 92.085(10). Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.
Allow use of lighted nocks on arrows in archery hunts as follows:

(10) with the following archery equipment or devices in a restricted weapons hunt that authorizes taking by bow and arrow:

(A) any type of electronic device, or light attached to the bow, arrow, or arrowhead with the exception of a non-illuminating camera **and the use of a lightednock on the end of the arrow;**

ISSUE: Restrictions on the use of lighted nocks on arrows used for bow hunting that would significantly improve the recovery potential of hunted animals. The proposed regulation change would improve the recovery rate of a hunted animal through the use of this visual aid. Additionally, the ability of the bow hunter to determine the accuracy of their shot would improve. The lightednock attached to the arrow is activated as it passes a magnet attached to the bow itself, not aiding the hunter in the initial locating of the animal. This newly developed electronic device would not offer the bow hunter an unfair advantage in the targeting or likelihood of a bow successfully hitting the animal.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the use of lighted nocks on arrows is not approved, then interested bow hunters would be restricted from utilizing a newly developed electronic tool that would improve the recovery rate of hunted animals and potentially lessen the time needed to gain access to a shot animal.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this proposal would improve the bow hunters’ ability to recover a hunted animal, therefore reducing the potential of leaving an animal unrecovered. Additionally, recovery time would be reduced, lessening the time needed to gain access to the animal for field dressing, and potentially improving the quality of the salvaged meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bow hunters and their ability to recover a hunted animal and determine the accuracy of their shot.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Bear Allen (I-04S-G-001)

PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 92.085(8). Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Exclude approved Civil Air Patrol missions from the restriction on same day airborne hunting as follows:

(8)(c)
a person flying on a regularly scheduled commercial airline, including a commuter airline; **or participating in a US Airforce approved Civil Air Patrol Mission;** or

ISSUE: Civil Air Patrol Mission (CAP) pilots are being penalized for their volunteer efforts. Every hunting season on numerous days, CAP pilots respond to actual missions which may only take a couple of hours. Because they have been airborne, the pilots cannot hunt that day. The regulation “same day airborne” is actually penalizing them.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? (1) CAP's will continue to be penalized for their volunteer efforts; and (2) some CAPs may choose not to respond to an emergency.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? CAP air crews.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered quitting CAP missions during hunting season, but rejected that option because these missions are essential.

PROPOSED BY: Jim Gibertoni (I-04S-G-004)

PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Allow same day airborne taking of black bear from a bait station as follows:

Add Paragraph 8F: taking black bear from a registered bait station, between May 1 and June 30 provided the hunter is at least 300 feet from the aircraft at the time of harvest.

ISSUE: Eliminate the conflict between the provisions allowing bear baiting and the prohibition of same day big game hunting. Currently there is a disparity in treatment of hunters depending on the method used to access the hunting site. Boat, air boat, SUV, ATV, RV, and automobile operators

are allowed immediate hunting access to the resource at the bait station while aircraft owners must wait.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Smaller, younger bears usually show up after 3 am, when the aircraft hunter is allowed to hunt causing a harvest of younger bears. Also causes a disdain and disrespect for the law. To be surrounded by black bears hours before you can harvest one makes no sense. What reason is there to discriminate against the hunter gaining access by aircraft.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The change will allow the more even harvest of black bear sizes and age groups leaving a healthier resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This change will benefit aviation-based hunters including the young hunters and elders who find it difficult to stay up until 3 am to hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Maintain the status quo. However, it seems nonsensical that the existing regulations allow you to lure a bear to a bait station, then makes you wait until the next day to harvest them based on your form of transportation to the site. Looks unnecessarily discriminatory.

PROPOSED BY: Michael D. Gavin (I-04S-G-066)

PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Allow baiting of brown bear as follows:

Not use bait except for black bears under specific conditions and grizzly bears in all Intensive Management areas by allowing the moving of dead animals and/or kill site waste as long as all edible meat is salvaged from legally harvested animals.

ISSUE: Excessive bear predation on newborn calves in Intensive Management areas. By allowing the moving of “gut piles” and naturally occurring dead animals to areas of increased observation harvest success of predators will increase.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The continuing downward populations of moose will continue with a predator pit situation preventing recovery of prey populations.

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? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood

(I-04S-G-100)

PROPOSAL 57 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.
Liberalize methods for taking wolf as follows:

The list of animals with additional restrictions would remain. Just without wolf on the list.

ISSUE: Delete wolf from list of animals with additional restrictions for harvest. This will assist persons trying to harvest wolves to reduce predation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? N/A

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? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood

(I-04S-G-103)

PROPOSAL 58 - 5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemptions; and 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Repeal bear tag fee and allow black and brown bear baiting as follows:

In all units where moose or caribou hunting is restricted by permit or Tier II season preferences no tag fee, no closed season.

In all units where Intensive Management areas exist no tag fee, no closed season and the baiting of all bears may occur without special permit.

ISSUE: Encourage the harvest of bears in areas where prey population shortage exists in part due to bear predation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose and caribou populations will continue to decline. Urban and rural residents will compete for declining populations to feed their families.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. By reducing bear predation on moose and caribou calves the slaughter of newborns will lessen, and the quality and quantity of moose and caribou will occur.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? N/A

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? All persons (including viewers and tourists) who want to see more moose and caribou.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-04S-G-107)

PROPOSAL 59 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Allow same day airborne hunting of black bears hunted over bait as follows:

Add **(F) Black bears that are hunted over bait sites that are registered with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game** to the list of exemptions to the same day airborne rule.

ISSUE: Allow same day airborne hunting of black bears that are hunted over registered bait sites. This will reduce hunting pressure on black bears along the road system. Currently, hunters that could access baits via aircraft choose to hunt the road system because if they have a limited time to hunt (a weekend) this regulation unnecessarily limits available hunting time, making a road system hunt more attractive and thus adding additional pressure to the resource along the roads.

In addition, guides that offer fly in hunts over bait can offer an extra day of hunting for the same price, making it more attractive and easier to compete with low priced Canadian black bear hunts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Reduced hunting opportunity of an under-utilized resource. Loss of revenues in Alaska because hunters looking for guided black bear hunts will choose to hunt in Canada.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Anytime that you can reduce hunting pressure in areas with easy access (the road system) and transfer that pressure to a more remote area, you are more likely to have the opportunity to harvest mature male bears, thus improving the quality of the resource and the quality of the hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All black bear hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anti-hunters and opponents to bear baiting (mental anguish only).

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Stan Parkerson

(I-04S-G-133)

Note: This proposal was deferred from the March 2002 Board of Game meeting so that it could be considered for application on a statewide basis.

PROPOSAL 60 - 5 AAC 92.085(3). Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.

Modify restriction on archery equipment as follows:

Equipment: You may not hunt big game with bow unless the arrow is tipped with a broadhead, at least 20 inches in overall length and 650 grains total weight. For moose and brown/grizzly bear, arrows must weigh 900 grains total weight.

ISSUE: Wound rate is too high in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area. The reduction in arrow weight has accelerated the wound rate, due to penetration reduction. Lightweight arrows shoot well at targets, but are inadequate for hunting big game.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The data from the natal study on arrow penetration in South Africa demonstrated the most lethal arrows are a minimum of 650 grains for big game. Heavier arrows are needed for “super big” animals – 900 grain. Many animals will needlessly be lost, if lethal weight standards are not adopted.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who, after making a good hit, lose the animal because of inadequate penetration to be lethal. The resource will benefit as wound rates will decline. Managers will know more closely what human induced mortality is, for sustained yield calculation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who do not understand that arrows must have deep penetration to be lethal, as bullets do.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? To require a three inch single blade (two blade) broadhead which is found to have deepest penetration. It complicated the proposal, but further addresses wound rate reduction.

PROPOSED BY: Jack Reakoff

(HQ-04S-G-112)

(Was Proposal 143 in March 2002 meeting book)

(HQ-02S-G-017)

Note: This proposal was deferred from the March 2002 Board of Game meeting so that it could be considered for application on a statewide basis.

PROPOSAL 61 - 5 AAC 92.085(3). Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.
Modify restriction on archery equipment as follows:

Legal equipment for the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area consists of arrows and broadheads with a minimum combined weight of 425 grains for class one big game animals and a minimum of 540 grains for class two big game animals.

ISSUE: The Dalton Highway corridor is an entry level hunt for a significant number of archers. Many archers are using equipment that is designed for hunting smaller game from tree stands. This country is highly visible to all. This has resulted in a perceived increase in the number of marginal hits in a highly visible thoroughfare.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Public relations between other Dalton Highway users and archers will erode.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would directly improve the quality of resource and its pursuit. It provides a better definition of legal arrow weight.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All archers and the bow hunting community. Public relations between the archery community and the other wildlife and Dalton Highway users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Do nothing. This was rejected because of an ever increasing concern about poor public relations for hunting and friction between the bow hunting community and other users.

PROPOSED BY: Scotty B. Bennett (HQ-04S-G-113)
(Was Proposal 144 in March 2002 meeting book) (I-02S-G-045)

PROPOSAL 62 - 5 AAC 92.090. Unlawful methods of taking fur animals and 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking fur bearers; exceptions. This is a housekeeping proposal to align regulations concerning fur animals and furbearers with the recent changes made to AS 16.05.783. Same day airborne hunting.

5 AAC 92.090. Unlawful methods of taking fur animals. The following methods and means of taking fur animals under a hunting license are prohibited, in addition to the prohibitions in 5 AAC 92.080:

...

(3) a person who has been airborne may not take or assist in taking a fur animal until after 3:00 a.m. following the day in which the flying occurred; this paragraph does not apply [TO THE TAKING OF COYOTE OR SQUIRREL] if the person is at least 300 feet from the airplane at the time of taking.

5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking fur bearers; exceptions. (a) The following methods and means of taking furbearers under a trapping license are prohibited, in addition to the prohibitions in 5 AAC 92.080:

...

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

ISSUE: SB155 was passed this summer and amended AS 16.05.783 by removing the prohibition for same day airborne taking of fox and lynx. This proposal aligns the regulations to allow taking of fox and lynx on the same day a person has been airborne, as long as the person is over 300 feet from the airplane at the time of the taking.

A fur animal is a classification of animals subject to taking with a hunting license and includes beaver, coyote, arctic fox, red fox, lynx, flying squirrel, ground squirrel, or red squirrel that has not been domestically raised.

A furbearer is a classification of animals subject to taking with a trapping license, and includes beaver, coyote, arctic fox, red fox, lynx, marten, mink, least weasel, short-tailed weasel, muskrat, land otter, red squirrel, flying squirrel, ground squirrel, Alaskan marmot, hoary marmot, woodchuck, wolf, or wolverine.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Regulation will be out of compliance with the governing statute.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and trappers who use airplanes.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-089)

PROPOSAL 63 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions. Prohibit traps within two miles of any residence or road statewide as follows:

No traps allowed within two miles of any residence or road, and the traps would be invisible to eagles.

ISSUE: Pets (mainly dogs) are getting caught in traps that were set close to homes and roads. Several required veterinary care in Anchorage, which is very expensive from the bush. Eagles were getting trapped as well.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More pets and animals that shouldn't be trapped will be harmed.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The people who love their pets, and would like to take them out for a walk on dirt roads. The animals would benefit the most.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The trappers will have to work a little harder.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I would love to ban trapping entirely. It is cruel, and unnecessary. I know this won't happen.

PROPOSED BY: Sandra Bryan (HQ-04S-G-013)

PROPOSAL 64 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.
Require signage near trapping areas as follows:

Before placing a trap or snare within fifty (50) yards of a publicly maintained trail and/or trailhead and/or developed recreation site, the agency, division, department, or service, responsible for holding of the land shall display a sign at the trailhead or developed recreation site, indicating that traps or snares are in the area. A sign at publicly maintained trail or trailhead, or a developed recreation site must be at least 8 ½ X 11 inches in size, be clearly visible, and have letters that are visible in a color that contrasts with the color of the sign, and alerts non-consumptive users that trapping could potentially be occurring within the area. The sign could state: "Warning, trapping in this area allowed" or "Warning-Trapping Zone, Alaska Administrative Code No. 5 AAC 92.095".

ISSUE: The lack of signage and public notice in areas such as publicly maintained trails and trailheads and developed recreation sites where trapping occurs.

Trappers and non-consumptive users should be granted equal access to our public lands while also being alerted that trapping occurs in these areas during certain times of the year. One particular problem that could be minimized through this proposal is the lack of knowledge regarding trapping on state and federal lands and the unintentional injury to pets in traps and snares in areas seeing heavy recreational use.

In most areas around the state, voice control of unleashed domesticated animals is legal. Hunting, search and rescue, and obedience training are also other recognized activities where animals are normally off of leash in public areas and under voice control of their owners. The lack of signage increases the risk of injury due to unidentified trapping areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Some pets, game, and humans will be injured and killed by these traps in unidentified areas containing traps and snares. The increase of injuries and death of domesticated animals will only result in bad public perception of trapping.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Non-consumptive users, other trappers, and pet owners.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? An identification requirement for trappers to identify their traps through a numbered tagging system was considered reflecting the same regulations passed for Unit 1C, Gustavus area, and for Unit 20B, Fairbanks Management Area (Alaska Administrative Code No. 5 AAC 92.095). This proposal has not been sought due to issues and conflicts with trappers and anti-trappers potentially moving and sabotaging traps out of legal areas into illegal trapping lands. We understand these conflicts and are advocating for a simpler precautionary measure to address the increase of injuries and death of domesticated animals, specifically warning signage.

PROPOSED BY: Todd Brown and Deborah L. Mole, individually (SC-04S-G-059)

PROPOSAL 65 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions. Prohibit use of conibear traps within 50 yards of publicly maintained trails as follows:

A person shall not set a conibear trap, or a similar instant-killing type trap, within 50 yards of a publicly maintained trail or developed recreation site such as a public-use cabin, viewing platform, with the exception of submerged traps. For purposes of this regulation, a “publicly maintained trail” is a trail for which public funds have been expended for construction of improvements such as bridges, culverts, and the placement of fill, or for maintenance activities such as the removal of trees and brush.

ISSUE: Conflicts between trappers and non-consumptive users reduce the enjoyment of Alaska’s public lands for some, and should be minimized. One particular problem that should be minimized is the unintentional killing of pets in conibear and similar traps in areas seeing heavy recreational use.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Conflicts will continue and probably increase in number.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal concerns conflicts between different user groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Responsible trappers and recreational users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The proposer has not submitted a proposal for a larger buffer zone, or for a complete ban on trapping near designated trails since trapping is an important traditional use and should continue to occur on lands in Alaska, in addition to non-consumptive uses, in order to provide equal access to game resources. The proposer also asserts that a ban on conibear traps within a larger distance of trails would likely lessen the risks to non-consumptive users but would also inconvenience trappers.

The proposer believes it would be acceptable as a secondary solution to these issues to enact a regulation providing for a 25 yard set-back to accommodate any inconvenience to trappers.

It is noteworthy to add that the South Central Trapping and Recreational Committee, a subcommittee formed to characterize interactions among trappers and recreational users of trails in southcentral Alaska (units 7, 14A, and 14C), to investigate the extent of problems, if there were any, and to develop recommendations for either non-regulatory or regulatory solutions if needed, unanimously agreed to a similar proposal.

The committee was comprised of three advisory committee members, a representative of the Alaska Trappers Association, and two other participants.

The final consensus of that group is as follows: “No 280 or 330 conibear traps within 50 yards of publicly maintained trails, developed recreation sites, and the trailheads with the exception of submerged traps.”

PROPOSED BY: J. Todd Brown and Deborah L. Mole, individually (SC-04S-G-060)

PROPOSAL 66 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.
Require use of breakaway snares for trapping wolves statewide as follows:

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game has developed a breakaway snare. The new regulation would require trappers to use this type of snare for wolves.

ISSUE: At present there is no requirement for trappers to use breakaway snares. The snares currently used by many trappers catch large animals such as moose. A snare around the mouth or leg will ultimately result in the animal’s death.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? These unfortunate animals will continue to die a slow and painful death.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who values the animal resource and does not believe that it should be wasted.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There would be an expense to replace or modify existing snares, but the cost would be far outweighed by the beneficial effects on the resource. I know trappers who currently use breakaway snares and they report that their trapping harvest is not diminished by the use of the breakaway snare.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I did not consider any other solutions.

PROPOSED BY: Virgil Umphenour

(I-04S-G-062)

PROPOSAL 67 - 5 AAC 92.110 Control of predation by wolves. Adopt a statewide brown/grizzly bear conservation and management policy, modify 5 AAC 92.110 to change the title to "Control of predation by wolves and bears" and include the policy by reference, as follows:

DRAFT BROWN/GRIZZLY BEAR CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT POLICY

PURPOSES OF POLICY

1. To guide the Alaska Department of Fish & Game (Department), in implementing any bear control management actions pursuant to AS 16.05.255(e) and 5 AAC 92.106, when the Alaska Board of Game (Board) determines ungulate populations important for human consumption are being kept at low levels because of brown/grizzly bear predation.
2. To assure all management actions provide for the conservation¹ of Alaska's brown/grizzly bears, their habitat and food sources, and are consistent with the Alaska Constitution, and applicable statutes.
3. To encourage review and comment and interagency coordination.

BACKGROUND

Brown/grizzly bears (*Ursus arctos*) are large omnivores found throughout most of Alaska. Although they are considered the same species, brown and grizzly bears occupy different habitats and have somewhat different lifestyles and body configurations. Grizzlies are typically found in interior and northern areas. They are generally smaller than brown bears and more predatory. Brown bears live in coastal areas of southern Alaska where they have access to productive salmon streams.

Brown/grizzly bears are found throughout their historic range in Alaska, and unlike populations in the contiguous 48 states, they are not considered a threatened or endangered species. Estimating precise population numbers is difficult because of the bears' secretive habits and often densely vegetated habitat, but in most places in the state, populations are considered stable

¹ For the purposes of this policy, **conservation** means "the care, protection, management and wise use of wildlife and other natural resources."

or increasing. Throughout most coastal habitats where salmon are abundant, bear densities typically exceed 175 bears/1,000 km² (450 bears/1,000 mi²). A population in Katmai National Park on the Alaska Peninsula was measured at 550 bears/1,000 km² (1420 bears/1,000 mi²). In most interior and northern coastal areas, densities do not exceed 40 bears/1,000 km² (100 bears/1,000 mi²). Densities as low as 7 bears/1,000 km² (20 bears/1,000 mi²) have been measured in the eastern Brooks Range. Extrapolations from existing density estimates yielded an estimate of 31,700 brown bears in 1993. All indications are that the population has increased in the past decade.

Brown/grizzly bears have relatively low reproductive rates and require abundant resources. Population stability can be threatened by human-caused mortality and from fragmentation or destruction of habitat. This combination is present to a sufficient extent on the Kenai Peninsula that brown/grizzly bears there have been designated by the State as a “population of special concern.” To address situations where bear populations have declined because of human activities, the Department has implemented remedial management actions. In the Kenai situation, a conservation strategy has been developed through a public stakeholder process.

Bears are intelligent animals that learn to adapt to new situations. This ability, coupled with their enduring drive to rebuild fat reserves prior to denning, makes bears experts in finding ways to get a meal. Garbage is often a source of food from people. If this happens, bears learn to exploit human-related food resources and lose their natural tendencies to avoid people. Frequently, such bears become classified as “nuisance” bears and often are killed in defense of life or property (DLP).

Respected by most, and feared by many, brown/grizzly bears can pose a threat in certain situations. Statewide, there are an average of about six encounters a year in which a human is injured. About half of those involve hunters in search of other quarry. About every two or three years, one of the attacks results in a human fatality.

Public interest in watching brown/grizzly bears has increased dramatically in Alaska during the past decade. Some of this activity is incidental to other pursuits such as sport fishing, hiking, or flight seeing, but much of it is specifically targeted at bear viewing. Bear viewing is a rapidly growing industry in selected areas of the state. The demand exceeds the opportunities provided by such established and controlled sites as McNeil River, Pack Creek and Brooks Camp. As a result, many entrepreneurs are spreading throughout high-density bear areas to provide clients with viewing opportunities.

Whenever bears and people interact with each other there are potential benefits and dangers. Displacing bears from feeding sites has serious consequences for them. Human behavior around bears not only impacts their own personal safety and viewing experience, it also impacts the health and safety of the bears and the people who come to the area later. When bears and people meet, it is important that bears never get food from them and that people are trained how to react to bear encounters. Comprehensive education is recognized as a vital component in all aspects of any bear viewing program.

Alaska is world-renowned as a brown/grizzly bear hunting area. It is the only place in the United States where they are hunted in large numbers, and the vast majority of record book bears come from the state. An average of about 1,500 bears are harvested each year, and the trend has been increasing. Many of the hunters are nonresidents and their economic impact is considerable. Hunters have traditionally been the strongest advocates for bears and their habitat, providing consistent financial and political support for research and management programs.

Because brown/grizzly bears can be both prey and predators, their relationship with people is complex. In areas where a population of large ungulates has been reduced to low levels by hunting and/or predation, brown/grizzly bears may have a regulating influence on species such as moose. This is especially true when bears are found in combination with thriving wolf populations. The role of bears in these situations greatly exacerbates the debate over predator control and complicates evaluation of potential management actions.

GOALS

1. To ensure the long-term conservation of brown/grizzly bears throughout their historic range in Alaska.
2. To provide guidelines for developing, implementing, and evaluating any brown/grizzly bear management actions designed to reduce bear predation in specific areas for specific time periods.
3. To increase public awareness and understanding of the uses, conservation, and management of brown/grizzly bears and their habitat in Alaska.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1. Manage brown/grizzly bears as part of the overall predator-prey relationship rather than pursue single species management.
2. Protect the genetic diversity of brown/grizzly bears.
3. Continue, and if appropriate accelerate research and management of brown/grizzly bears.
4. Consider short-term and long-term effects of habitat loss and fragmentation on bear populations.
5. Provide for consumptive and non-consumptive uses of brown/grizzly bears in management plans.
6. Do not allow identified prey populations to decline to a point where predation keeps them at low levels.
7. Avoid, where possible, programs that encourage the habituation of bears.
8. Implement measures to reduce brown/grizzly numbers to allow prey species to increase to population management objectives in areas managed for high consumptive use where predation is keeping prey at low levels.

9. Wherever possible, reduce brown/grizzly numbers through liberalized seasons, bag limits, and hunting methods and means, and through tag fee waivers rather than implementing formalized control programs.
10. Conduct brown/grizzly bear control activities for the minimum amount of time necessary to achieve the stated management objective for a specific area.
11. Establish minimum population goals that ensure the long-term viability of brown/grizzly bears in an area, recognizing the slow reproductive capacity of brown/grizzly bears.
12. Implement this policy in such a manner that the Department and the Alaska Board of Game can respond promptly to unforeseen situations.
13. Consider the management goals and objectives of state, federal, and private landowners and work cooperatively with them to design, implement, and evaluate bear control activities.
14. Pursue informational and educational efforts to help the public understand more about brown/grizzly bears and their management.
15. Work with enforcement agencies to identify priorities and to assist with and encourage adequate enforcement activities.
16. Review and recommend revisions to this policy as needed.

CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT

Management Strategies

As it does with most species statewide, the Department will manage brown/grizzly bears differently in different parts of the state. In some areas, such as the Kodiak Archipelago, portions of Southeast Alaska and the Alaska Peninsula, bears are managed for aesthetically pleasing trophy-hunting and viewing opportunities. In many other areas of the state, brown/grizzly bear populations are largely unaffected by human harvest, but continue to be an important big game species sought by resident and nonresident hunters and are managed to maximize opportunity for harvest. Keeping brown/grizzly bear populations in balance with wolf and ungulate species will be the strategy in areas that are identified as important for high levels of human consumption of prey species.

Bear hunting will be conducted on a sustained yield basis, except in areas where a bear predation control program is approved. Harvests will not be allowed to threaten the long-term population survival of brown/grizzly bears. In most areas of the state, sustained brown/grizzly bear harvests will generally be 4-8% of the estimated total population. Some brown/grizzly bear populations may be able to sustain a harvest above these guidelines and these will be evaluated for more liberal harvest programs. In areas where brown/grizzly bears have been identified as an important component in reducing and/or holding prey populations well below objectives, higher harvest levels will be allowed. . Lacking precise population data, managers will continue to indirect parameters to assess the status of brown/grizzly bear populations.

All brown/grizzly bears harvested under the general hunting regulations must be inspected and sealed by a Department representative, and hunters must obtain a bear tag prior to going in the field (except where the requirement is waived for residents). Nonresident, brown/grizzly bear hunters must be accompanied in the field by a registered big game guide or a resident relative. Sows accompanied by cubs, and the cubs, are protected. The Department will continue to maintain these strategies and regulations for most of the state, unless it is necessary to consider methods to increase bear harvests as part of a bear predation control program.

Large areas of the state have subsistence brown bear hunts with liberal seasons and bag limits, mandatory meat salvage, and relaxed sealing requirements. The Department will continue to accommodate subsistence needs and will consider the impacts on subsistence while devising any bear predation control programs.

Bear viewing and bear/human interactions are also important aspects of bear management in Alaska. Increasing interest in watching bears at concentrated feeding areas such as salmon streams and sedge flats is challenging managers to find appropriate levels of human activities near bears without jeopardizing people or bears. These burgeoning activities also compete in some cases with more traditional activities such as hunting. The Department and other land managers will seek to strike a balance between user groups by separating viewing and hunting by time and, if necessary, by space. Brown/grizzly bear hunting and viewing are compatible in many situations, however there are areas where the two uses conflict. Management programs should be developed that are not mutually exclusive by avoiding habituation wherever possible. Adoption and implementation of “best-viewing” practices provide the best way to provide such assurances. Recommendations on how deal with hunting and viewing in the same location have been made in some brown bear management plans.

In areas where formal bear management plans have been developed, the Department will adhere to the recommendations included in those plans.

Research Strategies

Developing and implementing precise, cost-effective methods for determining brown/grizzly bear populations will continue to be a research priority for the Department. Work to date suggests that no single population estimation method will work across the state given the vast areas, varied topography, differing vegetation communities and great differences in bear density. Some methods work well in one area but not in another. Aerial stream surveys, line-transect surveys, capture-mark-recapture, intensive aerial surveys, and DNA analysis are some of the tools that can be utilized to provide population estimates.

Predator–prey relationships between bears and large ungulates have not been thoroughly examined in most of the state. Bears use a wide variety of foods seasonally including vegetation, fish, mammals, birds, and carrion and they are exceptionally adaptable in their ability to capitalize on available food resources. Consequently, the impact of ungulate prey abundance on bears is difficult to ascertain. Similarly, the impact of bears on prey populations is multifaceted and can be further compounded by the presence of other predators such as wolves. In areas where bear predation control programs are considered, the Department may devise specific research projects to investigate the interrelationships between brown/grizzly bears and other

species and their habitats. Alternatively, the Department may use standard survey and inventory data and interpretation of other research results to guide the decision-making process.

Where appropriate, the Department will cooperate in research efforts with other agencies. Research findings will be reported in a timely fashion and presented in a form that is easily understood by the public.

Information and Education Strategies

Public education is critical in any brown/grizzly bear management program. Perhaps as much as any species in Alaska, bears elicit a wide variety of emotions, have myriad uses, and directly impact peoples' lives both in the field and near settlements. Clear, objective information is necessary for citizens and managers alike to make wise decisions when dealing with bears. As the agency primarily responsible for bear management, the Department must take a lead role in producing and disseminating this information.

Bear information will be developed for a wide range of audiences and be delivered in a variety of media. A principal focus of bear education will be to promote a better understanding of life history, behavior, and habitat associations. Specific messages will include discussions of bear/human interactions, bear hunting, bear viewing, and bear predation on moose and caribou. To assure consistent and accurate presentation of bear information, the Department will continue to work with the Alaska Interagency Bear Safety Education Committee. The Department will strive to include the public in all bear management decisions. The primary method of public involvement will be through existing local Fish and Game Advisory Committee and Board processes. Whenever practical or necessary, citizen-driven bear management plans will be sponsored and supported by the Department. To date, such plans have been developed for Game Management Unit 4, the Kenai Peninsula, and the Kodiak Archipelago. The Department is committed to implementing as many of the recommendations from bear management plans as possible.

In any situation where the Board or Department believe brown/grizzly bear predation control may become necessary, the public will be informed as soon as possible. Detailed information on the specific location, the predator, prey and habitat concerns, and the proposed management action and its anticipated costs and duration will be widely disseminated. Public meetings may be held in the affected area and in major Alaska communities, in addition to regularly scheduled Board and Advisory Committee meetings. Once implemented, the Department will provide the Board and the public with an annual report and evaluation of the management action.

Control

Based on careful consideration of scientific information and public comment, the Department and the Board believe that in limited circumstances in some areas it may be beneficial and appropriate to control predation by bears to achieve population and human use objectives.

The Board may consider brown/grizzly bear control when:

1. Brown/grizzly bear predation is a significant factor in an unacceptable decline in prey population size or productivity;

2. Brown/grizzly bear predation is a significant factor preventing recovery of a low density prey population; or
3. Brown/grizzly bear predation is a significant factor preventing attainment of approved prey population or human-use objectives.

If the Department or the Board determines that one or more of these conditions exist in a given area, at the Board's direction, the Department will prepare an implementation plan for public review that includes:

- Statement of the proposed action, including methods and means;
- Justification for the proposed action, including previous measures taken that failed to achieve the brown/grizzly bear and prey objectives and other alternatives considered;
- Geographical description of the area;
- Population and human use objectives;
- Relevant information about wildlife populations and human use, including brown/grizzly bear and prey population status and trend, harvest information, habitat, and estimates of the effects of all predators on prey populations;
- Estimate of the time and funding necessary to meet population and human use objectives; and,
- Schedule for update and reevaluation of the program.

Brown/grizzly bear control will be implemented using the most humane, selective, and effective methods available. If additional methods that do not require killing of bears are found to achieve desired results in a reasonable time and with reasonable financial resources, they will be considered. The Department does not intend to use lethal trapping, aerial shooting, or land-and-shoot taking for bear control. At no time will poisons be used for bear control.

Nothing in this policy affects the authority under state or federal laws for an individual to protect human life or property from bears (5 AAC 92.410). All reasonable steps must be taken to protect life and property by non-lethal means before a bear is killed.

PROPOSED BY: Submitted by Dept. at the request of the Board of Game

PROPOSAL 68 - 5 AAC 92.135. Transfer of possession. Repeal transfer of possession restrictions as follows:

Delete all transfer of possession statement regulations. Wild game meat is a valuable resource, which if shared or given away can be easily verified. To require the receiving person to have the

statement is just plain unworkable. Go to any rural village and check for hunting licenses and these statements.

ISSUE: Complicated regulations which makes honest persons criminals. The Transfer of Possession Statement requiring dual signatures, name, addresses, and subunit data about the harvest is ridiculous, and hinders customary and traditional sharing.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? N/A

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All persons who want to help others transport their harvest or receive unprocessed game meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The police who harass hunters traveling home.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-04S-G-099)

PROPOSAL 69 - 5 AAC 92.200. Purchase and sale of game. Allow for the sale of black bear hides and skulls statewide as follows:

Not buy, sell, or barter any part of a black or brown/grizzly bear except **for the hide and skull of a black bear and** an article of handicraft made from the fur of a black bear.

Not buy, sell or barter any big game animal skulls (except wolves, wolverines, **and black bears**).

ISSUE: There are multiple problems solved by this proposal: (1) The waste of black bear hides and skulls as marketable renewable natural resources; (2) the unacceptable level of black bear predation on moose and caribou calves; (3) the high probability that black bear baiting will be banned by initiative thus resulting in unacceptable low level of black bear harvesting; and (4) the burden on hunters in finding a human use for more than a few hides or skulls.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Black bears will not be harvested at acceptable levels. A natural resource (hides and skulls) will be wasted; either left in the field or relegated to attics, garages, or rotting on the sides of outbuildings.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Hunters will properly salvage hides and skulls for market instead of half-hearted effort required by law that results in trash. Hides and skulls of bears shot for various crimes (eg. eating four wheeler tires and seats; throwing freezer in yard; stealing fish from boat; eating dog's month supply of dog food, etc.) may actually be salvaged and sealed by the department, thus resulting in more accurate biological harvest data.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone who doesn't need to store another unwanted hide or skull. Rural residents could add the income from the sales of hides and skulls to their meager trapping incomes.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow the sale of only raw hides. Rejected because allowing more hides on the market will have a moderating influence on the value of hides.

PROPOSED BY: Mount Yenlo Advisory Committee (HQ-04S-G-024)

PROPOSAL 70 - 5 AAC 92.200. Purchase and sale of game. Allow the sale of handicraft articles from the fur of black and brown bears statewide as follows:

You may sell handicraft articles from the fur of a black bear and a brown/grizzly bear

ISSUE: The sale of brown/grizzly fur and/or hide. I would put this statewide.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued low harvest of bears in areas with one bear per year.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, not only could you take a grizzly for the meat and the hide, you could make hand crafted items to sell a value added product.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone; hunters, and skin sewers and ungulates, especially moose calves and caribou calves.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Other solution was selling the hide of a brown/grizzly. Rejected because Fish and Wildlife Protection continue to lobby that this is a problem for them, that I do not believe. Its time to put a little faith in people.

PROPOSED BY: Sue Entsminger (HQ-04S-G-050)

PROPOSAL 71 - 5 AAC 92.200. Purchase and sale of game. Allow the sale of black bear hide, skulls and claws statewide as follows:

Allow the sale of black bear hides, skulls and claws.

ISSUE: Make it legal to sell black bear hides, skulls and claws.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued loss of resource value.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Selling black bear hides, skulls and claws will increase the resource value.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and anyone who wants to see the entire bear utilized.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anyone who does not want to see economic benefits enhanced.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Change black bears to furbearer status.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-04S-G-051)

PROPOSAL 72 - 5 AAC 92.200. Purchase and sale of game. Allow sale of bear parts statewide as follows:

The sale and/or purchase of bear hides and skulls and/or taxidermist prepared hides, rugs, mounts or skulls is permitted.

ISSUE: The idea that once an animal is harvested that the department should still regulate it. The department should focus on increasing our game populations and not regulating persons or game after the harvest is reported.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will spend its resources on human dimensions study and not on game resource biology.

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? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-04S-G-095)

PROPOSAL 73 - 5 AAC 92.260. Taking cub bears and female bears with cubs prohibited. Allow harvest of sow and cub bears in designated management areas statewide as follows:

In areas designated as active predator management areas, allow the harvesting of bear sows and cubs.

ISSUE: Declining moose populations. Bears are eating calves.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose populations will continue to decline.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, for the moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose and their calf.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Animal cultist (animal rights people who worship animals and put them before people).

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The department could shoot bears from the air, but this would be too politically incorrect.

PROPOSED BY: Allen Dubord (SC-04S-G-039)

PROPOSAL 74 - 5 AAC 92.260. Taking cub bears and female bears with cubs prohibited.
Modify restriction on taking bear cubs as follows:

You may not take brown/grizzly bear cubs or sows accompanied by cubs. Cub bear means (brown/grizzly) bear in the first year of life.

ISSUE: High number of brown/grizzly bears in Unit 13. Would like to align the definition of brown/grizzly cubs with definition of black bear cubs.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continuing high brown bear populations in Unit 13 with high moose calf and caribou calf predation.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters, because of moose and caribou populations increase. Bear hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? With a potentially increased bear harvest, non-consumptive users may be marginally impacted.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Bear baiting, bounties, legalizing sale of bear hides and parts, same day airborne hunting, legalization of snowmobile hunting. None of these solutions were agreeable with all our members.

PROPOSED BY: Paxson Advisory Committee (SC-04S-G-041)

PROPOSAL 75 - 5 AAC 92.260. Taking cub bears and female bears with cubs prohibited.
Modify restriction on taking cub bears as follows:

Not hunt a cub bear or a sow accompanied by cub(s). Cub bear means a bear of all species in its first year of life.

ISSUE: Different definitions of cub bear. Is difficult to tell a two year old bear from a three year old bear, but all hunters can identify a newborn cub in its first year. Sow bears are not being harvested with older offspring. These females need to be harvested to help reduce predation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sow bears with older offspring won't be harvested due to confusion over age of "cubs".

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All persons who are concerned by the excessive bear predation on newborn moose calves.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? These sow bears will never be harvested and continue to produce more bears, adding to the predation problem.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levengood (I-04S-G-101)

PROPOSAL 76 – 5 AAC 92.265. Taking moose calves prohibited. Eliminate the statewide prohibition on taking moose calves as follows:

[5AAC 92.265. TAKING MOOSE CALVES PROHIBITED.

A PERSON MAY NOT TAKE A MOOSE CALF, AS DEFINED IN 5 AAC 92.990, EXCEPT THAT, IF OTHERWISE PERMITTED UNDER THIS TITLE, THE TAKING OF A MOOSE CALF IS NOT PROHIBITED IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS:

UNIT	AREA
(1) UNIT 1(C)	BERNERS BAY
	GUSTAVUS FORLANDS
(2) UNIT 5(A)	NUNATAK BENCH
(3) UNIT 7 AND 14(C)	PLACER RIVER DRAINAGE
(4) UNIT 14(A)	ENTIRE UNIT
(5) UNIT 14(C)	ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE
	BIRCHWOOD MANAGEMENT AREA
	FT. RICHARDSON

REMAINDER OF UNIT 14(C) AS
DEFINED IN 5 AAC 85.045

- | | |
|----------------|----------------------------|
| (6) UNIT 16(B) | KALGIN ISLAND |
| (7) UNIT 20(A) | ENTIRE UNIT |
| (8) UNIT 20(B) | FAIRBANKS MANAGEMENT AREA] |

ISSUE: A statewide prohibition on taking moose calves was adopted by the Board of Game in 2002. There are a number of disadvantages to this prohibition. It has inadvertently resulted in regulatory complications, inconsistencies, and legal uncertainties. It could reduce hunting opportunity in some situations and implies that taking moose calves is never a biologically sound wildlife management tool. Having a general prohibition on the taking of moose calves at the same time that calf hunts are being conducted in areas approved by the board (e.g., Unit 20A), sends a mixed message to the hunting public. This makes it difficult to gain public support for calf hunts in areas where they are biologically justified. Finally, a statewide prohibition reduces management flexibility, which is particularly important in Intensive Management areas.

The rationale for repealing the prohibition on taking moose calves fall into two general categories: regulatory and biological. Regulatory reasons to eliminate this regulation include: (1) “Antlerless” moose hunts are confounded. It is now illegal to take an antlerless calf in an “antlerless” hunt (e.g., Minto Flats Management Area Tier II hunt), except in a few specific areas where the board has provided for exceptions. This makes interpreting moose regulations across the state complicated and confusing; (2) If there are indications that calf harvest is affecting population growth or sustainability in an area, it is simpler to protect calves in that specific area than to prohibit calf hunts statewide; (3) It brings into question the legality of taking a calf moose for potlatches; (4) Currently, 5 AAC 92.265 makes the “one bull” bag limit technically incorrect throughout codified and the regulations booklet (i.e., wording should be changed to “one antlered bull” throughout both documents if 92.265 is not repealed); (5) The prohibition on taking calf moose is inconsistent in that there is no analogous prohibition on taking calves or fawns of other species (e.g., deer, sheep and caribou) in Alaska; and (6) The prohibition on taking calves is more restrictive than other states (i.e., a search of most western states found no other state that protects calves or fawns, except for spotted fawns in California).

Biological reasons include: (1) Calves are not harvested in significant numbers anywhere in the state. Hunter demand for calves is relatively low compared to bulls and cows, yet calves usually comprise 15 to 25 percent of the fall population; (2) The harvest of calves is more compensatory than the harvest of adults. Because fewer calves survive through winter than any other age class, a higher proportion of calves that are killed by hunters would die in any case, especially when food is limiting. Therefore, taking calves should increase yield, as has been demonstrated in Scandinavia and several Canadian provinces; (3) Harvesting calves emulates nature (i.e., natural mortality) more closely than “bulls-only” hunts; (4) Calf hunts can be used as a management tool in areas with low bull:cow ratios to reduce hunting pressure on adult bulls while maintaining hunting opportunity. This is particularly important in Intensive Management areas where harvest objectives are set in regulation; and (5) Taking calves is an efficient use of the resource in terms of allocation of meat. That is, families that need less meat can choose to take a calf, rather than a large, adult animal. A moose calf in the fall provides as much meat as an average sized caribou.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The opportunity to hunt a surplus of calf moose during general season, subsistence and potlatch moose hunts in most areas will continue to be lost, despite the fact that regulated calf harvest has not been shown to be biologically detrimental

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, additional hunting opportunity will be provided.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters benefit from the opportunity to harvest calf moose in subsistence hunts (e.g., Minto Flats Management Area Tier II hunt), general season bulls-only hunts, and potlatch hunts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Protect calves in areas where over-harvest can be demonstrated or it is a potential concern.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-090)

PROPOSAL 77 - 5 AAC 92.265. Taking moose calves prohibited. Prohibit calf moose hunts statewide as follows:

Calf hunting in Alaska is not legal.

ISSUE: The calf hunt in the Tanana Flats area is an unethical hunt, that and we are trying to get more moose to hunt and the department wants to kill our recruitment off. That and there is less than 100 pounds of meat there. Why not let it grow up and shoot it in its second year of life and get more meat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose will be killed off where we will not have any to hunt.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Shameful and downright embarrassing and unethical.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The people of Alaska because they would have more moose and would not be looked down at for being baby killers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one would suffer. We would gain moose and have more of a chance to kill moose in the future.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close the area to nonresidents.

PROPOSED BY: Lee (Skip) Olsen and the Interior Alaska Airboaters Association (I-04S-G-008)

PROPOSAL 78 - 5 AAC 92.400. Emergency taking of game. Expand the emergency taking of game provision to include unemployed residents as follows:

The emergency of taking of game regulations should be changed so that residents, who are unemployed, can take wild game, if the wild game population is held at a sustainable level of conservation.

ISSUE: The residents, who do not have jobs, do not have the means to provide for their livelihood, and cannot purchase meat or groceries from a local grocery store.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The residents who are unemployed do not have the means to purchase meat to provide for their families. Food stamps provided by the government do not last throughout the month. They do not have cash to buy groceries since they do not hold jobs. They will have hard times in providing for their families. If they have an opportunity to provide meat for their families in amended Emergency Taking of Game regulations, then they can have wild game for their families to eat.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Not applicable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The residents, who do not have the means to provide meat for their families. They will be able to hunt and take wild game, any time during the year, as long as the wild game population is held at a sustainable conservation level.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one is likely to suffer, if a hunt is allowed for those residents who really need wild game to provide for their families.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow for a longer hunting season under the Tier II Subsistence Hunting Regulations.

PROPOSED BY: Ken Johns, President and CEO of AHTNA, Inc. (SC-04S-G-057)

PROPOSAL 79 - 5 AAC 92.410. Taking game in defense of life or property. Allow for harvest of habituated animals as follows:

Added to the existing text should be the following:

However a police officer or Alaska Department of Fish and Game official may give permission for a person to harvest and retain a dangerous habituated animal if they reasonably believe that the habituated animal poses a threat to injure or harm the applicant or his property.

ISSUE: Allow harvest of dangerous habituated game animals. Sometimes moose or bears become habituated to gardens or livestock feed and become dangerous to property owners. Persons with hunting licenses should be permitted by a police officer or department official to harvest and keep the harvested animal.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Persons who are placed in danger by these habituated animals are fearful to shoot the animal for fear of prosecution.

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? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levengood (I-04S-G-094)

PROPOSAL 80 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. Permit for hunting black bears with the use of bait or scent lures; 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions; and 5 AAC 92.003. Hunter education and orientation requirements. This proposal simplifies and aligns the process of registering a bait station site to mirror registration hunts. The registration of a bear bait station would be handled as a registration permit for the person establishing the station, and would allow the department to apply discretionary hunt conditions necessary on an unit by unit basis.

5 AAC 92.XXX. Permit for hunting black bears with the use of bait or scent lures. (a) The department will issue a permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures as provided for in 5 AAC 92.085(4). A permit issued under this section is subject to the following restrictions:

- (i) no person may establish a black bear bait station unless that person obtains a permit; in addition, in Units 7, 14(A), 14(B), 15, 16(A), and 20(B), a person must complete a bear hunter clinic given by the department before that person can obtain a permit from the department;
- (ii) no person under the age of 16 may be issued a permit;
- (iii) no person may have more than two bait stations established (bait present) at any one time;
- (iv) no person may use bait or scent lures within one-quarter mile of a publicly maintained road, trail, or the Alaska Railroad;
- (v) no person may use bait or scent lures within one mile of a house or other permanent dwelling, or within one mile of a developed campground or developed recreational facility;
- (vi) no person may give or receive remuneration for the use of a bait station, including barter or exchange of goods; however, this does not apply to licensed guide-outfitters who personally accompany the client at the bait station site;
- (vii) a person using bait or scent lures shall clearly identify the site with a sign reading "black bear bait station" that also displays the person's hunting license number, and the permit number;

(viii) only biodegradable materials may be used for bait; only the head, bones, viscera, or skin of legally harvested fish and game may be used for bait. In Units 7 and 15, fish or fish parts may not be used for bait.

(ix) in areas where the bag limit is greater than one, the department may limit the number of bears taken over bait as a condition of the permit;

(x) a person using bait shall remove bait, litter, and equipment from the bait station site when hunting is completed.

5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. The following methods and means of taking big game are prohibited in addition to the prohibitions in 5 AAC 92.080.

...

(4) with the use of bait for ungulates and with the use of bait or scent lures for any bear; except that black bears may be taken with the use of bait or scent lures **as authorized by a permit under 5 AAC 92.XXX;**

(A) no person may intentionally obstruct or hinder a bait station permittee's feasibility of taking black bear by using the station without the permittee's written permission;

[ONLY AS FOLLOWS:

[(A) IN UNITS 1(A), 1(B), 1(D), 2, 3, 5 – 7 (EXCEPT RESURRECTION CREEK AND ITS TRIBUTARIES), 11, 13, 14(A), 14(B), 15, 16(A) (EXCEPT DENALI STATE PARK), AND 17 FROM APRIL 15 THROUGH JUNE 15; IN UNITS 12, 16(B), 19 - 21, 24, AND 25(A), 25(B), AND 25(C) FROM APRIL 15 THROUGH JUNE 30; IN UNIT 25(D) FROM APRIL 15 THROUGH JUNE 30 AND FROM AUGUST 1 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 25; IN THE PORTION OF UNITS 21(D) AND 24 WITHIN THE KOYUKUK CONTROLLED USE AREA FROM SEPTEMBER 1 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 25; AND WITHIN THE UNIT 19(D)-EAST WOLF PREDATION CONTROL AREA, DESCRIBED IN 5 AAC 92.125(1), FROM SEPTEMBER 1 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30;

(B) BAITING OF BLACK BEARS IS SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING RESTRICTIONS:

(I) ONLY BIODEGRADABLE MATERIALS MAY BE USED FOR BAIT; ONLY THE HEAD, BONES, VISCERA, OR SKIN OF LEGALLY HARVESTED FISH AND GAME MAY BE USED FOR BAIT. IN UNITS 7 AND 15, FISH OR FISH PARTS MAY NOT BE USED FOR BAIT.

(II) A PERSON MAY NOT USE BAIT WITHIN ONE-QUARTER MILE OF A PUBLICLY MAINTAINED ROAD, TRAIL, THE ALASKA RAILROAD, OR THE UNIT 14 SHORELINES OF THE SUSITNA RIVER AND LITTLE SUSITNA RIVER SOUTH OF THE PARKS HIGHWAY BRIDGE, OR THE UNIT 16 SHORELINES OF THE SUSITNA RIVER, YENTNA RIVER BELOW THE CONFLUENCE WITH THE SKWENTNA RIVER, THE DESHKA RIVER (KROTO CREEK) BELOW THE CONFLUENCE WITH TRAPPER CREEK, AND ALEXANDER CREEK, OR THE UNIT 7 OR 15 SHORELINES OF THE KENAI RIVER, KASILOF RIVER, AND SWANSON RIVER;

(III) NO PERSON MAY USE BAIT OR SCENT LURES WITHIN ONE MILE OF A HOUSE OR OTHER PERMANENT DWELLING, OR WITHIN ONE MILE OF A DEVELOPED CAMPGROUND OR DEVELOPED RECREATIONAL FACILITY;

(IV) A PERSON USING BAIT OR SCENT LURES SHALL CLEARLY IDENTIFY THE SITE WITH A SIGN READING "BLACK BEAR BAIT STATION" THAT ALSO DISPLAYS THE PERSON'S HUNTING LICENSE NUMBER, AND A NUMBER ASSIGNED BY THE DEPARTMENT UNDER (VIII) OF THIS SUBPARAGRAPH;

(V) A PERSON USING BAIT SHALL REMOVE BAIT, LITTER, AND EQUIPMENT FROM THE BAIT STATION SITE WHEN HUNTING IS COMPLETED;

(VI) NO PERSON MAY GIVE OR RECEIVE REMUNERATION FOR THE USE OF A BAIT STATION, INCLUDING BARTER OR EXCHANGE OF GOODS; HOWEVER, THIS DOES NOT APPLY TO LICENSED GUIDE-OUTFITTERS WHO PERSONALLY ACCOMPANY THE CLIENT AT THE BAIT STATION SITE;

(VII) NO PERSON MAY HAVE MORE THAN TWO BAIT STATIONS ESTABLISHED (BAIT PRESENT) AT ANY ONE TIME;

(VIII) A PERSON MAY NOT ESTABLISH A BLACK BEAR BAIT STATION UNLESS THAT PERSON FIRST REGISTERS THE SITE WITH THE DEPARTMENT; REGISTRATION CONSISTS OF COMPLETELY FILLING OUT A REGISTRATION FORM AVAILABLE AT ALL DIVISION OF WILDLIFE CONSERVATION OFFICES IN UNITS OPEN TO BEAR BAITING, AND ASSIGNMENT OF A REGISTRATION NUMBER; IN ADDITION, IN UNITS 7, 14(A), 14(B), 15, 16(A), AND 20(B), A PERSON MUST COMPLETE A BEAR HUNTER CLINIC GIVEN BY THE DEPARTMENT BEFORE THAT PERSON CAN REGISTER A BLACK BEAR BAIT STATION WITH THE DEPARTMENT; IF THE DEPARTMENT DOES NOT PROVIDE A BEAR HUNTER CLINIC, PROOF THAT THE PERSON COMPLETED A HUNTER EDUCATION CLASS THAT INCLUDED INSTRUCTION ON HUNTER CONSERVATION PRINCIPLES MAY BE SUBSTITUTED FOR THE BEAR HUNTER CLINIC REQUIRED UNDER THIS PARAGRAPH

(IX) IN AREAS WHERE THE BAG LIMIT IS GREATER THAN ONE, THE DEPARTMENT MAY LIMIT THE NUMBER OF BEARS TAKEN OVER BAIT AS A CONDITION OF REGISTRATION;

(X) THE DEPARTMENT MAY PROHIBIT ESTABLISHMENT OF A BLACK BEAR BAITING STATION WITHIN A PORTION OF ANY UNIT LISTED IN (A) OF THIS PARAGRAPH ON AN ANNUAL BASIS FOR THE SOLE PURPOSE OF AVOIDING LOCALIZED OVER-HARVEST OF BEARS;

(XI) A PERSON MAY NOT TAKE A BLACK BEAR OVER BAIT IN UNITS 7, AND 14 - 16 WITH A BOW AND ARROW UNLESS THE HUNTER HAS SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED A DEPARTMENT-APPROVED BOWHUNTING COURSE;

(XII) NO PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF 16 MAY REGISTER A BAITING STATION;

(XIII) NO PERSON MAY INTENTIONALLY OBSTRUCT OR HINDER A BAIT STATION REGISTRANT'S FEASIBILITY TO TAKING GAME BY USING THE STATION WITHOUT THE REGISTRANT'S WRITTEN PERMISSION;
(XIV) A PERSON MAY NOT USE BAIT IN THAT PORTION OF UNIT 1D ON THE CHILKAT PENINSULA SOUTH OF THE HAINES HIGHWAY, WITHIN ONE MILE OF THE HAINES HIGHWAY, LUTAK ROAD, THE PORCUPINE MINE ROAD TO THE CONFLUENCE OF THE PORCUPINE AND KLEHINI RIVERS, AND THE CHILKAT LAKE ROAD FROM THE PORCUPINE BRIDGE TO CHILKAT LANDING ON THE TSIRKU RIVER;]

5 AAC 92.003. Hunter education and orientation requirements.

...

(g) a person may not take a black bear over bait in Units 7, and 14 - 16 with a bow and arrow unless the hunter has successfully completed a department-approved bowhunting course;

ISSUE: Currently the regulations for bear baiting are found under methods and means. Restrictions have been added over the years, until the section has become burdensome and confusing. Registering a bait sight is very similar to other registration permit hunts, and administratively changing the registration of bear baiting sites to be treated as registration permits simplifies the process and allows discretionary conditions to be applied by the local biologist.

Two conditions for bear baiting currently apply to all hunters hunting over bait, not just the hunter establishing the bait station. The requirement to obtain written permission would remain in the methods and means regulation, and the bowhunting requirements for specific units would move to the hunter education regulation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Any time a small change is necessary, modifying the methods and means section.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People registering bait stations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Leave the conditions under methods and means.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-085)

PROPOSAL 81 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear; 5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemptions; 5 AAC 92.132. Bag limit for brown bears; 5 AAC 92.165. Sealing of bear skins and skulls; 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs and hides; and 5 AAC 92.530. Management areas. This proposal would remove references to the subsistence brown bear management areas and allow administration of the hunts on a unit basis. There would be no change to the conditions of the hunts, other than a liberalization of the bag limit. A bear taken under a subsistence permit would no longer count against the one bear every four regulatory years bag limit in other areas of the state. The proposal also reauthorizes the current tag fee exemptions in the areas.

5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(8)		
...		
Unit 9(E), that portion <u>including all drainages</u> <u>into the Pacific Ocean</u> <u>between Cape Kumliun</u> <u>and the border of Unit 9(E)</u> <u>and 9(D)</u>		
[WITHIN THE CHIGNIK ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA]		
1 bear every regulatory year by registration permit only	Nov. 1-Dec. 31 (Subsistence hunt only)	No open season.
1 bear every 4 regulatory years	Oct. 1-Oct. 21 (Odd years only) May 10-May 25 (Even years only)	Oct. 1-Oct. 21 (Odd years only) May 10-May 25 (Even years only)
<u>Remainder of</u> Unit 9(E), [THAT PORTION OUTSIDE THE CHIGNIK ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA]	Oct. 1-Oct. 21 (Odd years only) May 10-May 25 (Even years only)	Oct. 1-Oct. 21 (Odd years only) May 10-May 25 (Even years only)
1 bear every 4		

regulatory years

...

(17)

That portion of Unit 19(A)
downstream of and
including the Aniak
River drainage
[WITHIN THE WESTERN ALASKA
BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT
AREA]

1 bear every regulatory year
by registration permit

Sept. 1-May 31
(Subsistence hunt
only)

No open season.

1 bear every 4
regulatory years

Sept 1-May 31

Sept. 1-May 31

Remainder of Unit 19(A),
[OUTSIDE THE WESTERN
ALASKA BROWN BEAR
MANAGEMENT AREA]

Sept. 1-May 31

Sept. 1-May 31

1 bear every 4 regulatory years

That portion of Unit 19(B)
downstream of and
including the Aniak
River drainage [WITHIN
THE WESTERN ALASKA
BROWN BEAR
MANAGEMENT AREA]

1 bear every regulatory year
by registration permit

Sept. 1-May 31
(Subsistence hunt
only)

No open season.

1 bear every 4
regulatory years

Sept. 1-May 31

Sept. 1-May 31

Remainder of Unit 19(B)
[OUTSIDE THE WESTERN
ALASKA BROWN BEAR

MANAGEMENT AREA]

1 bear every 4
regulatory years

Sept. 1-May 31

Sept. 1-May 31

...

(21)

Unit 23, **all drainages
except the Baldwin
Peninsula north of the
Arctic Circle** [THAT
PORTION IN THE
NORTHWEST
ALASKA BROWN
BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA]

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bear every regulatory
year by registration permit

Aug. 1-May 31
(Subsistence hunt
only)

1 bear every regulatory
year

Aug. 1-May 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bear every
regulatory year by
drawing permit only; up
to 48 permits
may be issued
in combination with the
remainder of Unit 23

Sept. 1-Oct. 10
Apr. 15-May 31

Remainder of Unit 23

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bear every
regulatory year

Aug. 1-May 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bear every regulatory
year by drawing permit
only; up to 48 permits
may be issued in combination

Sept. 1-Oct. 10
Apr. 15-May 31

with that portion of Unit 23,
all drainages
except the Baldwin
Peninsula north of the
Arctic Circle [THAT
PORTION IN THE
NORTHWEST
ALASKA BROWN
BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA]

...

5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemptions. (a) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in **Unit 9(B), all drainages in Unit 9(E) that drain into the Pacific Ocean between Cape Kumliun and the border of Unit 9(E) and 9(D), Unit 17, Unit 18, that portion of Units 19(A) and 19(B) downstream of and including the Aniak River drainage, Unit 21(D), Unit 22, all drainages in Unit 23 except for the Baldwin Peninsula north of the Arctic Circle, Unit 24, and Unit 26(A)** [THE WESTERN ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA (5 AAC 92.530(15)), THE NORTHWEST ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA (5 AAC 92.530(16)), OR THE CHIGNIK ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA (5 AAC 92.530(17))] if the hunter obtains a registration permit before hunting.

...

5 AAC 92.132. Bag limit for brown bears. A person may not take more than one brown bear every four regulatory years, except that:

...

(4) the bag limit for a resident hunting in **Unit 9(B), all drainages in Unit 9(E) that drain into the Pacific Ocean between Cape Kumliun and the border of Unit 9(E) and 9(D), Unit 17, Unit 18, that portion of Units 19(A) and 19(B) downstream of and including the Aniak River drainage, Unit 21(D), Unit 22, all drainages in Unit 23 except for the Baldwin Peninsula north of the Arctic Circle, Unit 24, and Unit 26(A)** [THE NORTHWEST ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA (5 AAC 92.530(16)), THE WESTERN ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA (5 AAC 92.530(15)), OR THE CHIGNIK ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA (5 AAC 92.530(17))] with a brown bear registration permit is one bear per regulatory year; a bear taken under a registration permit in any of these [BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT] areas will not count against the one bear every four regulatory years bag limit established for brown bears taken under a resident tag;

...

5 AAC 92.165. Sealing of bear skins and skulls.

...

(7) in **Unit 9(B), all drainages in Unit 9(E) that drain into the Pacific Ocean between Cape Kumliun and the border of Unit 9(E) and 9(D), Unit 17, Unit 18, that portion of Units 19(A) and 19(B) downstream of and including the Aniak River drainage, Unit 21(D), Unit 22, all drainages in Unit 23 except for the Baldwin Peninsula north of the Arctic Circle, Unit 24, and Unit 26(A)** [THE WESTERN ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA (5 AAC 92.530(15))], brown bear taken by a resident hunter under a registration permit need not be sealed unless removed from the [MANAGEMENT] area **or presented for commercial tanning within the area**; if the skin or skull are removed from the [MANAGEMENT] area **or presented for commercial tanning within the area**, they first must be sealed by a department representative [THAT REPORTS TO ANIAK, BETHEL, DILLINGHAM, ILIAMNA, KING SALMON, OR MCGRATH];

(8) IN THE NORTHWEST ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA (5 AAC 92.530(16)), BROWN BEAR TAKEN BY A RESIDENT HUNTER UNDER A REGISTRATION PERMIT NEED NOT BE SEALED UNLESS THEY ARE REMOVED FROM THE MANAGEMENT AREA OR PRESENTED FOR COMMERCIAL TANNING WITHIN THE MANAGEMENT AREA; IF THE SKIN OR SKULL ARE REMOVED FROM THE MANAGEMENT AREA OR PRESENTED FOR COMMERCIAL TANNING WITHIN THE MANAGEMENT AREA, THEY FIRST MUST BE SEALED BY A DEPARTMENT REPRESENTATIVE THAT REPORTS TO BARROW, FAIRBANKS, GALENA, NOME, OR KOTZEBUE;

(9) IN THE CHIGNIK ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA (5 AAC 92.530(17)), BROWN BEAR TAKEN BY A RESIDENT HUNTER UNDER A REGISTRATION PERMIT NEED NOT BE SEALED UNLESS REMOVED FROM THE MANAGEMENT AREA; IF THE SKIN OR SKULL ARE REMOVED FROM THE MANAGEMENT AREA, THEY FIRST MUST BE SEALED BY A DEPARTMENT REPRESENTATIVE IN KING SALMON.]

(b) A person who possesses a bear in a unit where sealing is required shall keep the skin and skull together until a department representative has removed a rudimentary premolar tooth from the skull and sealed both the skull and the skin. The department may require that the skull of the bear be skinned and that the skin and skull not be frozen at the time of sealing. [IF THE BEAR WAS TAKEN IN THE WESTERN ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA (5 AAC 92.530(15)), THE NORTHWEST ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA (5 AAC 92.530(16)), OR THE CHIGNIK ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA (5 AAC 92.530(17)) UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF A REGISTRATION PERMIT, AND IF SEALING IS REQUIRED UNDER (A)(7)–(9) OF THIS SECTION, AT THE TIME OF SEALING THE DEPARTMENT REPRESENTATIVE SHALL REMOVE AND RETAIN THE SKIN OF THE SKULL AND THE FRONT CLAWS OF THE BEAR.]

...

5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs and hides. (a) Subject to additional requirements in 5 AAC 84 - 5 AAC 85, a person taking game shall salvage the following parts for human use:

...

(5) all edible meat of a brown bear taken under a registration permit **in Unit 9(B), all drainages in Unit 9(E) that drain into the Pacific Ocean between Cape Kumliun and the border of Unit 9(E) and 9(D), Unit 17, Unit 18, that portion of Units 19(A) and 19(B)**

downstream of and including the Aniak River drainage, Unit 21(D), Unit 22, all drainages in Unit 23 except for the Baldwin Peninsula north of the Arctic Circle, Unit 24, and Unit 26(A) [THE WESTERN ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA (5 AAC 92.530(15)), THE NORTHWEST ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA (5 AAC 92.530(16)), OR THE CHIGNIK ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA (5 AAC 92.530(17))] shall be salvaged for human consumption; salvage of the hide or skull is optional.

5 AAC 92.530. Management areas. The following management areas are subject to special restrictions

...

[(15) THE WESTERN ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA:

(A) THE AREA CONSISTS OF UNIT 9(B), UNIT 17, UNIT 18, AND THAT PORTION OF UNITS 19(A) AND 19(B) DOWNSTREAM OF AND INCLUDING THE ANIAK RIVER DRAINAGE;

(B) THE AREA IS OPEN TO BROWN BEAR HUNTING UNDER REGULATIONS GOVERNING UNITS 17 - 19, EXCEPT THAT

(I) RESIDENT HUNTERS MAY OBTAIN A REGISTRATION PERMIT IN PLACE OF A RESIDENT BROWN BEAR TAG BEFORE HUNTING;

(II) BROWN BEAR HUNTING UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF A BROWN BEAR REGISTRATION PERMIT IS OPEN FROM SEPT. 1 THROUGH MAY 31 FOR ONE BEAR PER REGULATORY YEAR;

(16) THE NORTHWEST ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA:

(A) THE AREA CONSISTS OF UNIT 21(D), UNIT 22, ALL DRAINAGES IN UNIT 23 EXCEPT FOR THE BALDWIN PENINSULA NORTH OF THE ARCTIC CIRCLE, UNIT 24, AND UNIT 26(A);

(B) THE AREA IS OPEN TO BROWN BEAR HUNTING UNDER REGULATIONS GOVERNING UNITS 21(D), UNIT 22, 23, 24, AND 26(A), EXCEPT THAT

(I) RESIDENT HUNTERS MAY OBTAIN A REGISTRATION PERMIT IN PLACE OF A RESIDENT BROWN BEAR TAG BEFORE HUNTING;

(II) AIRCRAFT MAY NOT BE USED IN ANY MANNER FOR BROWN BEAR HUNTING UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF A BROWN BEAR REGISTRATION PERMIT, INCLUDING TRANSPORTATION OF HUNTERS, BEARS, OR PARTS OF BEARS; HOWEVER, THIS DOES NOT APPLY TO TRANSPORTATION OF BEAR HUNTERS OR BEAR PARTS BY REGULARLY SCHEDULED FLIGHTS TO AND BETWEEN COMMUNITIES BY CARRIERS THAT NORMALLY PROVIDE SCHEDULED SERVICE TO THIS AREA, NOR DOES IT APPLY TO TRANSPORTATION BY AIRCRAFT TO OR BETWEEN PUBLICLY OWNED AIRPORTS;

(III) BROWN BEAR HUNTING UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF A BROWN BEAR REGISTRATION PERMIT IS OPEN FROM SEPTEMBER 1 THROUGH MAY 31 IN UNITS 21(D), UNIT 22 EXCEPT 22(C), 23, AND 24, FROM AUGUST 1 THROUGH OCTOBER 31 AND MAY 10 THROUGH MAY 25 IN UNIT

22(C), AND FROM AUGUST 20 THROUGH MAY 31 IN UNIT 26(A) FOR ONE BEAR PER REGULATORY YEAR.

(17) THE CHIGNIK ALASKA BROWN BEAR MANAGEMENT AREA:

(A) THE AREA CONSISTS OF ALL DRAINAGES IN UNIT 9(E) THAT DRAIN INTO THE PACIFIC OCEAN BETWEEN CAPE KUMLIUN AND THE BORDER OF UNIT 9(E) AND 9(D);

(B) THE AREA IS OPEN TO BROWN BEAR HUNTING UNDER REGULATIONS GOVERNING UNIT 9(E), EXCEPT THAT

(I) RESIDENT HUNTERS MAY OBTAIN A REGISTRATION PERMIT IN PLACE OF A RESIDENT BROWN BEAR TAG BEFORE HUNTING;

(II) BROWN BEAR HUNTING UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF A BROWN BEAR REGISTRATION PERMIT IS OPEN FROM NOVEMBER 1 THROUGH DECEMBER 31 FOR ONE BEAR PER REGULATORY YEAR;]

ISSUE: The department considers this proposal one more component of a continuing attempt to simplify brown bear regulations. This proposal removes all references to the brown bear management areas but retains the way the hunts are actually implemented and the associated special conditions of the hunts (no tag requirement, limited sealing requirements, meat salvage required, etc.). The only direct effects are a change to the way the department administers the hunts, and a liberalization of the bag limit.

The current management areas span both unit and regional boundaries. Currently, one biologist administers the hunts in each management area. Rewriting the regulations to refer to the subsistence hunts at a unit and/or subunit level allows the hunt to be managed locally by each area biologist.

The current general season bag limit for brown bear in all of the associated units but Unit 9 is already one bear per year that does not count against the one bear per four regulatory year bag limit in other areas of the state. This proposal aligns the subsistence brown bear bag limit with the general season bag limit throughout the unit.

Brown bear tag fee exemptions must be reauthorized annually. Continuation of the tag fee exemptions listed above is necessary in order to facilitate the associated brown bear harvest programs. We believe it would be difficult to document subsistence harvest by residents hunting primarily for food if the tag fee is in effect. Prior to establishment of the brown bear subsistence areas, little harvest was reported by resident hunters in the areas.

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

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

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to be confused by references to a management area with separate seasons and requirements. As general season bear regulations are liberalized, the department will be unable to simplify and liberalize subsistence seasons and requirements when necessary.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? There will be no change to the resource harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All bear hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-084)

PROPOSAL 82 - 5 AAC 92.xxx new section. Add a new statewide requirement for sealing of Dall sheep as follows:

Required sealing at the department office for Dall sheep.

ISSUE: Too many sub-legal rams being taken.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sub-legal rams will continue to be taken.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, fewer sub-legal rams will be taken, and hunter awareness, and responsibilities will increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska Department of Fish and Game management, ethical hunters, trophy hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Irresponsible hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Horn plugging; rejected because cost prohibitive.

PROPOSED BY: AK FNAWS (Foundation North American Wild Sheep) (HQ-04S-G-007)

PROPOSAL 83 - 5 AAC 92.420. Taking nuisance wildlife. This proposal would establish the requirements for obtaining a license to take nuisance wildlife.

5 AAC 92.420. Taking nuisance wildlife.

- (a) The department shall issue a wild animal control license to a person who pays the required fee, provided the applicant
 - (1) Is at least 18 years of age;
 - (2) completed a hunter education course administered by the department or provided proof of equivalent firearms safety training if firearms are to be used to take or euthanize animals;
 - (3) has not been convicted of a violation of the Fish & Game Code during the preceding five years.

- (b) A person with a nuisance wild animal control license may take a nuisance wild animal on land owned by another person when
 - (1) the animal being taken has invaded a dwelling, is causing property damage, or is an immediate threat to health, safety or property;
 - (2) the necessity for the taking is not brought about by harassment or provocation of the animals, or by an unreasonable invasion of the animal's habitat;
 - (3) the necessity of the taking is not brought about by the improper disposal of garbage or a similar attractive nuisance; and
 - (4) all other practicable means to protect property are exhausted before the game is taken.

- (c) A person taking nuisance wildlife by lethal means, under this section shall, within 15 days after the taking, submit to the department a completed questionnaire concerning the circumstances of the taking; in addition a person with a wild animal control license shall, by January 31 of each year, submit a summary of all nuisance wildlife activity during the previous calendar year, including numbers, species, locations or animals taken and name and addresses of property owners.

- (d) Animals taken under this section may be euthanized pursuant to the Animal Welfare Act but may not be held captive for more than 12 hours unless requested by a department representative or required by a physician for public health reasons. Circumstances will dictate euthanasia methods available to the operator; however, the method employed should be the safest, quickest and most painless available.

- (e) Animals taken may not be sold, traded, bartered or otherwise transferred to any other person. Animals taken may not be retained for personal use; species required to be sealed under hunting or trapping regulations must be presented to the department for sealing and final disposition. Species not requiring sealing shall be destroyed at the licensee's discretion.

- (f) Wildlife may be released to the wild only with the consent of the land manager or property owner and approval of the department.

(g) As used in this section

- (1) “property” means
 - (A) a dwelling, permanent or temporary;
 - (B) an aircraft, boat, automobile, or other conveyance;
 - (C) a domesticated animal;
 - (D) fenced gardens and landscaped plants, excluding native vegetation;
 - (E) other property of substantial value.
- (2) “nuisance wildlife” means feral domestic bird or mammal, deleterious exotic wildlife, unclassified game, small game, fur animals or furbearers or migratory bird for which there is a federal depredation order for Alaska. Wildlife may be considered “nuisance” when the animal invades a dwelling, causes property damage or is an immediate threat to health, safety or property.
- (3) “take” means taking, pursuing, hunting, fishing, trapping, or in any manner disturbing, capturing, or killing or attempting to take, pursue, hunt, fish, trap, or in any manner capture or kill fish or game.

ISSUE: Legislation recently passed allows private contractors to deal with some nuisance wildlife problems. This proposal establishes the regulation with conditions required by the department to issue a license for such control.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Private landowners who have property that is being damaged by wildlife will have no recourse.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Private landowners wishing to hire someone to deal with nuisance wildlife.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-086)

PROPOSAL 84 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. New section. Establish Tier II harvest level based on average resident harvest of preceding 20 years as follows:

Tier II harvest level cannot be set above the average resident harvest of twenty years preceding Tier II implementation less those that used commercial services.

ISSUE: Tier II qualification: The state subsistence/Tier II law is an obsolete attempt to keep the feds happy. It didn't work. If we must keep this archaic law on the books lets try to keep it from being such a farce.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Tier II applicants who are not subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II permits.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Actual subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonsubsistence hunters who have been qualifying for Tier II and lying and/or cheating and/or poachers who have qualified.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-04S-G-018)

PROPOSAL 85 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. New section. Establish Tier II harvest level based on average resident harvest level of preceding 10 years as follows:

Tier II harvest level cannot be above the average resident harvest of ten years preceding Tier II implementation less those who used commercial services.

ISSUE: Tier II qualification: The state subsistence/Tier II law is an obsolete attempt to keep the feds happy. It didn't work. If we must keep this archaic law on the books lets try to keep it from being such a farce.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Tier II applicants who are not subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II permits.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Actual subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonsubsistence hunters who have been qualifying for Tier II and lying and/or cheating and/or poachers who have qualified.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-04S-G-019)

PROPOSAL 86 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. New section. Establish Tier II harvest level based on average resident harvest level of preceding five years as follows:

Tier II harvest level cannot be set above the five year average resident harvest before implementation of Tier II less those who use commercial services to harvest.

ISSUE: Tier II qualification: The state subsistence/Tier II law is an obsolete attempt to keep the feds happy. It didn't work. If we must keep this archaic law on the books lets try to keep it from being such a farce.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Tier II applicants who are not subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II permits.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Actual subsistence hunters will qualify for Tier II.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonsubsistence hunters who have been qualifying for Tier II and lying and/or cheating and/or poachers who have qualified.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-04S-G-020)

PROPOSAL 87 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Restrict antlerless moose bag limit to one moose every four regulatory years as follows:

Make permits available to people, based on time, i.e. every four years, for the harvest of antlerless moose.

ISSUE: Reauthorization of antlerless moose hunts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Affect genetic diversity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? After evaluating antler restrictions as a basis of harvesting game and the affects of genetic diversity on the Kenai Peninsula moose population. It is clear, or proven, that the sex traits expressed have a genetic or environmental foundation. It is clear that if the genetic trait is available that deficiencies in the environment can prevent genetic traits from being expressed.

Antler restrictions are great for enforcement of regulation, however; it is most likely doing more harm than good to the population. Proper management would prevent this and prevent inevitable future costs of transplanting moose to increase genetic diversity for a healthy population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? N/A

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Same response as question 5: After evaluating antler restrictions as a basis of harvesting game and the affects of genetic diversity on the Kenai Peninsula moose population. It is clear, or proven, that the sex traits expressed have a genetic or environmental foundation. It is clear that if the genetic trait is available that deficiencies in the environment can prevent genetic traits from being expressed.

Antler restrictions are great for enforcement of regulation, however; it is most likely doing more harm than good to the population. Proper management would prevent this and prevent inevitable future costs of transplanting moose to increase genetic diversity for a healthy population.

PROPOSED BY: Darrel Williams, NTC Resource Officer (SC-04S-G-055)

REGIONS I, II, AND V

PROPOSAL 88 - 5 AAC 85.045(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the existing cow moose season at Berners Bay.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(1)		
...		
Unit 1(C), Berners Bay - drainages	Sept. 15–Oct.15 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15–Oct.15
1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 permits may be issued		
...		

ISSUE: This status quo proposal is necessary to accommodate antlerless moose hunting in Berners Bay. The Berners Bay strategic moose management plan calls for a post-hunt population of 90 moose, based on the estimated moose carrying capacity of this area. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game has been very successful at maintaining this population level

through the harvest of both bull and cow moose. Restricting the harvest to bull moose could disrupt this balance.

The number of moose counted during the fall aerial surveys determines the number of drawing permits issued. Aerial counts during 1990–2003 have ranged from a high of 107 moose in 1999 to a low of 59 moose in 2002. The mean annual count during this period has been 75 moose.

During 1998–2003, the number of drawing permits issued by the department for this herd has ranged from 10 bull permits and 10 antlerless permits to eight bull permits and zero antlerless permits. In 2003 there were nine bull permits issued, but zero cow permits based on low aerial survey counts. Based on the most recent count of 81 moose on Nov. 19, 2003, the department will likely again issue a limited number of antlerless permits in 2004.

The average annual harvest of bull moose during this period has been 7.6, and the cow harvest has been 5.8. Approximately 93 percent of the permittees with bull permits have hunted, with a success rate of 88 percent. Only 79 percent of the permittees with antlerless permits have actually hunted, and their success rate has been 85 percent.

In fall 2000 the Board of Game increased the allowable number of Berners Bay drawing permits from 20 to 30, to be allocated by sex, based on survey results, by department biologists (this change went into effect in the 2001 season). Although we have the latitude of issuing up to 30 permits, at present we will likely restrict the harvest to 5-10 bulls and zero to seven antlerless moose unless an increasing trend in moose numbers is detected.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population could increase and exceed the carrying capacity of the habitat. The Berners Bay moose harvest will be restricted to bulls thereby limiting opportunity for hunters.

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-055)

PROPOSAL 89 - 5 AAC 85.045(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the existing cow moose season in the Gustavus area.

Resident	
Open Season	
(Subsistence and	Nonresident

Units and Bag Limits	General Hunts)	Open Season
(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; or	Sept. 15–Oct. 15 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15–Oct. 15
1 antlerless moose	Nov. 15–Nov. 30	Nov. 15–Nov. 30
by drawing permit only; up to 35 permits may be issued	(General hunt only)	
...		

ISSUE: This proposal would retain the status quo necessary to continue the antlerless moose season in the Gustavus portion of Unit 1C. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game biologists counted 312 moose during an aerial survey in this area in 2003, and estimate the population to be 350–400 animals. This area contains only six to eight square miles of productive winter range as identified by abundant willow stands, and likely can not support these numbers of moose. The department biologists conducted spring browse utilization surveys in 1999–2003, and documented 85 to 95 percent of the current annual growth of willow twigs available to moose had been consumed. We believe that this high rate of utilization is not sustainable, and will likely prove detrimental to the willow shrubs if continued. A cow hunt provides the tool to decrease herd productivity, and hopefully prevent overutilization of critical winter browse and an ultimate decline of the moose herd due to reduction of browse vigor. Additional habitat studies were initiated in the fall of 2003 using exclosures to assess what impacts moose might be having on willow plant fitness, and ultimately on carrying capacity of this range. In addition, body fat measurements were taken from harvested female moose in November 2003 to assess moose body condition.

During the past four years hunters have killed an average of 46 bull moose at Gustavus. In addition 10 and 29 cow moose were harvested under drawing permits during November 2002 and 2003 respectively.

Although in the fall of 2000 the board authorized an antlerless hunt for the 2001 season, no permits were issued that year due to concerns by Gustavus residents about harvesting cow

moose. In 2002, 10 antlerless moose permits were issued, and 100 percent of the hunters were successful in harvesting a cow moose.

During the 2002 Board of Game meeting, the board adopted a proposal to allow the department to issue “up to” 35 antlerless moose permits and in 2003, 35 antlerless permits were issued with 29 cows and three calves being harvested.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population will continue to grow and could exceed the carrying capacity of the habitat, reducing the value of willow browse and leading to a herd decline.

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-056)

PROPOSAL 90 - 5 AAC 085.045(3). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season at Nunatak Bench.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(3)		
...		
Unit 5(A), that portion south of Wrangell-Saint Elias National Park, north and east of Russell and Nunatak Fjords, and east of the east side of East Nunatak Glacier to the Canadian Border (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 proposal to retain the status quo is necessary to continue the any-moose hunting season at Nunatak Bench in Unit 5A. The Nunatak Bench strategic moose management plan calls for a post-hunt population of 50 moose in this area, and a harvest of five moose by 10 hunters, expending 60 days of effort. An aerial survey conducted in February 2001 revealed 54 moose, probably near the carrying capacity of the available habitat.

During the 1997–2002 hunting seasons, an average of 11 permits were issued while three persons actually hunted each season. An average of eight days of hunting were expended each year to kill one to two moose. During this period, all but two of the nine moose taken were bulls.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The harvest of moose at Nunatak Bench will be limited to bulls without any biological reason to do so. In addition, since much of the season occurs post-antler drop, restricting the harvest to bulls would make it difficult for hunters to select a legal animal. Furthermore, moose habitat is not abundant in this area and if herd growth is not restricted by a limited cow harvest, carrying capacity of winter range may be exceeded.

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-057)

PROPOSAL 91 - 5 AAC 085.045(4). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6A.

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

(4)

Unit 6(A), all drainages into the Gulf of Alaska from Cape Suckling to Palm Point

1 moose per regulatory year,

only as follows:

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by registration permit only; up to 30 bulls may be taken; or

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

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 drawing permits may be issued

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

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 5 drawing permits may be issued

Sept. 1- Nov. 30

Remainder of Unit 6(A)

1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

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

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; up to 20 antlerless moose may be taken

Nov. 15-Dec. 31
(General hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1- Nov. 30

1 antlerless moose by registration permit; up to 20 antlerless moose may be taken

Nov. 15-Dec. 31

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. We recommend continuation of the antlerless season to promote population stability. The desirable post-hunt population size in Unit 6A west of Cape Suckling is 300 to 350 moose. A census completed during February 2002 yielded a population estimate of 300 moose with 13 percent calves. The reported antlerless harvest was four and three during 2002 and 2003, respectively.

The desirable post-hunt population size in Unit 6A east of Cape Suckling is 300 to 350 moose. A census completed during February 2002 yielded a population estimate of 285 moose with 15 percent calves. Reported harvest was 13 bulls in 2002. No antlerless hunts were held because of previous poor calf survival and population level below the management objective. However, if recruitment does improve, antlerless hunts may be needed to hold the moose population at objective levels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If antlerless hunts are eliminated in Unit 6A, hunting opportunity will be needlessly lost.

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

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-058)

PROPOSAL 92 - 5 AAC 85.045(4). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6B.

Units and Bag Limit	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(4)		
...		
Unit 6(B)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 antlered moose by registration permit only; up to 30 antlered moose may be taken; a moose may not be taken until after 3:00 a.m. on the day following the day on which an airboat is used for transportation, and all airboats used for transportation must display an ADF&G identifica-	Aug. 27- Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season

tion number; **or**

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

Aug. 27- Oct. 31
(General hunt only)

No open season

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. Desirable post-hunt population size is 300-350. A census completed during February 2002 resulted in a population estimate of 200 moose with 13 percent calves. Antlerless hunts have not been held during recent years because of continued poor calf survival and population level below the management objective. However, if recruitment does improve, antlerless hunts may be needed to hold the population at objective levels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the moose population in Unit 6B increases and a season is possible, antlerless hunts will provide additional hunting opportunity.

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

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-059)

PROPOSAL 93 - 5 AAC 85.045(4). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6C.

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

(4)

...

Unit 6(C)

Sept. 1-Oct. 31
(General hunt only)

No open season.

1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 40 permits for bulls and up to 20 permits for antlerless moose may be issued

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. The current population objective, established in 1995, is to allow the population to increase to 400 moose by the year 2006, and to increase the harvest accordingly. A census completed during February 2002 yielded an estimate of 340 moose, 20 percent of which were calves. Because the available antlerless harvest quota in Unit 6C is currently harvested under a federal subsistence season administered by the U.S. Forest Service, we have not held the hunt since the 1999 to 2000 season. During the last two years the department administered the hunt (1998-1999 and 1999-2000), the reported harvest was four and five cows, respectively. We recommend reauthorizing the state antlerless hunt in the event that the federal subsistence hunt is cancelled. If recruitment improves, continuation of the antlerless hunts will be necessary to hold the population at objective levels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity will be lost, and the population may exceed the objective, which is based on the availability of adequate habitat during severe winters.

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

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-060)

PROPOSAL 94 - 5 AAC 085.045(5). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Units 7 and 14C.

**Resident
Open Season
(Subsistence and Nonresident**

Units and Bag Limits

General Hunts)

Open Season

(5)

...

Unit 7, the Placer River drainages, and that portion of the Placer Creek (Bear Valley) drainage outside the Portage Glacier Closed Area, and that portion of Unit 14(C) within the Twentymile River drainage

RESIDENT HUNTERS:
1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits for bulls will be issued in combination with nonresident hunts, and up to 70 permits for antlerless moose will be issued.

Aug. 20-Oct. 10
(General hunt only)

Aug. 20-Oct. 10

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:
1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits for bulls will be issued in combination with resident hunts

Aug. 20-Oct. 10

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. Total moose observed during annual trend counts in 1997-1999 were 173, 181 and 116 moose, respectively. During those years, the ratios of the number of bulls per 100 cows were 30, 24 and 18, respectively. The ratios of the number of calves per 100 cows were 47, 30 and 23, respectively. Because of poor snow conditions, no surveys were flown during 2000, 2001, and 2002. The estimated population of 145 moose in 1999 is well below the management objective of 250; however, moose numbers have probably increased with two subsequent mild winters and low harvests. A population peak of 333 moose in 1990 probably exceeded the carrying capacity of the habitat, and an aerial survey completed 2 years later found that many of the moose had dispersed or died. The population also declined 25 to 30 percent during the severe winter of 1994-95. Harvest quotas and the number of permits issued were reduced in the late 1990s to allow the population to recover. Bull harvests during 2000, 2001, and 2002 were two, five, and five moose, respectively. No antlerless permits were issued during these years because of low population size and declining recruitment.

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

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

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-061)

PROPOSAL 95 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the drawing permit hunts for antlerless moose in Unit 14A.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
...		
Unit 14(A)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
...		
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 500 antlerless moose permits may be issued	Aug. 20-Sept. 25 (General hunt only) Nov. 1-Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	No open season
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the board. During October 2001, the subpopulation of moose in Unit 14A was surveyed and estimated at 6,680 which was greater than the post-hunt objective of 6,000 – 6,500 moose. During this survey we observed 19

bulls and 34 calves:100 cows. Snow depth accumulation in the subunit during the 2002-2003 winter was inconsequential and survival of calves and adults was reportedly high. Unfortunately the lack of snow precluded us from surveying this population. Reported accidental mortality along highways and railroads was also low for this subunit during the 2002-2003 winter.

During 1999 and 2000, we issued no permits because the subpopulation estimate remained below objective levels. During the fall of 2001, the department issued 50 antlerless moose drawing permits in the Matanuska River Valley east of Palmer, which resulted in the harvest of 30 cows. In 2002, 400 permits were divided among six hunt areas and resulted in the harvest of 206 moose. Our strategy for harvesting cows from six different permit hunt areas within the subunit was to concentrate antlerless moose permits in those areas where moose densities was highest. We reduced the number of permits issued in 2003 by 20 percent to be conservative since we were unable to survey the previous fall.

The number of permits to be made available for 2004 will be determined following 2003 fall surveys.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Portions of the Unit 14A moose subpopulation could grow beyond the ability of the habitat to sustain that population level. Increased cases of starvation, conflicts with humans and vehicle collisions will occur.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; excessively high moose density can lead to nutritionally stressed animals in the harvest.

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-063)

PROPOSAL 96 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Fort Richardson Management Area in Unit 14C.

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

(12)

...

Unit 14(C), that portion of the Fort Richardson Management Area north of Eagle River	Day after Labor Day -Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Nov. 15
1 moose by drawing permit by muzzle-loading rifle; up to 35 permits may be issued		
Unit 14(C), Fort Richardson Management Area	Day after Labor Day -Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Nov. 15 Dec. 15-Jan. 15
1 moose per regulatory year by drawing permit, by bow and arrow only; up to 125 permits may be issued.	Dec. 15-Jan. 15 (General hunt only)	

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. A November 2003 census on Fort Richardson, Elmendorf Air Force Base and upper Ship Creek yielded a population estimate of 649 moose with a bull:cow ratio of 58 bulls per 100 cows and a calf:cow ratio of 40 calves per 100 cows. The current estimate is similar to the previous population peak of 622 moose observed during November 1994, when the population exceeded the carrying capacity of local wintering areas. The moose population subsequently declined 45 percent on account of the severe winter of 1994-95 and deteriorating browse conditions within the area. Currently, the population is increasing and is above the management objective of 500 moose. Harvests for 2000, 2001, and 2002 were 33 bulls and 15 cows, 14 bulls and 19 cows, 27 bulls and 15 cows, respectively. Ten antlerless permits were issued for the fall hunts and 50 either-sex permits were issued for the winter hunts in 2000, 2001, and 2002.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population may again exceed the carrying capacity of the habitat if antlerless hunts are not authorized.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Muzzleloaders and bow hunters who draw permits. Persons living near Fort Richardson who incur damage to their gardens and shrubs and motorists on the Glenn Highway and in east Anchorage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who oppose antlerless moose hunting, and archery or muzzleloader hunting or hunting in general.

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

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and U. S. Army, Fort Richardson
 (HQ-04S-G-064)

PROPOSAL 97 - 5 AAC 85.045 (12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt on Elmendorf Air Force Base in Unit 14C.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
...		
Unit 14(C), Elmendorf Air Force Base	Day after Labor Day -Dec. 15 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Dec. 15
1 moose by drawing permit, by bow and arrow only; up to 25 permits may be issued.		

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Moose on Elmendorf Air Force Base are part of a resident wintering population that also occupies Fort Richardson. A November 2003 census on Ft. Richardson, Elmendorf Air Force Base and upper Ship Creek yielded a population estimate of 649 moose. During September, up to 150 of these moose frequent lands managed by Elmendorf. A majority of these animals move to Fort Richardson during late fall and winter, many into areas where hunting is not allowed. Because the density of hunters on Fort Richardson has reached maximum manageable levels, the Elmendorf hunt provides additional hunter opportunity and helps achieve desired harvest levels. During the 2000 seasons, hunters took four bulls and three cows, four cows, and four cows, respectively. Five antlerless permits were issued each year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Habitat may be over-browsed, reducing carrying capacity in subsequent years, and road and train kills will increase. The overall Fort Richardson-Elmendorf Air Force Base moose population is thought to have been above carrying capacity during the severe 1994-1995 winter. Browse was over-utilized across extensive areas during the severe winters of 1989-1990, 1991-1992, and 1994-1995. If cows are not harvested, the population could increase and suffer major losses during a severe winter.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BY IMPROVED?

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

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

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

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-065)

PROPOSAL 98 - 5 AAC 85.045 (12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Birchwood Management Area and the remainder of Unit 14C.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
...		
Unit 14(C), that portion known as the Birchwood Management Area	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30
1 moose by drawing permit, by bow and arrow only; up to 25 permits may be issued		
...		
Remainder of Unit 14(C)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30
1 antlerless moose by	Day after Labor Day	No open season

drawing permit only; up to 60 permits may be issued

-Sept. 30
(General hunt only)

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Composition counts are not routinely flown in the Birchwood Management Area. However, we believe that a small resident population of 10-15 moose as well as an equal number of animals from Fort Richardson frequent the area. During the 2000, 2001, and 2002 seasons, archers took three bulls, one cow and one unknown moose, and one cow, respectively. Five antlerless permits were issued in 2000 and 2002, and four antlerless permits were issued in 2001.

The number of cow moose in those portions of the remainder of Unit 14C where antlerless moose hunts are held appears to be about the same as observed during the early 1990's. One hundred thirty-nine cows were counted during the fall 2001 trend counts in Knik/Hunter and Peters Creek count areas. An additional 88 cows were observed in the upper Ship Creek drainage in 2001 and 105 cows in 2003, which is part of the Fort Richardson census area. The moose populations in these areas appear to be at or above carrying capacity. During the 2000, 2001, and 2002 seasons, hunters took seven, four, and 12 cows in the three areas, respectively. Forty permits were issued in 2000, 2001, and 2002.

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

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

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-066)

PROPOSAL 99 - 5 AAC 85.045 (13). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area of Unit 15A.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(13)		

Unit 15(A), the Skilak Loop
Wildlife Management Area

1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 permits for spike-fork antlered moose may be issued; or	Sept. 15-Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15- Sept. 30
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 50 permits may be issued; the taking of calves, and females accompanied by calves is prohibited	Sept. 15-Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. A joint management objective developed for the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area (SLWMA) by the department and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service calls for a fall population of approximately two moose per square mile or about 130 moose counted during the November survey. The SLWMA was last counted during November 2003 and yielded a count of 98 moose composed of 17 bulls (five yearlings, six mid-size, and six with antlers 50" or larger), 67 cows and 14 calves. The ratios observed were 26 bulls/100 cows and 21 calves/100 cows. Because the SLWMA is managed primarily for wildlife viewing, a second management objective requires that we maintain a minimum bull:cow ratio of 40 bulls/100 cows. The last permit hunt was held in 1999 when 40 permits were issued for antlerless and 20 for spike-fork antlered moose. Eight hunters were successful during the antlerless moose hunt but none during the spike-fork. Because the total number of moose counted during the fall 2003 survey were below the minimum number required to have a hunt, the department recommends maintaining the hunt, but not issuing permits for the fall 2004 season.

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

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Since this is a proposal to reauthorize an existing hunt, no resource or product improvements are expected.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals opposed to hunting.

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

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
(HQ-04S-G-067)

PROPOSAL 100 - 5 AAC 85.045(13). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Unit 15C.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(13)		
...		
Unit 15(C), that portion south of the south fork of the Anchor River and northwest of Kachemak Bay		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or	Aug. 20-Sept. 20 (General Hunt only)	Aug. 20-Sept. 20
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; the taking of calves, and females accompanied by calves, is prohibited; up to 50 permits may be issued	Aug. 20-Sept. 20	Aug. 20-Sept. 20
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. The Homer benchland in Unit 15C serves as traditional moose wintering range. Moose migrate into lower elevation areas when snow levels in upper elevations increase, and much of the browse becomes unavailable. During moderate to severe winters, moose are concentrated onto the Homer benchland earlier and in greater numbers than during mild winters. Winter moose densities calculated as high as six moose per mile have resulted in severely overbrowsed habitat. Many willow stands have low seasonal production due to yearly overbrowsing.

Winter mortality of moose, primarily calves, from malnutrition likely occurs yearly however magnitude of the problem varies with the severity of the winters. During the severe winter of 1998-99, 53 moose were reported dead around Homer as a result of malnutrition. Additional

mortality from defense of life and property kills and moose dying from accidents added to a record total of 71 dead moose.

The department's objective is to maintain this population at approximately 365 moose. We did not issue permits for the 2000 and 2001 season based on a lack of survey information. In the fall of 2001, 448 moose were counted in the permit area. Fifty permits were issued in both 2002 and 2003 resulting in a harvest of 24 and 26 cows, respectively. We recommend reauthorization of the antlerless hunt and anticipate issuing up to 50 permits for the fall 2004 hunt.

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

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The goal of the department is to maintain a healthy population of 365 moose. A limited antlerless moose hunt will maintain the herd at this optimum level.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals opposed to hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-068)

PROPOSAL 101 - 5 AAC 85.045(14). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt on Kalgin Island in Unit 16B.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(14)		
...		
Unit 16(B), Kalgin Island		
1 moose per regulatory year, by registration permit only	Aug. 20 - Sept. 20	Aug. 20 - Sept. 20
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be re-authorized annually. The population objective for this predator-free, 23-square mile island is 20-40 moose a density of 1-1.75 moose per square mile. Following a December 2001 survey, we counted 96 moose and estimated 100-125 moose (29 bulls and 80 calves:100 cows) still inhabited the island, which is approximately five moose per square mile.

Because of concerns of over-population and deteriorating habitat conditions, a drawing permit hunt for cows was initiated in 1995. In an attempt to reduce the population quickly, the board established a registration hunt for any moose for the fall 1999 season. The reported harvest for the 1999 season was 79 moose (50 cows, 29 bulls) from 438 permits issued, 62 moose (40 cows, 22 bulls) from 355 registration permits in 2000, 28 moose (17 cows, eight bulls) from 143 permits issued in 2001, and 37 moose (20 cows, 16 bulls and one unknown) from 130 permits in 2002. Preliminary harvest was reported in 2003 of 52 moose (30 bulls and 22 cows). At the current rate of harvest we believe that the population of moose on Kalgin Island remains above objective levels.

The density of moose on the island is still above objective levels. The "any moose" registration hunt is recommended to provide additional mortality on this predator-free island population. A registration hunt also allows the department to continue gathering biological information from specimens provided by successful hunters. The difficult hunting conditions and limited access will minimize the danger of overharvest. Allowing the continued harvest of calves provides an additional management tool needed to reduce population productivity.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Without a liberal harvest including cows and calves, the population will quickly grow to exceed the island's carrying capacity, resulting in habitat damage and ultimately decline in moose numbers through starvation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If the island population size is kept at or near objective levels, moose will have adequate available forage and therefore, show less sign of being nutritionally stressed.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who make the effort to get to Kalgin Island will have the opportunity to take any moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Seasonal residents of Kalgin Island have been concerned about hunters trespassing on their land and cabins. The current season dates concentrate hunter activity when most seasonal residents are present.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A general season for any moose will also work to lower moose densities, but would diminish the ability to collect biological information.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-069)

PROPOSAL 102 – 5 AAC 92.015(b). Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize the current resident tag fee exemption for brown bear in Unit 22, as follows:

...
(b) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear...in Unit 22,....

ISSUE: The board must reauthorize the Unit 22 tag fee exemption annually or the fee automatically becomes reinstated. We recommend continuing the tag fee exemption.

We believe the Unit 22 brown bear population can support current harvest levels. Elimination of the tag requirement is part of our plan to increase bear harvest in Unit 22. The exemption encourages a wider range of users to utilize the resource, including village residents who are otherwise deterred from hunting brown bears by the need to purchase a tag. Elimination of the tag requirement also simplifies brown bear regulations and allows hunters to harvest brown bears opportunistically.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The tag fee exemption would lapse and hunters in Unit 22 would be required to purchase \$25 tags for the 2004–2005 regulatory year.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents who are reluctant or unable to purchase the \$25 tag before hunting will be able to opportunistically and legally harvest a brown bear.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-078)

PROPOSAL 103 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(20). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 22C and a portion of Unit 22D, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(20)		
...		
Unit 22(C)		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull by registration permit only, or	Sept. 1 - Sept. 14	
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only	Sept. 15 - Sept. 30	

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

Sept. 1 - Sept. 14

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by registration permit only

...

Remainder of Unit 22(D)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from Dec. 1 through Dec. 31; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf; only antlered moose may be taken from Jan. 1 through Jan. 31

Aug. 10 – Sept. 14

Oct. 1 – Jan. 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side, by registration permit only.

Sept. 1 – Sept. 14

...

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Two areas in Unit 22 require reauthorization: (1) Unit 22C; and (2) the remainder of Unit 22D.

In October 1999, the board authorized a registration hunt for up to 20 antlerless moose in Unit 22C. The intent of the hunt is stabilization of the Unit 22C moose population, which is believed to be at or near carrying capacity of its winter range. The low bull:cow ratio (18 bulls:100 cows in November 2002 surveys) makes additional bull harvest ill-advised. The most recent composition surveys during November 2002 in the Snake and Stewart river drainages show calf production continues to be high (51 calves:100 cows).

The registration hunt in Unit 22C has worked well during the last three years. In 2001 only 10 permits were issued because of concerns about higher than normal mortality rates and delayed calving following the severe winter of 2000-2001. Eight of the 10 permits were filled. In September 2002 all 20 permits were issued and 11 of them filled. In September 2003 20 permits were issued and 12 were filled. We recommend reauthorizing the antlerless hunt in Unit 22C.

Low recruitment rates are believed to be causing moose population declines in many parts of Unit 22. The only portion of Unit 22, other than Unit 22C, where we recommend continued authorization of antlerless moose hunting is in the remainder of Unit 22D. This area is relatively remote, and difficult access limits hunting pressure. Most recent estimates of population size and recruitment provided by censuses indicate the population is stable. A census completed in

March 2002 resulted in calf:adult ratio of 17 calves:100 adults and a recruitment rate of 14 percent in this area of Unit 22D. A November 2003 composition survey found 27 calves:100 cows. The reported cow harvest in recent years in the remainder of Unit 22D has been low and is not having an adverse impact on the population: one cow during the 1997-1998 season; three cows in 1998-1999; two cows in 1999-2000; and five cows in 2000-2001 based on data from village harvest surveys. There was no reported cow moose harvest in Unit 22D during the 2001-2002 season and one cow was reported in 2002-2003. The village harvest survey data (only collected in 2000-2001) shows six cow moose were harvested from 22D remainder which is probably a more realistic estimate of annual cow harvest over the last several years than is reported harvest using harvest tickets. We recommend antlerless moose hunting be continued in the remainder of Unit 22D.

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

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-079)

PROPOSAL 104 - 5 AAC 85.045(21). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 23, as follows:

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

(21)

Unit 23, that portion north of and including the Singoalik River drainage

RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 moose by registration permit only; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from Nov. 1-Dec. 31;	July 1 - Dec. 31
---	------------------

a person may not take a calf
or a cow accompanied
by a calf; or

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

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

Remainder of Unit 23

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose by registration
permit only; however,
antlerless moose may be taken
only from Nov. 1-Dec. 31;
a person may not take a calf
or a cow accompanied
by a calf; or

Aug. 1 - Dec. 31

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

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Although moose populations appear to be declining in many portions of Unit 23, we prefer to retain existing antlerless moose regulations to allow resident harvest during the winter. Historically, the reported harvest of cow moose has been low throughout Unit 23 despite liberal antlerless seasons.

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

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered not requesting reauthorization of the Unit 23 antlerless moose season. We rejected this option because all Unit 23 Advisory Committees reached consensus at a joint meeting in July 2003 that the antlerless moose season should be limited to November and December throughout the unit. This was presented as a proposal to the Board of Game in November 2003 and was passed.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-080)

PROPOSAL 105 - 5 AAC 92.015(b). Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemption in Unit 13.

...

(b) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in that portion of Unit 13 outside of Denali State Park, ...

ISSUE: Brown bear tag fee exemptions must be reauthorized annually. The tag fee exemption in Unit 13 was enacted by the board during 1995 to provide increased hunting opportunity for brown bears. This tag fee exemption along with a bag limit change from one bear every four years to a bear every year, and a fall season extension was adopted by the board in an attempt to increase the brown bear harvest in Unit 13. In an effort to further increase harvests, the board during 1999 lengthened the spring season by an additional 15 days, and in 2003 extended the season to year-round.

Unit 13 was designated as an intensive management area by the Board of Game with the objective of providing more moose and caribou for human use. Because brown bears are important predators of moose calves in Unit 13, the board determined that it was necessary to reduce brown bear predation on moose calves by increasing the harvest of brown bears. During their March 2001 meeting, the board developed for Unit 13 an intensive management population goal of 17,000-21,900 moose and a harvest goal of 1,050-2,180 moose per year. These moose population and harvest goals have not been met.

Harvests of brown bears in Unit 13 have increased since more liberal seasons and bag limits, and the tag fee exemption were enacted. Brown bear harvests have increased from 97 bears during the 1994-95 season to 127 bears during 1995-1996, 139 during 1996-1997, 138 during 1997-1998, 125 during 1998-1999, 163 during 1999-2000, 150 during 2000-2001, and 134 during 2001-2002.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Increased harvest of brown bears in Unit 13 may help accomplish intensive management goals for moose. Without the tag fee exemption, there may be less interest in brown bear hunting and incidental harvest levels will be lower.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Brown bear hunters will benefit from increased hunting opportunity. Hunters and viewers of moose will ultimately benefit from increasing moose populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals who are opposed to these management programs.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Elimination of the tag fee exemption, and attempting to accomplish intensive management through long seasons and a more liberal bag limit only.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-062)

PROPOSAL 106 – 5 AAC 92.015(b). Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemption in Unit 16B.

(b) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in ... 16(B)

ISSUE: Brown bear tag fee exemptions must be reauthorized annually. In March of 2003 the board liberalized brown bear hunting regulations including the tag fee exemption in Unit 16B to increase the harvest of brown bears. Continuation of the exemption is necessary to encourage hunters to take brown bears in this unit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the board does not reauthorize the tag fee exemption the fee will be reinstated and hunters will not be able to legally harvest a bear unless they purchase the tag. This action may likely reduce the incidental harvest of bears by other hunters (i.e. sheep and moose hunters) and direct other potential brown bear hunters to other units.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The goal by both the board and the department is to increase the harvest of brown bears to decrease the predation on moose calves. A tag fee exemption will help to achieve this goal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? N/A

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-070)

PROPOSAL 107 - 5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemption in Unit 11.

(b) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in Unit 11...

ISSUE: Brown bear tag fee exemptions must be reauthorized annually. In March of 2003 the board eliminated the tag fee requirement in Unit 11. The department did not support the current tag fee exemption in Unit 11, and continues to advocate for tag fee exemptions only in intensive management areas where populations of moose and caribou have been found to be important for high levels of harvest for human consumption, and where increased bear harvests are desired and sustainable. Unit 11 moose and caribou populations do not meet these criteria.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the board does not reauthorize the tag fee exemption the fee will be reinstated and hunters will not be able to legally harvest a bear unless they had previously purchased the tag.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who do not wish to purchase the \$25 tag.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who have to purchase a \$25 tag before hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-083)

DELTA AREA

PROPOSAL 108 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Increase brown bear bag limit to one per year in Unit 20A as follows:

One grizzly every year on a normal hunting licenses (the same as 20D).

ISSUE: A dramatic increase in the grizzly population in 20A near the junction of the Tanana and Delta rivers. I have kept count of the local bears for 20 years and there is a boldness to travel in areas that have seen less bear pressure. There are more bears.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A lot of encounters between residents and bears.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This would thin the population of grizzlies but also increase the moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local hunters and residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I don't know.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Mark Costanza (I-04S-G-048)

PROPOSAL 109 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). Moose seasons and bag limits. Eliminate the Unit 20D Tier II moose hunt TM787 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts	Nonresident Open Season
(18)		
...		
Unit 20D that portion lying south of the north bank of the Tanana River and east of the west bank of the Johnson River, except that portion within the Robertson River drainage south of the confluence of east and west forks, and within one mile west of the west fork		
[1 BULL PER REGULATORY YEAR; ONLY AS FOLLOWS:]		
1 bull[; OR]	Sept. 1– Sept. 15	No open season.
[1 BULL BY TIER II SUBSISTENCE HUNTING PERMIT ONLY; UP TO 5 BULLS MAY BE TAKEN]	[JAN. 1–FEB. 15] (SUBSISTENCE HUNT ONLY)	[NO OPEN SEASON.]

Unit 20(D) that portion within the

Robertson River drainage south of the confluence of east and west forks, and within one mile west of the west fork

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull[; OR]

Sept. 1-Sept. 15

[1 BULL BY TIER II
SUBSISTENCE HUNTING
PERMIT ONLY; UP TO 5
BULLS MAY BE TAKEN]

[JAN. 1-FEB. 15
(SUBSISTENCE HUNT
ONLY)]

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 5-Sept. 15

...

ISSUE: The Unit 20D Tier II moose hunt TM787 is a Jan.1–Feb. 15 season, with 15 permits for a harvest quota of five bull moose. The hunt was originally established in 1990 to provide a customary and traditional moose hunting opportunity for residents of Dot Lake in southeastern Unit 20D. Since 1990, an average of only three Dot Lake residents per year have applied, and in the last five years, an average of only two Dot Lake residents per year have applied. Overall interest in the hunt and hunter participation is low and declining. The number of applications peaked in 1994 at 216 and has declined to 78 in 2003. Since 1990, only 38 percent of applicants have been from the local areas of Delta Junction, Dot Lake, Dry Creek, Tok, and Tanacross, with the remaining 68 percent coming from throughout the statewide roadsystem communities. Permit recipients for the last five years averaged 56 percent local residents, with only 40 percent local residents in 2003. In the last five years, only one Dot Lake resident (actually a physical resident of Dry Creek) hunted during one year and did not kill a moose. No Dot Lake resident has received a permit in the last three years. Historically, harvest has been low for the hunt, with only five moose killed since 1990, averaging 0.5 moose harvested/year, and with only one moose killed in the last five years.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will continue to expend resources administering a Tier II hunt with low participation and harvest.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The department will benefit by saving administrative resources on a low priority hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those few hunters that occasionally harvest a moose in this hunt will lose the opportunity.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Retain the status quo, change to a registration permit hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-099)

PROPOSAL 110 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose, and 5 AAC 92.530 Management areas. Modify season and bag limit in Bison Range Youth Moose Hunt in Unit 20D as follows:

5 AAC 85.045(18). Moose seasons and bag limits.

Unit 20(D), that portion within the
Bison Range Youth Hunt Management
Area

RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers
or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on at
least one side by drawing permit only; up
to 75 permits may be issued

Sept. 1–Sept. 30

5AAC 92.530(22). Management Areas.

(C) The area is closed to motorized vehicles for hunting and public access [FOR MOOSE HUNTING] from July 1 [SEPTEMBER1] - September 30, [INCLUDING THE TRANSPORTATION OF MOOSE HUNTERS AND THEIR GEAR IN THE MANAGEMENT AREA, EXCEPT TO RETRIVE A HARVESTED MOOSE.]

ISSUE: The Alaska Legislature established the 90,000 Delta Junction Bison Range in 1979 and directed the department to develop and manage bison forage on the range to attract bison away from private land and thus reduce bison damage to private agricultural crops in the area. The 2000–2005 Delta Bison Management Plan was approved by the Board of Game and stated that the department will manage the range to encourage the Delta bison herd to remain south of the Alaska Highway, and out of private agricultural land, as late in the fall as possible. Hunting and other human activity in the approximately 2,800 acres of Bison Range fields has been increasing in recent years resulting in high levels of disturbance to bison, damage to bison forage crops, physical damage to the fields (i.e. litter, fire pits, vandalism, etc.), and generated workplace safety concerns for department staff, thus reducing the department’s ability to meet objectives of the Bison Management Plan.

To address these issues, the Board of Game established the Bison Range Youth Hunt Management Area in 2002 and restricted moose hunting in the Bison Range Fields to youth only by drawing permit. Hunting for other species was not affected. The youth hunt met it’s objectives by substantially reducing the impact of moose hunters on the Bison Range, however

use of the fields by other hunters and non-hunting members of the public was still occurring at levels that may be reducing bison use of the Bison Range. Also, there were public concerns expressed to the department about the youth hunt.

In the spring of 2003, the department established an Ad Hoc Committee on Management of Moose Hunting on the Delta Junction Bison Range to evaluate moose hunting on the fields and make recommendations to the department. The Ad Hoc Committee completed their recommendations in October 2003.

The Delta Bison Working Group was established in 1992 to advise the department on bison and Bison Range issues, as well as working with the department on development of five-year bison management plans. The Delta Bison Working Group endorsed all recommendations in the October 2003 Final Report and Recommendations ADF&G Ad Hoc Committee on Management of Moose Hunting on the Delta Bison Range Fields. The Working Group's priority is to eliminate vehicular traffic in the fields to reduce disturbance to bison and damage to bison forage crops but feels that the entire package of recommendations by the Ad Hoc committee is appropriate including the following:

1. Change the Bison Range Youth hunt bag limit from any bull to 1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or 4 brow tines on at least one antler.
2. The majority of Working Group members concur with the majority of the Ad Hoc Committee members that hunting should be by drawing permit for youth only (ages 10–17), with one successful hunt per lifetime.
3. Motorized transportation should not be allowed in the DJBR fields for hunting any species of wildlife between July 1–September 30 to reduce disturbance to bison and damage to bison forage.
4. Motorized transportation should not be allowed in the fields for non-hunting activities between July 1–September 30 to reduce disturbance to bison and damage to bison forage.

At their October 2003 meeting, the Delta Fish and Game Advisory Committee voted to support the Ad Hoc Committee recommendations and co-sponsor this proposal with the Delta Bison Working Group.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department's ability to meet the objectives of the 2000-2005 Delta Bison Management Plan will continue to be jeopardized due to high levels of disturbance to bison on the Bison Range. The ultimate result will be continued bison damage to private agricultural crops that may also result in continued loss of hunting opportunity on private lands for hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Changing the bag limit from any bull to a spike-fork or 50-inch bull will help to improve the low bull:cow ratio in the area. Restricting motorized vehicles will improve Bison Range management results thus leading to improved compliance with Bison Management Plan objectives.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The general public will benefit by the department's improved ability to meet Bison Plan Management objectives, private landowners suffering

damage from bison, and area moose hunters will benefit from the contribution to a higher bull:cow ratio.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Youth hunters who will have reduced chances for a successful hunt due to the bag limit restriction and will have more difficulty retrieving a carcass due to motorized vehicle restrictions. Thus the hunt will lose the advantage of being an introductory moose hunt for youth with a high chance of success. Other users of the area will lose vehicular access to the Bison Range fields from July–September.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Numerous options have been discussed and considered by the public through Delta Fish and Game Advisory Committee meetings and the Ad Hoc Committee review, including completely closing the Bison Range fields to all hunting and public access, establishment of a controlled use area, establishment of a registration permit hunt, and others.

PROPOSED BY: Delta Bison Working Group and Delta Advisory Committee (I-04S-G-021)

PROPOSAL 111 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify moose seasons in Units 12 and 20D as follows:

- a) Align the moose hunting season between eastern Unit 20D and Unit 12.
- b) Close the moose hunting season in eastern Unit 20D between Sept. 1- Sept. 7.
- c) Close the Tier II moose season in eastern Unit 20D.
Remainder of Unit 12

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull	Aug. 20-Aug. 28
or	
1 bull	Sept. 8-Sept. 20

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on at least one side.	Sept.8-Sept. 20
---	-----------------

Unit 20D, south of the north bank of the Tanana River and east of the west bank of the Johnson River, except that portion within the Robertson River drainage south of the confluence of the east and west forks, and within one mile of the west fork:

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull	Aug. 20-Aug. 28
or	
1 bull	Sept. 8-Sept. 20

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season

ISSUE: (1) The present resident moose hunting season for “the remainder of Unit 12” is Aug. 24-Aug. 28 and Sept. 8-Sept. 17. The resident moose hunting season for eastern Unit 20D is Sept. 1-Sept. 15. This has resulted in a number of problems: (a) Confusion by both local and non local hunters as to the boundaries of the area open for hunting. For example, during the 2003 hunting season, there were a number of hunters hunting in eastern Unit 20D during the early season in Unit 12; (b) With the moose hunting season starting on Sept. 1 in eastern Unit 20D, we have experienced a large influx of hunters over the holiday weekend; and (c) Most local hunters hunt between the Johnson River and Tanacross. This includes both Unit 12 and eastern Unit 20D; and (2) The Tier II moose season in eastern Unit 20D is during a time when the bull moose are in very poor shape.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? (1) Continued confusion during the moose hunting season; and (2) Moose in poor condition will continue to be harvested.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it decreases the chance of confusion during hunting seasons, thereby reducing the number of incidental kills.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? N/A

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: William J. Miller, President, Dot Lake Traditional Council (I-04S-G-024)

PROPOSAL 112 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Close winter moose hunt in Unit 20D as follows:

Our preference is for the winter hunt from January 1 - February 15 for one bull moose in the Healy River drainage be eliminated.

ISSUE: Healy Lake Traditional Council requests that the winter hunt from January 1-February 15 for one bull moose in the Healy River drainage be eliminated. The reason for this request is the problem of trespassing on native lands and interference with our traplines by hunters. Access to hunting areas is either across our native lands or down the Tanana River, which can be dangerous since there are frequent overflows and open places in the river. We regret having to give up this opportunity to feed our families, but cannot see any other solution to the trespass issues.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The trespassing and interference will continue and probably escalate.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, there will be less stress on the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The people of Healy Lake village will benefit because our lands will not be trespassed and our traplines will not be interfered with. We will also suffer the loss of hunting opportunity which we greatly regret.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? We and others will suffer the loss of hunting opportunity.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We don't know what else to do about this issue.

PROPOSED BY: Healy Lake Traditional Council (I-04S-G-039)

PROPOSAL 113 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish drawing permit hunt for antlerless moose in Delta Junction Management Area as follows:

Establish a drawing permit hunt for 10 permits to take antlerless moose in the Delta Junction Management Area.

ISSUE: Too many moose in the Delta Junction Management Area, which includes the community of Delta Junction and outlying areas. The Board of Game adopted intensive management for moose in Unit 20D and established a population goal of 8,000-10,000 moose. This goal is too high. The southern Unit 20D moose population, which includes Delta Junction, has increased from 2,522 moose in 1995 to 3,435 in 2001. Much of this increase has occurred around the community of Delta Junction due to improved moose habitat from agricultural land clearing and several large wildfires. Many, if not most, nuisance moose issues around Delta Junction involve cow moose. Harvest of antlerless moose is appropriate under Intensive Management, unless the population should decline. The number of drawing permits can easily be adjusted up or down as populations fluctuate.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Residents will have more nuisance moose problems as the moose population grows. For example, road kills could increase, more encounters between moose and humans, such as children walking to or from their school bus stops.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters trying to put food on the table and people experiencing problems with nuisance moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Relocate some cow moose to other areas of Unit 20. The state probably would not fund this because it would be too expensive.

PROPOSED BY: Tim Webb (I-04S-G-052)

PROPOSAL 114 - 5AAC 92.125(3). Wolf Control Implementation Plan. Update the Unit 20D wolf control implementation plan as follows:

...

(3) a Unit 20(D) wolf predation control area is established and consists of Unit 20(D), except for the portions of Unit 20(D) within the Ft. Greely Military Reservation and within the Fortymile Nonlethal Predation Control Area described in (4) of this section; in accordance with 5 AAC 92.110, the commissioner or the commissioner's designee may conduct a wolf population reduction or wolf population regulation program in the Unit 20(D) wolf predation control area consistent with the following program objectives, methods, constraints, and requirements:

(A) the objectives for the program are as follows:

(i) to increase the Unit 20(D) fall moose population to 8,000 - 10,000 moose with a sustainable harvest of 500 - 700 moose per year [BY THE YEAR 2002]; and

(ii) to reverse the decline of the Macomb caribou herd and increase the fall population to 600 - 800 caribou with a sustainable harvest of 30 - 50 caribou per year [BY THE YEAR 2002];

(B) if the commissioner or the commissioner's designee conducts a wolf population reduction or a wolf population regulation program, the program shall be conducted in the following manner to achieve the objectives of (A) of this paragraph;

(i) for up to five years beginning July 1, **2004** [1997] the commissioner may reduce the wolf population in Unit 20(D); however, the commissioner may not reduce the wolf population within the Unit 20(D) wolf predation control area to fewer than 25 percent of the early-winter wolf population before initiation of the program; and

(ii) the commissioner shall reduce the wolf population in an efficient manner, but as safely and humanely as practical;

(C) hunting and trapping of wolves by the public in Unit 20(D) during the term of the program may occur as provided in the hunting and trapping regulations set out elsewhere in this title, including use of motorized vehicles as provided in 5 AAC 92.080; however, if the wolf population is reduced to 25 percent of the early-winter, pre-control size, the commissioner shall stop all taking of wolves until the wolf population increases;

(D) annually, the department shall provide to the Board of Game, at the board's **spring** [FALL] board meeting, a report of program activities conducted during the preceding 12 months, including implementation activities, the status of prey and predator populations, and recommendations for changes, if necessary, to achieve the plan's objectives;

(E) justification for the program, and wildlife population and human-use information, is as follows:

(i) consumptive use of moose and caribou has been a priority human use of wildlife in Unit 20(D) for decades; human demand for harvest of these species remains high in Unit 20(D); the board determined the moose population in Unit 20(D) and the Macomb caribou herd are important for providing high levels of human consumptive use; the board established objectives for population size and annual sustained harvest of moose in Unit 20(D) and the Macomb caribou herd consistent with multiple use and principles of sound conservation and management of habitat and all wildlife species in the area; these objectives are to have a moose population of 8,000 - 10,000 with an annual sustainable harvest of 500 - 700 moose and to have 600 - 800 caribou in the Macomb herd with an annual sustainable harvest of 30 - 50 caribou;

(ii) the Unit 20(D) moose population was [IS] estimated to be ~~4,956-6,704~~ [2,750 - 4,800] moose in fall 2001 based on Geostatistical Population Estimation [DENSITY EXTRAPOLATIONS FROM MOOSE SURVEY AREAS IN VARIOUS PORTIONS OF THE UNIT]; the annual harvest from Unit 20(D) has averaged about 204 [140] moose per year for the past five years; both the population size and harvest are well below the management objective level;

(iii) the moose population in Unit 20(D) is divided into three subpopulations for management purposes: northern 20(D), southeastern 20(D), and southwestern 20(D);

(iv) the northern 20(D) [EXTRAPOLATED] moose population is [LOW AND] estimated to be ~~2,070-2,719~~ [900 - 1,600] moose; moose calf survival to fall was 18 calves:100 cows in 1999 [IN THE CENTRAL CREEK TREND COUNT AREA IN NORTHWESTERN 20(D) HAS AVERAGED ONLY 13 CALVES TO 100 COWS (RANGE 4 - 21) DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS AND WAS 16 CALVES TO 100 COWS IN 1994]; moose habitat quality is good in northern 20(D), with extensive areas of subalpine habitat, lowland habitat associated with several major rivers and creeks, and numerous areas burned by wildfire within the last 1 [5] - 30 years; the resident and nonresident hunting season is September 1 - 15 for any bull; during the last five years, an average of 261 [243] hunters per year killed an average of 67 [62] moose per year;

(v) the southwestern 20(D) [EXTRAPOLATED] moose population is estimated to be ~~1,990-3,175~~ [1,000 - 2,000] moose; moose calf survival to fall [IN THE DONNELLY TREND COUNT AREA HAS AVERAGED 34 CALVES TO 100 COWS (RANGE 24 - 44) DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS AND] was 20 [37] calves to 100 cows in 2001 [1994]; moose habitat quality is good with extensive areas of subalpine habitat, several major wildfires in the last 5-15 [FIVE] years, and large areas of cleared land that are revegetating with moose browse; the resident hunting season is September 1 - 15 for one bull with spike-

fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with four or more brow tines on at least one side; the nonresident season is September 5 - 15 for one bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with four or more brow tines on at least one side; the Delta Junction **Management** [CLOSED] Area and the **Bison Range Youth Hunt Management Area** is hunting by **drawing permit** [CLOSED TO MOOSE HUNTING] within this portion of Unit 20(D); during the last five years, an average of **432** [300] hunters per year killed an average of **118** [71] moose per year;

(vi) the southeastern 20(D) [EXTRAPOLATED] moose population is estimated to be **544-1,162** [850-1,200] moose; moose calf survival to fall [IN THE ROBERTSON RIVER SURVEY AREA HAS AVERAGED 29 CALVES TO 100 COWS (RANGE 12 - 38) DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS AND] was **28** [ONLY 12] calves to 100 cows in **2001** [1994]; moose habitat quality is good with extensive areas of subalpine habitat and lowland habitat along the Tanana River; the resident hunting season is September 1 - 15 for any bull, and a Tier II hunt is open from January 1 through February 15 with a harvest quota of five bulls; there is no open season for nonresidents **except within a portion of the Robertson River drainage**; the Macomb Plateau Controlled Use Area within this portion of Unit 20(D) restricts motorized access for hunting, and makes moose hunting difficult in much of this area; during the last five years, an average of **47** [39] hunters per year killed an average of **13** [10] moose per year during the general hunting season; the Tier II moose harvest ranges from 0 - 1 moose per year;

(vii) the Unit 20(D) grizzly bear population can be estimated by extrapolation from bear research data collected in adjacent units; the extrapolated estimate for Unit 20(D) is 181 - 210 total grizzly bears, with 143 - 176 bears older than 2 years; the grizzly bear estimate for southeastern and southwestern Unit 20(D) combined is 76 - 86 total bears, including 51 - 58 bears older than 2 years; in northern Unit 20(D), the grizzly bear population is estimated to contain 105 - 124 total bears with 92 - 109 bears older than 2 years; **human-caused grizzly bear mortality has averaged 14 bears per year for the last 5 years**;

(viii) black bears occur throughout Unit 20(D) at low to mid elevation; no estimate of black bear density or population size can be made; both black bears and grizzly bears are known to prey on moose in Unit 20(D), but the extent of predation has not been measured; **human-caused black bear mortality has averaged 22 bears per year for the last 5 years**;

(ix) the Macomb caribou herd declined significantly in size from 800 caribou in fall 1990 to 458 in fall 1993; **the herd increased to 550-575 by fall 2003 with a ratio of 19 calves to 100 cows** [THE MAJOR CAUSES OF THE DECLINE WERE ADVERSE WEATHER AND LOW CALF SURVIVAL, PROBABLY DUE TO PREDATION; HUNTING OF THE HERD WAS CLOSED BY AN EMERGENCY ORDER ISSUED IN SEPTEMBER 1991 AND HAS NOT RESUMED; A RESEARCH PROJECT TO DIVERT PREDATORS FROM

NEWBORN CARIBOU CALVES TO MOOSE CARCASSES WAS TESTED IN SPRING 1990 AND 1991 BUT DID NOT REVERSE THE HERD DECLINE; CALF SURVIVAL IS CURRENTLY LOW, RANGING FROM 9 THROUGH 18 CALVES TO 100 COWS SINCE FALL 1990, AND HERD SIZE HAS REMAINED BELOW THE OBJECTIVE, RANGING FROM 458 - 560 CARIBOU];

(x) winter weather in Unit 20(D) has been moderate for the past five to eight years; [DRY SUMMER WEATHER MAY HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO LOW CALF PRODUCTION OR SURVIVAL IN THE MACOMB CARIBOU HERD, BUT NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS OF WEATHER ON UNGULATE POPULATIONS ARE EVIDENT];

(xi) extensive research in Alaska and northern Canada demonstrates the potential for naturally regulated wolf and bear populations to regulate moose numbers at densities well below the forage-carrying capacity of the habitat; potential harvest from such moose populations is low; it is likely that the moose population in Unit 20(D) fits this pattern, **particularly in northern Unit 20(D)**; unless combined wolf and bear predation is reduced, the moose population will not increase to objective levels in spite of mild weather, abundant high quality forage, and restriction on hunter harvest;

(xii) bear regulations have been liberalized in portions of Unit 20(D) for several years; in parts of the unit, grizzly numbers are probably reduced somewhat as a result of hunter harvest and other human-caused mortality; no corresponding increase in moose or caribou numbers or harvestable surplus is evident as a result;

(xiii) the **fall 2002** wolf population is estimated to be **88-98** [60 – 80] based on **aerial surveys**, incidental observations, sealing records, and interviews with knowledgeable trappers; [HOWEVER, INFORMATION IS NOT AVAILABLE FOR TWO POSSIBLE PACKS, AND THE ACTUAL POPULATION MAY BE HIGHER]; an average of **38** [25] wolves per year have been taken by hunting and trapping during the past five years; this is below maximum sustainable levels; **in addition, several packs in northern Unit 20(D) were treated during the Fortymile Nonlethal Predation Control Program and still contain sterilized pairs of wolves.**

(xiv) if local hunters and trappers do not achieve adequate wolf reductions, the Delta Fish and Game Advisory Committee recommended the department issue permits to allow **either aerial shooting or** land-and-shoot taking of wolves by the public; if this is unsuccessful in achieving adequate reduction of wolf numbers, the committee recommends the department implement aerial shooting;

ISSUE: The Board of Game has requested an update on the Unit 20D wolf control implementation plan.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Unit 20D wolf control implementation plan has expired and will not be renewed.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If wolf predation is reduced in Unit 20D, greater quantities of moose can be harvested in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? If renewal of the plan results in wolf control, hunters will benefit by increased moose, caribou, and sheep populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to predator control.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-109)

PROPOSAL 115 - 5 AAC 92.540(3)(G). Controlled use areas. Restrict Macomb Plateau Controlled Use Area to walk-in hunting only as follows:

(7) Macomb Plateau Controlled Use Area

Restrict the area to “walk-in” hunting only.

Unit 20D south of the Alaska Highway, draining into the south side of the Tanana River between the east bank of the Johnson River upstream to Prospect Creek, and the east bank of bear creek (Mile 1357.3). The area is **closed to any motorized vehicle or pack animal for hunting including the transportation of hunters, their hunting gear, and/or parts of game, from August 10-September 30 except for motorized vehicles and aircraft to, from, and on the Dry Creek Airstrip at Mile 1379 Alaska Highway.**

ISSUE: As written, this area is presently open to the use of horses or other animals, and the use of float planes on Fish Lake, to transport hunters, gear and/or game within the area. Over the last few years, the number of hunters as well as the number of moose being taken with the aid of horses and aircraft has increased. This has resulted in fewer animals being available to hunters in the flats that cannot afford to maintain horses or own an aircraft, hire a guide with horses, rent horses, or rent an aircraft to hunt the area.

In addition, a number of the moose being taken in this area are the larger breeding bulls, that would remain high until later in the season.

If the intent of this Controlled Use Area is to protect the game resource, this area should be closed to all but “Walk-in” hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The number of moose (especially the larger breeding bulls) being taken in this area will continue to increase and the moose population will continue to decline.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. By reducing the access to this area, the number of breeding bulls harvested will be decreased, thereby allowing for an increase in the number of cows being impregnated. This will in turn increase the number of moose in the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The large number of hunters that hunt the flats within eastern Unit 20D.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The individuals that presently hunt the area with horses and aircraft.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Closing the area completely. This option would hurt those individuals that are willing to expend the energy and effort required to hunt the area on foot.

PROPOSED BY: William J. Miller, President, Dot Lake Traditional Council (I-04S-G-025)

FAIRBANKS AREA

PROPOSAL 116 5 AAC 84.270(1). Furbearer trapping; and 5 AAC 92.095(a)(10). Unlawful methods of taking fur bearers; exceptions. Extend the beaver trapping season in the remainder of Unit 20B in the fall and spring as follows:

5 AAC 84.270 Furbearer trapping.

Units and Bag Limits	Open Season	Limit
(1) Beaver		
...		
Unit 20(B), that portion of the Chena River downstream from its Confluence with the Little Chena River, and Badger (Piledriver) Slough downstream from Plack Road	No open season; however, the department may set seasons and bag limits, by permit only, to curb high beaver populations and reduce property damage.	
Remainder of Unit 20(B) [AND	<u>Sept. 25-May 31</u>	No limit

UNITS 20(C) AND 20(F)]

[NOV. 1-APR. 15]

Units 20(C) and 20(F)

Nov. 1-Apr. 15

No limit

...

5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking fur bearers; exceptions. (a) The following methods and means of taking furbearers under a trapping license are prohibited, in addition to the prohibitions in 5 AAC 92.080:

...

(10) taking beaver in Unit 13 and Unit 16 from September 25 through November 9 **and in the remainder of Unit 20(B) from September 25 through October 31 and April 16 through May 31**; except with underwater traps or snares;

ISSUE: Beaver densities in the Fairbanks residential and roaded areas are high and current harvest is likely far below sustainable yield. Extending the beaver season could increase harvest in the Fairbanks residential and roaded areas and reduce the current level of property damage caused by beaver. There is room for increased beaver trapping opportunity, but there is little risk of over-harvest because market demand is low. An open water season should encourage trappers who would not normally trap beaver under the ice. During open water season, effort will likely be focused near roads, since trapper mobility is limited. Therefore, this proposed change may decrease beaver numbers and nuisance complaints near roads and residences, but will not likely affect beaver numbers in rural areas of 20B.

The department surveyed beaver caches along the Chena River for 13 of the last 18 years. The 2003 survey showed the highest number of caches ever recorded, indicating a high beaver population throughout the Fairbanks area. Between April 15, 2003 and October 31, 2003 the department issued 34 permits to take beaver that were damaging property, resulting in the take of 61 beaver. Property damage by beavers is a significant problem in the residential and roaded areas of 20B. Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities expends considerable resources unplugging culverts and repairing roads damaged by the raised water levels. Private property damage consists of flooding of basements, contamination of wells from flood waters, and trees dropped onto power lines and buildings. In addition, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game spends considerable time determining the need for nuisance beaver permits, finding trappers to do the job, and issuing permits to trap for specific locations. Increasing beaver harvest near roads and residences will likely reduce these problems.

Therefore, the department recommends extending the season for beaver in the remainder of 20B to increase trapping opportunity during open water conditions and to mitigate property damage and nuisance complaints. An extended beaver season (outside of November 1-April 15) already exists in Units 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 11-14, 16, 18, 19, 20E, 21E, 22, 23 and 25. The remainder of 20B will be added to other areas in which 5 AAC 92.095 requires underwater sets, which reduces conflicts with pets and humans.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Opportunity for increased harvest of this resource will be lost. Complaints of property damage will continue to be high. The department will continue to issue damage permits to take beaver that could otherwise be taken during an extended general season.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Quality of beaver meat salvaged for human consumption may be improved in an open water trapping situation due to the increased access to beaver traps and the potential for increased frequency of checks.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers, property owners, and people who use the roads in 20B.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who don't wish beaver to be trapped.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No change to regulation, but increasing the number of nuisance beaver calls and permits.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-098)

PROPOSAL 117 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.
Lengthen brown bear season in portion of Unit 20B as follows:

Brown bear/grizzly season Aug. 10-June 30.

One bear every regulatory year in that portion of Unit 20B upstream from Vancurlers on the middle fork of the Chena also upstream from the confluence of the north fork and middle fork of the Salcha rivers.

ISSUE: Harvest opportunities for brown bear in Unit 20B upstream from Vancurlers on the middle fork of the Chena and upstream of the confluence of the north fork and middle fork of the Salcha rivers. Change of season dates to reflect that of Unit 20E Aug. 10-June 30, thereby allowing early season caribou hunters the opportunity to harvest grizzly bears in known caribou calving areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Missed opportunities for harvest of brown bears where they are very abundant but access is limited. Opportunity to remove grizzly bears out of known caribou calving areas in that portion of Unit 20.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Longer season equates to higher harvest in an area of 20B where bears are abundant but access is limited. Earlier season will help achieve management goals for that area of 20B.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Where bear harvest is non-existent, early season caribou hunters wanting to harvest a bear, also caribou calves would benefit by lowering abundant bear numbers on traditional calving grounds in this portion of 20B.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? By the Sept. 1 fall hunt, traditionally caribou have moved East to 20E thereby losing the opportunity to harvest bears during the time period Sept. 1-Sept. 20.

PROPOSED BY: Richard Swisher (I-04S-G-118)

PROPOSAL 118 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou; 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose; and 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Close nonresident season for hunting of sheep, caribou, and moose in Unit 20 as follows:

Unit 20A map numbers & restrictions #6-8-13-14-17-19.
Nonresidents: No open season for sheep-moose-caribou

Unit 13E within 25 mile corridor east of the Parks Highway:
Nonresident: No open season for sheep, caribou, and leave moose closed to nonresidents as it is now.

ISSUE: There is very heavy hunting pressure by outfitters in 20A, the Wood River and Yanert Controlled Areas and in Unit 13E. There are five to six outfitters hunting the Wood River and Yanert area at once. There is no control. Outfitter hunting is going wild. Resident hunters are struggling to hunt the area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It has already happened: low mature sheep ram numbers, low mature moose bull numbers, less old bears. A quality area has lost its quality! Rich areas 10 years ago are almost barren now. Residents continue to compete and struggle with outfitters. There is no care among outfitters to manage wildlife numbers because there are no outfitter areas!

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Less hunting by outfitters will give the wildlife a chance to increase in mature numbers. There will be better quality hunting areas, less air traffic and less large camps.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters and nonresident bear and wolf hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Outfitter use in the small area proposed.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Please create some form of Outfitter Areas, something that would be consistent with the Alaska Constitution.

PROPOSED BY: Kevin Bopp (HQ-04S-G-014)

PROPOSAL 119 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Apply the alternate list system for allocating nonresident drawing permits for caribou in Unit 20A as follows:

The board would use 5 AAC 92.061 (3) and (4) as a template. The average percentage of hunters who draw permits and don't go hunting would be allocated to guided nonresidents. Approximately 35-40 percent.

(3) The department shall enter, in a guided nonresident drawing, each application from a nonresident who will be accompanied by a guide; the department may issue a drawing permit for the general hunt only to a successful nonresident applicant who presents proof that the applicant will be accompanied by a guide;

(4) the following provisions apply to a guided nonresident drawing under this section:

(A) an applicant for a guided nonresident drawing permit may apply for only one such permit per application period;

(B) after the successful applicants have been selected by drawing, the department shall create an alternate list by drawing the remaining names of applicants for a specific hunt and placing the names on the alternate list in the order in which the names were drawn;

(C) if a successful applicant fails to provide proof that the applicant will be accompanied by a guide or cancels the guided hunt, the person whose name appears first on the alternate list for that hunt shall be offered the permit; if an alternate applicant fails to furnish proof that the applicant will be accompanied by a guide, the permit must be offered in turn to succeeding alternate applicants until the alternate list is exhausted;

(D) if a guided nonresident drawing permit is available, but the alternate list is exhausted, the permit becomes available, by registration at the Fairbanks ADF&G office, to the first applicant furnishing proof that the applicant will be accompanied by a guide;

ISSUE: Clients of hunting guides not drawing a caribou permit. Approximately 35 percent of the hunters drawing permits are not hunting. Last year (2003) only 48 percent of the hunters who drew permits hunted. The recent average harvest is only 34.5 caribou per year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Residents will continue to draw permits without investigating the difficulty of access and not participate in the hunt. Hunting guides who operate in the area will not have clients.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the guides have the equipment and ability to take care of the animal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nonresident hunters who want to be guided.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Awarding guides one caribou tag (for their clients' use) per three wolves they kill.

PROPOSED BY: Virgil Umphenour

(I-04S-G-138)

PROPOSAL 120 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Close cow and calf moose hunts in the Tanana Flats portion of Unit 20A as follows:

No more calf and cow permits in 20A – Tanana Flats

ISSUE: Rapid decline of cow:calf population in 20A – Tanana Flats.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose will be depleted.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by halting the declining population in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everybody.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Loren E. Hite

(HQ-04S-G-018)

PROPOSAL 121 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change bag limit and prohibit taking of calf moose in Unit 20A as follows:

Unit 20A, Residents: One bull with a spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with three or more brow tines on at least one side. Instead of calf permits, have permits for any antlered bull under 50-inches.

ISSUE: Unnecessary regulations. Simplify the regulation by changing Unit 20A legal moose definition, and doing away with calf permits.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose that are legal on the south side of the Rex, which are shot on the south side of the trail become illegal if they run across to the north side and die after being shot are now an illegal moose. If we continue to shoot calves that the wolves have not eaten we are not going to have greatly reduced numbers of moose to hunt.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All resident hunters in Unit 20A by simplifying the regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Changing the regulations four brow tines instead of three brow tines. The current antler restrictions are to restrictive, besides antlers make awfully poor stew.

PROPOSED BY: Frank E. Hollis (HQ-04S-G-035)

PROPOSAL 122 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Increase opportunity for moose hunters under 16 in Unit 20A as follows:

Hunters under the age of 16 may harvest one bull moose.

ISSUE: Lack of opportunity for hunters under the age of 16 to legally shoot a moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fewer young hunters will continue to hunt as they grow frustrated with such restrictive antler restrictions. We will continue to have more people who no longer respect the value of wildlife.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Young hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A special hunt just for young hunters in August. Would rather have these youngsters gain the memories in September, when the leaves are starting to fall, the smell of a brisk fall morning, and hunting when there are fewer insects. Also watching the migrating waterfowl and other birds, while waiting for moose. Learning to call moose.

PROPOSED BY: Frank E. Hollis (HQ-04S-G-036)

PROPOSAL 123 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Open muzzleload hunt for antlerless cow moose in November in the Wood River Controlled Use Area portion of Unit 20A as follows:

Open a November Muzzleloader hunt, in the Wood River Controlled Use Area of 20A for cow moose (antlerless).

ISSUE: High number of cow moose to bull ratio. A population of aged animals with low reproductive rate.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Poor reproductive rate. Possible sudden decline in moose numbers.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? By reducing the number of cows in an aged population, improve cow to bull ratio.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All persons that harvest moose in 20A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one that I can think of.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Roggie L. Hunter (HQ-04S-G-051)

PROPOSAL 124 – 5 AAC 85.045(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize and modify antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20A.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(18)		
Unit 20(A), the Ferry Trail Management Area, Wood River Controlled Use Area, Healy-Lignite Management Area, and the Yanert Controlled Use Area		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or	Sept. 1-Sept. 20 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 300 permits may be issued in Unit 20(A); a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in Unit 20(A); or	<u>Aug. 25 -Sept. 30</u> [SEPT. 1-SEPT. 25] (General hunt only)	
<u>1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; or</u>	<u>Nov. 1 -Nov. 30</u>	
1 calf moose by <u>registration</u>	<u>Sept. 1-Nov. 30</u>	

[DRAWING] permit only; [UP TO 300 PERMITS MAY BE ISSUED IN UNIT 20(A); A RECIPIENT OF A DRAWING PERMIT IS PROHIBITED FROM TAKING AN ANTLERED BULL MOOSE IN UNIT 20A] or

[SEPT. 1-SEPT. 25]
(General hunt only)

1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only; by muzzle-loading firearms only; up to 75 permits may be issued

Nov. 1-Nov. 30

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1-Sept. 20

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only; by muzzle-loading firearms only; up to 75 permits may be issued

Nov. 1 -Nov. 30

Unit 20(A) within the Nenana Controlled Use Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1-Sept. 20
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by registration permit [ONLY DURING THE SEASON TO BE ANNOUNCED BY EMERGENCY ORDER]; a recipient of a registration permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in Unit 20(A); or

Aug. 25 -Sept. 30
[TO BE ANNOUNCED]
(General hunt only)

1 calf moose by **registration** [DRAWING] permit only; [UP TO 300 PERMITS MAY BE ISSUED IN UNIT 20(A); A RECIPIENT OF A DRAWING PERMIT IS PRO-

Sept. 1-Nov. 30
[SEPT. 1-SEPT. 25]
(General hunt only)

HIBITED FROM TAKING AN
ANTLERED BULL MOOSE IN
UNIT 20(A)]

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1-Sept. 20

Remainder of Unit 20(A)

1 moose per regulatory year,
only as follows:

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1-Sept. 20
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit
only; up to 300 permits may be
issued in Unit 20(A); a recipient of a
drawing permit is prohibited from
taking an antlered bull moose in Unit
20(A); or

Aug. 25 -Sept. 30
[SEPT. 1-SEPT. 25]
(General hunt only)

1 calf moose by **registration**
[DRAWING] permit only; [UP TO 300
PERMITS MAY BE ISSUED IN
UNIT 20(A); A RECIPIENT OF A
DRAWING PERMIT IS PRO-
HIBITED FROM TAKING AN
ANTLERED BULL MOOSE IN
UNIT 20(A)]

Sept. 1-Nov. 30
[SEPT. 1-SEPT. 25]
(General hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1-Sept. 20

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. The primary reasons for the Unit 20A antlerless hunts are to limit growth of the moose population in the central portion of the unit and to provide the opportunity to harvest a surplus of cow moose in an effort to meet subsistence and Intensive Management harvest objectives. Moose density in central Unit 20A, which contains about 50 percent of the moose habitat and about 67 percent of the moose, is

relatively high and stable. As a result, the moose population has been exhibiting density-dependent effects, such as low twinning rates, relatively light calf weights, late age of first reproduction, reproductive pauses, and heavy browsing of winter forage. Thus, our management goal is to curtail population growth in the central portion of the unit through the limited harvest of cow moose. Recent surveys estimate the number of cow moose (excluding calves) in Unit 20A at approximately 7500 and increasing at an estimated one to two percent annually. Average annual reported harvest has been 79 (approximately 1.1 percent) antlerless moose (1996-1998 and 2000-2003) and the maximum reported harvest was 137 (1.8 percent) in 2003. Trend data suggests annual harvests of about 150 cows is sustainable (i.e., maintain a stable moose population).

We recommend extending the drawing permit antlerless moose season by 11 days (i.e., from September 1-September 25 to August 25-September 30) to provide additional hunting opportunity and to increase harvest. Starting the antlerless season six days before and closing it 10 days after the general season will reduce competition and crowding among moose hunters and improve hunt quality. In addition, we predict this will result in a slight increase in harvest, helping us reach our harvest objective of approximately 150 cows.

We recommend a November 1-30 antlerless season by registration permit. The primary objective of this proposed hunt is to improve the spatial distribution of the cow harvest (i.e., take a greater proportion of the cow harvest from high-density foothill areas in central 20A). The hunt will also provide additional hunting opportunity.

We also recommend the continuation of calf moose hunts in Unit 20A. Although calf harvests have been low (2002=33; 2003=24), these hunts provide additional hunting opportunity, reduce hunting pressure on bull moose; reduce competition among hunters, and help meet Intensive Management harvest objectives. However, we recommend restructuring the calf hunts from a drawing permit to a registration permit hunt. This proposal would also allow for a potentially longer season, which in turn would provide for additional hunting opportunity, especially during a time when little opportunity exists to hunt other big game (e.g., October and November). With increased hunting opportunity, we expect calf harvest to increase accordingly. Late season hunts would also improve the distribution of the harvest because snowmachines could be used to access hunt areas that are difficult to reach prior to freeze-up. Furthermore, because calf harvests are more compensatory than adult harvests, especially in high density, food limited moose populations like Unit 20A, we expect overall yield to increase. Increasing yield is desirable for any hunted moose population, but it is paramount in units with Intensive Management regulations. Finally, the harvest of calf moose is a useful management tool in areas like Unit 20A where the harvest of bulls must be reduced to improve low bull:cow ratios and still meet intensive management harvest objectives. Data on moose population trends, productivity, and calf survival in Unit 20A indicates that a limited number of calves can be harvested without negatively impacting the population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The central 20A moose population may increase, which may result in further deterioration of the habitat and exacerbate a population decline in years with severe winter conditions. The opportunity to hunt a harvestable surplus of cow and calf moose will be lost and subsistence needs in the western Tanana Flats and Intensive Management harvest objectives for Unit 20A may not be met.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, hunting opportunity and harvest will increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence hunters will benefit from the opportunity to harvest cow and calf moose in the western Tanana Flats. In the remaining antlerless hunt areas, hunters will benefit by having the opportunity to harvest cow moose for meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-073)

PROPOSAL 125 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunting season in Unit 20B within the Fairbanks Management Area and the Minto Flats Management Area as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(18)		
...		
Unit 20(B), that portion within the Fairbanks Management Area		
1 moose per regulatory year only as follows:		
1 bull with spike-fork or greater antlers by bow and arrow only	Sept. 1-Sept. 30 (General hunt only) Nov. 21-Nov. 27 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1-Sept. 30 Nov. 21-Nov. 27
1 moose by bow and arrow only; by drawing permit only; up to 100 permits may be issued	Sept. 1-Sept. 30 (General hunt only) Nov. 21-Nov. 27 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1-Sept. 30 Nov. 21-Nov. 27
Unit 20(B), that portion within the Minto Flats Management Area		

1 moose per regulatory year,
only as follows:

1 moose by Tier II subsistence hunting permit only; up to 100 permits may be issued	Sept. 1-Sept. 20 (Subsistence hunt only) Jan. 10-Feb. 28 (Subsistence hunt only)	No open season.
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side	Sept. 11-Sept. 20	No open season.

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually.

Fairbanks Management Area (FMA):

The purpose of this antlerless hunt is to provide opportunity to harvest a surplus of cow moose in the FMA and potentially reduce moose/vehicle collisions and nuisance moose problems.

Population estimates in the FMA and adjacent areas as well as anecdotal information indicate high and stable moose numbers. The number of moose/vehicle collisions in the FMA is also high and continues to be a chronic problem that poses significant safety concerns to motorists. Between 1997 and 2002 more moose were reported killed in moose/vehicle collisions than were reported taken by hunters. In addition, moose nuisance complaints continue to place significant demands on department staff. To increase hunting opportunity and harvest, and reduce moose/vehicle collisions the department increased the number of drawing permits for antlerless moose by archery hunting only (DM788) from 25 in 1999 to 50 in 2000, 75 in 2001 and 2002, and 100 in 2003. Correspondingly, harvest during the antlerless hunt increased from 11 in 1999 to 37 in 2002. Between 1997 and 2000, an average of 103 moose were reported killed by vehicles annually in the FMA. That number dropped to 71 in 2001. This encouraging decrease was short-lived, as the number jumped to 116 in 2002. At this juncture, we do not have sufficient data to evaluate the effect of higher antlerless moose harvests on moose-vehicle collisions or moose nuisance problems. Population estimates, trend surveys, harvest data and anecdotal observations indicate that the current harvests are sustainable.

Minto Flats Management Area (MFMA):

The primary purpose of this antlerless hunt is to provide for subsistence needs. The subsistence hunt (100 permits) for “any moose” occurs during September 1-September 20 and January 10-February 28. In addition, there is a 10-day general hunt for bulls only with antler restrictions (spike-fork or 50” or four or more brow tines) to provide for additional hunting opportunity and to help meet Intensive Management harvest objectives for Unit 20B.

Population estimation surveys indicate that the moose density within the MFMA is high and stable. The reported harvest of cow moose taken during the subsistence hunt (TM785) has averaged 24

(1996-2002). This harvest of approximately 1 to 2 percent of the MFMA moose population has been demonstrated to be sustainable. We are currently meeting both the subsistence needs and the management objective of 30 bulls:100 cows for this area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The opportunity to hunt a surplus of cow moose will be lost. In the FMA, moose/vehicle collisions and nuisance moose problems will likely remain high or increase. In the MFMA, if the subsistence harvest is restricted to bulls only, the general season may have to be further restricted or eliminated to maintain the desired bull:cow ratio.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, hunting opportunity and harvest will increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence hunters benefit from the opportunity to harvest cow moose in the MFMA hunt. In the FMA, hunters benefit by having the opportunity to harvest cow moose, and urban residents may benefit from reduced moose/vehicle collisions and moose/human conflicts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-074)

PROPOSAL 126 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Liberalize moose antler restrictions in portion of Unit 20A as follows:

In Unit 20A central and eastern Tanana Flats change resident hunter's bag limit to "any bull" for hunts that now have a bag limit of spike-fork/50-inch.

ISSUE: Spike-fork/50-inch antler regulation that is being pushed on the people of Alaska by the trophy hunters and the guides. They are trying to make every unit in Alaska a trophy area, making it hard on everyone that is trying to get a moose to feed their family. It's a hardship to try to find the right size moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? (1) The guides will get the big bulls for their hunters. The people that don't have the money or the means will go without. The trophy hunter will have horns on the wall to brag about or be put in the paper and the guy with a family that works all the time to make ends meet and doesn't have the time to hunt for a 50-inch bull for weeks at a time goes without; and (2) Moose will continue to be shot and left because they were not big enough.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The people in Alaska that depend on the moose meat to subsidize their food bills.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The guides that are going to have to earn their money and go out and hunt a large moose for their clients, and the trophy hunter that is going to have to hunt a little bit harder to find the big bulls for the horns.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Make it “any bull” for everyone and not try to be like people in the lower 48 that are trying to make trophy areas so they have big horns on the wall to brag about. It also lets people go back to the areas that they use to hunt in and spreads hunters out over the state of Alaska so we are not on top of each other fighting over hunting areas.

PROPOSED BY: Lee (Skip) Olsen and the Interior Alaska Airboaters Association (I-04S-G-011)

PROPOSAL 127 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Close nonresident moose season in Unit 20C as follows:

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

Unit 20(C), that portion within the Tanana drainage west of the mouth of the Zitziana River

RESIDENT HUNTERS: One bull; however, white-phased or partial albino (more than 50 percent white) moose may not be taken	Sept. 1-Sept. 20
--	------------------

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: <u>One bull; however, white-phased or partial albino (more than 50 percent white) moose may not be taken</u>	[SEPT. 1-SEPT. 15] <u>No open season</u>
---	--

ISSUE: Non-local hunters in Unit 20C, including nonresidents, are competing for a very limited moose resource with locals. Adjacent Unit 20F is already closed to nonresidents. This proposal would expand the area closed to nonresidents.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Local hunter success rates will decline and, in general, the quality of hunting experiences for local hunters will deteriorate. There will not be enough harvestable surplus for both residents and nonresidents.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents and locals.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresidents.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A corridor along the Tanana where transporting and guiding is not allowed.

PROPOSED BY: Tom Hyslop and Tanana Rampart Manley Advisory Committee (I-04S-G-018)

PROPOSAL 128 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Open an any bull archery moose hunt in Healy-Lignite Management Area as follows:

Healy Lignite Management Area open to harvest any bull, with bow and arrow only.

ISSUE: We would like the Board of Game to change this area from spike, fork, 50” or four brow tines back to any bull. According to the department’s area biologist, the average harvest is only six moose with the any bull regulation. This past year we only know of one bull taken out of this area. The area biologist said, “Biologically speaking, it will not hurt the population to open it back up to any bull.” As you may know, the success rate hunting with a primitive weapon is lower than hunting with a gun.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Lost opportunity for people who are not worried about horn size and just want to put some meat in the freezer.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It gives a person a better chance to put quality meat in the freezer instead of buying meat at the supermarket. Those who hunt with primitive weapons will argue the quality of the hunt is much better.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Beginning bowhunters and bowhunters looking to put some meat in the freezer.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Possibly hunters looking for larger antler size. But with this being a small area and with moose migrating from the flats to the mountains each year, we don’t believe this will be a problem.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We thought about leaving it at the current regulation for two more years, but decided we wanted more opportunity.

PROPOSED BY: Middle Nenana River Advisory Committee (I-04S-G-022)

PROPOSAL 129 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify antler restriction for moose hunt in Unit 20A as follows:

20A Residents:

1 bull with spike-fork or greater antlers

ISSUE: 20A Residents: One bull moose with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on at least one side. I would like to see this regulation repealed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Resident hunters will get less of an opportunity to harvest a moose in their area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It would give the hunter a better chance at harvest opportunities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No one.

PROPOSED BY: Michael S. Rosetti

(I-04S-G-040)

PROPOSAL 130 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Close antlerless moose hunt in Unit 20A as follows:

Moose

20A

Residents: one bull with spike-fork or greater antlers.

ISSUE: 20A residents: One antlerless moose by permit DM764. I would like to see the board repeal this permit

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will eventually drop drastically, requiring more regulation and less harvest opportunities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes – it improves the resource. Higher cow moose survival means higher overall moose numbers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters looking for long range harvest opportunities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunter harvesting cow moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Michael Rosetti

(I-04S-G-041)

PROPOSAL 131 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Close calf moose hunt in Unit 20A as follows:

Moose

20A Residents: one bull with spike-fork or greater antlers.

ISSUE: 20A residents: One calf by permit – DM754-DM756. I would like to see the board repeal this permit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Eventually the moose population will drop drastically and will require more regulation and less harvest opportunities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it improves the resource by having higher calf survival.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All resident hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters that would harvest immature moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Michael S. Rosetti

(I-04S-G-042)

PROPOSAL 132 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Close nonresident moose hunt in Unit 20A as follows:

Moose

20A – no nonresident hunters.

ISSUE: 20A non-residents: One bull spike-fork or 50 inch antlers or antlers with four or more brow-tines on at least one side. I would like the board to repeal the nonresident hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be less harvest opportunities for resident hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes – it improves the resource by less hunting pressure from nonresident (higher survival).

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All resident hunters, and all subsistence hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides and nonresident hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Michael S. Rosetti (I-04S-G-043)

PROPOSAL 133 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Delete antler restriction in portion of Unit 20A as follows:

I would like to recommend that the antler restriction be lifted as it is nearly impossible to limit the flats with any restriction. I believe it could be wise to consider dividing the eastern portion of the unit and making the little Delta River the boundary. This would give an option of leaving the western portion of the unit under antler restriction as it is in the easier end of the unit to access.

ISSUE: I would like to see the antler restriction in Unit 20A be looked at from the perspective of the meat hunter.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The main problem is that the hunters will move into other areas and more heavily crowd them. It also is possible that illegal bulls will be shot and not salvaged.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposal allows the harvest of meat hunters to be improved, while the chances for trophy hunters still remain strong.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? I believe that those hunters who have established hunting grounds in this unit will benefit by lifting the antler restriction.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those hunters who have established hunting grounds in this unit could also suffer due to heavier amounts of hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Benjamin Greenleaf (I-04S-G-049)

PROPOSAL 134 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Delete antler restriction in portion of Unit 20A as follows:

One bull harvested between Sept. 1- Sept. 20 for all residents (like it has been in the past up through 2001).

ISSUE: Antler restriction on Unit 20A for residents; change it back to unrestricted for one bull like it was before being changed recently.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to have difficulty finding legal moose to hunt in our “backyard”.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? With Ft. Greely bombing range restrictions it is difficult to find legal moose in the Delta – Little Delta – Rainbow Lake area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone living in the Delta area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresidents.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Find another place to hunt. I am trying to find other places to hunt, but I’ve hunted behind the Delta for 14 years and like it because its my home area.

PROPOSED BY: Don Winston (I-04S-G-050)

PROPOSAL 135 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Delete antler restriction in southeast portion of Unit 20A as follows:

I would suggest lifting the antler restriction in the southeast portion of Unit 20A between the Little Delta and the Delta River. This would still allow for control of the heavily-hunted portion of 20A towards Fairbanks where access is much easier.

ISSUE: The antler restriction in Unit 20A has proved to be extremely limiting to the meat hunter. Access to the east side of the Little Delta is already very challenging for the few of us who actually live here and finding legal game is even more difficult with the present restrictions.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? First of all it will force us to hunt in already over-hunted areas of other subunits. Secondly it will increase the chance of meat from accidentally taken illegal bulls to be left unclaimed by trophy hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes: this would assist resident meat hunters and also lessen chances of meat from illegal bulls being left in the field.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents of 20A who live on the west side of the Delta River where access is very challenging and limited.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? These same residents may contend with more hunters who might come to this small portion of 20A if the antler restrictions were listed, but due to access problems these would have to be very determined hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Gabriel Greenleaf (I-04S-G-051)

PROPOSAL 136 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Delete antler restriction in portion of Unit 20A as follows:

Divide Unit 20A at the Little Delta River and have the west section harvest requirement remain as it is. Change the east section of 20A harvest restriction back to one bull with no antler restriction.

ISSUE: The bull moose harvest restriction of requiring the antlers to be spike-fork or 50-inch spread or 3 or more brow tines on at least one side.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Overpopulation for feed.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Knowing that the east section of 20A has a large population of bulls per square mile. This change will allow a larger harvest, maintaining the proper moose per area ratio therefore producing healthier moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those hunters who hunt Unit 20A would benefit. Dividing this unit will produce a more accurate managed moose herd to benefit all.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who hunt only the east portion of Unit 20A could experience more hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Ronald Greenleaf (I-04S-G-053)

PROPOSAL 137 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Restrict antlerless moose permit holders from taking bulls in Fairbanks Management Area as follows:

Why have a cow tag drawing if you're not required to shoot a cow? If you draw a cow tag in 20B Fairbanks Management Area you cannot take a bull moose in the management area. You can travel outside the management area and take a bull moose but you can't pick and choose in the management area. You have to take a cow moose only.

ISSUE: Fairbanks Management Area (archery) allows only so many cow tags to be drawn. Hunters are using the permits as a last resort if they don't get a bull moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Not enough cows will be taken to reach management goals.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the department can manage cow/bull ratios better.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Families who want meat only.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trophy hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Grady Brown Jr., and Bart W. Colledge (I-04S-G-056)

PROPOSAL 138 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Allow a two-person party registration permit for moose in Unit 20A as follows:

Any bull moose may be taken by a two-person party registration permit in Unit 20A.

ISSUE: Lower than projected harvest numbers for moose in Unit 20A.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The harvest numbers will remain below projected levels.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? I believe it improves harvest results without greatly impacting the current antler restrictions. This also promotes hunting in pairs rather than individually, which I feel is ultimately safer in the long run.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The hunters that are not hunting for “trophy” animals.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one; the trophy hunters would still be regulated by the current antler restrictions.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Removing all antler restrictions in 20A. I rejected this thought because it would probably raise the harvest count dramatically.

PROPOSED BY: Mark Albert (I-04S-G-061)

PROPOSAL 139 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Add an antler restriction for nonresident moose hunt in Unit 25C as follows:

Nonresident: One bull with 50” antler or antlers with 3 or more brow tines at least on one side.

ISSUE: Low density of moose in 25C, low bull/cow ratio, increasing numbers of hunters and unsuccessful hunters, and how to effectively limit the harvest of moose hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will continue to decline.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The moose population in 25C and all Alaskan residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident hunters who are seeking non-trophy moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Requesting wolf control or aerial wolf hunting to be opened.

PROPOSED BY: Central Advisory Committee (I-04S-G-067)

PROPOSAL 140 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Repeal Tier II subsistence moose hunts in Unit 20 as follows:

In GMU 20 the Minto Tier II hunts TM785 should be ended when the Tier II harvest exceeds 20 moose (the C&T harvest)

Similarly Tier II hunt TM787 in 20B-20D should end when the harvest meets or exceeds five moose (the C&T number).

ISSUE: Never ending Tier II hunts. The Board of Game should modify this regulation to provide that Tier II hunts are administratively ended when the Tier II harvest meets or exceeds the lowest C&T harvest number.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? N/A

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? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Ending the Tier II hunt when the two year average harvest exceeds the lower C&T number.

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levengood (I-04S-G-108)

PROPOSAL 141 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Liberalize antler restrictions in Unit 20A as follows:

Either remove the restriction completely, or go back to any bull; or spike-fork, or 30 inches with brow tine on both antlers.

ISSUE: Antler restrictions in Unit 20A.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population in this area is already beyond its carrying capacity, and the animals will suffer if this restriction is not lifted. This type of harvest restriction is generally reserved for areas where the animals are in jeopardy of falling below management goals. In 20A this is not a concern as we are having a tough time harvesting the number of animals required to meet our management goals, and the moose population is too large for the condition of its range.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will keep the number of moose at an expectable level until some habitat manipulation can occur. Only after the habitat has been improved and some real biological proof provided should antler restrictions be considered, not an assumption that an area with a very selective access requirement is going to be suddenly over-run by out of area hunter.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska’s children, by managing our game with sound judgment we can ensure that they have wildlife for their uses.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I believe all will benefit.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered leaving it as it is, but the current harvest strategy for this area is totally unacceptable to the residents of the surrounding community. And since there is no real biological reason for this restriction, the only solution is to remove it.

PROPOSED BY: Raymond Heuer (I-04S-G-110)

PROPOSAL 142 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish a muzzleloader drawing permit hunt in the Fairbanks Management Area as follows:

The preferred solution is to address hunter efficiency and methods and means to increase the harvest of cow moose in the Fairbanks Management Area (FMA). The best solution is to allow the taking of cow moose in the FMA by muzzleloader. The regulation would read as follows:

UNIT 20B Fairbanks Management Area
Residents..... One antlerless moose by muzzleloader.....drawing.. Nov 21-27.

The new drawing permit hunt would be for one antlerless moose by muzzleloader occurring simultaneously within the current general and drawing (by bow and arrow only) winter moose season for the FMA. The number of permits to be issued would be set by the department. The same restrictions for muzzleloaders found in 5AAC 92.085 1(B) and 1(C) would apply to this hunt and department approved muzzleloader safety certification would be required.

ISSUE: The FMA is currently restricted to moose hunting by bow and arrow only. Harvest levels under these restrictions have not reached objectives. While the number of permits has increased to 100 harvest levels of cow moose are still less than the number of moose killed by motor vehicles.

From 1998 to 2003, cow moose harvested in the FMA has varied from 34 to 61.* In the same time period, the number of moose killed by motor vehicles has varied from 71 to 117. The opportunity to harvest additional cows exists but harvest levels under the current methods and means have failed to reach the level that is possible.

(*2003 harvest data is preliminary)

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be lower than potential harvest levels for cow moose in the FMA and a high number of moose/vehicle collisions.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Allowing the harvest of cows by muzzleloader within the FMA would increase hunter efficiency and create more hunting opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All moose hunters in the FMA.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Consideration was given to restricting the muzzleloader hunt to the boundaries of Creamer’s Field Refuge (that area where firearms are allowed for game other than moose). This restriction in the permit hunt could serve as a preliminary test for a muzzleloader hunt for the FMA. The idea was rejected due to the potential for conflicts between users in November. A fall hunt within the same boundaries could be considered.

Consideration was again given to proposing a special drawing permit that would allow the taking of a cow/calf pair by muzzleloader. Applicants would be required to apply as a party of two – each application having only one chance of being drawn (and both applicants meeting the education requirement). If drawn, the hunters would receive a drawing permit authorizing the taking of one cow/calf pair. This would alleviate the one obstacle of hunting in the FMA – the regulation that it is illegal to take cows accompanied by calves, thus increasing the harvest level to meet objectives. This idea was rejected due to the complex nature of create a new, special regulation.

PROPOSED BY: Valerie A. Baxter (I-04S-G-121)

PROPOSAL 143 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish a drawing permit hunt for moose calves in the Fairbanks Management Area as follows:

Because so many calves will be lost in motor vehicle collisions before they are recruited to the population, the best solution is to allow hunters to harvest moose calves in the Fairbanks Management Area (FMA). There are many benefits to hunting calves, including increased hunting opportunity for FMA hunters and decreasing moose/vehicle collisions. The new regulation would read as follows:

UNIT 20B Fairbanks Management Area
Residents..... one calf moose by permit.....drawing.. Sept 12-30
OR Nov 21-27

The new drawing permit hunt would be for calf moose only, occurring within the current general and antlerless seasons for the FMA. Number of permits to be issued would be set by ADF&G and methods and means would be the same that apply currently to the FMA.

ISSUE: There are a high number of moose/car collisions in the FMA. The number of moose killed by motor vehicles in 2001 was 80. In 2002 it was 105 and as of September 30, 2003, there have been 52 road-killed moose. The segment of the population that appears to be impacted the most is moose calves. The number of calves killed in collisions is high: in 2001 38 out of those 80 moose hit were calves (48 percent); 2002 showed a slight drop in percentage; 40 out of 105 moose killed were calves (38 percent); so far for 2003, 24 of the 52 moose hit by cars have been calves (46 percent). These numbers indicate that just less than half of all moose killed by motor vehicles in the FMA are calves. Population census data from 2001 showed that within the FMA there were 39 calves per 100 cows. This seems like a high and healthy ratio. However, there were only 13 yearlings per 100 cows from the same survey, which seems like a significant decrease. Some loss of calves from the first year to second from natural causes is expected, but the collision records indicate that motor vehicle deaths contribute significantly to the overall loss of calf moose. Calf moose that are killed by motor vehicles are moose that are also missed opportunities for hunters to harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A high percentage of moose killed by motor vehicles in the FMA will continue to be calves.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal seeks to harvest moose calves within the Fairbanks Management Area. Because so many are killed in motor vehicle collisions, hunting calves would increase hunter opportunity to harvest moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All moose hunters in the FMA and all motor vehicle drivers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Consideration was given to proposing a special drawing permit that would allow the taking of a cow/calf pair. Applicants would be required to apply as a party of two, each application having only one chance of being drawn. If drawn, the hunters would receive a drawing permit authorizing the taking of one cow/calf pair. This would alleviate the major obstacle of hunting in the FMA – the regulation that it is illegal to take cows accompanied by calves. It would also insure the harvest of calves to alleviate the high number of calves involved in motor vehicle collisions. This idea was rejected due to the complex nature of creating a new, special regulation.

PROPOSED BY: Valerie Baxter

(I-04S-G-122)

PROPOSAL 144 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Convert calf hunts to Take a Child Hunting hunts in Unit 20A as follows:

The board does away with the calf hunt altogether in the Tanana Flats and implements a Take a Child Hunting (TACH) hunt in its place. This will give the general public a harvest of the calf crop in the flats that's a little bit more acceptable to the public and sportsman alike. In a TACH you want to teach the child the responsibilities of hunting: field dressing, game care, packing the meat out, hanging the meat, and everything else that goes along with harvesting an animal. So we let them harvest the largest animal in the state. The only thing they can help with on a bull moose is pulling the trigger. With a calf TACH smaller caliber rifles and smaller body weight of the animal allow the child to take part in the whole experience versus shooting an animal and then standing back to watch somebody else care for the meat.

ISSUE: Calf hunting in the Tanana Flats 20A. I would like to see the permit hunt for calves converted to a TACH hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The area biologist is not having success with this hunt and his quotas will continue to go unfilled.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will give the local biologist a larger number of calves harvested and will allow the general public to become accustomed to the thought of calves being harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska's children, by providing them an opportunity to hunt, which they can realistically take full participation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I believe all will benefit.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None other considered.

PROPOSED BY: Raymond H. Heuer (I-04S-G-126)

PROPOSAL 145 - 5 AAC 85.060. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals.
Liberalize coyote season and bag limit in Units 20A and 20C as follows:

Year-round hunting open to resident and nonresident for coyotes in subunits 20A and 20C.

ISSUE: Continued increase and expansion of coyote population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued increase of predation on Dall sheep lambs.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Products produced; by harvesting more coyotes there will be less predation on Dall sheep.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Dall sheep lambs/herds.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Middle Nenana River Advisory Committee (I-04S-G-064)

PROPOSAL 146 - 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Modify spring ptarmigan season and bag limit in Units 20 and 25C as follows:

Extend open season to March 31. Lower bag limit to five ptarmigan in spring.

ISSUE: Provide more spring ptarmigan hunting opportunity. After a long, dark, cold winter spent indoors, this is a fine time to go out ptarmigan hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? N/A

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: James M. McCann (I-04S-G-044)

PROPOSAL 147 - 5 AAC 92.015(b). Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize the current brown bear tag fee exemption for Unit 20(D).

...

(b) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in ... Unit 20(D)

ISSUE: The Unit 20D brown bear tag fee exemption must be reauthorized annually. The tag fee exemption was implemented in 1995 for portions of Unit 20D primarily to increase the harvest of brown bears for the purpose of reducing predation on moose and caribou calves (Board of Game Policy 95-85-BOG; and 5AAC 92.125(3)). The tag fee exemption was expanded to all of Unit 20D in 2003.

Current Unit 20D brown bear hunting regulations include no tag fee and require the skull and hide to be sealed in 20D or in Tok. Those portions of Unit 20D north of the Tanana River, or south of the Tanana River and east of the Gerstle River, have an Aug 10-Jun 30 hunting season, a

bag limit of one bear per year. The southwestern portion of Unit 20D has a Sept. 1-May 31 hunting season, and a bag limit of one bear every four years.

The current Unit 20D brown bear harvest objective adopted by the Board of Game (BOG) in March 1995 is five to 15 bears per year. Observations of brown bears by local residents, hunters, and pilots indicate that brown bears are common in Unit 20D. Brown bear harvest in Unit 20D has increased since the tag fee exemption was implemented. Mean annual brown bear human-caused mortality from both hunting and nonhunting is within the harvest objective, averages 14 bears per year, and has ranged from nine to 20 bears per year. Much of the increase, however, was in the southwest portion of 20D where the bear hunting season is shorter, and where mortality of brown bears killed in defense of life and property and kill of nuisance bears in the vicinity of Delta Junction is significant.

The Macomb caribou herd population objective was not met in the fall of 2003. The board adopted a herd population objective of 600–800 caribou with a sustainable harvest objective of 30–50 caribou per year. The fall 2003 population was estimated to be 550–575, with a ratio of 19 calves:100 cows. The harvest objective of 30–50 bulls per year was met with a harvest of 30 caribou. However the harvest of 30 caribou exceeded the harvest quota of 25 caribou and the season was closed by emergency order.

The Unit 20D moose management objectives have not been met. The board adopted a Unit 20D population objective of 8,000–10,000 moose with a sustainable harvest objective of 500–700 moose per year. The current Unit 20D moose population estimate is 4,956–6,704 moose. Reported harvest during the 2002 hunting season was 200 moose.

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

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

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

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

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-075)

PROPOSAL 148 – 5 AAC 92.015(b). Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize the current exemption of brown bear tag fee in a portion of Unit 20E.

...

(b) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear ... in that portion of Unit 20(E) outside of Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve...

ISSUE: The Unit 20E brown bear tag fee exemption must be reauthorized annually. The tag fee exemption was implemented in 2002 for that portion of Unit 20E excluding Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve. The intent was to determine if eliminating the tag fee would encourage hunters to increase grizzly bear harvest and if so, to study the effects of increased bear harvest on moose calf survival.

Liberal grizzly bear harvest regulations have been used in Unit 20E since 1981 to reduce bear numbers. During 1984-1992 the tag fee exemption was added to the long season and one bear per year bag limit. This significantly increased brown bear harvest, resulting in a population decline. The tag fee was reinstated in 1993 because the 10 to 20 percent decline in the bear population did not appear to increase moose calf survival.

Currently, a tag fee exemption is a reasonable addition to the liberal season and bag limit because of changes in the following biological and social factors since 1993: (1) Moose calf survival has declined to nine to 19 calves:100 cows since 1998; (2) Wolf numbers were reduced in southwest Unit 20E by 75 to 80 percent during 1997-2001 and currently are at low density; (3) Caribou and moose hunter numbers have increased significantly compared to the 1984-1992 tag fee exemption period; (4) The moose and caribou populations in this area have been identified as important for providing high levels of harvest; and (5) To benefit data analysis, the tag fee exemption will be implemented within a defined area that historically has received the greatest grizzly bear harvest. Increasing bear harvest now while the wolf population is reduced may have greater benefits on moose population growth compared to reducing only bears or wolves.

In relation to the tag fee exemption, the following management questions are being evaluated: (1) Will moose and caribou hunters incidentally harvest more brown bears; (2) If brown bear harvest increases, will it alter the sex and composition of the brown bear population and cause a population decline; and (3) Will changes in the brown bear population composition and size affect moose calf survival? Results will be presented annually to the board.

Based on Unit 20E grizzly bear population estimates, if hunters take advantage of the tag fee exemption, the harvest level could meet or exceed maximum sustained yield and cause a decrease in the population. The fall 2002 hunting season was the first under the tag fee regulation. During fall 2002, more than 1,500 people hunted moose and caribou in the tag fee exempt area and harvested 12 bears. During fall 2003, over 2,500 people hunted moose and caribou, and 15 grizzly bears were harvested. This is a slight increase over the 10-year average fall harvest of 12.8.

While efforts to increase hunter awareness of the tag fee exemption improved hunter participation during fall 2003, follow up interviews indicated that many were still unaware of the

regulatory changes. Harvest may have been greater if the changes had been better publicized. To better assess hunter reaction to the tag fee exemption, additional years are necessary.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The tag fee will be reinstated for the 2004-2005 regulatory year. We will be unable to evaluate the above management questions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local and state resident hunters will benefit from increased brown bear hunting opportunity. Supporters and opponents of liberal bear regulations will benefit by better understanding effects of different brown bear regulations on harvest, population trends, and possibly on ungulate calf survival.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People against liberal brown bear regulations.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-076)

PROPOSAL 149 - 5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Remove brown bear tag fee for Unit 25C as follows:

No brown bear tag fee for Unit 25C

ISSUE: Elimination of the brown bear tag fee.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the problem is not solved, hunters will be less likely to harvest brown bear. People would be more inclined to harvest a brown bear without a fee. The fee is unnecessary.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters of 25C, as this eliminates the need to acquire a tag prior to hunt. This is in line with the departmental concept to liberalize brown bear seasons.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Eliminating sealing requirements for brown bear in 25C

PROPOSED BY: Central Fish and Game Advisory Committee (I-04S-G-006)

PROPOSAL 150 - 5 AAC 92.036. Permit for taking a child hunting. Add Units 20A and 20C to units with take a child hunting seasons as follows:

I would like to see the early youth moose hunt to be expanded to include 20A and 20C along with 20B.

ISSUE: The problem is having the early youth moose hunt take place only in 20B.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If not changed, more people will feel negative about the hunt as most of the hunters are concentrated around a few prime locations.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This would spread the hunters out and impact on 20B would be less, also more people might take part in the hunt because of increased opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Most youth hunters would benefit because of expanded opportunities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who hunt in 20A and 20C who don't want to participate.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I would like to open it up statewide as it was intended but without approval of local advisory boards that won't happen.

PROPOSED BY: John Krieg (I-04S-G-046)

PROPOSAL 151 - 5 AAC 92.036. Permit for taking a child hunting. Liberalize season and bag limit for take a child hunting hunt in Unit 20 as follows:

Unit 20 youth (under 17) accompanied by adult over 21 may harvest one moose, any bull or adult cow not accompanied by newborn calf. No special permit required, season Aug. 1-Aug. 15. Report by mail-in harvest post card.

ISSUE: Low success on kids hunt plus adult barren cow moose. Allow youth to harvest any bull or adult cow not accompanied by newborn calf.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Success rate will be low and unproductive cows will skew cow calf ratio.

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? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levengood

(I-04S-G-112)

PROPOSAL 152 - 5 AAC 92.095(a)(15). Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions. Repeal requirement for trap identification in Fairbanks Management Area as follows:

No new regulation is needed. This additional restriction would simply be removed. A working solution that has already shown success is better awareness and practice of ethical behavior by both trappers and pet owners. The Alaska Trappers Association (ATA) has been active statewide in this endeavor.

ISSUE: Maintaining an unnecessary additional restriction for trap identification within the Fairbanks Management Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Trappers will continue to expend valuable time complying with a restriction that serves no verifiable purpose.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trapper will benefit by not having to take the time or expense to mark traps.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No data was available through Alaska State Troopers or the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to verify the restriction has served any useful purpose and is worth leaving in place.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Trappers Association

(I-04S-G-137)

PROPOSAL 153 - 5 AAC 92.108. Identified big game prey populations and objectives. Increase moose population and harvest objectives in Unit 20 as follows:

The moose population and harvest objectives for moose in Unit 20 should be changed to the following:

- 20(A) 15,000 population objective 1,500 harvest objective
- 20(B) 18,000 population objective 1,800 harvest objective
- 20(C) 5,000 population objective 500 harvest objective
- 20(D) 15,000 population objective 1,500 harvest objective
- 20(E) 13,000 population objective 1,300 harvest objective

ISSUE: Curtail manipulation and confusion by using only one number for pressing harvest and population objectives. Increase ridiculously low harvest objectives and population objectives for moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? N/A

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? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-04S-G-082)

PROPOSAL 154 - 5 AAC 92.108. Identified big game prey populations and objectives. Increase population and harvest objectives for Delta caribou as follows:

Delta caribou herd 10,000 population objective and 1,000 harvest objective.

ISSUE: Absurdly low population and harvest objective of Unit 20 Delta caribou herd.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? No active management will occur because of low population objectives.

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? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-04S-G-109)

PROPOSAL 155 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, fur, and hides. Require destruction of trophy value of moose antlers in portion of Units 20C and 20F as follows:

Moose antlers must be cut off the skull plate at the kill site within 20F and that portion of 20C west of the Zitziana River.

ISSUE: Trophy hunters are competing for a very limited moose resource with other hunters in the area. Some hunters are hunting mainly for trophy antlers. Cutting the antlers from the skull plate would degrade the trophy value of the antlers and possibly deter trophy hunters from choosing to hunt in the area, thus allocating more of the harvest to non-trophy hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Non-trophy hunter success rates will decline and, in general, the quality of hunting experiences for non-trophy hunters will deteriorate. There will not be enough harvestable surplus for both trophy and non-trophy hunters.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Non-trophy hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trophy hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: The Tanana/Rampart/Manley Advisory Committee (I-04S-G-017)

PROPOSAL 156 - 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting; and 5 AAC 92.550. Areas closed to trapping. Remove hunting and trapping closures by Denali National Park as follows:

(18) Stampede Closed Area – Unit 20C, all lands west of the Savage River bounded by Denali National Park [ARE CLOSED TO THE TAKING OF WOLVES] **5 wolves...Aug. 10-Apr. 30**

ISSUE: The narrow corridor of road accessible area adjacent to the Denali National Park has a limited and declining population of harvestable moose, yet supports an unnaturally high predator population. This unnatural predator population does not have sufficient need for restrictions from human harvest. The board should take into account the consumptive use of non-predator populations in the area for use by humans as food, and the negative impact this predator population may impose upon moose and caribou in this unit and its immediately adjacent units. This regulation is also inconsistent with the remainder of the unit, causing confusion and division among user groups.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The unnaturally high predator population will continue to increase to an even more unhealthy point, eventually decimating its food source. The prey population will continue to decline, eventually causing the board to enact intensive management measures. Local residents will continue to unfairly be denied the opportunity to harvest the ungulate resource causing further contention among user groups.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by achieving a more natural balance of all game in this unit with a goal of ensuring the health of both predators and prey populations for the future. Biologists have testified previously that mortality of wolves in this area has been attributed to internal pack predation, and

that packs of unhealthy size for an area often display internal predation, as well as become susceptible to parasitic invasion.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups and game populations in this area. Wolves will enjoy a healthier pack under biologically sound management. Prey populations will avoid reduction to emergency management. Viewers and tourists will enjoy healthy populations of a variety of resources sustained over a long period of time in their natural environment. Those wishing to participate in the harvest of Alaska's wild moose will have the opportunity to provide clean food for their families. Those wishing to teach their children about Alaska's wild resources and our heritage of uses will have the example of healthy abundant game populations from which to do so. The Board of Game may avoid contentious debates regarding emergency regulations for Intensive Management and Tier II preference in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? In reality, no one. Unfortunately those who may not have an understanding of responsible game management or who may have over romanticized their personal relationship to this wolf population, may experience an initial emotional suffering as they discount the long term overall health of the game populations in this area. As these populations continue to thrive, this feeling is expected to dissipate upon realization that sound biological management has protected the overall long term health of the resource. Those who would like to discriminate between uses and hypocritically believe that consumptive uses should only occur after strenuous physical effort far from road accessibility, while viewing should occur from vehicles on highways may fall into this category as well.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Several ideas were considered, but did not provide a solution to the problem. To take no action would serve only to cause more harm in this area.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee (I-04S-G-005)

PROPOSAL 157 - 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting; and 5 AAC 92.550. Areas closed to trapping. Remove hunting and trapping closures by Denali National Park as follows:

It would do away with both of the buffer zones in the Nenana Canyon Closed Area and go back to hunting and trapping of wolves in both areas. Note: in a small portion of land around the McKinley Village community we have proposed to close to trapping of any kind. This is due to concern from local residents about trapping in their growing community and has nothing to do with Alaska Wildlife Alliance (AWA).

ISSUE: We would like the Board of Game to terminate these two buffer zone areas in the Nenana Canyon Closed Area and reopen them to hunting and trapping of wolves. This has been addressed many times. At this point we all know this is not a biological issue and we believe these areas should be managed for sustained yield.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Lost opportunity for moose hunters to take wolves and lost opportunity for trappers to take wolves. We also believe the wolves in these areas are a significant cause of the decline in the Denali caribou herd. We feel this is just a stepping stone

for the AWA's agenda. They won't be happy until there is a buffer zone from the Canadian border to the Bering Sea.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? We believe this will definitely help out the Denali caribou herd and moose in these areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The Denali caribou herd, moose hunters who may have a chance to harvest a wolf, and trappers who could resume using these areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer that we can see. Yet AWA will try and make all of us think we are wiping out these wolves and the tourists are suffering because of it.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The following is a quote from our testimony at a Board of Game meeting in Anchorage in October of 2002. This is one of the reasons we are fighting this again.

“We feel proposal 53 is the lesser of three evils. In an attempt to show that we are not a bunch of blood thirsty hunters out to kill every last wolf that we see, and due to the fact that the area was not being trapped for a couple of years before the closure, and in an attempt to keep this from becoming a ballot initiative, we are willing to compromise on this issue and try and make it go away. We had our line drawn in the sand and now for the hope of ending this once and for all we have taken a step back and moved our line. We would hope the Alaska Wildlife Alliance would be willing to do the same. If this issue does not go away we will move our line back to its original position. So, hesitantly, we request that you adopt proposal 53 and do not adopt proposals 54 and 55. Thank you for your time and I would be happy to answer any questions I can.”

We offered a compromise, but the board at the time went beyond what we offered and the AWA still wasn't happy. They said they wouldn't stop until there is 100 percent protection for these wolves.

PROPOSED BY: Middle Nenana River Advisory Committee (I-04S-G-023)

PROPOSAL 158 - 5 AAC 92.510(17). Areas closed to hunting; and 5 AAC 92.550(7). Areas closed to trapping. Remove hunting and trapping closures by Denali National Park as follows:

Open the Stampede-Savage River to taking wolves as in the past.

ISSUE: To rescind the action taken by the Board of Game on proposals 53 and 54 of the fall 2002 proposals on the closing of the taking of wolves along the Stampede Trail and Savage River.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wolves have overpopulated the area for the amount of available prey (moose & caribou). Eight to ten years ago you could travel this trail in the winter and see many moose and caribou. Now you see very few. If you manage the wolves and

prey, the number will be in balance. The wolves will starve and die off over the next few years. After that the moose and caribou herds will gradually come back followed by the comeback of wolves.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Taking wolves will improve the balance of predator and prey. More moose, caribou and wolves for viewing and hunting and trapping.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska residents who depend on hunting for food and trappers for the fur sales and fur sewing.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People not interested in the management of game.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? This regulation change (proposal 53 and 54) was a political move. Many years of study by the biologists found this closure is not necessary. Let's get back to the biologists managing wildlife of Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee (SC-04S-G-028)

PROPOSAL 159 - 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting. Remove hunting closure by Denali National Park in Unit 20 as follows:

Simply remove subsections (17) and (18) from 92.510.

ISSUE: These areas in 20A and 20C are closed to the taking of wolves with no biological or other scientific justification.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaskans will continue to be unnecessarily restricted from taking wolves in this area of traditional use.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Restoring the harvest of wolves in the area should help achieve a better balance of all game and improve wolf pack health.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone. Consumptive and nonconsumptive users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Other ideas considered provided no resolutions.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Trappers Association (I-04S-G-136)

PROPOSAL 160 - 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting. Close area along Chena Slough in Unit 20B to duck hunting as follows:

Duck hunting is not permitted along the Chena Slough that is bordered by homes and roadways.

ISSUE: Duck hunting on the Chena Slough along Badger Road. This hunting area is bordered by homes and Badger Road along this area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There may be serious harm or injury to people, and damage to property in this area.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both residents and hunters. Residents won't have to be concerned for the safety of their children and themselves. Hunters will have less chance of injuring others.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Hunters would still have plenty of places to duck hunt that won't have as much of a chance of hurting others.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There was no other solution, because if duck hunters shoot anyway along residences or the road, there is a great chance of someone getting seriously hurt.

PROPOSED BY: Ed and Amy Borneo/Patrick and Sue Scott (I-04S-G-002)

PROPOSAL 161 - 5 AAC 92.520. Closures and restrictions in state game refuges. Allow consumptive uses in all portions of Creamers Field Migratory Water Fowl Refuge as follows:

Creamers Field Migratory Waterfowl Refuge, hunting trapping and viewing by registration. Consumptive uses permitted on all areas of refuge of firearms permitted in areas outside city limits. Activities to attract wildlife must be equal in both consumptive use and non-consumptive use areas. This area will be managed by the Board of Game.

Delete the "discretionary authority" of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

ISSUE: The disregard of the DU ponds and the continuing restrictions on consumptive use activities in Creamers Field Refuge while spending department funds, which are required to benefit hunting license holders. Delete "discretionary authority" of ADF&G.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? All consumptive uses will be curtailed under the current management by discretionary authority, if management authority isn't returned to the Board of Game.

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? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levengood (I-04S-G-086)

PROPOSAL 162 - 5 AAC 92.530(8). Management areas. Allow airboat use in Minto Flats Management Area as follows:

The Minto Flat Controlled Use Area: There is no Restricted Access.

ISSUE: Minto Flat Controlled Use Area: The problem is the closure to airboats during moose hunting season. There is no biological reason for the closure other than discrimination against one user group.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The discrimination of one user group by the State of Alaska.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; it lets everyone hunt in the area without restrictions because of what mode of access they use.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone will benefit by this by not letting people hunt in whatever mode of access they want.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close the area to everyone: but not being selfish like other people we would not like this way of dealing with it.

PROPOSED BY: Lee (Skip) Olsen and the Interior Alaska Airboaters Association (I-04S-G-010)

PROPOSAL 163 - 5 AAC 92.530. Management areas. Expand Fairbanks Management Area near Nordale and Chena Hot Springs roads as follows:

Expand the Fairbanks Management Area to include that area that runs from Tungsten Hill then southerly along Steel Creek to intersect with Chena Hot Springs Road, down Chena Hot Springs Road easterly on the south side of Chena Hot Springs Road to Nordale Road, and south on the west side of Nordale Road to the Chena River. Open this to the taking of moose and bear by bow and arrow only.

ISSUE: Expand the Fairbanks Management Area and open this to the taking of moose and bear by bow and arrow only.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People will keep shooting in the direction of Fairbanks and populated areas from the Nordale Road.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it lets people hunt with archery. That does not shoot a long ways, and does not have the force to shoot through walls of a house as a rifle does, which is better for the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The archery hunters would benefit plus the people of Fairbanks and the populated areas around there who don't have to worry about getting shot by a stray bullet. Plus the people that drive Nordale Road that have to worry about the guy that's parked along the road with his rifle hanging out the window looking for moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Yes, the road hunter that is going to have to go a little farther out of town to hunt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Don't have any other solutions.

PROPOSED BY: William Pearson (I-04S-G-020)

PROPOSAL 164 - 5 AAC 92.530. Management areas. Delete access restriction in Minto Flats Management Area as follows:

I would prefer that the Minto Flats Management Area was no longer a Restricted Access Area.

ISSUE: Access restrictions in the Minto Controlled Use Area. The access restriction into this area is extremely prejudiced (in fact this whole issue is a matter of sour grapes) against airboats and aircraft. The fact that airboats can travel over many types of terrain without leaving much of a signature at all, and the fact that aircraft cover large distances without contact with the earth's surface except at landing and take off points makes these vehicles best suited for this area. As far as the issue of these vehicles giving an unfair advantage to those individuals who use them, there is no restriction on the purchase of either of these vehicles.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The exclusionary practices of this state will continue to be based on a case of sour grapes between user groups. Versus, access determinations based on the use of biology and environment impact studies to determine if a vehicle is unsuited for use in a specific location/terrain. Instead, it appears the state is content to encourage the use of vehicles that promoted the erosion of the small amount of top soil this state has or other vehicles that constantly stir up contaminants which have settled to the bottom of waterways and would normally remain encapsulated in the sediment there.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes and no. Yes, some user groups will be very happy with this change. In fact

it will allow numerous users to return to their traditional hunting areas which they had use for decades, but were forced to abandon when their access was removed. In other words, they could no longer get to their normal hunting location due to the fact that any other means of transportation would have caused too much of an environmental impact to reach these locations, and walking was not conducive.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The user groups who were banished from their traditional hunting areas due to this regulation's implementation, and the lack of a substitute vehicle that could get them to their hunting locations without totally destroying the environment they love.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody is likely to suffer, however user groups may be forced to work out their differences between themselves instead of having a wedge driven between them from the Board of Game giving one user group preference over another.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There are no other solutions available. Either this area is restricted or it is not. If the concern is how the user groups will get along, then that is between them. If it is environmentally/biologically a concern then again it is funny that the vehicles best suited for this habitat are the only vehicles restricted.

PROPOSED BY: Raymond H. Heuer (I-04S-G-127)

PROPOSAL 165 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Delete access restriction in Nenana Controlled Use Area as follows:

I would prefer that the Nenana Controlled Use Area was no longer a restricted access area to airboats; the only vehicles/user group affected by this area is airboats.

ISSUE: Access restrictions in the Nenana Controlled Use Area. The access restrictions into this area is extremely prejudiced (in fact this whole issue is a matter of sour grapes) against airboats. The fact that airboats can travel over many types of terrain without leaving much of a signature at all (in fact a 200 pound man leaves more of an impression on a marshy areas than an airboat) makes these vehicles best suited for this area. As far as the issue of these vehicles giving an unfair advantage to those individuals who use them, there is no restriction on the purchase of these vehicles.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The exclusionary practices of this state will continue to be based on a case of sour grapes between user groups. Versus, access determinations based on the use of biology and environment impact studies to determine if a vehicle is unsuited for use in a specific location/terrain. Instead, it appears the state is content to encourage the use of vehicles that promote the erosion of the small amount of top soil this state has or other vehicles that constantly stir up contaminants which have settled to the bottom of waterways and would normally remain encapsulated in the sediment there.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes and No. Yes, some user groups will be very happy with this change. In

fact, it will allow numerous users to return to their traditional hunting areas they had used for decades, but were forced to abandon when their access was removed. In other words they could no longer get to their normal hunting location due to the fact that any other means of transportation would have caused too much of an environmental impact to reach these locations, and walking was not conducive.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The user group who was banished from their traditional hunting areas due to this regulations implementation, and the lack of a substitute vehicle that could get them to their hunting locations without totally destroying the environment they love.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody is likely to suffer, however user groups may be forced to work out their differences between themselves instead of having a wedge driven between them by the Board of Game by giving one user group preference over another.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There are no other solutions available. Either this area is restricted or it is not. If the concern is how the user groups will get along, then that is between them. If it is environmentally/biologically a concern then again it is funny that the vehicles best suited for this habitat are the only vehicles restricted.

PROPOSED BY: Raymond H. Heuer (I-04S-G-128)

PROPOSAL 166 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Clarify allowable use of the Parks Highway through the Wood River Controlled Use Area in Unit 20A as follows:

Make an exclusion for the use of the Parks Highway for access to the Wood River Controlled Use Area.

ISSUE: The Wood River Controlled Use Area restricts the use of motorized vehicles for hunting and transport of hunters. The Parks Highway is within this area for a short stretch north of McKinley Village thus a lawyer's interpretation of the regulations imply a person cannot use the Parks Highway to access the area.

The Parks Highway crosses to the east side of the Nenna River, just south of McKinley Village.

The Wood River Controlled Use Area's western boundary in this area is the east bank of the Nenna River.

Thus, if a hunter accesses the Wood River Controlled Use Area from the Parks Highway in the area where the highway is on the east bank, he would technically be in violation of the restriction against motorized access. If the hunter came from the south and drove past this short section of the highway to access the area, he would still be in violation of the regulation as now written.

To be in complete compliance with the current regulation, a hunter coming from the south would need to stop and park south of the bridge over the Nenna River to access the area. A hunter cannot

drive on the Parks Highway where the highway crosses to the east bank of the Nenna River and be in compliance with the regulations as written.

I spoke with several members of the department and with Fish and Wildlife Protection enforcement officers to verify that it would be okay to use the Parks Highway. They all thought it would be okay; however, one of the enforcement officers agreed that the regulation as currently written implies the highway cannot be used. The officer also said that this question has never come up before.

I have no vested interest in the outcome of this. I was fortunate enough to draw a calf permit for this area, and that is why I am writing this. It is unlikely I will be hunting in this area again anytime soon, but I always read the regulations carefully and want to be absolutely certain that I am in complete compliance with the regulations when I hunt. If an exception that allows the use of the Parks Highway is added to the regulation, then I and others who read the “letter” of the regulations will not have any worries about the legality of our hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A hunter could get cited for a violation if he used this section of the highway for his hunt.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and law enforcement officials.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Do not know.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Gregory M. Errico (HQ-04S-G-021)

PROPOSAL 167 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Open the Wood River Controlled Use Area to motorized vehicles as follows:

The Wood River Controlled Use Area would be open to motorized vehicles with gross vehicle weight of less than 1,500 pounds.

ISSUE: Access to the Wood River Controlled Use Area, motor vehicle restriction.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose populations will continue to grow to unsustainable levels.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; it would open an under-harvested area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters of the Ferry and Rex Trail areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I can think of no one who would suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Opening to larger vehicles would see too many hunters flooding into area. Larger vehicles with larger range would affect hunting guides and lodges in area, and also tear up vegetation and cause erosion.

PROPOSED BY: Roggie L. Hunter (HQ-04S-G-033)

PROPOSAL 168 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Eliminate the Wood River Controlled Use Area in Unit 20A as follows:

Eliminate the Wood River Controlled Use Area.

ISSUE: The closure of the Wood River Controlled Use Area to motorized vehicles. By closing this area you are limiting access to residential hunters that cannot afford to hire guides or air taxi services.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Guides and nonresidential (out of state) hunters have preferential treatment, by allowing them better access to our game. In addition, these trophy hunters unbalance the game population, i.e. bull:cow ratios, by going after only the largest and best bulls. The spike-fork population is not reduced, allowing more inferior bulls in the unit.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Opens us an additional 960,000 acres of land for hunting. This allows for better game management and proper game ratios.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters, especially those that have difficulty hiking long distances. By allowing motorized vehicles the access is more evenly distributed to older individuals and other individuals that have medical problems.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The guides-since they will no longer have exclusive use to the area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Harold Bryant (SC-04S-G-001)

PROPOSAL 169 - 5 AAC 92.540(3)(J). Controlled use areas. Allow airboat use in Nenana Controlled Use Area as follows:

The Nenana Controlled Use Area is open to everyone and anyone.

ISSUE: Closed to one user group for moose hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The discriminations of one user group.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone; no one will be discriminated against because of what mode of transportation they take to the field.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The people that cannot hunt the area by use of an airboat.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close the area to everyone.

PROPOSED BY: Lee (Skip) Olsen and the Interior Alaska Airboaters Association (I-04S-G-009)

PROPOSAL 170 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Repeal all controlled use areas in Unit 20 as follows:

Because they are not biologically justified do away with the Delta Junction Management Area, the Glacier Mountain Controlled Use Area, the Yanert Controlled Use Area, the Fairbanks Management Area, the Healy-Lignite Management Area, and the Stampede Closed Area and Nenana Canyon Closed Areas. Delete any reference to these areas.

ISSUE: Do away with all biologically unjustified controlled use areas and management areas.

None of the above areas are biologically justified.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? N/A

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? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-04S-G-087)

PROPOSAL 171 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Allow motorized hunting within two miles south of Rex Trail in Unit 20 as follows:

Extend motorized hunting south of the Rex Trail for two miles between Totatlanika River and Saint George Creek.

ISSUE: To extend the motorized area south of the Rex Trail between the Totatlanika River and Saint George Creek, for two miles south of the Rex Trail.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? All hunters on the trail or to the north of the trail. Improve quality of hunting. Better to be able to get up on hill side for spotting. Able to see brow tines. Able to use trails south of Rex Trail.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It would reduce pressure on another area. Quality of hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Quality of hunting by all. To prevent future violations of hunting in nonmotorized area with vehicles.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None, this has no biological impact. Already has horn regulations. Used to be open.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Open more area. Did not want to crowd others using horses and airplanes. Whether to use ridge top or mileage. Mileage is used in other unit.

PROPOSED BY: Middle Nenana River Advisory Committee (I-04S-G-135)

PROPOSAL 172 - 5 AAC 92.550. Areas closed to trapping. Create an area closed to trapping near McKinley Village as follows:

No trapping between the Yanert River (south bank) east to the intertie then south along intertie to Carlo Creek then west to the Nenana River then north along the east bank of the Nenana River to the junction of the Yanert River and Nenana.

ISSUE: Continued conflicts between trappers and non-trappers in close proximity of McKinley Village.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued conflicts.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Products produced. We hope the people of McKinley Village and trappers of the area will all accept this and all live happily ever after.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? McKinley Village non-trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trappers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Middle Nenana River Advisory Committee

(I-04S-G-065)

FORT YUKON/NORTH SLOPE AREA

PROPOSAL 173 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Open a season for arctic fox trapping in Unit 25 as follows:

Add Arctic Fox to the list of color phases of other foxes in Unit 25. Season of Nov. 1-Feb. 28 to Unit 25, with a “no limit” bag limit (identical to red fox season in Unit 25).

ISSUE: The problem is it is illegal to catch Arctic Fox in Unit 25. It is impossible to tell what color phase fox will end up in your trap or snare.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? I will occasionally catch Arctic Fox illegally in my sets, along with others who trap in Unit 25.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All trappers in Unit 25 who might occasionally catch an Arctic Fox.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There is no practical alternative.

PROPOSED BY: Heimo Korth

(I-04S-G-003)

PROPOSAL 174 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish a registration hunt for moose in Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area as follows:

Moose hunting on the haul road should go to a registration permit hunt, like it is at Chicken. You may not hunt caribou and moose at the same time. Permits have to be returned to Fairbanks. Then you may go back up north and hunt caribou.

ISSUE: Bow hunters are limited to where they can hunt moose without competing with gun hunters. I’ve hunted and trapped most of the haul road and surrounding mountains since 1978; Bart has since 1978. The area has a substantial wolf/bear population. In the past five to six years myself Bart and others have been removing the larger bears and some wolves (which are tough to take with a bow) in the area. Moose calf populations have been low for the past 10 years. We have noticed a significant increase in the moose calf population over the past four years. Drawing permits aren’t

fair. Too many people seem to draw permits almost every year, while others (including myself, 1974 to present) have never drawn a permit. It totally cuts hunters out who've lived and hunted the area longer than the so-called residents of Coldfoot or Wiseman. Not to cut them out, if you live there year round you deserve a preference. Also not enough information was at hand about the area to warrant a drawing permit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The drawing permit displaces a lot of bow hunters and puts too much pressure on the Fairbanks Management Area (FMA) bull moose population. The bull moose population in the FMA cannot sustain that much pressure without over-harvesting. The haul road has a lot of major migration routes with plenty of transient bulls as well as resident bull moose.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Most hunters going up north are going for caribou. They are only chance hunting moose, i.e. hunters from south of Fairbanks are mainly targeting caribou not moose. They don't know the area that well and the moose they take is incidental. It is not likely a hunter from south of Fairbanks would hunt moose on the haul road without being able to hunt caribou also. The drawing permit still makes it a two-animal hunt. Registration would remove pressure off moose which is the main objective.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose, the people who live in Coldfoot/Wiseman and hunters who want to hunt moose only.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. The department could defer registration to local licensing agencies (like Valdez for goat hunting).

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Grady Brown Jr., and Bart W. Colledge (I-04S-G-055)

PROPOSAL 175 - 5 AAC 92.015(b). Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize the current exemption of brown bear resident tag fee for Unit 25D.

...

(b) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear...in Unit 25(D).

ISSUE: The brown bear tag and fee requirement for Unit 25D was eliminated by the Board of Game beginning in the 1998-1999 regulatory year. The Board must reauthorize the exemption annually or the fee automatically becomes reinstated. The Board has identified the moose population in Unit 25D as important for providing high levels of human consumption (5AAC 92.108). This tag fee exemption was intended to increase harvest reporting and also to increase harvest of brown bear to benefit moose calf and adult survival. Prior to the exemption, relatively few local residents purchased a tag because they generally do not hunt specifically for brown bears. However, some brown bears are taken incidental to encounters in or near communities or fishing and hunting camps. Calf mortality studies in Interior Alaska, including Unit 25D, indicate brown

bears are often an important predator on moose calves. Prior to the tag fee exemption, reported harvest was zero to five bears per regulatory year. During regulatory years 1998-1999 through 2001-2002 reported harvest was zero to six bears, and preliminary data indicate that 10 were taken in 2002-2003. The tag fee exemption appears to have increased reporting and may have increased the harvest of brown bears, however the harvest is still below a level that would significantly reduce the effect of brown bear predation on moose calf survival. We recommend continuing with the present regulation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The tag fee would be reinstated for the 2004-2005 regulatory year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents who are reluctant or unable to purchase the \$25 tag before hunting will be able to opportunistically and legally harvest a brown bear.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-082)

PROPOSAL 176 - 5 AAC 92.510(16)(B). Areas closed to hunting. Reopen archery hunting within 1/4 mile of Dalton Highway in Unit 26B as follows:

Open on either side of the road from the Yukon River bridge to Prudhoe Bay closed area for archery hunting.

ISSUE: Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area. The problem is the 1/4-mile hunting restriction from either side of the road from the Yukon River bridge to Prudhoe Bay Closed Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Lost opportunity by hunters because of having to walk out 1/4 mile from the road for no reason at all. The elderly and the disabled hunter have a hard time to hunt that far out, and it is a law enforcement nightmare to boot trying to figure out if the hunter was or was not out 1/4 of a mile. Law enforcement would be better off somewhere else where they were needed.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it lets people go back to hunting caribou and moose and bear and small game without bow that are out to feed their families without being harassed by law enforcement checking to see if they are 1/4 mile off the road.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The hunter will benefit that is up getting game to feed their families.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Open the area to every mode of transportation and use a rifle either side of the road but now that will never happen because this is a political thing.

PROPOSED BY: William Pearson (I-04S-G-012)

PROPOSAL 177 - 5 AAC 92.510(16)(B). Areas closed to hunting. Reopen archery hunting within 1/4 mile of Dalton Highway in Unit 26B as follows:

Open the road back up. It will open up the areas where you can't get 1/4 mile from the road because of mountains or river.

ISSUE: The 1/4 mile corridor was implemented because of unethical hunters shooting caribou from the road, across the road, and in the road. This did not stop them from breaking the law. They're still doing it. Yes punishes law abiding, honest hunters with a good hunting ethic. Since the 1/4 mile the unethical are taking even longer shots than they can reasonably be proficient at.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bow hunters will suffer for things unethical hunters do.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will let the honest hunters hunt now and into the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Honest and ethical hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unethical hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Stiffer fines and confiscation of weapon on the spot. Vehicle impoundment or confiscation after the offender drives it back to his or her home town?

PROPOSED BY: Grady Brown Jr., and Bart W. Colledge (I-04S-G-057)

PROPOSAL 178 - 5 AAC 92.510(16)(B). Areas closed to hunting; and 5 AAC 92.530(7)(B). Management areas. Delete archery ID requirement and 1/4 mile closure along Dalton Highway in Unit 26B as follows:

Under "State restricted areas in Unit 26" omit the following:

(1) ; hunters must mark their bowhunter education certification card number in permanent ink on the fletching or shaft of each arrow in possession;

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

ISSUE: (1) The ¼ mile corridor on each side of the Dalton Highway closed to big game hunting. Establishing a known ¼ mile distance is difficult and adds unnecessary stress to hunting. It also sets a dangerous precedence in creating “no hunting buffer zones” near roads and trails. Regulations have been in place for many years which adequately address hunting near roadways: “You may not shoot on, from, or across the drivable surface of any constructed road or highway”; (2) Bowhunters are required to write their bowhunter education certification number on their arrows. This regulation is difficult to enforce, complicates the regulations for no practical reason, and is an ineffective deterrent from taking a poor shot.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? (1) The quality of the hunt will continue to be hampered by complicated and unnecessary regulations; (2) elderly and disabled bowhunters will be disadvantaged; and (3) due to restricted access and unnecessary regulations, bowhunters will be displaced from a hunt area which has no biological reason for the restriction and can sustain a substantial harvest.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. More accessible hunting area means more shot selection and an increased likelihood hunters will make clean kills.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? (1) Bowhunters who hunt in 26B; (2) those who hunt in areas where displaced hunters may go; (3) elderly or disabled bowhunters who cannot physically transport game back to the road; and (4) State Troopers - simplified regulations will ease law enforcement efforts

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Those hunters who want a more “pristine” hunt can still hunt ¼ mile off the roadway.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Leaving as written. Unnecessary regulation of bowhunting.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee (I-04S-G-038)

PROPOSAL 179 - 5 AAC 92.530(7). Management areas. Clarify restriction on vehicle use in Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area as follows:

Licensed highway vehicles may only be operated on public access roads.

ISSUE: Use of highway vehicles in the Dalton Highway Corridor.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This regulation was not originally designed to prevent hunters from traveling on public access roads like Galbreath and Toolik Lakes access roads. In October of 2003 the State Troopers were up on the Dalton Highway giving citations for driving into Toolik Lake and warning and citations to those parking at the gravel pit at Galbreath

Lake. This is going to become a dangerous situation with vehicles left no other place to park other than the side of the road and the very few camp sites.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this change would allow hunters who have been using these access roads to continue hunting in the locations and the way they have been for years. It will also reduce the risk of conflict between hunters and truckers on the highway due to hunters having to park along the road systems.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users of this area (hunters, truckers, and other recreators).

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The same people who will benefit from this solution.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered leaving it as it is. This is a case where a regulation has gone through the process and been approved. After the regulation was approved the actual problem came in enforcement’s interpretation of the law. The law needs to be written in language which clearly states the intent of the law (which I believe is to keep vehicles from driving across the tundra, and not to prevent vehicles driving down an open access road and parking in a gravel pit or on a state owned lake access).

PROPOSED BY: Raymond H. Heuer (I-04S-G-111)

PROPOSAL 180 - 5 AAC 92.530. Management areas. Clarify vehicle use for hunting in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area as follows:

I would like to see the board adopt “only licensed highway vehicles are allowed to leave the Dalton Highway”.

ISSUE: Dalton Highway Corridor Regulations: “Licensed highway vehicles are only allowed on publicly maintained roads.”

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will have less of an opportunity to harvest moose in an area that has in the past allowed access.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It allows the resource to be harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All resident hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Michael S. Rosetti (I-04S-G-134)

PROPOSAL 181 - 5 AAC 92.530(7)(B). Management areas. Delete archery ID requirement in Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area as follows:

Stop the unneeded numbering of each arrow. It is a waste of time and a waste of law enforcement time looking to see if you have your ID numbers on your arrows.

ISSUE: Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area. The problem is having to put your bow hunter education card number.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It is unfair to have to put your bow hunter ID number on your arrows. If the archery hunters have to do this then the rifle hunters should have to put some kind of ID on every bullet they shoot too.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it lets people get back to hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The hunter will benefit that is getting game to feed their families.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Open the area up for rifle hunting but that's not politically correct.

PROPOSED BY: William Pearson (I-04S-G-013)

PROPOSAL 182 - 5 AAC 92.530(7). Management areas. Reduce size of Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area as follows:

In Units 20, 24, 25, and 26
Existing text modified to define width as one mile from each side of the pipeline and deleting any reference to motorized vehicle restrictions.

ISSUE: Modify the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area to narrow its width one mile on each side of the pipeline (all that's required for safety) and delete all transportation restrictions against using motorized vehicles to transport hunters, their gear, or harvested game.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This is classic anti-hunter, department people management. The department should manage wildlife for abundance and create more opportunities for consumptive uses.

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? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-04S-G-083)

GALENA AREA

PROPOSAL 183 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Expand muskrat trapping season in Unit 21 and allow open water trapping as follows:

Unit 21 muskrat trapping season Sept. 26 – June 10. No limit.

ISSUE: Unit 21 muskrat trapping. Allow open water trapping from boats for approximately two weeks before freeze up. Open new season from Sept. 26 – June 10. No limit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? N/A

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, allows legal harvest of subsistence meat for an extra 1 ½ months.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers and subsistence users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I wanted to open a firearms season, but too many of the animals get wasted.

PROPOSED BY: James Sears (HQ-04S-G-031)

PROPOSAL 184 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Expand beaver trapping season in Unit 21 and allow open water trapping as follows:

Unit 21 beaver trapping season Sept. 26 – June 10. No limit.

ISSUE: Unit 21 beaver trapping. Allow open water trapping from boats for approximately two weeks before freeze up. Open new season from Sept. 26 – June 10. No limit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? N/A

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, allows legal harvest of subsistence meat for an extra 1 ½ months.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers and subsistence users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I wanted to open a firearms season also, but too many of the beaver get wasted with this practice.

PROPOSED BY: James Sears (HQ-04S-G-032)

PROPOSAL 185 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.
Establish a drawing permit hunt for brown bear in Unit 24 as follows:

In general a & b.

a – Establish a permit drawing hunt in area described, concurrent and consistent with 26B.

b – Maintain the existing regulations in the remainder of Unit 24.

Propose a permit drawing hunt within and adjacent the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area (DHCMA). To read as follows:

(1) Unit 24, that portion within and adjacent the DHCMA to the west the border of Gates of the Arctic National Park, to the east the boundary of GMU 25, to the north the boundary of Unit 26B (continental divide) and to the south from approx M.P. 164 Dalton Highway where Chapman Creek crosses to the west to the border of the Gates of the Arctic National Park, then from the 67-degree latitude (south of the Dalton Hwy crossing on the South Fork of the Koyukuk) east to the boundary of GMU 25.

Residents and Nonresidents: one bear every four regulatory years by drawing permit. Six permits to be issued.

(2) The remainder of Unit 24, residents and nonresidents: one bear every regulatory year. Current regulations remain.

(3) Northwest Alaska Brown Bear Management Area: subsistence regulations remain.

ISSUE: The bear harvest in Unit 24, within and adjacent DHCMA, exceeds sustainable yield for the population in this geographically constrained area.

An overview...

Overall Unit 24 bear harvest is calculated, in part, on a total geographic landmass of 26,000 square miles. However, optimal bear habitat is the mountains and foothills of the Brooks Range, which encompass about 7,000 square miles, a portion of the northern half of the unit. Of this, 50 percent is

inside the Gates of the Arctic National Park (closed to hunting for the general public), and 50 percent is outside.

The bear harvest within and adjacent the DHCMA is disproportionately large relative to the entire area, as well as exceeding its own sustainable yield. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game management objectives include no more than 20 bears harvested, at least 50 percent males, in the entire northern half of the unit (11,500 square miles). However, calculations to determine a sustainable harvest of 20 bears are inflated because 3,500 square miles of national parklands – closed to hunting – are included in determining population size.

Research by the department shows the potential reservoir in the Gates of the Arctic National Park for males but not females. Males may emigrate from where they are born, but females do not.

Overharvest of bears within and adjacent the DHCMA occurs for two additional reasons:

(1) primarily because of easy road access that enhances its popularity with few restrictions and consequent high hunter density; and (2) hunting pressure is constrained by geography, access and transportation within this narrow area.

Currently, substantially more than one-half the bear harvest allocated for all of Unit 24 is concentrated within 1,750 square miles of the DHCMA, a region bounded from Gobblers Knob in south to Unit 26B, Chandalar Shelf in the north, west by the Gates of the Arctic National Park border and east by Unit 25A & D.

A 5 percent sustainable harvest within and adjacent the DHCMA should be three bears. However, for a period of years the harvest has exceeded 10 bears, with an average of four females killed every year. Thus, the female component alone exceeds sustainable yield.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the harvest, including females, continues at current levels to exceed sustainable yield, the population will be reduced below a sustainable level; resulting in substantial loss of hunting opportunities.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? (1) The bear population and everyone who uses it. Various groups who will not be affected; (2) Local subsistence hunters downriver. They can be assured bear hunting will remain as one means of enhancing moose survival; (3) The few resident families at Wiseman; (4) Other area residents and nonresident guided hunters to the west where access is by air only; and (5) Caribou bow hunters bound for Unit 26.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Mostly, opportunistic bow hunters driving the Dalton, moose meat hunters who chance upon a bear, and guides who have nonresident hunters who do not draw a permit.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSAL 186 - 5 AAC 85.025(a)(16). Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou.

Closes caribou hunting in the range of the Galena Mountain caribou herd as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(16)		
...		
<u>Unit 21(B), that portion north of the Yukon River and downstream from Ukawutni Creek</u>	<u>No open season</u>	<u>No open season</u>
<u>Remainder of Unit 21(B)</u>	<u>Aug. 10-Sept. 30</u>	<u>Aug. 10-Sept. 30</u>
<u>1 caribou</u>		
<u>Unit 21(C), that portion within the Dulbi River Drainage and that portion within the Melozitna River Drainage downstream from Big Creek</u>	<u>No open season</u>	<u>No open season</u>
<u>Remainder of Unit 21(C)</u>	<u>Aug. 10-Sept. 30</u>	<u>Aug. 10-Sept. 30</u>
<u>1 caribou</u>		
<u>Unit 21(D), that portion north of the Yukon River and east of the Koyukuk River</u>	<u>(Winter season to be announced)</u>	<u>No open season</u>
<u>2 caribou</u>		
[UNITS 21(B), 21(C), AND THAT PORTION OF 21(D) NORTH OF THE YUKON RIVER AND EAST OF THE KOYUKUK RIVER AND 21(E)]	[AUG. 10-SEPT. 30 (WINTER SEASON TO BE ANNOUNCED)]	[AUG. 10-SEPT. 30]

[1 CARIBOU; HOWEVER, 2 ADDITIONAL

CARIBOU MAY BE TAKEN DURING A WINTER SEASON TO BE ANNOUNCED]

Remainder of Unit 21(D)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

5 caribou per day; however, cow caribou may not be taken May 16-June 30

July 1-June 30

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

5 caribou; however, cow caribou

July 1-June 30

may not be taken May 16-June 30

Unit 21(E)

Aug. 10-Sept. 30
(Winter season to be announced)

Aug. 10-Sept. 30

1 caribou; however, 2 additional

caribou may be taken during a winter season to be announced

ISSUE: The Galena Mountain caribou herd is an small isolated mountain herd that ranges in a small area of the Kokrine Hills north of the Yukon River. Surveys conducted in 2002 and 2003 have shown that the Galena Mountain Caribou Herd has declined from about 350 animals in 1999-2000, to 80-90 animals in 2003. Surveys conducted in October 2003 found only nine bulls and one calf among the 73 caribou classified. The harvest of even a single animal from this herd could be detrimental. The season closures in this proposal would protect the Galena Mountain Caribou Herd while allowing harvest of Western Arctic Herd caribou.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The herd could potentially become extirpated if the few remaining animals are not protected.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who want to maintain the Galena Mountain Caribou herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? One or two hunters every other year that may harvest an animal from that herd.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No change.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-102)

PROPOSAL 187 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Restrict moose hunters to applying for only one of the two Koyukuk moose hunts each year in Units 21D and 24 as follows:

Koyukuk moose hunters can only apply for one of the two Koyukuk moose hunts each year.

ISSUE: Koyukuk moose hunt applicants applying for only one of the two hunts have a lower probability of winning a permit than applicants applying for both hunts. Hunters with time constraints should not have reduced chances of drawing compared to applicants for both hunts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Single hunt applicants will have to compete with multi-hunt applicants.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those hunters who only apply for one hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters historically applying for both hunts will have a slightly lower chance of winning a permit.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Harry Forquer (HQ-04S-G-022)

PROPOSAL 188 - 5 AAC 85.045(19). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize antlerless moose hunting seasons in Unit 21D as follows:

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

(19)

...

Unit 21(D), that portion within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:

1 moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or

Aug. 27-Aug. 31
(Subsistence hunt only)

1 bull by registration permit only; or

Sept. 1-Sept. 20
(Subsistence hunt only)

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 320 permits may be issued in combination with Unit 24, that portion within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area; or

Sept. 5-Sept. 25
(General hunt only)

1 moose during a five-day season to be announced by emergency order during the period Feb. 1-Feb. 28; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf

(To be announced)
(Subsistence hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit; up to 80 permits may be issued in combination with Unit 24, that portion within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area;

Sept. 5-Sept. 25

Remainder of Unit 21(D)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose per regulatory year; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from Sept. 21- Sept. 25 and during a five-day season during the period Feb. 1-Feb. 28 to be announced by emergency

Sept. 5-Sept. 25
(To be announced)

order; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 5-Sept. 25

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. Antlerless moose harvest in the two geographic areas described in regulation (above), can be supported by present moose populations on a limited basis only. Fall 2001 trend count surveys suggest static or declining numbers in Three Day Slough, Kaiyuh Slough, Pilot Mountain Slough, and Squirrel Creek trend count areas. Population estimation surveys in northern Unit 24 in 1999 and southern Unit 24 in 2001 also suggest a decline has occurred in the population. Calf:cow and yearling:cow ratios indicate recruitment rates are declining and more conservative harvest on the reproductive portion of the population is needed in some areas of the unit. Surveys conducted in March of 1999 and 2000 indicated an increasing wolf population that was also having a downward influence on recruitment of moose in the unit. Conservative management strategies have been implemented in a step-wise progression outlined by the Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan developed in 2001. Emergency Order (EO) closure of the fall antlerless moose season was implemented in 2003 for the third year. This EO is consistent with the Plan. Advisory committees wanted the fall cow hunts to remain in codified because they were concerned about getting them reinstated if they were dropped entirely. The flexibility of the EO process has been requested by advisory committees.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The opportunity to harvest cow moose when the population can sustain it will be lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will maintain the opportunity to harvest cows when the population can sustain this segment of the harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who like to hunt cow moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to hunting cow moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? (1) Close the cow harvest for all seasons currently open; (2) continue the cow harvest during the winter seasons only; and (3) close the fall cow seasons by Emergency Order.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-077)

PROPOSAL 189 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunting seasons in Unit 24 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(22)		
Unit 24, that portion within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 moose by registration permit only; or	Aug. 27-Aug. 31 (Subsistence hunt only)	
1 bull by registration permit only; or	Sept. 1-Sept. 20 (Subsistence hunt only)	
1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 320 permits may be issued in combination with Unit 21(D), that portion within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area; or	Sept. 5-Sept. 25 (General hunt only)	
1 moose	Dec. 1-Dec. 10 Mar. 1-Mar. 10 (Subsistence hunt only)	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit; up to 80 permits may be issued in combination with Unit 21(D), that portion within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area		Sept. 5-Sept. 25

Unit 24, that portion of the John and Alatna River drainages within the Gates of the Arctic National Park

1 moose

Aug. 1-Dec. 31

No open season.

Unit 24, that portion of the North Fork of the Koyukuk River drainage within the Gates of the Arctic National Park

1 moose

Sept. 1-Sept. 25
Mar. 1-Mar. 10

No open season.

Unit 24, all drainages to the north of the Koyukuk River upstream from the Henshaw Creek drainage, to and including the North Fork of the Koyukuk River, except that portion of the John River and North Fork of the Koyukuk River drainages within Gates of the Arctic National Park

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from Sept. 21-Sept. 25

Sept. 1-Sept. 25

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 5-Sept. 25

Unit 24, all drainages to the north of the Koyukuk River between and including the Alatna River and Henshaw Creek drainages, except that portion of the Alatna River drainage within Gates of the Arctic National Park

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose; however, antlerless
moose may be taken only
from Sept. 21-Sept. 25
and Mar. 1-Mar. 10

Sept. 1-Sept. 25
Mar. 1-Mar. 10

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 5-Sept. 25

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. Antlerless moose harvest in the four geographic areas described in regulation above can be supported by present moose populations on a limited basis only. Trend count surveys conducted in 2000 and 2001 suggest static or declining moose numbers in the areas of Dulbi Slough, Dulbi River Mouth, Treat Island, and Huslia River Flats. Population estimation surveys in northern Unit 24 in 1999 and southern Unit 24 in 2001 also suggest a decline in the population has occurred. Calf:cow and yearling:cow ratios indicate recruitment rates are declining, and a more conservative harvest of the reproductive portion of the population is needed. Conservative management strategies have been implemented in a step-wise progression outlined by the Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan developed in 2001. Emergency Order (EO) closure of the fall antlerless moose season was implemented in 2003 for the third year. This EO closure is consistent with the Plan. Advisory committees wanted the fall cow hunts to remain in codified because they were concerned about getting them reinstated if they were dropped entirely. The flexibility of the EO process has been requested by advisory committees.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The opportunity to harvest cow moose when the population can sustain it will be lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will maintain the opportunity to harvest cows when the population can sustain this segment of the harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who like to hunt cow moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to hunting cow moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? (1) Close the cow harvest for all seasons currently open; (2) continue the cow harvest during the winter seasons only; and (3) close the fall cow seasons by Emergency Order.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-04S-G-081)

PROPOSAL 190 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify brow tine restrictions for moose hunting in Unit 24 as follows:

All Unit 24 moose hunts that employ antler restrictions either; spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with three or more brow tines; or one bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with three or more brow tines on one side.

ISSUE: There is a need to reevaluate the four brow tine harvest strategy for moose in Unit 24 and probably statewide. Moose in Unit 24 have been in decline for over ten years. Demand has dramatically increased, especially among nonresidents, at the same time. Four brow tine moose are usually the largest and strongest genotype. I have never personally seen a small-bodied brow palm moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Arbitrarily culling of the best gene pool will eventually lead to lower over-winter survival of future moose populations. When winter snows exceed four feet, only the largest moose survive the long winter, getting to feed. The spike/fork/50-three brow tine was successful on the Kenai Peninsula to regain the necessary large bull breeding component. The four brow tine is a digression allowing maximum opportunity, but sacrifices our best genetic moose, for a short-term gain.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will allow across-the-board harvest of moose genotypes, while protecting some breeding component. Without doing long-term damage to the genetic makeup of the herd. Further harvest reductions should be pursued through season reduction, registration or drawing hunts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaskans who want to maintain genetically diverse moose populations and optimize sustained yield.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one should suffer under this proposal.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A bag limit of one bull without antler restrictions for nonresidents in Unit 24. I felt it was too liberal for the escalating numbers of nonresident hunters in Unit 24.

PROPOSED BY: Jack Reakoff (I-04S-G-015)

PROPOSAL 191 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Close nonresident moose hunting season in Unit 21B as follows:

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

(19)

...

Unit 21(B), that portion upstream of the mouth of the Nowitna River and east of the west bank of the Nowitna River

RESIDENT HUNTERS: Sept. 5-Sept. 25
One bull

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: [SEPT. 1-SEPT. 20]
One bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on at least one side No open season

ISSUE: Non-local hunters in Unit 21B, including nonresidents, are competing for a very limited moose resource with locals. Adjacent Unit 20F is already closed to nonresidents. This proposal would expand the area closed to nonresidents.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Local hunter success rates will decline and, in general, the quality of hunting experiences for local hunters will deteriorate. There will not be enough harvestable surplus for both residents and nonresidents

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents and locals.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresidents.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: The Tanana/Rampart/Manley Advisory Committee (I-04S-G-016)

PROPOSAL 192 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Increase brown bear bag limit to two per year Unit 21B, 21C, 21D, and 24 as follows:

- (1) the bag limit for brown bear in Units 6 (except 6(D)), 12, 13, (except in the Denali State Park Management Area, 19-20, [19(C), 19(D), 20(D), EAST OF THE EAST BANK OF THE GERSTLE RIVER OR NORTH OF THE TANANA RIVER, 20(E), 21(D)] 22 (except Unit 22(C)), 23, 25, [25(D)], 26(B) and 26(C) is one bear per regulatory year; a bear taken in these units does not count against the one bear every four regulatory years' bag limit established for brown bears in other units.

(2) The bag limit for brown bears in Units 21(B), 21(C), 21(D) and 24 is two bears per regulatory year; a bear taken in these units does not count against the one bear every four regulatory years' bag limit established for brown bears in other units;

ISSUE: Harvest of grizzly bears is below sustainable yield and averages about 19 of 48 in Units 21B, C, D, and about 23 of 102 in Unit 24. The population is increasing, which will allow for an even higher sustainable yield. Increasing the bag limit to two bears is biologically sustainable and will provide for increased opportunity. Increased harvest of grizzly bears will be beneficial to the survival of moose and caribou calves, a strategy that the department has employed in the McGrath area, where bear predation has been shown as a major factor in moose calf mortality.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If nothing is done, hunting opportunity will be lost, grizzly bears will continue to increase even though demand is low for that species, while moose and caribou will continue to decline when demand for those species is high.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who depend on moose and caribou, hunters that would like to shoot more than one bear in a year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who are unjustifiably concerned that grizzly bears will be over-harvested.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Other solutions considered included: (1) No change; and (2) extend seasons.

PROPOSED BY: Friends of Moose (I-04S-G-073)

PROPOSAL 194 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change nonresident moose season and bag limit in Unit 21C as follows:

Leave the resident season from September 5- September 25 with a bag limit of 1 bull. Change the nonresident season to September 5- September 15 with an antler restriction of 50" minimum or four brow tines (spike-fork left to resident meat hunters).

ISSUE: Bring unit to this area as compared to other surrounding areas. At this time, this is the only area with no restrictions for nonresidents (Unit 21C).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Over-hunting of this area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Nonresidents are not meat hunters, but are trophy hunters. Local and Alaska resident hunters will have a better chance to harvest a moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local and Alaska resident hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Shorter season for nonresidents.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Closed to nonresident hunting; outfitters and guides may suffer financially.

PROPOSED BY: Leslie Olson (I-04S-G-076)

PROPOSAL 195 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Lengthen nonresident moose season in Units 21A and 21B as follows:

Amend the moose hunting season dates for Unit 21A and 21B as follows:

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

Units 21A and 21B; those portions of the Nowitna River drainage within the Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge:

NONRESIDENTS one bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with four or more brow tines on at least one side; harvest;	Sept. 10 – Sept. 25
--	---------------------

Remainder of Units 21A and 21B;

NONRESIDENTS one bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with four or more brow tines on at least one side; harvest	Sept. 5 – Sept. 25
---	--------------------

ISSUE: For the past two seasons nonresident hunters of this area have been limited to hunting only the early part of the season. Their season has been shortened from the long-standing 21-day season to 16 days, foregoing the last days of the season altogether. They constitute only a minor percentage of the hunters in this area.

Unfortunately, this regulatory change has resulted in negative impacts in three areas that are of vital interest to all Alaskans: (1) local residents; (2) resource dependant livelihoods; and (3) the resource itself.

Local residents:

The shortened season for nonresident hunters has resulted in the same number of hunters coming during a shorter period of time. There is now also a greater concentration of air taxi activity during this restricted time. This has increased the competition between all users during this period, having the further effect of increasing the likelihood that sub-legal moose are to be taken due to increased pressure. If hunters feel pressured by being forced to hunt at less productive times, they become more competitive and lower their standards. The desire to harvest before the next fellow gets “their moose” pushes people into situations where they are hoping the moose is legal, rather than passing it up for another.

Resource dependent livelihoods:

Three local subsistence users have been operating small-scale guiding operations in this area for many years. This has been a means both to harvest their own moose for the winter months and also to supplement trapping incomes. The season being shortened from the later dates for nonresident hunters has prevented us from offering two consecutive hunts during the season. We are now in a situation where we have to take all of our clients during the same time period, once again increasing the number of hunters in the field at the same time. Besides frustrating longtime resident hunters, this greatly lowers the quality of the wilderness experience we are attempting to offer, and sometimes prevents us from finding moose altogether. This greatly increases the cost of operating (more guides to employ, more air-charters, more boats in the rivers at the same time) and seriously puts these small businesses at risk.

The resource:

By being forced to hunt at earlier dates some hunters are now harvesting moose too early in the season, especially those on unguided float hunts. This meat now has to survive early season temperatures that were once avoidable. The resulting spoilage and waste of these animals is something that has to be addressed. It is in the interest of all parties to assure that these animals are properly utilized. It is illegal to waste game meat in this state, and unethical to intentionally restrict hunters in a manner that results in greater waste of meat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? User conflict is likely to increase. Incidents of meat spoilage will continue at the present higher levels. The local residents of the Nowitna who guide face the prospect of going out of business altogether.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge’s proposal (#41, 2002) stated that their reason for requesting the change was to create a regulatory consistency within the Nowitna River drainage.

This newly proposed change would continue to meet their goal of having a common closing date for Unit 21 (with the added monitoring benefit of having all hunters finish on the same day), while addressing some of the new problems that I have listed above, especially:

(1) Assuring that the harvested meat is taken at the proper time for its preservation: less spoilage; and (2) allowing the few of us who continue to live in this remote area to maintain a vital source of income that supplements our subsistence lifestyles. By hunting at the later dates we will once again be able to provide our clients a reasonable chance to take a moose, without the increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? (1) Alaska residents; (2) local; (3) the resource; and (4) nonresidents.

Importantly, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will continue to have the closing dates for the Nowitna Refuge correspond to the closing dates for the entire area of Unit 21, allowing for the regulatory consistency they are hoping to maintain. The fact that the closing dates will now correspond for all hunters should be an added benefit towards their efforts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident hunters and guides within the refuge will continue to be limited to a season that is five days shorter than residents within the boundaries of the Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge. That this loss of time will come from the beginning rather than the end of the season will ease the loss somewhat.

This proposal is intended to be a compromise between the needs of local who are dependent on this resource and the stated goals of the Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Returning the dates to those previously allowed until June 2002. This is not acceptable since it would once again create the regulatory inconsistency within the Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge.

PROPOSED BY: Nathan Turner (I-04S-G-115)

PROPOSAL 196 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Apply the alternate list system for allocating nonresident drawing permits for moose in Unit 21D and 24 as follows:

The new regulation would use 5 AAC 92.061(3), and (H) as a template. A new section would be put in 5 AAC 92.050(4)(G) (Required permit hunt conditions and procedures) that would allocate 50 percent of the nonresidents permits to guided nonresidents.

(3) The department shall enter, in a guided nonresident drawing, each application from a nonresident who will be accompanied by a guide; the department may issue a drawing permit for the general hunt only to a successful nonresident applicant who presents proof that the applicant will be accompanied by a guide;

(4) the following provisions apply to a guided nonresident drawing under this section:

(A) an applicant for a guided nonresident drawing permit may apply for only one such permit per application period;

(B) after the successful applicants have been selected by drawing, the department shall create an alternate list by drawing the remaining names of applicants for a specific hunt and placing the names on the alternate list in the order in which the names were drawn;

(C) if a successful applicant fails to provide proof that the applicant will be accompanied by a guide or cancels the guided hunt, the person whose name appears first on the alternate list for that hunt shall be offered the permit; if an alternate applicant fails to furnish proof that the applicant will be accompanied by a guide, the permit must be offered in turn to succeeding alternate applicants until the alternate list is exhausted;

(D) if a guided nonresident drawing permit is available, but the alternate list is exhausted, the permit becomes available, by registration at the Fairbanks or Galena ADF&G office, to the first applicant furnishing proof that the applicant will be accompanied by a guide;

...
(G)

ISSUE: Hunting guides' clients not drawing permits for the controlled use area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The guides and assistant guides who live in Hughes, Huslia, Koyukuk, Nulatte and Kaltag will not be able to take clients hunting in the controlled use area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The meat from the moose will be taken care of better and the majority of the meat will go to the local people who otherwise may have a hard time getting their needs met (i.e. elders, disabled, and single mothers).

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The local guides and the people they distribute meat to.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The people who are being illegally guided.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Virgil L. Umphenour (I-04S-G-139)

PROPOSAL 197 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reduce nonresident season and bag limit for moose in Unit 21C as follows:

Resident season from Sept. 5- Sept. 25 with a bag limit of one bull, as it is now. Nonresident season from Sept. 5- Sept.15 with an antler restriction of 50" minimum or four brow tines.

ISSUE: Bring unity to this area as compared to other surrounding hunt areas. At this time, this is the only area with no restrictions for nonresidents (Unit 21C). As a result, there are too many hunters coming into this area and too many moose have been taken in recent years. This combined with the very significant number of wolves and bears in the area, has resulted in far fewer moose

than there were even 10 years ago. I first started hunting in the area in 1989 and have hunted there almost every year since. One of my hunting partners had hunted there for many years prior to mine. We used to see a lot of moose and never had a problem getting a moose in the earlier years. We have seen a very significant increase over the years in the number of hunters, particularly nonresident hunters. We have also seen a very significant increase in the number of bears and especially wolves in the area. This past year on a two week hunt we did not see any bulls and only three cows. Only one had a calf. The previous year we saw only two bulls and no cows. The year before that we did not see any moose in two weeks of hunting. We did see a couple of wolves and some bears and we did see hunting parties camped on almost every other bend in the river as we were flying out. In the late 80's and early 90's we would see at least one moose a day and often many more. Other groups hunting the area over the years have made similar observations. This needs to be turned around and it may be too late already. Too many hunters, too many predators, and as a result, not many moose left.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? No moose for anyone to hunt and feed their families with.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Local and Alaska resident hunters will have a better chance to harvest a moose for their freezer. Quality will be improved simply by having more moose in future years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local and Alaska resident hunters and their families.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresidents and guides/commercial outfitters, however they can still hunt, they will just need to limit themselves to trophies, which is likely what they came to hunt anyway.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Closed to nonresident hunters. Reject, because it would cause guides and outfitters to suffer financially and would simply push them into other areas, just like they have moved into this area by less stringent regulations as compared to the surrounding areas. Just want fewer animals taken to prevent depletion and allow the resource to recover. Also considered predator control, but that does not appear to be a viable option in Alaska any longer due to politics and a lack of common sense on the part of some Alaskans, many nonresidents and state and federal government officials.

PROPOSED BY: Tim Wingerter (I-04S-G-140)

PROPOSAL 198 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf. Lengthen wolf hunting season in Unit 24 as follows:

Wolf season closes when most hunters are entering the field to hunt grizzly bear and black bear. We mainly hunt Unit 24 (Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area) during the month of May. Other units statewide, hunters are starting to hunt bear during the month of May also. April can be a little too early to hunt bears due to snow conditions, temperature, and in some places light. We see on an average of two to 20 wolves during the month of May. If the season was extended from April

30 to May 31. It would be better suited, because most hunters are in the field at this time and this would up their chances of taking a wolf. Its hard enough taking a wolf with a rifle, much less with a bow and arrow.

ISSUE: Wolf predation in Unit 24 (Dalton Corridor Management Area) and other units statewide.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If this problem is not addressed we will continue to see a decline in moose, caribou, and Dall sheep populations.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Wolves are incidental when taken hunting other game. Moose, caribou and sheep would benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose, caribou, and sheep.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Grady Brown Jr. and Bart W. Colledge (I-04S-G-054)

PROPOSAL 199 - 5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Eliminate brown bear tag fee in Unit 21B, 21C, and 21D as follows:

Eliminate brown bear tag fee for Units 21B, 21C, and 21D.

ISSUE: Subsistence hunters hunt bears opportunistically and may not be able to purchase a brown bear tag before they are in the field hunting or working. The \$25.00 fee is too high to gamble on whether they are successful getting a bear each year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters may miss a chance to shoot a bear or harvest one illegally.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Ruby Advisory Committee (I-04S-G-070)

PROPOSAL 200 - 5 AAC 85.045(19). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Implement antler restrictions for Unit 21B as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(19) ...		
Unit 21(B), that portion within the Nowitna River drainage		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull <u>with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side</u>	Sept. 5-Sept. 25	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side		Sept. 5-Sept. 20
Remainder of Unit 21(B)		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull <u>with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side</u>	Sept. 5-Sept. 25	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side		Sept. 5-Sept. 25
...		

ISSUE: Moose trend count survey data collected in 2003 for the Nowitna River Drainage indicate a continuing decline in the number of bulls which began in the fall 2000 surveys and continued from the fall 2001 surveys. Tentative bull:cow ratios for the Nowitna Mouth and Nowitna-Sulatna Confluence Trend Count Areas were 10 bulls:100 cows and 15 bulls:100 cows respectively in November 2003. Bull:cow ratios have declined from 22 and 30 bulls:100 cows for the two areas respectively since 2000. Reported harvest for all of Unit 21B in 2002 was 60 bulls, 29 of those bulls had antlers less than 50" including 6 bulls less than 30". Preliminary

harvest data for 2003 shows a total harvest of 51 bulls harvested with 25 of those bulls less than 50”, including seven bulls less than 30”. Subsistence harvest data indicates a harvest of up to 35 moose occurs annually by residents of Ruby and Tanana. Harvest tickets reports from those communities was six in 2002 and five in 2003.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The harvest of bulls will continue to be high and with the depressed numbers of bulls in the population it could result in a negative impact on the overall reproductivity of the population.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Future hunters who depend on the moose resource will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Short-term users will have decreased opportunity.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A drawing permit and registration permit system: shorten the season by five days.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-104)

PROPOSAL 201 - 5 AAC 85.045(19 and 22). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Close the February season in Unit 21D and the March seasons in Unit 24; open a ten day, bulls only, December season in Unit 21D; and change the December seasons in Unit 24 to bulls only as follows:

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

(19)

...

Unit 21(D), that portion within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:
 1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:

1 moose by registration permit	Aug. 27-Aug. 31
--------------------------------	-----------------

only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or

(Subsistence hunt only)

1 bull by registration permit only; or

Sept. 1-Sept. 20
(Subsistence hunt only)

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 320 permits may be issued in combination with Unit 24, that portion within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area; or

Sept. 5-Sept. 25
(General hunt only)

1 bull [MOOSE DURING A FIVE-DAY SEASON TO BE ANNOUNCED BY EMERGENCY ORDER DURING THE PERIOD FEB. 1-FEB. 28; A PERSON MAY NOT TAKE A COW ACCOMPANIED BY A CALF]

Dec. 1-Dec. 10
[(TO BE ANNOUNCED)]
(Subsistence hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit; up to 80 permits may be issued in combination with Unit 24, that portion within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area;

Sept. 5-Sept. 25

Remainder of Unit 21(D)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose per regulatory year; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from Sept. 21- Sept. 25 [AND DURING A FIVE-DAY SEASON DURING THE PERIOD FEB. 1-FEB. 28 TO BE ANNOUNCED BY EMERGENCY ORDER]; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; **or**

Sept. 5-Sept. 25
[(TO BE ANNOUNCED)]

1 bull

Dec. 1-Dec.10

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 5-Sept. 25

...

(22)

Unit 24, that portion within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:

1 moose by registration permit only; or

Aug. 27-Aug. 31
(Subsistence hunt only)

1 bull by registration permit only; or

Sept. 1-Sept. 20
(Subsistence hunt only)

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 320 permits may be issued in combination with Unit 21(D), that portion within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area; or

Sept. 5-Sept. 25
(General hunt only)

1 **bull** [MOOSE]

Dec. 1-Dec. 10
[MAR. 1-MAR. 10]
(Subsistence hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit; up to 80 permits may be issued in combination with Unit 21(D), that portion within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area

Sept. 5-Sept. 25

Unit 24, that portion of the John and Alatna River drainages within the Gates of the Arctic National Park

Aug. 1-Dec. 31

No open season.

1 moose; **however, antlerless**

**moose may be taken only from
Sept. 21-Sept. 25**

Unit 24, that portion of the North Fork of the Koyukuk River drainage within the Gates of the Arctic National Park

**1 moose per regulatory
year, only as follows:**

1 moose; **however, antlerless moose may be taken only from Sept. 21-Sept. 25; or**

Sept. 1–Sept. 25
[MAR. 1-MAR.10]

No open season.

1 bull

Dec. 1-Dec 10

No open season.

Unit 24, all drainages to the north of the Koyukuk River upstream from the Henshaw Creek drainage, to and including the North Fork of the Koyukuk River, except that portion of the John River and North Fork of the Koyukuk River drainages within Gates of the Arctic National Park

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from

Sept. 1-Sept. 25

Sept. 21-Sept. 25

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 5-Sept. 25

Unit 24, all drainages to the north of the Koyukuk River between and including the Alatna River and Henshaw Creek drainages, except that portion of the Alatna River drainage within

Gates of the Arctic National Park

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:

1 moose; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from Sept. 21-Sept. 25; **or** [AND MAR. 1-MAR. 10]

Sept. 1-Sept. 25
[MAR. 1-MAR. 10]

1 bull

Dec. 1-Dec.10

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 5-Sept. 25

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose harvest in Units 21D and 24 can be supported by present moose populations on a limited basis only. Fall 2001 trend count surveys suggest static or declining numbers in Three Day Slough, Kaiyuh Slough, Pilot Mountain Slough, and Squirrel Creek trend count areas. Population estimation surveys in northern Unit 24 in 1999 and southern Unit 24 in 2001 also suggest a decline has occurred in the population. Calf:cow and yearling:cow ratios indicate recruitment rates are declining and more conservative harvest on the reproductive portion of the population is needed throughout the area. Surveys conducted in March of 1999 and 2000 indicated an increasing wolf population that could influence recruitment of moose in the unit. Conservative management strategies have been implemented in a step-wise progression outlined by the Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan developed in 2001. Emergency Order closure of the fall antlerless moose season was implemented in 2003 for the third year, but with poor recruitment and continuing declines in the population, additional measures to conserve cow moose must be taken. Harvest of cows during the winter seasons averages approximately 120 and 70 for Units 21D and 24, respectively. As moose populations decline and local hunter success declines during the fall hunt, more local hunters will hunt during the winter season and a larger portion of the winter harvest will include cows. Regulatory changes in this proposal should reduce the harvest of cows and help conserve the productive component of the moose population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If nothing is done, the cow moose segment of the population will continue to decline and calf production will be low and continue to decline. With continued declines in the moose population, allowable harvest will be reduced and demand for moose will have to be regulated more intensively.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Fewer cows will be harvested from the population. The number of calves born will increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who depend on moose for food will benefit. Hunters who do not want to see a decline in hunting opportunity due to the continued decline of the moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who want to hunt in February and March will suffer, but that loss will be mitigated by the opportunity to hunt in December.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Other solutions considered included: (1) No change; implement a bulls only season in February; (2) implement a 50" or less regulation along with the proposed change; (3) have the proposed December season be announced by Emergency Order; and (4) have the December season be a five day season; eliminate all the winter seasons.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-105)

PROPOSAL 202 - 5 AAC 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures. Prohibit use of proxies in the permit moose hunts in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area in Units 21 and 24 as follows:

Hunters hunting by proxy will be required to hunt under the current subsistence registration hunt. This hunt was set up for hunters that are taking moose "primarily for food."

ISSUE: The use of proxies to obtain trophy permits in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area (KCUA). Currently, some hunters are using proxies to double and even triple their chances of drawing a trophy permit. AS 16.05.405(a) states that "a resident may take fish or game harvested primarily for food on behalf of another person". This statute does not mention the use of proxies for trophy purposes.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters using proxies are using limited drawing permits that allow keeping the antlers intact for trophy value. When hunters solicit proxies, it gives them an unfair advantage over hunters that have only one chance to draw a trophy permit. Proxy hunting should take place in the registration hunt that was intended for hunters to hunt "primarily for food".

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It makes the odds of getting a trophy permit in the KCUA better for those who are interested in getting a trophy.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who only have one chance at drawing a KCUA trophy.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Proxy hunters who are trying to enhance their chances of drawing a trophy permit.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Destroy the trophy value of antlers taken by proxy hunters holding KCUA trophy permits. This was rejected, as it would be easier to enforce under (5 AAC 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures.) making proxy hunters hunt under the registration hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Reuben Hanke (HQ-04S-G-045)

PROPOSAL 203 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Allow the taking of black bear using snares and traps in Units 21 and 24 as follows:

... not use a trap or a snare to take big game, fur animals, waterfowl, cranes or snipe. However, **you may take black bear in Units 21 and 24 using snares of 3/32 cable or larger or with foot hold snare and traps with a jaw spread of 7 1/2 inches or larger. Trap sites must be clearly marked with a sign indicating the hunters license number.** Also you may take grouse, hare, ptarmigan or unclassified game with a snare (see definitions of fur animals and unclassified game, pages 20 and 21.)

Area	Open Season by trapping	Limit
<u>Unit 21</u>	<u>Mar. 1- June 10</u>	<u>3 bears</u>
Area	Open Season by trapping	Limit
<u>Unit 24</u>	<u>Mar. 1-June 10</u>	<u>3 bears</u>

ISSUE: A decline in the Units 21 and 24 moose population by 20 to 30 percent and the local caribou population by nearly 60 percent in the last five years due to predation by black bears and wolves.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A continued decline in moose and caribou numbers by unregulated black bear populations until even subsistence user needs cannot be met. When it is all but too late, crisis management will kick in, which benefits no one.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. In a three year study conducted by the US Fish and Wildlife Service on the Koyukuk and Nowitna National Wildlife Refuges, and other studies in Alaska, show that 45 percent of moose calves are taken by bears, especially black bears. We appreciate what the state has done in the McGrath area with black bears to help increase the moose herd. However the people in Units 21 and 24 have demonstrated a willingness to be personally involved in predator management as demonstrated in the increase of wolf harvest over the last three years from an average of 50 to 60 wolves annually in Unit 21D to more than 130 wolves each of the last three years. We can reduce the number of black bears without the expenditure of state funds, all we need are the tools with which to do it.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? (1) All hunters who would like to use other methods and means to harvest black bears; (2) the moose resource; and (3) people who depend on moose and caribou for food.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who fear that any liberalization of regulations will cause an overharvest of black bears.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None thought of.

PROPOSED BY: Friends of Moose (HQ-04S-G-042)

PROPOSAL 204 - 5 AAC 92.085(8). Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.
Expand the same day airborne restriction in Units 21 and 24 as follows:

Moose hunters in any camp that has an aircraft connected with it or a camp that is visited by an aircraft in which the pilot or passenger is known to any persons in that camp in Units 21 and 24 cannot hunt the same day that the aircraft has been airborne.

This regulation should be tried with a two-year sunset clause and only in Units 21 and 24. It then should be evaluated by law enforcement for possible continuance.

ISSUE: A loophole that allows a violation of the “same day airborne” regulations. Several guide camps and self guided camps in Units 21 and 24 have aircraft associated with them that take off and land several times a day to “scout” or “run to town for beer” and then circle in the near vicinity of the camp. Shortly after the aircraft lands a boat leaves camp and a large bull moose is “suddenly” found and shot. This was witnessed happening many times during the last few seasons in these units. It is impossible for law enforcement to prove that the pilot or passengers told the hunters where to look.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Game thieves, sometimes wrongly referred to as hunters and guides, will continually overharvest moose by violating the “same day airborne” regulations with impunity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Fewer moose will be harvested. Those harvested will be harvested in fair chase, making for a more enjoyable hunt for the hunter, guided, or unguided, and make for a more quality experience for hunters in camps in the area that are harassed by aircraft taking off and landing several times per day.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters, the moose resource, and the over burdened game wardens.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Game thieves and nonresidents looking for the all too common “two day moose hunt”.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None thought of.

PROPOSED BY: Middle Yukon Advisory Committee

(I-04S-G-068)

PROPOSAL 205 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Allow baiting of brown bears in Unit 21D as follows:

Allow the harvest of brown bears using bait in Unit 21D.

ISSUE: Unit 21D is heavily forested and grizzly bears cannot be harvested efficiently under the current regulations. Interior grizzly bears in Unit 21D are very secretive, avoid human encounters, and are very difficult to hunt. By allowing grizzly bear to be hunted with bait, bears can be selectively hunted and hopefully predation on calves can be reduced. Currently in all of Units 21B, C, and D, less than 20 bears are harvested each year while the sustainable harvest rate will allow for up to 48 bears per year. Bears are being underutilized and they are a significant predator on moose in the area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Grizzly bears will continue to be harvested at very low levels and they will continue to have a negative impact on the moose population.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All bear hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to bear baiting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Increase bag limit to two bears.

PROPOSED BY: Middle Yukon Advisory Committee

(I-04S-G-069)

PROPOSAL 206 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Liberalize methods and season for taking black bear in Unit 21B, 21C, 21D, and 24 as follows:

(a) The department may issue a permit for the taking of black bear with the use of bait, scent lures, traps, snares or aircraft. A permit issued under this section.

(1) is valid only for the time period and geographic area specified in the permit; and

(2) is nontransferable;

(a) Taking of black bears with traps and/or snares is subject to the following restrictions:

(1) by destroying a den;

(2) with a steel trap smaller than 7 1/2" in diameter, or with a snare smaller than 3/32 inch diameter

(3) A permittee shall surrender a permit to the department upon receipt of notification from the department that the department has determined that the permittee has violated any of the conditions set out in this section.

(b) no person may use an aircraft to land and shoot a black bear without first obtaining a permit from the department. For purposes of this subsection, "land and shoot" means using an aircraft to locate a black bear, landing the aircraft, and immediately shooting or attempting to shoot the black bear from the ground:

(1) except the Koyukuk Controlled use area and Kanuti Controlled use Area from August 20 through September 30.

5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. The following methods of taking game are prohibited:

...

(5) except as otherwise specified, with the use of an aircraft, snowmachine, motor-driven boat, or other motorized vehicle to harass game or the purpose of driving, herding or molesting game, **an aircraft may be used in Units 21 B, C, D and 24 to take black bear under conditions of a permit as defined in 5 AAC 92.069**

....

(7) with the aid of a pit, fire, artificial light, laser light, electronically enhanced night vision scope, radio communication, cellular or satellite telephones, artificial salt lick, explosive, expanding gas arrow, bomb, smoke, chemical (excluding scent lures), or a conventional steel trap with an inside jaw spread over nine inches; however, the "conibear" style trap with a jaw spread of less than 11 inches and rangefinders and artificial light for the purpose of taking furbearers under a trapping license Nov. 1 – Mar. 31 in Units 7 and 9-26 may be used, **a conventional steel trap with an inside jaw spread 7 ½" inches or larger may be used to take a black bear under conditions of a permit as defined in 5 AAC 92.069 and smoke and artificial light may be used at a den site under conditions of a permit as defined in 5 AAC 92.069;**

(8) with a snare, except for taking an unclassified game animal, a furbearer, grouse, hare, or ptarmigan, **or a black bear under conditions of a permit as defined in 5 AAC 92.069;**

...

5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. The following methods and means of taking big game are prohibited in addition to the prohibitions in 5 AAC 92.080.

...

(4) with the use of bait for ungulates and with the use of bait or scent lures for any bear; except that black bears may be taken with the use of bait or scent lures **under conditions of a permit as defined in 5 AAC 92.069**

...

(6) with the use of a trap or snare; **except black bear under conditions of a permit as defined in 5 AAC 92.069;**

...

(8) a person who has been airborne may not take or assist in taking a big game animal until after 3:00 a.m. following the day in which the flying occurred; however, this paragraph does not apply to

...

(F) a black bear in Units 21 B, C, D and 24 under conditions of a permit as defined in 5 AAC 92.069;

5 AAC 92.260. Taking cub bears and female bears with cubs prohibited. No person may take a cub bear or a female bear accompanied by a cub bear, **except a black bear in Units 21B, C, D and 24 under conditions of a permit as defined in 5 AAC 92.069.**

...

5 AAC 92.200. Purchase and sale of game. ...

(b)...

(2) any part of a bear, except an article of handicraft made from the fur of a black bear, **except any part of a black bear may be sold in Units 21B, C, D and 24 under conditions of a permit as defined in 5 AAC 92.069....**

...

5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear.

(a)...

...

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(3)		
Units 9, 11-13, 16, 18, 19(A), 19(B), 19(C), 19(D) down-stream from and including the Selatna and Black River drain-Ages, 20, <u>[20-24] 21(A), 21(E), 22, 23, 25(A), 25(B), 25(C), and 26</u>		
3 bears	No closed Season (General hunt only)	No closed Season
<u>Units 21(B), 21(C), 21(D) and 24</u>		
3 bears	<u>No closed season (Permit hunt only)</u>	<u>No closed season (Permit hunt only)</u>

...

ISSUE: Black bears are underutilized in the Galena Management Area, and populations are completely unregulated and occur in the area in high numbers. Adopting regulations that would liberalize methods and means of harvest, will allow for an increase in harvest of black bears and will help to improve the survival of moose calves and caribou calves. Moose populations in the Galena Management Area have declined 20 to 30 percent in the last five years and poor recruitment has been identified as the key reason for the decline. The Galena Mountain Caribou herd in Unit 21D, has declined from more than 350 animals in 1999 to less than 100 in 2003. A study done on the lower Koyukuk and Nowitna River drainages of Units 21B and 21D in 1988-90, showed that black bears were responsible for 40 percent of moose calf mortality. South of the Galena Management Area, in the McGrath experimental management area, more than 80 bears were trapped in an area of about 520 square miles in 2003, which demonstrated that interior populations of black bears occur at much higher densities than previously thought. Unregulated high populations of black bears are probably the number one reason why moose calf survival is so poor in the Galena Management Area. Local residents have increased wolf harvest in the area for the past three years in an attempt to boost moose populations. Without more liberal methods and means to harvest black bears, however benefit incurred from the increased wolf harvest is lost, due to unnecessarily restrictive black bear regulations. Predator management is a viable alternative to improve moose populations as demonstrated by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game's strategy in McGrath, where bear removal is advocated as means to increase that moose population. Liberalized black bear regulations will allow the public to harvest bears and achieve the same objectives being implemented in the McGrath EMMA, without public expense. People in the Galena Management Area have demonstrated the willingness to be personally involved in predator management. This is demonstrated in the increase of wolf harvest over the last three years from an average of 50-60 wolves annually in Unit 21D to more than 130 wolves each of the last three years.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If nothing is done, hunting opportunity will continue to be lost and unregulated black bear populations will condition to depress moose and caribou calf survival.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No improved quality of harvested resources is expected

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who would like to use other methods and means to harvest more bears. People who depend on moose and caribou for food.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People will suffer who fear that any liberalization of regulations will result in over-harvest of black bears.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We would like this proposal to be considered as package proposal because the combination of regulation changes will result in the most opportunity to increase the harvest of black bears. Each regulation will increase the harvest incrementally, and achieving a meaningful harvest rate is important if we are to see a response in

the moose and caribou levels. However, the following is a prioritized list of the regulations changes that we are proposing, the first four being most important to consider for adoption: (1) Trapping and snaring; (2) sale of bear parts; (3) use of smoke in dens; (4) use of artificial light in dens; (5) harvest of sows with cubs; and (6) same day airborne except in Kanuti and Koyukuk Controlled Use Areas in the gall.

PROPOSED BY: Gilbert Huntington (Galena) (I-04S-G-071)

PROPOSAL 207 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, fur, and hides. Repeal meat on bone requirement in Unit 21C as follows:

Get rid of the regulation for leaving the meat on the bone in Unit 21C. This unit is mostly used by outfitters bringing nonresident rafting parties on to the river. Most rafters take very poor care of their meat. There is already a “wanton waste” regulation in effect.

ISSUE: Get rid of the regulation which requires hunters to leave the meat on the bone. There is already a law for “wanton waste”. I hunt for meat and take pride and care of it. Unit 21C is a fly-in unit. It costs a lot of money to fly out bones. There is always a “potential for waste”. If nonresident/resident hunters are not taking care of their meat, Fish and Wildlife Protection needs to be more proactive and check with air taxis and outfitters to ensure the wanton waste regulation is being enforced and not punish the majority of the hunters for the abuse of a few.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Cost of hunting continues to increase so only the wealthy can afford the sport. Fish and Game wants kids to hunt, but the cost of hunting in this area is getting prohibitive.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes – nonresidents are not meat hunters, but are trophy hunters. It will be more cost effective for local and Alaska resident hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local and Alaska resident hunters and kids.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Nonresidents must leave the meat on the bone.

PROPOSED BY: Leslie Olsen (I-04S-G-077)

PROPOSAL 208 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, fur, and hides. Delete meat on the bone requirement in Unit 21C as follows:

Remove the regulation that prevents hunters from removing the meat from the bones in the field. Hunters could document the location of the bones for inspection by law enforcement officers if

necessary. Global Positioning System (GPS) coordinates could easily be provided to enforcement officers. There is already a “wanton waste” regulation in effect and it should be enforced.

ISSUE: The current regulations require moose meat to be left on the bone until it is transported from the field in Unit 21C. Since most of the area (the Melozitna River above the falls) is accessible only by aircraft, the several hundred pounds of additional weight causes an increased flight safety hazard. The weather in the area is unpredictable in September. The necessary flight routes over the Kokrine Hills cause further safety concerns for pilots and their passengers. The extra trips required to remove the extra weight also add greatly to the expense of hunting in the area, making hunting there something only the wealthy can afford. Due to the increased expense, few hunters can afford to bring their children and spouses along on hunts in this area. Handling of large heavy quarters of moose is also difficult and can result in injuries and sprains, especially with older and younger hunters. There is already a law for “wanton waste” and therefore this requirement is not necessary for this area. If nonresident/resident hunters are not taking care of their meat, enforcement officers need to be more proactive and check with air taxis and outfitters to ensure the “wanton waste” regulation is being enforced and not punish the majority of the hunters for the abuse of a few. It is a ridiculous regulation that has very little justification and is therefore unnecessary.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Some pilots and passengers will eventually lose their lives due to the safety hazards of the increased weight they are forced to fly out. The bones add to the landfill use at other locations and provide no benefit to the scavengers in the hunt area. My children, spouse, and I will likely not be able to hunt in this area in the future due to the increased cost. We spent over \$4,000 for three of us to fly in and hunt there (for two weeks) this year and did not even see a bull moose. I hate to think what it would have cost us if we had shot a couple of bulls. Due to the high cost, it was the only hunt we could afford this year.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will improve the quality of the food product. In the past, after the meat cooled, we could bone out the meat and put it into pails for transport to our home. The meat was kept cleaner and was much easier to handle and get in and out of planes and trucks. It was also easier to keep insects and animals, such as camp robbers and other pests, away from the meat. In some cases, boning also allows the meat to be removed from the field quicker, thus the likelihood that a bear or wolf will find the kill site before all of the edible meat is removed is less in some situations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Pilots, and Alaska resident hunters, their spouses and their children.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Nonresidents must leave meat on the bone. Rejected, because I don’t think there is evidence that there is a significant amount of wanton waste in this unit and nonresidents are exposed to the same economic and safety concerns as residents.

PROPOSED BY: Tim Wingerter (I-04S-G-141)

PROPOSAL 209 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, fur, and hides. Delete meat on the bone requirement in Unit 21C as follows:

Re-address this regulation with (the practice of) a little common sense. Education is the key, not another regulation. Inform people of the expectations, talk to outfitters, offer clear instruction to nonresident hunters, increase fines on those that refuse to abide.

ISSUE: The regulation that requires meat to be transported “on the bone” out of this unit is ridiculous. The only way to get where I hunt (Unit 21C) is to fly in, transporting out bones adds to my already expensive hunting trip (not to mention the added weight can be a safety factor). Everybody I hunt with enjoys moose meat and do not approve of those that waste it. If anything, we’ll report anybody that we suspect of wanton waste.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The expense of hunting in areas such as this will continue to rise until men like me can no longer afford it, and subsequently an increase in hunting pressure in areas that are already overhunted.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, I don’t believe that most nonresident hunters know what they are getting into. I’ve seen many examples of this over the years... on one hunting trip alone my party has helped out a few nonresident hunting parties that may have died if it were not for our intervention. I know that if they don’t bother to take care of themselves or their gear, the animals they harvest are also poorly cared for. I am not implying that only the nonresidents are guilty of wanton waste, however I am stating that not one resident hunter I know condones this practice, so from my perspective, one can easily assume that the majority of the people that do it are nonresident hunters. Those little tents are pretty tight quarters with a complete moose and gear.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everybody.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Considered suggesting that all nonresident hunters hunting without the presence of Alaskan kindred be required to have a licensed guide.

PROPOSED BY: Theodore S. Wingerter (I-04S-G-142)

PROPOSAL 210 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Eliminate the prohibition on aircraft access in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area as follows:

Koyukuk Controlled Use Area, eliminate sentence 3:

[THE AREA IS CLOSED TO THE USE OF AIRCRAFT FOR HUNTING MOOSE, INCLUDING THE TRANSPORTATION OF MOOSE HUNTERS, THEIR HUNTING GEAR, AND/OR MOOSE PARTS; HOWEVER THIS DOES NOT APPLY TO THE

TRANSPORTATION OF MOOSE HUNTERS, THEIR HUNTING GEAR, AND/OR PARTS OF MOOSE FROM A PUBLICLY OWNED AIRPORT IN THE CONTROLLED USE AREA.]

ISSUE: Prohibition of aircraft access to the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area (KCUA).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? (1) Nearly three million acres of public lands that are inaccessible by any means other than aircraft will remain essentially closed to hunting without any biological reason. The thin ribbon of water (Koyukuk River) that courses through the nearly four million acre Koyukuk National Wildlife Refuge affords moose hunting only to boat borne hunters and only to an average of less than one mile back from the river. Meanwhile the KCUA covers an area so vast that small ponds and lakes thirty miles back from the river, that are inaccessible except to aircraft, are left unutilized on otherwise huntable public lands; (2) With the ever closing of more federal park lands, native held lands etc., crowding has become and will continue to become a problem. This is an opportunity to easily open more public land and spread out the pressure; (3) The clause of equal access to natural resources for all residents in the Alaska Constitution will continue to be violated. Since the controlled use area is an area of drawing permit and registration permit only a set number of hunters will have access to the area. It should therefore not matter that a hunter transports himself by boat or aircraft; (4) The controlled use area restriction to aircraft was conceived twenty-four years ago to limit the number of hunters in the area. In the intervening years the very fact so many hunters have engulfed the area that a drawing permit system became necessary show what an abject failure the aircraft restriction is. Without allowing some of those permitted hunters to get off of the river and into the back country the problems associated with crowding on the river will continue; and (5) In no aircraft access continues, all hunters will remain bunched together on the river corridor, competition and hostilities between local and non-local users will continue and hunting pressure on the moose herd in a small area will continue rather than be spread out over a larger area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Many of the drawing permit hunters are non-local. Many would prefer to fly into the area well back from the main river thus reducing conflict and crowding with other hunters and also providing a more quality hunting experience. Also, since this is a drawing permit area, only a set number of hunters are allowed in, so the harvest would not increase and it would be spread over a larger area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All people who want to see the hunting pressure and people conflicts reduced on the Koyukuk River, while at the same time providing a more quality outdoor experience. Also benefiting are all the people who would like to see an approximate three million more acres of public land opened to moose hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? (1) All those who believe an Alaska resident who owns an aluminum boat with a 150 horsepower engine and a propeller should have open access to this huge area while an Alaska resident who owns an aluminum airplane with a 150 horsepower engine and propeller should not. We need to get past the idea that an airplane owner is rich and therefore doesn't deserve to hunt this controlled use area. Fly-in hunting and certainly scouting the area from the air is an option that is affordable to anyone, especially those who can afford to hunt via gas guzzling motorboat; and (2) All those who wrongly assume that the inaccessible area acts as a

reserve in which moose are raised to come to the river. Biological studies show that moose grow up and die in a five to seven square mile area. Even if it was true that the area acted as a reserve, shouldn't aircraft owners then also be allowed to land on the river? Why would boat hunters have a "reserve" of three million acres off limits to other Alaskan citizens simply because of their mode of travel?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? (1) Changing the KCUA to a five-mile wide corridor along the Koyukuk River (2 ½ miles either side) that would be inaccessible to aircraft. This solution still violates the equal access clause to the Alaska Constitution; (2) Changing the regulation for the KCUA to allow only the use of aircraft for moose hunting and banning boats for moose hunting completely. This solution also violates the equal access clause of the Alaska Constitution and is as silly as the present ban on aircraft; and (3) Suing the state. This was rejected as I thought that a proposal that corrected a violation to the Alaska Constitution, that was good for the local people, non-local hunters, environmentalist and the moose would be taken as common sense and slide right through the approval process. I am submitting this for the second time, as I feel common sense may be more "common" now than it was two years ago.

PROPOSED BY: Colin B. Brown (HQ-04S-G-043)

PROPOSAL 211 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Repeal Koyukuk and Kanuti controlled use areas as follows:

Unit 24

The biologically unjustified Koyukuk and Kanuti Controlled Use Areas should be sunsetted.

ISSUE: This is classic department people management in areas which have the highest moose density in the state. Require the department to manage game for abundance and not position Alaskans against each other.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? N/A

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? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-04S-G-084)

PROPOSAL 212 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Modify Koyukuk Controlled Use Area by establishing a no aircraft corridor in Units 21D and 24 as follows:

Aircraft cannot be used to hunt moose, including transportation of moose parts, hunters or hunting equipment within two miles of either bank of that portion of the Koyukuk River that lies within the Koyukuk River Management Area (KRMA).

ISSUE: Change the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area (KCUA) to a management area, to allow for the current draw hunts DM828-830. Establish a new controlled use corridor (no aircraft) within two miles of the Koyukuk River.

The KCUA was originally established to limit the number of hunters. Now that the numbers are controlled by a permit drawing, there is no reason to control how hunters access the area. The current KCUA is approximately 3700 square miles. Only a small portion of this area is even accessible by boat, this means that a large portion of the area is essentially not hunted.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? By opening most of the KCUA to aircraft access and creating a no fly corridor along the river you can spread out hunting pressure and reduce pressure along the river where most of subsistence users hunt.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? I believe any time you can spread out hunting pressure and reduce congestion, the quality of the hunt goes up. Secondly I suspect that harvesting the same number of animals over a bigger area is better for the herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone that hunts the KCUA especially subsistence hunters that live in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Riverboat hunters because competition to draw this tag will increase.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Kill more wolves so there are enough moose that we don't have to fight over them.

PROPOSED BY: Stan Parkerson (I-04S-G-132)

MCGRATH AREA

PROPOSAL 213 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Increase brown bear season and bag limit Unit 19 as follows:

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

Unit 19

Brown/Grizzly bear
1 bear every regulatory year

Aug. 1-June 10

Aug. 1-June 10

ISSUE: Super low spring moose calf survival rate in Unit 19. All predators are part of the problem. Need solutions to super high predation on spring calves by bears. Bear populations are at historical highs and increasing. Even if wolf predation is reduced, studies show bears may take over half the spring calves.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose population will not improve, and may decline even further because of almost no recruitment. Bear population may continue to rise even more and have more and more impact on calf mortality. Subsistence hunters will have a hard time providing meat that is needed for families. All hunters will lose opportunity. The department will have less funding.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will improve the quality of moose resource and it won't have a too drastic impact on the bears. It will increase state revenues.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The moose resource and all hunters who hunt them, especially subsistence hunting families. Increased opportunity for bear hunters, bear guides, and increased revenue for the department from nonresident tag sales.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Unconventional methods of controlling bears similar to wolf reduction methods, but many of these are less socially acceptable. Allow brown bear bait stations in Unit 19.

PROPOSED BY: George Siavelis (HQ-04S-G-003)

PROPOSAL 214 - 5AAC 85.025(14). Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Align Mulchatna Caribou Herd bag limits in Units 19A and 19B with current bag limits in Unit 17B as follows:

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

(14)

...

Units 19(A) and 19(B) within
the Nonresident Closed Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

5 caribou; however,
no more than **1 bull** [2 BULLS]
may be taken from **Aug. 1**
[OCT. 1] through Nov. 30

Aug. 1-Apr. 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

Remainder of Units 19(A) and
19(B)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

5 caribou; however,
no more than **1 bull** [2 BULLS]
may be taken from **Aug. 1**
[OCT. 1] through Nov. 30

Aug. 1-Apr. 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1[2] caribou

Aug. 1-Apr. 15

...

ISSUE: The proposed change would align the season and bag limits within the range of the Mulchatna Herd as recommended by the Mulchatna Caribou Herd Management Technical Working Group. The change in Units 19A and 19B will align with previous changes made in Unit 17B and 18 caribou bag limits and seasons. Season and bag limit changes were made by the Board of Game at the March and November 2003 meetings. The changes were originally proposed in response to a declining trend in the proportion of large bulls found during fall composition surveys.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The proportion of large bulls will continue to remain low, if not decline further. Caribou season and bag limit will continue to differ among subunits for the same herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident and nonresident caribou hunters who would like continued opportunity to harvest caribou from the Mulchatna caribou herd in adjacent units with less complex regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Resident hunters who wanted to harvest two bulls prior to November 30 in Units 19A and 19B, and nonresidents who wanted to harvest two caribou.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-093)

PROPOSAL 215 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Change Mulchatna caribou season and bag limit in Units 19A and 19B as follows:

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

Caribou
Remainder of Units 19(A) and (B)

NONRESIDENT HUNERS

1 [2] caribou Aug. 1-Apr. 15

ISSUE: Mulchatna caribou herd’s dropping bull to cow ratios. Availability of quality trophy class bulls. Reduced bag limit last year in bordering Unit 17, sending hunters over to nearby Units 19A and 19B and displacing those Unit 19 users. If Mulchatna caribou herd needs protection in Unit 17 then they need the same measures in Unit 19A and 19B. Align Unit 17 and Unit 19A and 19B bag limit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bull to cow ratios may continue to decline. More and more hunters will be dropped off in Unit 19 instead of 17 upsetting the distribution of hunting pressure and excessively disturbing Unit 19 users and businesses.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will improve the quality of the caribou resource harvested. Bull/cow ratios should increase to a level the department and Unit 19 users would be more comfortable with. Larger trophies should eventually start to be harvested again because of reduced hunting pressure by nonresidents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The caribou resource and all hunters who hunt them, especially subsistence hunting families.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident hunters who want to continue to take two caribou even with dropping resource numbers and ratios.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: George Siavelis (HQ-04S-G-001)

PROPOSAL 216 - 5AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Shorten the season by 10 days and changes the bag limit from one caribou to one bull for the Beaver Mountains caribou herd in Units 19D and 21A as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(14)		
...		
Unit 19(D), except the drainages of the Nixon Fork River		
1 <u>bull</u> [CARIBOU]; or	<u>Aug. 10 - Sept. 20</u> [AUG. 10 - SEPT. 30] [NOV. 1 - JAN. 31]	<u>Aug. 10 - Sept. 20</u> [AUG. 10 - SEPT. 30]
<u>1 caribou; or</u>	<u>Nov. 1 - Jan. 31</u>	
5 caribou may be taken during the winter season to be announced; however, the commissioner may close the season and immediately reopen, by emergency order, a season during which the bag limit is less than 5 caribou	(Season to be announced) (Subsistence hunt only)	No open season.
Remainder of Unit 19(D)	<u>Aug. 10 - Sept. 20</u> [AUG. 10 - SEPT. 30]	<u>Aug. 10 - Sept. 20</u> [AUG. 10 - SEPT. 30]
1 <u>bull</u> [CARIBOU]		
(16)		
Unit 21(A)		
1 <u>bull</u> [CARIBOU]	<u>Aug. 10 - Sept. 20</u> [AUG. 10 - SEPT. 30] [DEC. 10 - DEC. 20]	<u>Aug. 10 - Sept. 20</u> [AUG. 10 - SEPT. 30] [DEC. 10 - DEC. 20]
...		

ISSUE: This proposal would align the season and bag limit of the Beaver Mountains caribou herd with other small, interior Alaska caribou herds. During the early 1980's this herd was estimated at over 3,000 animals. By the late 1980's the herd had dropped to an estimated 1,600 animals and in 1998 the herd was estimated at 200-300 animals. The reasons for the decline are unknown, however predation and the associated lack of recruitment are believed to be primary factors. To conserve the reproductive portion of the herd, the department prefers harvest of bulls rather than cows on smaller Interior herds such as this. Harvest of Beaver Mountains caribou during the fall season has been less than 15 annually since 1999, and no additional loss of hunting opportunity is expected. Harvest during the winter season has not been reported during the last 5 seasons, and this regulation change will not affect the November 1 to January 31 hunt or the "to be announced" season to allow harvest of Mulchatna Caribou if they make winter migrations through the upper Kuskokwim.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Harvest of cows will continue to occur, contributing to the decline of the herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who would like to continue to hunt Beaver Mountains caribou in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-094)

PROPOSAL 217 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou; 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose; and 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Close nonresidents season for sheep, moose, and caribou in Post River drainage of Unit 19C as follows:

The Post River drainage is closed to nonresident hunting of Dall sheep, moose, and caribou.

ISSUE: Dall sheep, moose, and caribou populations have been reduced by 90 percent from historic levels in the Post River drainage, due primarily to no wolf control and nonresident hunters taking the last remaining game.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The game populations will never recover to their historic levels.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? There will be a quicker recovery of game populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone will benefit once game populations recover to sustainable levels.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Anna Jansen

(SC-04S-G-053)

PROPOSAL 218 - 5AAC 85.045(17). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Close the winter moose season in a portion of Unit 19D as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(17)		
...		
Unit19(D), that portion between and including the Cheeneetnuk and Gagaryah River drainages, excluding that portion within 2 miles of the Swift River		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull per regulatory year	Sept. 1 - Sept. 20 [DEC. 1- DEC. 15]	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side		Sept. 1 - Sept. 20
Remainder of Unit 19(D) 1 bull per regulatory <u>year</u>	Sept. 1 - Sept. 20 [DEC. 1 - DEC. 15]	No open season.

ISSUE: The moose population remains at low densities. The moose harvest in the remainder of 19D during the December season has been low, averaging about one moose per year since 1993. Surveys in this area of 19D have not been conducted. However, a low bull:cow ratio (18:100) and mediocre calf:cow ratios (28-34:100) have been observed in adjacent 19D East since 1998. Since 1998, two hunters have report hunting this December season and reported harvest was two moose. Moose surveys in nearby portions of GMU 19D indicate calf survival is poor at

approximately 25 percent resulting in low recruitment. Based on the low survival and recruitment, a closure of the winter season is warranted at this time. This proposal would align seasons in Unit 19D with other areas of 19D and proposed seasons downriver in 19A and B.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will continue to be exposed to unwarranted potential harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who want to see the moose population increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those few individuals who harvest a moose in 19D during the winter season.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-095)

PROPOSAL 219 - 5 AAC 85.045(17). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Adjust season dates and bag limits to reduce harvest while maintaining diverse hunting opportunities in Units 19A and 19B. This proposal would: (1) change the bag limit from two moose to two bulls in the Lime Village Management Area (LVMA); (2) eliminate the resident winter seasons in 19A; (3) require registration permits for nonresidents in 19A (with a maximum harvest quota of 15 bulls); (4) for residents in Units 19A and 19B, require registration permits for any bull or harvest tickets for bulls with spike/fork or 50” or 4 brow tines, and; (5) in Unit 19B, reduce the length of the fall resident season and the nonresident season by five days.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
... (17)		
Unit 19(A), that portion within the Lime Village Management Area	Aug. 10 - Sept. 25 (Subsistence hunt only) Nov. 20 - Mar. 31 (Subsistence hunt only)	No open season.
2 bulls [MOOSE] per regulatory year; up to 28 bulls [MOOSE] may be taken by Tier II subsistence hunting permit only; up to 14 permits may be issued		

Unit 19(A), that portion [OF THE

KUSKOKWIM RIVER UPSTREAM FROM, BUT NOT INCLUDING, THE DRAINAGES OF THE KOLMAKOF RIVER AND THE HOLOKUK RIVER,] within the Nonresident Closed Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull **by registration permit only; or**
1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side [PER REGULATORY YEAR]

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20
[NOV. 20 - NOV. 30
FEB. 1 - FEB. 5]

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

[UNIT 19(A), THAT PORTION OF THE KUSKOKWIM RIVER UPSTREAM FROM, BUT NOT INCLUDING, THE DRAINAGES OF THE KOLMAKOF RIVER AND THE HOLOKUK RIVER, OUTSIDE THE NONRESIDENT CLOSED AREA]

[RESIDENT HUNTERS:]

[1 BULL PER REGULATORY YEAR]

[SEPT. 1 - SEPT. 20]
[NOV. 20 - NOV. 30]
[FEB. 1 - FEB. 5]

[NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:]

[1 BULL WITH 50-INCH ANTLERS OR ANTLERS WITH 4 OR MORE BROW TINES ON ONE SIDE]

[SEPT. 1 - SEPT. 20]

[UNIT 19(A), THAT PORTION OF THE KUSKOKWIM RIVER DOWNSTREAM FROM, AND INCLUDING, THE DRAINAGES OF THE KOLMAKOF RIVER AND THE HOLOKUK RIVER, WITHIN THE NONRESIDENT CLOSED AREA]

[RESIDENT HUNTERS:]

[1 BULL PER REGULATORY YEAR]

[SEPT. 1 - SEPT. 20]
[NOV. 20 - NOV. 30
FEB. 1 - FEB. 10]

[NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:]

[NO OPEN SEASON.]

Remainder of Unit 19(A)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull **by registration permit only; or 1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side** [PER REGULATORY YEAR]

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20
[NOV. 20 - NOV. 30
FEB. 1 - FEB. 5]

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull [PER REGULATORY YEAR,] with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side **by registration permit only**

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

Unit 19(B) within the Nonresident Closed Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull **by registration permit only; or 1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side**

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20
[SEPT. 1 - SEPT. 25]

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

Remainder of Unit 19(B)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull **by registration permit only; or 1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side**

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20
[SEPT. 1 - SEPT. 25]

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20
[SEPT. 1 - SEPT. 25]

tines on one side

...

ISSUE: The Central Kuskokwim Moose Management Planning Committee (CKMC) has carefully evaluated the moose populations and harvest levels in Units 19A and 19B. The CKMC has concluded that reductions in harvest are needed to help the moose population grow. Limiting nonresident hunting in Unit 19A will help maintain resident hunting opportunity. Reducing harvest of cows that can often be taken in the resident winter hunts is necessary to improve productivity of the moose population. Use of registration permits in 19A and 19B is expected to improve harvest report data and ability to control harvest. Registration permits would be made available only in communities with Unit 19A and would not be available after five days prior to the start of the hunting season (August 27).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Cow moose will continue to be harvested in the LVMA and incidentally during the winter bull only seasons in Unit 19A. Higher than desired harvest will occur throughout Units 19A and 19B and harvest data will not be improved by use of registration permits. Nonresident harvest in Unit 19A may increase and exceed 15 bulls. Without reductions in harvest the moose population will have greater difficulty increasing or may decline further. Over time even greater reductions in harvest may be necessary if action is not taken to reduce harvest now.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? There may be better care of moose meat because with greater harvest restrictions it will become a more scarce resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Over time, all hunters will benefit from the effort to increase the moose population in Units 19A and 19B. Nonresident hunters will retain a small opportunity to hunt in Unit 19A under a registration permit system with a harvest quota of 15 bull moose. Resident hunters will benefit through restrictions in the nonresident harvest in 19A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? All hunters will suffer to some degree by reduced opportunity during the effort to rebuild the moose population. The resident and nonresident fall seasons in Unit 19B will be reduced by five days. Loss of the winter seasons will impact resident hunters who do not succeed in taking a bull moose during the fall. Resident hunters who live outside Unit 19A will be inconvenienced by having to obtain a registration permit in a Unit 19A community five days prior to the start of the hunting season or having to hunt under spike fork or 50" or four brow tines antler restrictions. Nonresident harvest will be limited in Unit 19A and there will be a requirement for prompt reporting to implement the harvest quota.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? One option considered by the CKMC was shifting the resident winter season in Unit 19A to December when bulls still have antlers and cow moose take could be more easily minimized. This option was not recommended due to concern about the potential for excessive harvest if this were the only winter season open in the region (The winter season has been closed in Unit 21E and there is a proposal to close all moose hunting seasons in Unit 18). Depending on whether the effort to increase the moose population is

successful, further hunting restrictions according to the state subsistence priority may be necessary in the future.

The CKMC considered a wide range of alternative approaches to reducing harvest to help the moose population grow. The planning committee developed two alternative proposals for moose hunting seasons and bag limits in Units 19A and 19B that are being circulated for public review and comment during fall 2003. The CKMC may recommend modification of this proposal based on further public review and comment and recommendations made by other advisory committees.

PROPOSED BY: The Alaska Department of Fish and Game on behalf of the Central Kuskokwim Moose Management Planning Committee (HQ-04S-G-096)

PROPOSAL 220 - 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting. Add the Stony River from its confluence with the Kuskokwim River to Stink Creek to existing system of nonresident closed areas in Units 19A and B as follows:

5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting.

...

(14) Units 19(A) and 19(B), Nonresident Closed Area: the following areas are closed to the taking of caribou and moose by nonresidents in the portions extending two miles on either side of, and including, the following rivers:

- (A) the Holitna River, from the mouth of the Chukowan River to the Kuskokwim River;
- (B) the Titnuak River, from Fuller Mountain to the Holitna River;
- (C) the Hoholitna River, from Old Woman Rock to the Holitna River;
- (D) the Aniak, Salmon, and Kipchuk Rivers, from the mouth of Bell Creek of the Salmon River to the Kuskokwim River, including the main channel of the Aniak River downstream from Atsaksovlak Creek, and the Kipchuk River from its confluence with the Aniak River to a point 25 river miles upstream;
- (E) the entire length of the Owhat River;
- (F) the Kolmakof River, from its confluence with the Kuskokwim River to a point five river miles upstream;
- (G) the Holokuk River, from its confluence with the Kuskokwim River upstream to its confluence with Chineekluk Creek;
- (H) the entire length of Veahna Creek;
- (I) the Oskawalik River, from its confluence with the Kuskokwim River upstream to a point two miles north of Henderson Mountain;
- (J) Crooked Creek, from its confluence with the Kuskokwim River upstream to Crevice Creek;
- (K) the George River, from its confluence with the Kuskokwim River upstream to the South Fork;
- (L) the Buckstock River, from its confluence with the Aniak River to a point five river miles upstream;

(M) the Doestock River, from its confluence with the Aniak River to a point five river miles upstream;

(N) the entire length of Aniak Slough; and

(O) the Kuskokwim River, from the mouth of the Holitna River downstream to the boundary of GMU 18;

(P) the Stony River, from its confluence with the Kuskokwim River upstream to Stink Creek;

...

ISSUE: The Central Kuskokwim Moose Management Planning Committee (CKMC) has carefully evaluated the moose populations and harvest levels in Units 19A and 19B. The CKMC has concluded that reductions in harvest are needed to help the moose population grow. Limiting nonresident hunting in Unit 19A will help maintain resident hunting opportunity. The Stony River was omitted from the system or river corridors in Units 19A and 19B previously closed to nonresidents because a representative of Stony River was not present at the time.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be hunting by nonresidents on the Stony River at a time when the moose population is low and residents are having a difficult time harvesting moose.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents of Alaska that hunt moose on the Stony River would benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident hunters would lose some opportunity. Resident guides might also be impacted by the nonresident closure.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The CKMC considered a wide range of alternative approaches to reducing harvest to help the moose population grow. The planning committee developed two alternative proposals for moose hunting seasons and bag limits in Units 19A and 19B that are being circulated for public review and comment during the fall of 2003. The CKMC may recommend modification of this proposal based on further public review and comment and recommendations made by other advisory committees this fall.

PROPOSED BY: The Alaska Department of Fish and Game on behalf of the Central Kuskokwim Moose Management Planning Committee (HQ-04S-G-097)

PROPOSAL 221 – 5 AAC 85.045(19). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Close the winter moose season in Unit 21A as follows:

Resident	
Open Season	
(Subsistence and	Nonresident

Units and Bag Limits

General Hunts)

Open Season

(19)

Unit 21(A), that portion within the Nowitna River drainage

RESIDENT HUNTERS:
1 bull per regulatory year

Sept. 5 - Sept. 25
[NOV. 1 - NOV. 30]

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

Sept. 5 - Sept. 20

Remainder of Unit 21(A)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:
1 bull per regulatory year

Sept. 5 - Sept. 25
[NOV. 1 - NOV. 30]

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

Sept. 5 - Sept. 25

...

ISSUE: Harvest ticket reporting indicates that fall moose hunting success in Unit 21A has declined during the last five years from 63 percent in 1997 to 46 percent successful in 2002. From 1993 to 2003, a total of 10 hunters reported harvesting a moose during the November 1-30 season. There are no communities in Unit 21A and the nearby village of Takotna reports hunting in 21A for moose along the Ophir road, but no records show winter harvest since 1998. Travel during this time of year is difficult due to poor ice and snow conditions.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose harvest during November may contribute to declining fall hunting success.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident and nonresident moose hunters participating in the September season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The few individuals who hunt moose in 21A during November 1-30.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-103)

PROPOSAL 222 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunting season in Unit 19A.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(17)		
Unit 19(A), that portion within the Lime Village Management Area	Aug. 10-Sept. 25 (Subsistence hunt only) Nov. 20-Mar. 31 (Subsistence hunt only)	No open season.
2 moose per regulatory year; up to 28 moose may be taken by Tier II subsistence hunting permit only; up to 14 permits may be issued.		
....		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. An estimated average of 15 moose are taken during the winter season within the Lime Village Management Area. This is a Tier II hunt with a fixed number of permits issued, thus controlling the harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be a loss of hunting opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Continuation of the ability to harvest antlerless moose will benefit primarily local Tier II hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one is likely to suffer except, perhaps, people opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-071)

PROPOSAL 223 – 5 AAC 92.015(b). Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize the current exemption of brown bear tag fee in Unit 19D.

...

(b) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear ... in Unit 19(D)...

ISSUE: The brown bear tag and fee requirement for Unit 19D was eliminated by the Board of Game for the 1998-1999 regulatory year. The exemption must be reauthorized annually. This tag fee exemption was designed to increase the harvest of brown bear in Unit 19D to benefit moose calf survival. Calf mortality studies in the unit have indicated brown bears are a significant predator on moose calves. Prior to the tag fee exemption, reported harvests of brown bears averaged two bears per year. Since the exemption was implemented the total reported harvest has been 23 bears, which is 4.6 bears per year. The population estimate of 13 bears per 1000 square miles (165 bears) in Unit 19D is based on the population estimate developed through grizzly bear research conducted by the department and extrapolated to this area. The tag fee exemption has increased the harvest of brown bears, however the harvest is still below levels required to significantly reduce the effect of brown bears on moose calf survival. We recommend continuing with the present regulation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The tag fee would be reinstated for the 2004-2005 regulatory year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local and state resident hunters that wish to harvest bears incidentally without obtaining a \$25 brown bear tag.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who do not feel brown bears should be harvested incidentally and without the prior \$25 tag fee.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-072)

PROPOSAL 224 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify season and bag limit for moose in Units 19C and 19D as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 19C		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 brow tines on at least one side; or	Sept. 10-Sept. 30	
1 bull by registration permit RM 655	Jan. 15-Feb. 15	

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 10-Sept. 30

Unit 19D, that portion including the Kuskokwim River drainage downstream from the Big River drainage and upstream from the Selatna River but excluding the Selatna River and the Black River drainages

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by registration permit RM650

Sept. 1-Sept. 30

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season

Unit 19D, that portion of The Kuskokwim River drainage Upstream from and including the Big River drainage

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by registration permit RM650

Sept. 1-Sept. 30

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS

No open season

Unit 19D, that portion between and Including Cheeneetnuk and Gagaryah River drainages excluding that portion Within 2 miles of the swift:

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on at least one side; or

Sept. 10-Sept. 30

Dec. 1-Dec. 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 10-Sept. 30

Remainder of Unit 19D

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with spike-fork antlers or Sept. 10-Sept. 30
50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or
more brow tines on at least one side; or Dec. 1-Dec. 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: No open season

ISSUE: The declining number of young bulls and the shortened fall moose hunting season for resident and nonresident hunters in game management Units 19C and 19D.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? I work in Unit 19C and the southern area of 19D. Over the last five to six years I have noticed a reduction of moose in these areas. The most affected are young bulls, I'm assuming between the ages of three to seven years old. The problem with this is that the ratio of bulls to cows has become lower than normal. This results in a lower number of inseminated cows during mating season. It also results in the reduction of huntable mature bulls during the hunting season.

The quality of moose hunting for both sport and subsistence purposes will decline. The current open seasons for moose pose no biological, management, or enforcement problems. The quality of moose hunting is compromised due to the following reasons: (1) the ability to keep salvaged meat in the field from spoiling due to long periods of warm temperatures without regular cool periods. Spoilage due to fly infestation is more prevalent this time of year; (2) Acceptable methods of moose hunting is somewhat ineffective because the current season is out of line with the rut timing for moose in this area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal 100 percent addresses the issue of improving the quality moose hunting and the products it produces for both sport and subsistence hunting. Subsistence hunters will benefit with slightly longer seasons in the areas that subsistence hunting is generally done. In areas such as 19C and the southern part of 19D where most hunting is conducted more for sport than subsistence, because of the expensive and difficult nature of accessing this area, should eventually see an increased number of huntable mature bulls. All hunters would benefit with the opportunity to hunt later when taking care of game meat is less difficult. This produces better quality food and less waste due to spoilage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Most people that moose hunt in Unit 19 will benefit by the either slightly extended or the adjusted season by improving hunting opportunities and to be able to better care for the taken game meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The people that are likely to suffer if this solution is adopted will be resident hunters that want to hunt moose early in September in Unit 19C and the southern part of 19D. Hunters that want to be able to take a bull when the opportunity arises, regardless of its age or antler size.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I did not consider any other solutions.

PROPOSED BY: Rob Jones Jr.

(SC-04S-G-031)

PROPOSAL 225 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Create a drawing hunt for nonresident moose hunting in Unit 19C as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 19C		
RESIDENT HUNTERS		
1 bull with 50-inch antlers or bigger by drawing permit	Sept. 21-Oct. 10	

ISSUE: Moose: the larger trophy bulls start moving into the area right when regular season ends.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Less chance of at least a few people harvesting a trophy bull moose.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, more quality opportunity for resident hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Local Fish and Game biologist in McGrath should have most input in the number of permits, but no more than six.

PROPOSED BY: Allen Dubord

(SC-04S-G-038)

PROPOSAL 226 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Add an antler restriction to the moose bag limit in Unit 19C as follows:

One bull with spike fork antler or 50” antler or antlers with four or more brow tines on one side or Jan. 15-Feb. 15 – one bull by registration permit only.

ISSUE: The heavy pressure of hunting of the breeding bull moose of Unit 19. This is the last stronghold of moose populations in upper Unit 19. Large airport enables large aircraft, DC-3, C46, and DC-6 to haul large quantities or 4-wheelers (ATV) into area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If this moose population is not protected from overharvest of mature breeding bulls, the “overflow” of the 19C moose population into 19D area will be non-existent.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? By protecting the mature breeding stock of moose in 19C will help with the depleting moose population in 19D.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters of 19C and 19D.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fly-in hunters from Anchorage and Fairbanks areas.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo.

PROPOSED BY: McGrath Advisory Committee (I-04S-G-078)

PROPOSAL 227 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify winter moose season in Unit 19C as follows:

Unit 19C resident hunters one bull Sept. 1-Sept. 20 or one bull by registration permit only Feb. 15-Mar. 15.

ISSUE: In light of the current restrictions on moose hunting in Unit 19D. Shifting the winter moose season in 19C one month later will provide local hunters with more of an opportunity to harvest a moose. Snow conditions and daylight in March are more conducive for traveling from the local communities to 19C to hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Local hunters will continue to have lessened opportunities to harvest moose in the McGrath area.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters of the 19C and 19D area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo.

PROPOSED BY: McGrath Advisory Committee (I-04S-G-079)

PROPOSAL 228 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Lengthen season for moose in Unit 19D as follows:

Remainder of Unit 19D outside of McGrath EMMA:
1 bull only Sept. 1-Sept. 25.

ISSUE: McGrath registration permit hunt 19D East Emergency Management Area. If predator control is conducted, moose hunting in EMMA will be closed for four years. McGrath hunters will have to travel outside of EMMA to hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Many hunters will not harvest a moose, cost would be greater since hunters will travel farther to hunting area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Will give residents an extra five days of hunting since cost and travel will be greater.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All residents that hunt 19D.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo.

PROPOSED BY: McGrath Advisory Committee (I-04S-G-080)

PROPOSAL 229 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Delete 50-inch antler restriction in Units 21A and 21E as follows:

1 bull with at least 4 brow tines on one side in Units 21A and 21E as a nonresident moose bag limit.

ISSUE: In the area that the nonresident hunters do their quality moose hunting, have a hard time measuring 50" antlers in the field. Although the 4 brow tine requirements for a legal bull are in order, it is also the only measure that the hunters have to reliably decide whether an animal is legal or not.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People in general will continue to guess and end up shooting a smaller 50" bull, thus ruining their hunt. Some hunters will commit these such acts, attempt to hide it and this takes valuable time for the game wardens to investigate.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This solution will assist in reducing the stress of having to guess and make a judgment if a bull is 50" or greater. This will save game wardens valuable time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All nonresident hunters do not wish to make a guessing game of this but to have a quality moose hunt by not taking an illegal bull by size.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The nonresident hunters who think they know how to judge a 50" bull will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Connie Demientieff/AK Pike Safari's and Wilderness Adventures(I-04S-G-125)

PROPOSAL 230 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf. Increase wolf season and bag limit in Unit 19 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Wolves		
Remainder of Unit 19		
10 wolves per day	Aug. 1-May 31	Aug. 1-May 31

ISSUE: Super low moose population and calf recruitment in Unit 19. Need some conventional, socially acceptable solutions to help control wolf numbers long term. There may not always be a possibility of intensive predator management and other options are needed to help reduce the amount of intensive management needed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose population will not improve without always needing aerial hunting. Subsistence hunters will have a hard time providing meat that is needed for families. All hunters will lose opportunity for moose. Many spring bear hunters in May and August, and caribou hunters will have to continue to pass up opportunities to help control wolf problem. Fish and Game will have less funding.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will improve the quality of the moose resource and it won't have a too drastic impact on the wolves. It will increase state revenues because of increased potential moose tags. It will help subsistence needs to be met.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The moose resource and all hunters who hunt them, especially subsistence hunting families. Increased opportunity for bear hunters to also harvest a wolf. Bear and wolf guides and increased revenue for Fish and Game from nonresident tag sales.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Large state funded bounty on wolves. Not as socially acceptable and more costly.

PROPOSED BY: George Siavelis (HQ-04S-G-002)

PROPOSAL 231 - 5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Remove the tag fee requirement for brown bear in Unit 19C as follows:

No resident tag required for brown/grizzly bear hunts.

ISSUE: Brown/grizzly bear populations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There are plenty of bear that are eating moose calves contributing to moose population declines.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, will make it easier for moose hunters to harvest brown/grizzly bears.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All resident hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The department could shoot bears from the air, but this would be a waste of resource and politically incorrect.

PROPOSED BY: Allen Dubord (SC-04S-G-033)

PROPOSAL 232 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Allow brown bear baiting and bait stations in Units 19A and 19B as follows:

Legalize brown/grizzly bear baiting and bait stations in Units 19A and 19B.

ISSUE: Super low spring moose calf survival rate in Unit 19. All predators are part of the problem. Need solutions to super high predation on spring calves by bears. Bear populations at historical highs and increasing. Even if wolf predation is reduced, studies show bears may take over half the spring calves.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose population will not improve, and may decline even further because of almost no recruitment. Bear population may continue to rise even more and have more and more impact on calf mortality. Subsistence hunters will have a hard time providing meat that is needed for families. All hunters will lose opportunity. The department will have less funding.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will improve the quality of the moose resource and it won't have a too drastic impact on the bears. It will increase state revenues.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The moose resource and all hunters who hunt them, especially subsistence hunting families. Increased opportunity for bear hunters, bear guides, and increased revenue for the department from nonresident tag sales.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Unconventional methods of controlling bears similar to wolf reduction methods, but many of these are less socially acceptable. Allow brown bear bait stations in the spring only in Unit 19A and 19B.

PROPOSED BY: George Siavelis (HQ-04S-G-004)

PROPOSAL 233 - 5 AAC 92.125. Wolf predation control implementation plan. Allow land and shoot and aerial shooting of wolves in Unit 19 by permit as follows:

Allow land and shoot and aerial shooting of wolves in Unit 19 by permit issued by department.

ISSUE: Excessively high numbers of wolves in Unit 19.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose and caribou will continue to have very high levels of wolf predation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. If nothing is done there may be no quality moose and caribou resource to harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who want abundant wildlife populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who do not want abundant wildlife populations.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions can viably manage wolf numbers in Unit 19.

PROPOSED BY: David Haeg, Director, Alaska Western Wildlife Alliance (HQ-04S-G-028)

PROPOSAL 234 - 5 AAC 92.125. Wolf predation control implementation plan. Establish a wolf predation control implementation plan for Units 19(A) and 19(B) as follows:

...

(7) a Unit 19(A) and 19(B) wolf predation control area is established and consists of those portions of the Kuskokwim River drainage within Units 19(A) and 19(B) that are drained by the Kuskokwim River upstream from a straight line drawn between Lower Kalskag and Paimuit and downstream from and including the Moose Creek drainage on the north bank and downstream from and including the Stony River drainage; excluding lands administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Park Service. In accordance with 5 AAC 92.110, the commissioner or the commissioner's designee may conduct a wolf population reduction or wolf

population regulation program in the Units 19(A) and 19(B) wolf predation control area consistent with the following control objectives, constraints, and requirements:

(A) the objective of the program is to initiate an increase toward the intensive management moose population objective of 13,500–16,500 moose with a sustainable annual harvest of 750–950 moose; progress towards increasing the moose population and sustainable harvest shall be evaluated every two years or no later than prior to the expiration of this wolf predation control program and a recommendation shall be made to the Board of Game concerning the need for continuation of the program;

(B) when the commissioner or the commissioner's designee conducts a wolf population reduction or wolf population regulation program, the program shall be conducted in the following manner to achieve the objective of (A) of this paragraph:

(i) for up to five years beginning March 15, 2004, the commissioner may reduce the wolf population in Units 19(A) and 19(B); however, the commissioner may not reduce the wolf population within Units 19(A) and 19(B) wolf predation control area to fewer than 50 wolves; and

(ii) the commissioner shall reduce the wolf population in an efficient manner, by any means, but as safely and humanely as practical;

(iii) the commissioner may issue public aerial shooting permits or public land and shoot permits as a method of wolf removal pursuant to AS 16.05.783;

(C) hunting and trapping of wolves by the public in Units 19(A) and 19(B) during the term of the program may occur as provided in the hunting and trapping regulations set out elsewhere in this title, including use of motorized vehicles as provided for in 5 AAC 92.080; however, if the wolf population is reduced to 50 wolves, the commissioner shall stop all taking of wolves until the wolf population increases;

(D) annually, the department shall provide to the Board of Game, at the board's spring board meeting, a report of program activities conducted during the preceding 12 months, including implementation activities, the status of moose, caribou, black bear, brown bear, and wolf populations, and recommendations for changes, if necessary, to achieve the plan's objective;

(E) justification for the program, and wildlife population and human-use information, is as follows:

(i) the Board of Game determined the moose population in Units 19(A) and 19(B) is important for providing high levels of human consumptive use; the board established objectives for population size and annual sustained harvest of moose in Units 19(A) and 19(B) consistent with multiple use and principles of sound conservation and management of habitat and all wildlife species in the area;

(ii) The wolf predation control area is established as part of the overall program to rebuild the moose population in Units 19(A) and 19(B) recommended in the Central Kuskokwim Moose Management Plan (CKMMP); the mission of the CKMMP is to restore and maintain the Central Kuskokwim moose population to ensure reasonable subsistence opportunities, provide for high levels of human consumptive use, provide for a diversity of other uses of the moose resource, manage predators and moose habitat, and maintain the overall health of the ecosystem;

(iii) The Central Kuskokwim Moose Management Planning Committee (CKMC) considered many alternatives to rebuild the moose population in Units 19(A) and (B) including reducing moose harvest, habitat improvement, reducing wolf predation through wolf hunting and trapping seasons and bag limits and reducing black bear and/or grizzly bear predation; the CKMMP includes recommendations involving moose harvest reductions, habitat management, wolf predation control, brown bear and black bear hunting, public education needs and acquisition of additional biological data; the CKMC also considered alternative methods of wolf predation control in addition to issuing permits to the public for aerial shooting or land and shoot wolf removal; ground based trapping is not likely to achieve the desired reduction in wolf numbers due to the remoteness of the region and the limited number of trappers relative to the size of the area;

(iv) the department has conducted two moose density estimates within Units 19(A) and 19(B) since 1998; one estimate was in late March 1998 in Unit 19(A) within a portion of the Holitna Drainage; the estimated density was 1.25 ($\pm 14\%$ @80% CI) moose/square mile; this yielded a population estimate of 2183 ± 314 moose; the second density estimate was completed in March 2001, in the Aniak River drainage in 19(A); the area covered was 1731 square miles and the estimated density was 0.70 ($\pm 17\%$ @80% CI) moose/square mile; the resulting population estimate was 1200 moose ± 204 ; using those two surveys and extrapolating to the rest of the units we currently estimate the entire 19(A) and 19(B) moose population at 6800–11300 moose (0.38–0.63 moose/square mile);

(v) moose hunting seasons and bag limits have been reduced in Units 19(A) and 19(B); the resident and nonresident season in Unit 19B has been reduced by five days; nonresident hunters are restricted from hunting within two miles either side of the Kuskokwim River and its major tributaries and may only take bulls with antlers ≥ 50 " or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; resident winter moose hunting seasons have been eliminated to reduce overall harvest and eliminate incidental cow harvest to improve the reproductive potential of the population; the overall reported number of moose taken in Unit 19(A) has declined by over 60 percent from 168 in 1994–1995 to 67 during 2002–2003; overall reported harvest in Unit 19(B) has decreased from 163 in 1994–1995 to 81 taken in 2002–2003;

(vi) the estimated moose population and harvest levels in Units 19(A) and 19(B), including unreported harvest, are well below the intensive management population and harvest objectives established for the Units;

(vii) habitat quality in Units 19(A) and 19(B) is not currently believed to be a significant factor limiting the moose population; wildfires are common and fire suppression efforts are limited; all indications are that habitat in this area is capable of sustaining the higher densities needed to meet the intensive management objectives; efforts to increase moose populations through habitat manipulation would likely be of little value;

(viii) black and brown bear densities have not been estimated in Units 19(A) or 19(B), but based on observations of local residents and anecdotal information are thought to be moderate to high; research from Unit 19(D) East suggests that black and brown bear predation is likely a factor that contributes to limiting the moose population in Units 19(A) and (B);

(ix) the wolf population in Unit 19(A) and 19(B) was estimated using an extrapolation technique combined with anecdotal observations; the population in the 18,000 square mile entire area is estimated at 340–455 wolves in 45–53 packs; that is approximately 1.9–2.5 wolves per 100 square miles; wolves are believed to be a major limiting factor for moose;

(x) available moose and wolf population estimates suggest the current moose-to-wolf ratio is between 15:1 and 33:1; if the moose population has decreased since the 2001 survey, moose:wolf ratios could be lower; with the influence of the Mulchatna caribou herd and other prey in Units 19(A) and 19(B), wolf predation rates on resident moose are high; moose can be expected to persist at low densities with little expectation of increase unless moose calf and adult survival increase;

(xi) hunting and trapping of wolves in the area have not exceeded sustainable levels; the department can continue trapper education efforts in local villages, but previous trapper education programs in the area had little effect on wolf harvest; a regulation adopted in 2002 to allow wolves to be taken with the use of snowmachines has not had a significant effect on increasing wolf harvest; economic factors are a major obstacle to reducing wolf numbers through hunting and trapping; if the wolf population is to be reduced to achieve prey population objectives, measures beyond normal hunting and trapping will have to be employed;

ISSUE: The Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee (CKAC) has advocated for wolf predation control in Units 19A and 19B for several years based on their concerns about the declining moose population and their belief that numbers of wolves in the area have increased. In March 2002 the Board of Game considered proposals from the CKAC and others to establish a

wolf predation control area in Units 19A and 19B and authorized the taking of wolves by snowmachine. This method has not proven to be effective in reducing wolf numbers enough to increase moose calf and adult survival and promote growth of the moose population. The board has identified moose in Units 19A and 19B as being important for providing high levels of moose for human consumptive purposes. The current moose population and harvest estimates are well below the Intensive Management population and harvest objectives established by the board. Wolf predation control is necessary to help rebuild the moose population in and better provide for human consumptive uses of moose.

The Central Kuskokwim Moose Planning Committee (CKMC) established by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Wildlife Conservation and composed of diverse stakeholders with an interest in Central Kuskokwim moose management has evaluated all available data on moose populations, harvest levels, habitat and predation. The committee has also heard testimony of local residents and other hunters who report a decline in the moose population and an increase in wolf numbers in the area. The majority of the CKMC members endorse recommending wolf predation control for Units 19A and 19B to the Board of Game and seek expedited implementation of the proposal. The concept and differing opinions on implementing wolf predation control was circulated for public review and comment in the July issue of the Central Kuskokwim Moose Planning News. There was strong support for wolf predation control at that time including persons who responded from communities within Unit 19A and Unit 18, McGrath and rail belt communities including Kenai, Soldotna, Anchorage, Palmer and Wasilla. Further public review is planned as part of the planning process.

The draft Central Kuskokwim Moose Management Plan is intended to help rebuild the moose population in Units 19A and 19B and includes recommendations involving moose harvest reductions, habitat management and predation control. This proposal has been written with the presumption that the Board of Game will close the winter moose hunting seasons in Unit 19A and add the Stony River to the system of nonresident closed areas in Units 19A and 19B. As a first priority for wolf predation control the CKMC has recommended focusing on the river corridors in Unit 19(A) that are important for providing moose for subsistence hunters. The committee recommends using techniques that are as efficient and effective as possible.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Regulatory proposals are also being submitted to reduce harvest of moose in Units 19A and 19B; however, harvest reductions alone are not expected to achieve significant increases in the moose population. If the moose population declines further, harvest reductions will be required including the possibility of restricting harvest to subsistence only through Tier II permits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If predation by wolves on moose is reduced in Units 19A and 19B, the moose population may increase, resulting in greater moose harvests in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters will likely benefit from an increase in the moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There was not consensus among all members of the CKMC to recommend a wolf predation control plan. Those who do not feel the current moose population is low enough to justify wolf predation control or who oppose wolf predation control on philosophical grounds will not agree with implementing wolf predation control.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? This proposal is one component of a multifaceted program recommended by the CKMC. The entire program includes reductions in moose harvest, monitoring habitat conditions and promoting a natural fire regime, and increasing harvest of bears. Further public review and comment on this and other proposals stemming from the Central Kuskokwim moose management planning effort will occur during winter 2003-04. This public comment will be made available to the Board of Game for their consideration.

PROPOSED BY: The Alaska Department of Fish and Game on behalf of the Central Kuskokwim Moose Management Planning Committee (HQ-04S-G-092)

PROPOSAL 235 - 5 AAC 92.125. Wolf predation control implementation plan. Establish a wolf control program in Unit 19C as follows:

Create predator management area in Unit 19C. Allow snowmachine use for wolf hunting.

ISSUE: Predation on moose and Dall sheep by wolves is increasing steadily since aircraft use has been stopped.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose and Dall sheep populations will continue to decline and Unit 19C will end up with a serious problem like Unit 19D has.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Save some moose and moose calves.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone, including the wolves that will have more to eat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Animal rights people who worship wolves.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Shoot wolves from air. Unit 19C is not that serious yet, and this is too politically incorrect.

PROPOSED BY: Allen Dubord (SC-04S-G-037)

PROPOSAL 236 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Remove the 40 horsepower boat motor restriction in the Holitna Controlled Use Area in Unit 19 as follows:

Completely remove the 40 horsepower (HP) max limit for boat motors in the Holitna – Hoholitna Controlled Use Area.

ISSUE: Remove the 40 HP boat motor max limit in the Holitna-Hoholitna Controlled Use Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Access discrimination will continue for people who don't live in the immediate area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This is more an allocation than access issue.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People with boats with more than 40 HP.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lenard M. Haire (HQ-04S-G-110)

PROPOSAL 237 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Repeal Koyukuk and Paradise Controlled Use Areas as follows:

Unit 21

Delete any references to the Koyukuk and Paradise Controlled Use Areas.

ISSUE: The continuation of biologically unjustified controlled use areas. In Unit 21 the Koyukuk and Paradise Controlled Use Areas are biologically unjustified and should be deleted. The Board of Game should manage game, not Alaskans.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? N/A

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? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-04S-G-085)

PROPOSAL 238 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Repeal Upper Kuskokwim and Holitna-Hoholitna Controlled Use Areas as follows:

All references to the Upper Kuskokwim Controlled Use Area and the Holitna-Hoholitna Controlled Use Area will be deleted as there is no biological justification for either Controlled Use Areas (CUA).

ISSUE: The proliferation of biologically unjustified controlled use areas. These are nothing more than local resident protection zones which discriminates against all state residents. Without biological justification these CUA's should be deleted.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The entire state will become off limits to non-local hunters.

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? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levengood (I-04S-G-088)

TOK AREA

PROPOSAL 239 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Increase resident and nonresident brown bear bag limit in Unit 20E to three bear per regulatory year as follows:

Increase grizzly bear bag limit. Unit 20E: Residents and nonresidents
Three bears every regulatory year. Sunset clause two years after regulation is in effect.

ISSUE: Overpopulation of grizzly bears in Unit 20E.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Within a few years the 20E moose population will not be large enough for a general hunting season.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? In the short term no, long term yes. Temporary reduction in bear numbers would allow moose to increase so bear numbers can maintain healthy levels.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose calves and, in time, moose harvesters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individual grizzly bears.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? This is a serious and timely problem. No rational solutions are being rejected, only solutions that are not of the boards' scope, such as: drop the guide requirement on grizzlies in Unit 20E.

PROPOSED BY: Frank Entsminger (HQ-04S-G-049)

PROPOSAL 240 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Increase bag limit for brown bear in Unit 20E as follows:

In Unit 20E, the bag limit for grizzly bears will be two per regulatory year, one of which would not count against the yearly bag limit in any other unit.

ISSUE: There are too many grizzly bear in Unit 20E.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be high calf predation on moose and caribou.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It will give hunters that might pass on a shooting a grizzly the opportunity to harvest one while out hunting, knowing that it would not count against the one per year in any other unit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters, moose and caribou (both calves and adults).

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Opening grizzly season year round. Didn't reject, could be an alternative.

PROPOSED BY: Michael Cronk (I-04S-G-034)

PROPOSAL 241 - 5 AAC 85.025(15)(20). Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Simplify Fortymile caribou herd registration permit hunts as follows:

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

(15)

...

Unit 20(B), that portion south and east of the Steese Highway

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 caribou by registration permit only; up to **1,800** [300] caribou may be taken under combined resident and nonresident bag limits in combination with Unit 20(D), that portion north of the south bank of the Tanana River, [AND] Unit 20(E), [THAT PORTION WITHIN THE MIDDLE FORK OF THE FORTYMILE RIVER AND CHARLEY RIVER DRAINAGES] **and the remainder of Unit 25(C)**

Aug.10–Sept. 30
Dec. 1–Feb. 28
(General hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by registration permit only

Aug. 10–Sept. 20

Unit 20(D), that portion north of the south bank of the Tanana River

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 caribou by registration permit only; up to **1,800** [300] caribou may be taken under combined resident and nonresident bag limits in combination with Unit 20(B), that portion south and east of the Steese Highway, [AND] Unit 20(E), [THAT PORTION WITHIN THE MIDDLE FORK OF THE FORTYMILE RIVER AND CHARLEY RIVER DRAINAGES] **and the remainder of 25(C)**

Aug.10–Sept. 30
Dec. 1–Feb. 28

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by registration permit only

Aug. 10–Sept. 20

...

Unit 20(E) [, THAT PORTION WITHIN THE MIDDLE FORK OF THE FORTYMILE RIVER

AND CHARLEY RIVER
DRAINAGES]

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 caribou by registration permit only; up to **1,800** [300] caribou may be taken under combined resident and nonresident bag limits in combination with Unit 20(B), that portion south and east of the Steese Highway, [AND] Unit 20(D), that portion north of the south bank of the Tanana River, **and the remainder of 25(C)**

Aug.10–Sept. 30
Dec. 1–Feb. 28

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by registration permit only

Aug. 10–Sept. 20

[REMAINDER OF UNIT 20(E)]

[RESIDENT HUNTERS:]

[1 CARIBOU BY REGISTRATION PERMIT ONLY; UP TO 900 CARIBOU MAY BE TAKEN UNDER COMBINED RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT BAG LIMITS]

[AUG.10–SEPT. 30]
[DEC. 1–FEB. 28]

[NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:]

[1 BULL BY REGISTRATION PERMIT ONLY]

[AUG. 10–SEPT. 20]

...

(20)

...

Remainder of Unit 25(C)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 caribou by registration permit only; up to **1,800** [600] caribou may be taken under combined resident and nonresident bag limits **in combination with Unit 20(B), that portion south and**

Aug.10–Sept. 30
Dec. 1–Feb. 28

**east of the Steese Highway,
Unit 20(D), that portion north
of the south bank of the Tanana
River, and Unit 20(E)**

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by registration permit only

Aug. 10–Sept. 20

ISSUE: This is a housekeeping proposal that would facilitate combining the three fall registration permit hunts for Fortymile caribou into one hunt to simplify hunter use and department administration of permits. The harvest quota would continue to be distributed between the three geographic areas included in current fall hunts, as described in the 2001-2006 Fortymile Harvest Management Plan.

Under the existing three separate registration permits used for the fall Fortymile caribou hunt, hunters commonly acquire two to three permits so they can hunt in more than one area. Multiple permits are confusing for hunters and an added cost for the department for processing multiple permits, reports, and reminder letters.

The Fortymile caribou hunt was originally partitioned into multiple registration hunts in 1996 because of concerns that the entire quota could be taken in a small portion of the hunt area, leaving hunters in other areas with no opportunity to hunt. This has proven to work well; however, the current fall quota of 640 caribou is much larger than the original quota of 135 bulls only, lessening the need to precisely divide the quota among three hunt areas. Under one registration permit, the department will continue to divide the overall hunt quota by closing portions of the hunt area, which coincide with the three original areas, so that hunters have an opportunity to hunt in their local area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunter confusion and unnecessary administrative costs will continue.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? There will be no change to the resource harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will benefit from the simplified requirements to hunt Fortymile caribou, and department costs will be reduced.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Other solutions considered included drawing permit hunts or hiring additional department staff to administer the registration permit hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-100)

PROPOSAL 242 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Include a portion of the Middle Fork of the Fortymile River drainage into the existing Unit 20E registration permit hunt as follows

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

(18)

...

Unit 20(E), that portion draining into the Middle Fork of the Fortymile River upstream from **and including the Joseph Creek drainage** [THE DRAINAGE OF THE NORTH FORK OF THE FORTY MILE RIVER]

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull

Aug. 24–Aug. 28

Sept. 8–Sept. 17

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 8–Sept. 17

...

ISSUE: Hunters in Unit 20E are currently restricted, under the rules of the RM865 registration hunt, from hunting both moose and caribou at the same time, except in that portion of the unit draining into the Middle Fork of the Fortymile River upstream from the North Fork of the Fortymile River. The intent was to control incidental harvest of moose to prevent over-harvest of this low density moose population by a rapidly increasing number of Fortymile caribou hunters. This portion of the Middle Fork was excluded from that restriction because it experienced minimal hunting pressure and offered a mixed bag opportunity to hunters without threat to the moose population within the Middle Fork. However, over the past three years, increasing numbers of Fortymile caribou hunters have begun to access this portion of the Middle Fork drainage. Because caribou hunters who hunt upstream of the North Fork can currently harvest a moose on a general harvest ticket, incidental to hunting caribou, we have seen an increase in the moose harvest in this area by hunters primarily hunting for caribou.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We anticipate moose harvest in this portion of the Middle Fork will exceed a sustainable level and the moose population will decline.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Quantity and quality of moose available to hunters primarily hunting for moose, in the portion of the Middle Fork drainage upstream of the North Fork, is expected to improve.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters primarily hunting for moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters interested in hunting both moose and caribou on the same hunting trip.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? (1) Including the entire drainage of the Middle Fork of the Fortymile River into RM865; and (2) No change.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-101)

PROPOSAL 243 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Close nonresident moose hunting season in portion of Unit 12 as follows:

In Unit 12, everything north of the Alaska Highway from the Alaska-Yukon border to the junction with the Taylor Highway, then north along the Taylor Highway, including everything on the east side of the Taylor Highway to the junction of the Taylor Highway and the West Fork, then follow the West Fork (southern side) to where it meets the Ladue Controlled Use Area boundary, then following the current northern boundary of the Ladue Controlled Use Area to the (northeast to the Alaska-Yukon border and then south, back down to the Alaska-Yukon border junction with the Alaska Highway, nonresident moose hunters could not in this area. (See Attached Map)

ISSUE: There are a couple of problems. First, there is a very suppressed moose population that is scattered around in the northern part of Unit 12 and the eastern part of Unit 20E. Secondly, there is a problem of wanton waste by nonresident hunters. We have seen “many” moose shot for their horns and at best 100 pounds of meat brought out. Fish and Wildlife Protection is already stretched thin as it is and we believe requiring a nonresident to have a guide to moose hunt should be a requirement, but realize that that is a legislative decision and not a Board of Game decision. There are large parties of nonresidents coming up and hunting moose in areas that are traditionally hunted by locals. This traditional area is located in the northern portion of Unit 12 and the eastern portion of Unit 20E. The moose are being shot before they can travel to areas that we hunt. These moose come down out of the hills, pick up their cows from the flats and then head back into the hills. These moose are being shot before they come down. The traditional “safe” areas for moose have been penetrated more and more every year. There are getting to be fewer safe areas for moose to survive. We are seeing fewer and fewer moose to hunt. Fewer and fewer people are getting the opportunity to secure their meat for the winter.

This area is an area that isn't trapped heavily due to the hardship of accessing it. Wolf and bear numbers are extremely high. Moose calf ratios have been very low for the past two to four years. This year's current calf to cow ratio is 10-12 calves per 100 cows. With an aging bull/cow ratio of 27/100. There is very little recruitment, and anyone can see that this is a disaster waiting to happen. Since the native and before other drastic actions must take place.

Units 12 and 20E have the easiest access to hunting in Alaska via the Alaska and Taylor highways which makes the moose population very susceptible to over-harvest. The areas in the northern part of Unit 12 and the eastern part of Unit 20E is in need of some help and if we would like to see nonresidents eliminated from hunting moose in this area. There are many other units in the state that have much better moose populations that these nonresident hunters can hunt in. Moose populations have been extremely low in these portions of Units 12 and 20E.

Even though there is a nonresident restriction of 50" or 4 brow tines, it is common practice for nonresidents to hunt with residents, allowing for any bull to be shot as long as there is a resident tag available, so we feel the antler and brow tine restrictions that are in place are not doing the job. Moose in Unit 20E are traditionally very important animals to the native and local people of the surrounding areas. Populations are at very low densities and moose meat is dependent on heavily in the villages. Since Units 12 and 20E are designated Intensive Management areas, we believe that eliminating nonresident hunters would be a viable alternative for this part of Units 12 and 20E. Resident hunters depend on moose meat and don't have the luxury of hunting many other species of big game for our meat supply. We are getting larger parties of nonresidents that are shooting moose and leaving the state with minimal cost, but reaping the benefits of being able to hunt Alaska's most hunted big game animal.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be continued wanton waste, over-harvest of moose, and continued nonresident hunters competing for and harvesting game that is traditionally needed by local people.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Absolutely. There will be fewer cases of wanted waste, fewer moose harvested by nonresident hunters, and more moose surviving. There will be more opportunity for resident hunters to secure their meat for the winter. By eliminating nonresident moose hunters in the eastern portion of 20E in the Ladue Controlled Use Area, we will be helping the moose population by lessening the harvest of moose by nonresident hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All resident and local moose hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Non resident hunters that may hunt there.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? (1) To make it a requirement that nonresident hire a guide to hunt moose in Unit 20E. This was rejected because it is a legislative decision and not a board decision; and (2) Totally eliminating nonresident moose hunting by all nonresidents. Unit 13 has already eliminated nonresident hunting for moose there due to low moose population. There are guides that work both units that aren't affecting the local moose populations. We don't feel all of

Units 12 or 20E need to eliminate nonresident hunting, so we wanted to keep it in a smaller area. That is why we specifically asked for the area described above.

PROPOSED BY: Northway Village Council

(I-04S-G-116)

PROPOSAL 244 - 5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Eliminate resident brown bear tag in Units 20E and 25B as follows:

A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in Units 20E and 25B including the portions of Units 20E and 25B within Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve.

ISSUE: The brown bear population in Units 20E and 25B is not likely to undergo a significant reduction in population as a result of eliminating the tag fee for resident hunters. Resident hunters are currently exempt from the brown bear tag fee in that portion of 20E outside of Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Resident hunters will have to purchase a \$25.00 tag to harvest a brown bear in Units 20E and 25B.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters in Units 20E and 25B. If the brown bear population decreased slightly, this could benefit moose populations somewhat in Units 20E and 25B where moose populations have decreased over the past five years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. The brown bear population status should not decrease significantly based on resident hunters. Nonresident hunters will continue to pay the brown bear tag fees as required.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Eagle Advisory Committee

(I-04S-G-027)

PROPOSAL 245 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Prohibit use of electronic calling devices for moose hunting in Units 12 and 20E as follows:

In Units 20E and 12, the use of electronic game callers to call moose will be illegal. Only non-electronic calling methods may be used.

ISSUE: The use of electronic callers for moose. I believe that we already have the advantage over the animal while we are hunting. I feel that hunters should be able to call the moose “naturally” without the aid of an electronic caller and recorded moose sounds. These callers can be heard for miles and give the hunter an unfair advantage. Both Units 20E and 12 are in Intensive Management

areas and by not allowing electronic game callers to attract the already low population of moose, it will hopefully result in more moose being able to live and breed that otherwise might be called in from long distances by the aid of electronic callers, and then shot.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More and more people will use them as the effectiveness of the electronic moose caller is publicized. The resource (moose) will lose.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Absolutely. It will leave more moose in the field that can breed for the future. This will also curtail the continued popularity of the electronic caller for moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both moose and all hunters that don't use electronic callers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who can't call moose naturally and use electronic callers to call moose in from miles away.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Michael Cronk (I-04S-G-036)

PROPOSAL 246 - 5 AAC 92.125. Wolf predation control implementation plans. Authorize a predator control program in Unit 20E as follows:

It would allow same day airborne hunting of grizzly and black bears in Intensive Game Management Unit 20E.

ISSUE: The current lack of predator control in Intensive Management Unit 20E.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A severely depressed moose population that is in dire need of help in curtailing predators.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Unit 20E is in dire need of predator control. This will help get the bear harvest to a level that will help the moose population rebound from low years of calf survival.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters and ungulate populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People against same day airborne hunting and some bears.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None. They've already done wolf sterilization which didn't help. Bears are a major problem and eliminating the bear tag fee hasn't done any good.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/40 Mile Advisory Committee (I-04S-G-030)

PROPOSAL 247 - 5 AAC 92.125. Wolf predation control implementation plans. Authorize a predator control program in Unit 20E as follows:

It would allow same day airborne hunting of wolves in Intensive Management areas of Units 12 and 20E.

ISSUE: The lack of predator control in Intensive Management Units 12 and 20E.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Suppressed moose and caribou population and a severe lack of moose calf survival due to high predation by bears and wolves.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If this is allowed, we can get wolf populations to where their numbers are manageable, which will allow ungulate populations to grow, which in turn will allow there to be more wolves once the ungulate population rebounds.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters and ungulate populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People against same day aerial hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Sterilization was already tried in Unit 20E and it didn't help. There needs to be a combined effort in lowering both wolf and bear populations.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/40 mile Advisory Game Committee (I-04S-G-031)

PROPOSAL 248 - 5 AAC 92.200. Purchase and sale of game. Allow the sale of bear hides in Units 12 and 20E as follows:

Obviously hunters need some kind of incentive to harvest more bears; by legalizing the sale of bear skins in 12 and 20E, which are intensive management units, this should help address the overpopulation problem. If the law is administered correctly, with a sunset clause, only the desired reduction in bear numbers will occur, safeguarding the overall population.

The sunset clause should be for two years after the regulation is in effect to monitor the effects. I believe well regulated, legalized sale of bear hides will not jeopardize this resource as only a moderate market for high quality, well taken care of hides exists.

The new regulation should read something like this:

You cannot sell any part of any bear except an article of handicraft made from the fur of a black bear or the skin of a grizzly and/or black bear from Units 12 or 20E which must be sealed within these units and have a special "for sale" seal attached to the hide along with the normal seal.

ISSUE: Lack of a substantial harvest of our interior bears and the misconception that when wildlife can be sold, that species will automatically be exploited to extinction.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to harvest low numbers of bears in Units 12 and 20E which in turn will decrease the moose population even further. Also help perpetuate this misconception of selling wildlife.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it ultimately does, by balancing the predator-prey ratios.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Most certainly the hunting community, but any person or group who enjoys healthy wildlife populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anyone who advocates using only “fake fur”.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Using grizzly hides from these units as articles in handicraft and relocating bears during calving season, but neither would be as effective as this proposal.

PROPOSED BY: Frank Entsminger (HQ-04S-G-048)

PROPOSAL 249 - 5 AAC 92.200. Purchase and sale of game. Allow the sale of bear hides in Units 12 and 20E as follows:

In Intensive Management areas in Units 12 and 20E, both black and grizzly bear hides will be legal to sell if they are harvested from Intensive Management areas. There would be a two-year sunset clause for the board to see if it is working. Bears that are harvested in Units 12 and 20E have to be sealed in that Unit and the hide must have a special seal that allows it to be sold.

ISSUE: We would like the board to make it legal to sell grizzly and black bear hides that are taken from Intensive Management areas of Units 12 and 20E. These areas need a larger bear harvest and we believe that by making it legal to sell both grizzly and black bear hides, more bears will be harvested. There is only a limited market for these bear hides. They are legal to sell in Canada and the state of Alaska and the Fish and Wildlife Protection are selling them, so why can't a hunter sell their legally taken bear?

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued high predation on moose and caribou calves by black and grizzly bear.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. We are hoping that by being able to sell the hides, more hunters will harvest more grizzly and black bears, thus allowing more moose and caribou calves to survive.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters and ungulates.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A few people who might be lucky enough to see a bear in these areas.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Another solution would be to make it legal to sell handicraft items made from grizzly and black bear hides taken in Intensive Management Units 12 and 20E. This wasn't rejected, but is an alternative solution.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/40 mile Advisory Committee (I-04S-G-028)

REGIONWIDE PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL 250 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Extend wolf trapping season in Units 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B and 26C from August 1 to May 31 as follows:

Extend wolf trapping season in Units 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B and 26C from August 1 to May 31.

ISSUE: Excessively high numbers of wolves in Units 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B and 26C.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose and caribou will continue to have very high levels of wolf predation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. If nothing is done there be no quality moose and caribou resource to harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who want abundant wildlife populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who do not want abundant wildlife populations.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow land and shoot and aerial shooting of wolves. We did not reject this.

PROPOSED BY: David Haeg, Director Alaska Western Wildlife Alliance (HQ-04S-G-029)

PROPOSAL 251 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Modify season dates and bag limit for wolf trapping as follows:

Retain existing limits and standardize closure date statewide to: April 30 in all units that now end on March 31 or later and/or have no limits.

ISSUE: This year several units will see the new elimination of April from the traditional trapping season for wolves. With the increase in wolf predation throughout most of their range, the state cannot afford to lose harvest time at the present rate of loss.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? With the present rate of harvest time lost, increased wolf predation will have a downward effect on many of Alaska's prey species.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Controlled numbers of wolves are healthier numbers of wolves.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Future generations of Alaskans truly dedicated to the health of our wildlife resources.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody I know.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Possible department control measures, but my proposal keeps the financial burden off the state and keeps the public more actively involved.

PROPOSED BY: Robert Jahnke (HQ-04S-G-040)

PROPOSAL 252 – 5 AAC 84.270(3). Fur bearer trapping; and 5AAC 85.060(2). Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals. Open a trapping and hunting season for arctic foxes in Units 24 and 25as follows:

5 AAC 84.270(3). Fur bearer trapping.

Unit	Open Season	Bag Limit
...		
(3) Fox, arctic, white, or blue		
...		
Units 22- 26 [, 23, AND 26]	Nov. 1 - Apr. 15	No limit.
...		

5 AAC 85.060(2). Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(2) Arctic fox (including white and blue phases)		

...

Units 9, 17, 18, 22-~~26~~ [23, AND 26]

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

Sept. 1 - Apr. 30

2 foxes

ISSUE: Small numbers of arctic foxes periodically disperse south of the Brooks Range and are sometimes encountered by hunters or are caught in traps set for other species. However, there is currently no open season for them in Units 24 and 25. The proposed regulation would allow hunters and trappers to legally take arctic foxes in these areas. Arctic foxes are not likely to establish viable populations south of the Brooks Range, even in the absence of hunting and trapping. Allowing hunters and trappers to harvest dispersing foxes will not harm established populations and will enable trappers to keep furs of arctic foxes that are caught south of the Brooks Range.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The harvest of arctic foxes will be unnecessarily restricted in these areas. Trappers south of the Brooks Range will continue to be required to turn over any arctic foxes they catch to the State.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and those interested in efficient use of furbearer resources.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-106)

PROPOSAL 253 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear.
Standardize black bear seasons and bag limits as follows:

- Bear; black
- All Interior region units
- Residents and nonresidents: three bears... no closed season
- Residents must report harvest within 30 days.
- Nonresidents must have hide and skull sealed within 30 days.

ISSUE: Black bear season. Excessive predation by bears and non-uniform seasons in Interior region units make the season and all conditions the same in all Interior units.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? N/A

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? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levengood (I-04S-G-092)

PROPOSAL 254 - 5 AAC 85.020(11, 17–19, 22–24). Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear; 5AAC 92.132. Bag limit for brown bears; 5AAC 92.165(a)(3)(5). Sealing of bear skins and skulls. Simplify and liberalize seasons and bag limits for brown bear in Units 12, 19–21, 24, 25, 26B, and 26C; exclude brown bears taken in Units 12, 19–21, 24–26 from counting against the one bear every 4 regulatory years bag limit established for brown bears in other units; and delete the requirement for in-unit sealing of brown bears in Units 19D, 25D, 20D, and 20(E) as follows:

5 AAC 85.020(11, 17–19, 22–24) Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
(11)		
Unit 12	<u>Aug. 10–June 30</u> [SEPT. 1-JUNE 30] (General hunt only)	<u>Aug. 10–June 30</u> [SEPT. 1-JUNE 30]

1 bear every regulatory year

...

(17)

That portion of Unit 19(A)
downstream of and including
the Aniak River drainage
[WITHIN THE WESTERN
ALASKA BROWN BEAR

MANAGEMENT AREA]

1 bear every regulatory year by registration permit

Aug. 10–June 30
[SEPT. 1–MAY 31]
(Subsistence hunt only)

No open season.

1 bear every **regulatory year**
[4 REGULATORY YEARS]

Aug. 10–June 30
[SEPT. 1–MAY 31]

Aug. 10–June 30
[SEPT. 1–MAY 31]

Remainder of Unit 19(A),
[OUTSIDE THE WESTERN
ALASKA BROWN BEAR
MANAGEMENT AREA]

Aug. 10–June 30
[SEPT. 1–MAY 31]

Aug. 10–June 30
[SEPT. 1–MAY 31]

1 bear every **regulatory year**
[4 REGULATORY YEARS]

That portion of Unit 19(B)
downstream of and including
the Aniak River drainage
[WITHIN THE WESTERN
ALASKA BROWN BEAR
MANAGEMENT AREA]

1 bear every regulatory year by registration permit

Aug. 10–June 30
[SEPT. 1–MAY 31]
(Subsistence hunt only)

No open season

1 bear every **regulatory year**
[4 REGULATORY YEARS]

Sept. 1–May 31

Sept. 1–May 31

Remainder of Unit 19(B)
[, OUTSIDE THE WESTERN
ALASKA BROWN BEAR
MANAGEMENT AREA]

Sept. 1–May 31

Sept. 1–May 31

1 bear every **regulatory year**
[4 REGULATORY YEARS]

Unit 19(C)

Sept. 1–May 31
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1–May 31

1 bear every regulatory year

Unit 19(D)

Aug. 10–June 30
[SEPT. 1–MAY 31]

Aug. 10–June 30
[SEPT. 1–MAY 31]

1 bear every regulatory year

(18)

Unit 20(A)

Sept. 5–May 31
(General hunt only)

Sept 5–May 31

1 bear every **regulatory year**
[4 REGULATORY YEARS]

Unit 20(D)[, THAT PORTION
EAST OF THE EAST BANK
O F THE GERSTLE RIVER OR
NORTH OF THE TANANA RIVER]

Aug. 10–June 30
(General hunt only)

Aug. 10–June 30

1 bear every regulatory year

Unit 20(E)

Aug. 10–June 30
(General hunt only)

Aug. 10–June 30

1 bear every regulatory year

Remainder of Unit 20

Sept. 1–May 31
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1–May 31

1 bear every **regulatory year**
[4 REGULATORY YEARS]

(19)

Unit 21, except 21(D)

Aug. 10–June 30
[SEPT. 1–MAY 31]

Aug. 10–June 30
[SEPT. 1–MAY 31]

1 bear every **regulatory year**
[4 REGULATORY YEARS]

Unit 21(D)

1 bear every regulatory year
by registration permit

Aug. 10–June 30
[SEPT. 1–JUNE 15]
(Subsistence hunt only)

No open season

1 bear every regulatory year

Aug. 10–June 30
[SEPT. 1–JUNE 15]

Aug. 10–June 30
[SEPT. 1–JUNE 15]

...

(22)

Unit 24

1 bear every regulatory year
by registration permit

Aug. 10-June 30
[SEPT. 1-JUNE 15]
(Subsistence hunt only)

No open season

1 bear every regulatory year

Aug. 10-June 30
[SEPT. 1-JUNE 15]

Aug. 10-June 30
[SEPT. 1-JUNE 15]

(23)

Units 25(A) and 25(B)

Aug. 10-June 30
[SEPT. 1-JUNE 15]

Aug. 10-June 30
[SEPT. 1-JUNE 15]

1 bear every **regulatory year**
[4 REGULATORY YEARS]

Unit 25(C)

Sept. 1-May 31
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1-May 31

1 bear every **regulatory year**
[4 REGULATORY YEARS]

Unit 25(D)

July 1-Nov. 30
Mar. 1-June 30
[MAR. 1-NOV. 30]
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1-Nov. 30
Mar. 1-June 15

1 bear every regulatory year

(24)

...

Unit 26(B) that portion within
the Dalton Highway Corridor
Management Area

1 bear every **regulatory year**
[4 REGULATORY YEARS] by
drawing permit only; up to 10
permits may be issued

Sept. 1-May 31

Sept. 1-May 31

Remainder of Unit 26(B)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bear every **regulatory year**
[4 REGULATORY YEARS]

Sept. 1–May 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bear every **regulatory year**
[4 REGULATORY YEARS] by
drawing permit only; up to 10
permits may be issued

Sept. 1–May 31

Unit 26(C)

Aug. 10–June 30
[AUG. 20–MAY 31]

Aug. 10–June 30
[AUG. 20–MAY 31]

1 bear every **regulatory year**
[4 REGULATORY YEARS]

5AAC 92.132(1). Bag limit for brown bears.

(1) the bag limit for brown bear in Units 6 (except 6(D)), 11, 12, 13 (except in the Denali State Park Management Area), 16(B), 17, 18, **19–21**, [19(C), 19(D), 20(D) EAST OF THE EAST BANK OF THE GERSTLE RIVER OR NORTH OF THE TANANA RIVER, 20(E), 21(D)] 22 (except Unit 22(C)), **23–26** [, 24, 25(D)], is one bear per regulatory year; a bear taken in these units does not count against the one bear every four regulatory years' bag limit established for brown bears in other units;

...

5AAC 92.165(a)(3)(5). Sealing of bear skins and skulls.

...

(3) in Unit[S] 8[, 12, 19(D), AND 25(D)], brown bear taken may not be transported from that unit until sealed;

...

[(5) IN UNIT 20(D) AND 20 (E), BROWN BEAR TAKEN MAY NOT BE TRANSPORTED FROM THAT UNIT, EXCEPT TO TOK, UNTIL SEALED]

ISSUE: Brown bear regulations in much of the Interior and eastern Arctic are more complicated and conservative than necessary for management of populations, resulting in confusion among hunters and lost hunting opportunity. Correcting this situation will result in some additional harvest, but it will likely not cause declines in most bear populations.

Regulations have become complicated primarily because they were sporadically liberalized in attempts to increase harvest in some units where predation by brown bears was perceived as a major limiting factor on growth of some moose and caribou populations. Liberalizations included allowing hunters to take one bear per year, varying whether or not the one bear per year bag limit counted against the bag limit of one bear every four years in other parts of the state, resident tag fee exemptions, and lengthening seasons. Liberalizations also included in-unit sealing requirements in some units to prevent “bootlegging” of harvested bears (taking a bear in one unit, and then reporting that it was taken in another unit with a more liberal season). The one bear per year bag limit was also applied in some areas to increase hunter opportunity where harvest was below sustainable levels. Liberalizations have increased until regulations are now so complex that they are very difficult for department staff to explain and for the public to understand.

Substantial simplification and increased hunter opportunity can be achieved by adopting a one bear per year bag limit in all Interior and eastern Arctic units that does not count against the bag limit of one bear every four years in other parts of the state and by adopting consistent, long seasons in rural areas. In addition, in-unit sealing requirements would no longer be necessary because regulations would be more consistent, reducing the potential for “bootlegging”. The change in bag limit would likely have little or no effect on harvest because few hunters are interested in taking a bear each year. Longer seasons in rural areas are also not expected to significantly affect harvest because of relatively light hunting pressure due to poor access and low resident human populations.

These proposed changes in regulations are not likely to cause declines in most bear populations. Historically, we have estimated that a kill rate of about six percent, composed primarily of males, was sustainable. However, human-caused mortality in most Interior and Eastern Arctic units has been consistently below this level, indicating that increased harvest can be accommodated with little effect on bear populations in these units. In addition, past liberalizations in rural units have resulted in minimal increases in harvest.

A decline in the bear population in southwestern Unit 20D will likely occur if the season is lengthened and the bag limit is changed to one bear per year as proposed for that area. Moose and caribou populations in Unit 20D have been identified as important for providing high levels of harvest for human consumptive use (5AAC 92.108) and a wolf predation control implementation plan has been approved (5AAC 92.125). A reduction in the bear population would be consistent with these earlier Board of Game actions.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If nothing is done, hunting opportunity will continue to be lost and hunters will continue to be confused by unnecessarily complex regulations.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No improved quality of harvested resources is expected.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who would like a longer season, desire to take a bear every year, and want easily understandable regulations will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People will suffer who fear that any liberalization of regulations will result in overharvest.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Other solutions considered included: no change; shorter seasons; and longer seasons.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-107)

PROPOSAL 255 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Standardize brown bear seasons and bag limits as follows:

Bear; brown/grizzly
All Interior units
Residents and Nonresidents
Two Bears per year Aug. 1 -June 30
Resident tag fee not required, harvest must be reported within 30 days.
Nonresidents must seal the hide and skull within 30 days.

ISSUE: Grizzly bear predation and non-uniform seasons. The seasons should be longer and the same in all Interior units.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The excessive predation on newborn moose will continue the predator pit and prevent moose abundance.

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? Those who want the continuation of the slaughter of 70 percent of all newborn moose to remain.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-04S-G-091)

PROPOSAL 256 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Revise Fortymile Caribou Herd Harvest Plan as follows:

Factors to consider: (1) There is a Yukon harvest increment that can affect the total; (2) the present harvest plan is ultra-conservative based on maximizing herd growth; (3) some of the Fortymile

caribou herd goals have been met. The Fairbanks Advisory Committee (FAC) recommends a bag limit of one caribou from 2006-2010.

TA split season Aug. 10-Sept. 20

Dec. 1-Mar. 31

Harvest objective: four percent of the population from the previous years census divided between fall/winter and the subunits similar to the present plan (management should avoid hunting “highway corridor concentrations”).

Fall hunt report with regular harvest ticket (due in by Nov. 1).

Winter hunt by registration.

ISSUE: The current harvest plan strategy for the Fortymile caribou herd will “sunset” between Board of Game meetings (out-of-cycle). This proposal is a placeholder until the five advisory committees can meet and bring a common strategy to the board in February. The goal is to provide a longer term management strategy to transition into when the existing H.P. ends.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Board would have to consider the FCH out-of-cycle. We do not want to “end” one harvest strategy without a new recommendation in place.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Continued herd growth, expansion of occupied range, opportunity for use.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and other wildlife users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Extend “present” management harvest strategy “in-total” – too intensive to manage. Not needed after 2005.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee (I-04S-G-075)

PROPOSAL 257 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Establish drawing permit hunts for caribou in Units 12 and 20 as follows:

Have a drawing permit system to limit harvest. You would not have to shoot the first animal you see, and crowds would not be there.

ISSUE: The caribou seasons based on quotas – harvest limit – everyone rushing to kill a caribou – not a quality hunt and dangerous.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? N/A

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes – more casual approach to harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who wants a quality hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The present system encourages unethical hunting.

PROPOSED BY: Bruce Dove (I-04S-G-129)

PROPOSAL 258 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Standardize sheep seasons in Units 20, 25, 26B, and 26C as follows:

Units 20, 26B, 26C, and 25

Sheep residents and nonresidents Aug. 1-Sept. 15

Keep this same season for all drawing and permit hunts to spread out the hunting pressure.

ISSUE: Early school start, weather/climate shift and concentration of sheep hunting pressure. The bad rain and foggy weather has shifted back to early August. Also hunting pressure could be lessened if the season was begun earlier.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Due to school starting earlier and the weather pattern shift, fewer residents are hunting sheep.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, because hunting can occur under better weather conditions less spoilage will occur due to non-flying conditions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? N/A

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levengood (I-04S-G-089)

PROPOSAL 259 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf. Standardize wolf seasons and bag limits as follows:

Wolf – all Interior region units.

No nonresident tag required.

Hide must be sealed within 30 days.

Residents and nonresidents 10 wolves – no closed season.

ISSUE: Excessive wolf predation and non-uniform seasons. The seasons should be year long with uniformity. There is no biological justification for any restrictions on season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The predator pit situation keeping moose populations depressed will continue.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone (including viewers) who want an abundance of wildlife.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Environmental extremists/pantheists who worship wolves.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-04S-G-090)

PROPOSAL 260 - 5 AAC 85.060. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals. Increase coyote season and bag limits in Units 12 and 20 as follows:

With a rifle the coyote harvest will be up from ten per year to an unlimited number from Sept. 1 to April 31. The current fur harvest regulations will remain the same.

ISSUE: The expansion of coyotes into all game units, which leads to the destruction of wild sheep, small game, and in some cases big game like caribou and moose calves.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sheep numbers will continue to decline as well as other big and small game groups.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, sheep numbers will increase and problems that are becoming apparent in cities and villages throughout the state will decrease.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Outdoor enthusiasts, tourists, hunters, and the general public.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, and all other inclusive organizations.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered trapping coyotes, but most trappers do not take coyotes in large numbers due to the low fur prices.

PROPOSED BY: Roy Chaney (I-04S-G-131)

PROPOSAL 261 - 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Shorten season for ptarmigan in Units 12, 20, and 25C as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season
-----------------------------	---------------------------------

Units 12, 20 and 25C

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

Ptarmigan. 20 per day,
40 in possession

Aug. 10-Mar. 31

ISSUE: Potential hunter impact on already low ptarmigan populations in Unit 13. In 2003 we had an emergency closure in this unit due to hunting pressure. Need to align bird seasons along the interior highway system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Influx of spring ptarmigan hunters into Unit 13 from neighboring units.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? See no adverse affects.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Emergency closure of ptarmigan again in spring 2004 (Unit 13). Change Unit 13 season, but is out of cycle.

PROPOSED BY: Paxson Advisory Committee (SC-04S-G-040)

PROPOSAL 262 - 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Reduce season and bag limit for grouse in Units 12 and 20 as follows:

The preferred solution is a simple reduction in bag limits (limits are cut in half) and a return to pre-2001 season lengths. The seasons and bag limits would read as follows:

Units 12, 20A, 20B, 20C, 20E, and 20F:

Residents and Nonresidents..... 10 per day, 20 in possession... Aug. 10-Mar. 31

Unit 20D:

That portion lying west of the east bank of the Johnson River and south of the north bank of the Tanana River

Residents and Nonresidents.....10 per day, 20 in possession...Aug. 25-Mar. 31*

*provided that not more than 5 per day/10 in possession are sharp-tailed grouse

Remainder

Residents and Nonresidents.....10 per day, 20 in possession...Aug. 10-Mar. 31

ISSUE: In March 2001 the Board of Game adopted grouse regulations that created fluctuating, shortened season lengths. These actions resulted in a decrease in hunting opportunity and an increase in the likelihood of hunters committing game violations due to complex, changing regulations. Decreasing hunting opportunity has negative ramifications. Grouse hunting is often the first type of hunting that new and young hunters are exposed to. Shortening seasons in spring, when access is easiest and weather more accommodating, has a direct negative effect on opportunity. The 2001 changes also increased the complexity of grouse regulations for all hunters. Current season fluctuate yearly and these unpredictable changes increase the difficulty for hunters to understand and track the regulations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If current regulations remain unchanged there is the potential of decreasing the recruitment and training opportunities of new and young hunters. In addition, there is a loss of grouse hunting opportunity to all hunters and an increased risk of game violations due to complex regulations.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The reduction in bag limit addresses concerns of overharvesting in cyclical grouse populations. Overharvesting grouse at low parts of their population cycle was the principle argument used in 2001 to shorten season lengths. Because altering season length reduces opportunity, this proposal suggests that a better solution to address population concerns is to implement reduced bag limits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All grouse hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Consideration was given to proposing fluctuating bag limits to track grouse population highs and lows, just like the current fluctuations in season lengths. This was dismissed (as discussed in #2) due to the complexity of varying regulations annually.

PROPOSED BY: Daniel Rees (I-04S-G-123)

PROPOSAL 263 - 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Reduce season and bag limit for ptarmigan in Units 12 and 20 as follows:

The preferred solution is a simple reduction in bag limits (limits are cut in half) and a return to pre-2001 season lengths. The seasons and bag limits would read as follows:

Units 12 and 20

RESIDENTS AND NONRESIDENTS

10 per day, 20 in possession

Aug. 10-April 30

ISSUE: In March 2001 the Board of Game adopted ptarmigan regulations that created fluctuating, shortened, season lengths. These actions resulted in a decrease in hunting opportunity and an increase in the likelihood of hunters committing game violations due to complex, changing regulations. Decreasing hunting opportunity has negative ramifications. Ptarmigan hunting is often the first type of hunting that new and young hunters are exposed to. Shortening seasons in spring, when access is easiest and weather more accommodating, has a direct negative effect on opportunity. The 2001 changes also increased the complexity of ptarmigan regulations for all hunters. Current seasons fluctuate yearly and these unpredictable changes increase the difficulty for hunters to understand and track the regulations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If current regulations remain unchanged there is the potential of decreasing the recruitment and training opportunities of new and young hunters. In addition, there is a loss of ptarmigan hunting opportunity to all hunters and an increased risk of game violations due to complex regulations.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The reduction in bag limit addresses concerns of over-harvesting in potentially cyclical ptarmigan populations. Over-harvesting ptarmigan at low parts of their population cycle was the principle argument used in 2001 to shorten season lengths. Because altering season length reduces opportunity, this proposal suggests that a better solution to address population concerns is to implement reduced bag limits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All ptarmigan hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Consideration was given to proposing fluctuating bag limits to track ptarmigan population highs and lows, just like the current fluctuations in season lengths. This was dismissed (as discussed in #2) due to the complexity of varying regulations annually.

PROPOSED BY: Daniel Rees (I-04S-G-124)

PROPOSAL 264 - 5 AAC 92.036. Permit for taking a child hunting. Modify and expand the take a child hunting program as follows:

Sunset all current youth requirements

Alaska residents 17 and under are not required to possess a hunting license or any purchased tags (salmon, waterfowl, etc.). Any adult resident may hunt with any child under 17 for any game animal in all units from Aug. 1-Aug. 15. No special permit required. Regular harvest tags to be

used for harvest in limited or special permit areas. The child can hunt Aug. 1-Aug. 15 if he draws the necessary permit.

ISSUE: Inability to teach hunting skills to our children because of school starting in mid-August.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Our children will never learn to properly hunt with adult supervision until they exit the school system.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All youth who wish to learn to hunt and all businesses who sell hunting related goods.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Have all school boards start school September 15.

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levensgood (I-04S-G-098)

PROPOSAL 265 - 5 AAC 92.036. Permit for taking a child hunting. Expand the Take a Child Hunting program to additional units as follows:

The Board of Game should add additional units in Interior Alaska and statewide to the Take a Child Hunting (TACH) program, or in the alternative, discontinue the TACH program in 20B until the department can recommend to the board an equitable method of implementing the law. If such recommendations cannot be developed by the department, the board should ask the legislature to repeal the law.

ISSUE: The inequitable way in which the board in March 2002, implemented AS 16.05.255(i), the "Take a Child Hunting" law.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The board and the department will see a disproportionate and increased pressure on the moose harvest in Unit 20B, in areas such as the Salcha River.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This proposal will eliminate pressure on one area of the resource and stop the waste and spoilage of the harvest due to its early August hunting dates.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaskan hunters, especially those in 20B, and more directly, Salcha River Property Owners Association.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. If the program is discontinued, hunters aged 8-17 can hunt regular seasons like everyone else.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The above solutions are the only solutions we could come up with.

PROPOSED BY: John Giuchici, Pres., Salcha River Property Owners Association (I-04S-G-130)

PROPOSAL 266 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.
Allow use of helicopters in trapping wolves as follows:

Helicopter use by the public for trapping wolves in Units 19 and 20 designated for Intensive Management.

Units 12 and 19.

Helicopters can be used to transport trappers, trappers gear, and furbearers to and from the field during the time period of Nov. 1-Apr. 30.

ISSUE: The trapping public does not have adequate means of access into some of the more remote areas of the Unit targeted for Intensive Management. Safe access is the issue.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The trapping public will not be able to help achieve management objectives. The helicopter will be another tool to use in the overall management strategy.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, increase wolf harvest for fur, allowing ungulates survival to increase, thereby improving viewing, more harvest, limiting the need for antler restrictions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The trapping public interested in harvesting wolves in hard to access areas. People interested in viewing and hunting animals such as moose, caribou, and sheep.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Have tried all forms of access from snowmachines to airplanes. Due to the amount of forest and steep valleys access by these means have proven unsafe and unsatisfactory.

PROPOSED BY: Richard Swisher (I-04S-G-117)

PROPOSAL 267 - 5 AAC 92.108. Identified big game prey populations and objectives. The Board of Game has asked for a review of the following population and harvest objectives in the Interior Region.

For purposes of implementing AS 16.05.255 (e) - (g), the Board of Game has made the following findings on whether the listed big game prey populations, or portions of those populations, are identified as important for providing high levels of harvest for human consumptive use, and has established the following population and harvest objectives:

Population	Finding	Population Objective	Harvest Objective
Caribou Herds			
Beaver Mountain	Negative		
Central Arctic	Positive	18,000 - 20,000	600 - 800
Chisana	Negative		
Delta	Positive	5,000 - 7,000	300 - 700
Denali	Negative		
Farewell/Big River	Negative		
Fortymile	Positive	50,000 - 100,000	1,000 - 15,000
Galena Mountain	Negative		
Macomb	Positive	600 - 800	30 - 50
Porcupine	Positive	100,000 - 150,000	1,500 - 2,000
Rainy Pass	Negative		
Ray Mountain	Negative		
Sunshine Mountain	Negative		
Tonzona	Negative		
White Mountain	Negative		
Wolf Mountain	Negative		
Moose			
GMU 12	Positive	4,000 - 6,000	250 - 450
GMU 19(A) and 19(B)	Positive	13,500 - 16,500	750 - 950
GMU 19(C)	Negative		
GMU 19(D)-East	Positive	at least 3,000 - 3,500	130 - 150
GMU 19(D)-remainder	Positive	4,000 - 6,000	250 - 600
GMU 20(A)	Positive	10,000 - 12,000	500 - 720
GMU 20(B)	Positive	12,000 - 15,000	600 - 1,500
GMU 20(C)-outside Denali	Positive	3,000 - 4,000	150 - 400
GMU 20(D)	Positive	8,000 - 10,000	500 - 700
GMU 20(E)- Fortymile/ Ladue River Drainages	Positive	8,000 - 10,000	500 - 1,000
GMU 20(E)-Yukon River	Negative		
GMU 20(F)	Negative		
GMU 21(A)	Negative		
GMU 21(B)	Negative		
GMU 21(C)	Negative		

GMU 21(D)	Positive	7,000 - 10,000	450 - 1,000
GMU 21(E)	Positive	9,000 - 11,000	550 - 1,100
GMU 24	Positive	8,000 - 12,000	400 - 850
GMU 25(A)	Negative		
GMU 25(B)	Negative		
GMU 25(C)	Negative		
GMU 25(D)	Positive	10,000 - 15,000	600 - 1,500
GMU 26(A)	Negative		
GMU 26(B)	Negative		
GMU 26(C)	Negative		

ISSUE: The board has asked the department to present this regulation for review.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? N/A

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? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04S-G-108)

PROPOSAL 268 - 5 AAC 92.530. Management areas. Allow hunting with crossbows in specific management areas as follows:

Allow the use of crossbows in the Fairbanks Management Area, Creamers Field Refuge, and the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area.

ISSUE: Low harvest in game management areas. Allow hunting by crossbow in Fairbanks Management Area, Creamers Field Refuge, and the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area. Increase hunting opportunity in these areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? These ungulate populations will be killed by highway vehicles unless additional animals can be harvested in these areas.

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? N/A

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow adult cows without offspring to be harvested in these management areas.

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Levengood

(I-04S-G-113)
