

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY
REVIEWER LETTER

August 2004

DEAR REVIEWER:

The Alaska Board of Game will consider the attached book of regulatory proposals at its **Fall 2004** meeting, to be held **November 2 - 5, 2004**, at the Westmark Baranof Hotel in Juneau, Alaska. The proposals generally concern changes to the regulations governing hunting and the use of game in the Southeast Region (Region I). 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, bold 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. 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 by **October 19, 2004** 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 are available 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 Fall 2004 Board of Game meeting is shown on page **x**. A roadmap detailing the tentative order in which proposals will be considered will be available in October 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 October 19, 2004, to ensure that necessary accommodations can be provided.

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
FALL 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 – 70

PROPOSAL TOPICS

Proposal Number

Ketchikan Area	1 – 5
Petersburg Area	6 – 20
Sitka Area	21
Juneau-Douglas Area	22 – 48
Southeast Regionwide	49 – 67
Regions II, III, and V	68 – 69
Statewide	70 – 73

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
TENTATIVE MEETING SCHEDULE
as of April 2004**

	<u>Dates & Location</u>	<u>Topics</u>
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 and Southwest (Region II)
Fall 2005	Date to be announced Location to be announced Proposal Deadline: to be announced Written Comment Deadline: two weeks prior to meeting	Arctic/Western (Region V) and Statewide "A" list
Spring 2006	Date to be announced Location to be announced Proposal Deadline: to be announced Written Comment Deadline: two weeks prior to meeting	Interior (Region III)

For information about the Board of Game, contact:

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

For information on the Board of Game's past, current, and upcoming meetings and actions, including proposal forms, access our website 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 fall 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 2006	Spring 2008	Spring 2010
Game Management Units: 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, 26C All GMUs: Brown Bear Tag Fees Reauthorization of Antlerless Moose Hunts			
STATEWIDE REGULATIONS	Fall 2005	Fall 2007	Fall 2009
Cycle "A" and Cycle "B" addressed in alternating two year periods			

Alaska Board of Game Statewide Regulations Schedule

STATEWIDE REGULATIONS:

CYCLE “A”: Fall 2005, 2009, 2013, 2017, 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:

CYCLE “B”: Fall 2007, 2011, 2015, 2019, 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 May 2004)

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	3/1/2007
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	3/1/2007
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 Fall 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 465-6098

<vacant>, Publication Specialist 465-6097

Lori Van Steenwyk, Administrative Assistant 465-6096

<vacant>, 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>

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 or an organization. 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
Southeast Region
November 2 - 5, 2004
Westmark Baranof Hotel, Juneau, 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.

Tuesday, November 2, 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 6:00 P.M., TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 2
(Public testimony will continue until those who are present at the meeting are heard.)

Wednesday, November 3, 8:30 AM

Continue PUBLIC TESTIMONY

BOARD DELIBERATIONS ON PROPOSALS, at conclusion of public testimony

Thursday, November 4 through Friday, November 5

BOARD DELIBERATIONS ON PROPOSALS

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

ADJOURN

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 October 19, 2004 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 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, and statewide provisions including but not limited to the following.

- A. **TRAPPING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS:** Bag and possession limits and seasons for coyote, fox, lynx, marten, muskrat, otter, and wolf in Units 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.
- B. **HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS:** Bag and possession limits and seasons for black bear, brown bear, deer, elk, goat, moose, wolf, small game and fur animals in Units 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.
- C. **LICENSES, HARVEST TICKETS, HARVEST REPORTS, TAGS, FEES, AND PERMITS:** Take a child hunting permits, harvest tickets for deer, and black bear baiting in Units 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 and Tier II subsistence permits in all units statewide.
- D. **METHODS AND MEANS:** Hunting and trapping methods and means, use of boats, and archery hunting in Units 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, use of snowmachines in Unit 18
- E. **INTENSIVE MANAGEMENT:** Population and harvest objectives in Units 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, predator control in Units 12 and 20E.
- F. **POSSESSION, TRANSPORTATION, USE OF GAME, AND EMERGENCY TAKING:** Sale of bear fur, and wolf sealing requirements in Units 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.
- G. **RESTRICTED AREAS:** Areas closed to hunting, areas closed to trapping, closures in state game refuges, management areas, controlled use areas in Units 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

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, by October 19, 2004 to ensure inclusion in the board workbooks.

TENTATIVE MEETING SCHEDULE
Westmark Baranof Hotel, 127 Franklin Street, Juneau, AK 99801
November 2-5, 2004
Southeast Region Topics

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.

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 Diana Cote at (907) 465-6095 no later than October 19, 2004 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 hearing, the board may adopt these or other provisions dealing with the same subject, without further notice, amend, 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 – AS 16.30

Statutes being implemented, interpreted, or made specific: AS 16.05 – AS 16.30

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

DATE: _____

Jim Marcotte, Executive Director
Alaska Board of Fisheries and Game

KETCHIKAN AREA

PROPOSAL 1 - 5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer. Require a registration permit for deer hunting in Unit 2 as follows:

A registration permit is required for all deer hunting in Unit 2. Under the terms of this registration permit hunters need to report their harvests within 15 days of the close of the hunting season. This new regulation would apply to Unit 2 only.

Should the Board of Game support our proposal for a state registration permit, the federal regional advisory council would encourage state and federal managers to develop a single permit that may be used for hunters hunting under either state or federal regulations. Joint permits have been used for a number of hunts and in many subsistence fisheries throughout the state. The use of a joint permit reduces the regulatory burden on the public and provides better management data.

ISSUE: Under current State of Alaska hunting regulations, deer hunters in Southeast Alaska are required to have harvest tickets, but they are not required to complete harvest reports subsequent to the end of the hunting season. Limited deer harvest information has been available from voluntarily returned post season mail-out surveys.

The council has found that this information is incomplete and often does not have the accuracy needed to support council recommendations on federal subsistence management regulations, particularly for the harvests coming from rural communities. The council and the Federal Subsistence Board would like to be able to use the data that a registration permit hunt will provide in order to fulfill their responsibility to provide for subsistence needs and while limiting the adverse effects of federal subsistence regulations on nonsubsistence hunters.

Over the past nine years, the council and the Federal Subsistence Board have received proposals annually concerning deer management in Southeast Alaska. Proposals concerning Unit 2 have raised difficult management issues. The Southeast Regional Advisory Council makes recommendations to the Federal Subsistence Board for proposals affecting Units 1-5. The council and the board need the greater accuracy and specificity that will be provided by requiring registration permits for all deer hunting taking place under federal subsistence or state hunting regulations in Unit 2.

Federal registration permits with stringent reporting requirements have been required of federally qualified subsistence hunters taking antlerless deer in Unit 2 since 1998. Beginning with the 2003-2004 season, federal permits have also been required for use by all federally qualified subsistence hunters wishing to take deer on federal land in Unit 2 during the July 24-Aug. 31 federal season and during the August 1-21, 2003 and August 1-15, 2004 time period when federal land in Unit 2 has been closed to nonfederally qualified hunters. These federal permits require hunters to report their harvests and hunting activity within 15 days after taking their legal limit or at the end of the hunting season and are the federal equivalent of state registration permits. Hunters who do not turn in federal permits risk prosecution and may not receive federal permits in subsequent seasons.

Returns for these Unit 2 federal-permit deer hunts has been excellent, typically with an above 90 percent rate of return at the end of the season. Similar return rates have taken place for permits issued in the federal designated hunter program for deer and moose throughout the region. These experiences with the federal permits lead us to believe that a mandatory reporting requirement can work well in rural Southeast Alaska.

The Federal Subsistence Board has authorized the council to initiate a planning process to develop approaches for deer management in Unit 2; the first meeting of the council subcommittee working on Unit 2 deer management issues took place in Ketchikan, May 26-28, 2004. As this planning proceeds, better deer harvest amount and location of harvest data will be needed. We need the reporting requirement in place for the coming 2005-2006 season.

No one likes additional regulations or reporting requirements. However, we believe that good management of subsistence by the federal subsistence program requires a more thorough and accurate assessment of deer hunting success than is available without a reporting requirement. Subsistence hunters have shown that they are willing to accept the permit and reporting requirements that are needed to insure conservation of the deer resource and continuation of federal subsistence hunting opportunities. Careful management of subsistence resources is part of the ethic of subsistence. We believe that all ethical hunters will gratefully participate in the mandatory reporting that is needed to conserve and manage the deer herd.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If nothing is done, the state and federal regulations for deer in Unit 2 will be based on inadequate data for harvest numbers and distribution of harvest. This may lead to management decisions that adversely affect both federally qualified subsistence hunters and other hunters. Reliance on poor data may affect conservation of the deer resource. The cooperative deer management planning effort that has been initiated in 2004 will be hampered by inadequate data.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The regulation change would improve management decisions for deer in both the federal and state regulatory systems.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All ethical hunters are likely to benefit from the adoption of this proposal. The council, Federal Subsistence Board, and federal managers will have better information to fulfill legally required federal regulation and management responsibilities. The Department of Fish and Game may also be able to use this information to improve its management of Unit 2 deer.

More accurate harvest information will help insure that federally qualified subsistence hunters' need for deer will be met. Better data may also reduce impacts on nonsubsistence hunters when the federal subsistence priority requires restrictions to be placed on their hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? All hunters will share a minor "burden on the public" of being required under regulation to report.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered requesting the Federal Subsistence Board to require a federal permit for all hunting taking place on federal lands in Unit 2. We rejected this option because it would cause further divergence between federal and state management regimens. Should the Board of Game fail to provide a registration permit hunt, the council may approach the Federal Subsistence Board with this request.

PROPOSED BY: Southeast Alaska Regional Advisory Council (HQ-04F-G-008)

PROPOSAL 2 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Open a drawing permit hunt for goat in Cleveland Peninsula portion of Unit 1A as follows:

Issue a limited number of archery and rifle permits. Season would begin Sept. 15 through Dec. 31 with a bag limit of one goat by drawing permit only. Encourage hunters to take billys through education. Hunters who draw may not apply the following year.

ISSUE: Cleveland Peninsula area of Unit 1A open to mountain goat hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Local hunters lose chance to hunt a very accessible area. Harvestable trophy goats may die naturally rather than being harvested by hunters. This is one of the few areas in Unit 1A that is conducive to archery hunting with vegetation near mountain peaks.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? I believe this option would maintain this isolated population group.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Lucky goat hunters who draw.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those hunters who do not draw but realize they have an equal opportunity.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Open it to everyone but with an emergency closing by ADF&G.

PROPOSED BY: Kurt Kuehl (HQ-04F-G-026)

PROPOSAL 3 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Open a drawing permit hunt for goat in Cleveland Peninsula area as follows:

Open the mountain goat season in Units 1A and 1B, specifically the closed area on the Cleveland Peninsula, south of the divide between Yes Bay and Santa Anna Inlet. Allow hunting by registration permit from Aug. 1 through Dec. 31.

ISSUE: I would like to see the mountain goat season in Units 1A and 1B, specifically the closed area on the Cleveland Peninsula, south of the divide between Yes Bay and Santa Anna Inlet, open to

hunting by registration permit from Aug. 1 through Dec. 31. This area is currently closed to mountain goat hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The area will remain closed to hunting for mountain goat.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this area is somewhat unique in that it provides hunters with a chance at a mixed bag hunt taking mountain goat and deer in the same area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Mountain goat hunters interested in hunting the lower Cleveland Peninsula.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A “billy only” season in this area might result in nannies shot but left in the field to rot.

PROPOSED BY: Ed Toribio (HQ-04F-G-027)

PROPOSAL 4 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Open a drawing goat hunting season for the Mahoney Peak/Deer Mountain area of Revillagigedo Island.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
... (1) ...		
Unit 1A, remainder of Revillagigedo Island	Aug. 1 – Dec. 31	Aug. 1 – Dec. 31
1 goat by drawing permit; up to 25 permits will be issued ...		

ISSUE: This proposal is to establish a drawing hunt for goats that were transplanted to Mahoney Peak and Deer Mountain in 1992. From its introduction this herd has increased in number and current population estimates are 100-120 goats in the area between Mahoney Peak and Deer Mountain. Goat habitat in the area is limited and this small population may be nearing the carrying capacity. The department believes there are enough goats in this area to allow a limited drawing hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Goats in this area will begin to degrade the limited habitat and that could result in a decline in goat numbers and long-term habitat damage.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Goat hunters who desire a chance to participate in an easily-accessed goat herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who desire to keep this goat herd from being hunted.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Continue with closed season.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04F-G-059)

PROPOSAL 5 - 5 AAC 84.270(13). Furbearer trapping. Lengthen wolf trapping season in Unit 1A as follows:

Wolves in Unit 1A, season Nov. 10-Apr. 30, bag limit of “No limit.”

ISSUE: The decision to remove the month of April in Unit 1A to trapping of wolves in the year 2003.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The continued loss of opportunity to harvest a valuable resource.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It does not take away from the quality of the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None. Because Nov. 10-April 30 is the most realistic season the state has had to properly manage the wolf resource for everyone involved.

PROPOSED BY: Robert Jahnke (HQ-04F-G-007)

PETERSBURG AREA

PROPOSAL 6 - 5 AAC 85.035. Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk. Open registration hunt and extend season for elk in Unit 3 as follows:

Unit 3 to be open from Oct. 1 - Oct. 31, by registration permit hunt for bull elk, Etolin and Zarembo Islands would each have a quota of bulls and would be closed if they reach this limit.

ISSUE: We would like the board to open Unit 3 to a registration permit hunt for elk.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Many local people who would like to hunt elk will be denied the opportunity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal addresses more access to the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local hunters who would have more access and opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Elk hunting will be more crowded and the hunting experience may decline.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered increasing the drawing permit numbers but felt it was time to open this hunt to all who want to participate.

PROPOSED BY: Wrangell Advisory Committee (HQ-04F-G-042)

PROPOSAL 7 - 5 AAC 85.035. Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk. Replace drawing permit hunts with registration permit hunts for elk in Unit 3 as follows:

The drawing permit hunts DE318 and DE322 would be eliminated and replaced by registration permit hunts for the same period. A maximum number of bull elk harvest would be established separately for Etolin and Zarembo Islands. The percentage of harvest between the archery season and the general season would remain the same.

ISSUE: Need to increase harvest of Unit 3 elk and slow down the migration to other drainages of introduced elk.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The harvest of bull elk will continue to be less than desired and the herd size will continue to grow at a high rate. This could result in the following: localized degradation of winter range for elk and deer; increase in the average size of wolf packs in order to take elk and the effects on deer of large packs on the winter range; and increased pressure to migrate to other islands and the mainland due to increase population density.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposal has no effect on the quality but it sure affects the quantity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The people most affected are those that want to limit access to the resource and have it remain a trophy hunt. More harvest means that more people will have access to the resource. I would think that with open access, the guides in Southeast Alaska would benefit as more non-locals would want to hunt the herds.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The people who would have drawn permits in the future.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Increase the number of permits - we tried this with limited success and it also has the effect of having a disproportionate harvest shift to Zarembo Island. Increase the length of the season - rejected by the Board of Game during the last cycle.

PROPOSED BY: Bruce H. Eagle (HQ-04F-G-055)

PROPOSAL 8 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish drawing permit hunts for moose in Units 1B and 3 as follows:

Drawing hunts for any antlered moose will be established in small distinct areas where the department believes that excess bulls are present. The number of permits will be set on a yearly basis in order to take into account the yearly fluctuations in moose over winter survival. The pool of applicants will come from the hunters who have turned in harvest reports in a timely manner from the previous year. The drawing permit season will start five days after the regular hunt closes and will end by emergency order.

ISSUE: Harvest of mature bulls that are in excess to numbers needed for maintenance of the proper bull:cow ratio. There is a lack of data on the proper antler configuration for the maintenance of proper sex ratios in the *andersoni* subspecies of moose in this area. This area has been under either state or federal spike-fork/50-inch regulations for years and most people agree that there are more bulls than needed. During the last Board of Game cycle, it was very evident that antler data was not available to support any change in regulations and that under present regulations, it would be impossible to collect the data in the future. This change would at the very least allow the data to start to be gathered and at the same time, allow a limited and controllable harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Units 1B and 3 will continue to have bulls that could be harvested but that are not because the regulations are based on data from research on *Alces alces gigas*.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who choose to participate in the hunt. The people of the state in general as information on antler configuration will start to be gathered on moose in Southeast Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Because of the limited increase in harvest this proposal leads to, the only people who might not like it are those who like the status quo and do not want the hassle of establishing and managing multiple draw hunts.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Change the antler configuration to increase the harvest. This is not possible because of lack of data on age/antler correlation.

PROPOSED BY: Bruce H. Eagle (HQ-04F-G-054)

PROPOSAL 9 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify moose bag limit in Units 1B and 3 to require two or more brow tines on both sides as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? See other proposals.

PROPOSED BY: Wrangell Advisory Committee (HQ-04F-G-043)

PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify brow tine restriction in Units 1B and 3 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 1(B) and 3 1 bull with spike-fork antlers [OR 50-INCH ANTLERS] or antlers with <u>2</u> [3] or more brow tines on one side by [REGISTRATION PERMIT ONLY]	Sept. 15 – Oct. 15 (General hunt only except in Stikine Drainage)	Sept. 15 – Oct. 15

ISSUE: Antler restriction in Units 1B and 3 for moose

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be less cow moose as evident now due to the moose moving out of Stikine Valley and because of the overabundance of bulls.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This would make for fewer bulls thus increasing the number of cows, thus making the herds more healthy.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The rural hunters of this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No known people will be affected in a way that they would suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Have a paddle horn regulation, but this was rejected due to complicated regulations that would be needed for enforcement.

PROPOSED BY: James A. Stough Sr. (HQ-04F-G-050)

Note, Identical proposals were submitted by the individuals listed at the bottom of the proposal. The submissions are reproduced here as one proposal for publishing purposes.

PROPOSAL 11 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify brow tine restriction in Units 1B and 3 as follows:

Resident

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

1 bull with spike-fork antlers
or 36 [50]-inch antlers or antlers
with 2 [3] or more brow
tines on one side by
registration permit only.

ISSUE: Three brow tines, 50-inch antler restriction does not work. Stikine herd has not grown. Very few over 50 inches.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. There are old bulls with two brow tines under 50-inches that we cannot harvest. Very few three brow tine 50-inch bulls.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Chet Powell (HQ-04F-G-024)
Randy Easterly (HQ-04F-G-022)

PROPOSAL 12 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify brow tine restriction in Units 1B and 3 as follows:

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

1 bull with spike-fork antlers
or 50-inch antlers or antlers
with 2 [3] or more brow

tines on one side by registration permit only.

ISSUE: Would like to see regulations changed to two brow tines.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Gerald Davis (HQ-04F-G-021)

PROPOSAL 13 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify brow tine restriction in Units 1B and 3 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 1(B) and 3	Sept. 15 – Oct. 15 (General hunt only except in Stikine Drainage)	Sept. 15 – Oct. 15
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with <u>2</u> [3] or more brow tines on one side by registration permit only.		

ISSUE: Would like to see regulations changed to allow shooting of moose with two brow tines.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? I will shoot anything when the freezer is empty.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Mike Ottensen, Jr. (HQ-04F-G-023)

PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify brow tine restriction in Units 1B and 3 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 1(B) and 3	Sept. 15 – Oct. 15 (General hunt only except in Stikine Drainage)	Sept. 15 – Oct. 15
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with <u>2</u> [3] or more brow tines on one side by registration permit only.		

ISSUE: Three brow tines. Used to get moose every year, now getting moose only one year in ten.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? No hunting opportunity.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Ronald Kagee (HQ-04F-G-028)

PROPOSAL 15 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify brow tine restriction in Units 1B and 3 as follows:

Resident Open Season (Subsistence and	Nonresident
---	-------------

Units and Bag Limits	General Hunts)	Open Season
Unit 1(B) and 3	Sept. 15 – Oct. 15 (General hunt only except in Stikine Drainage)	Sept. 15 – Oct. 15
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with <u>2</u> [3] or more brow tines on one side by registration permit only.		

ISSUE: I would like the board to consider changing to two brow tines.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Look for another change.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Because the 50-inch and three tines does not seem to be working.

PROPOSED BY: Leonard Angerman (HQ-04F-G-029)

PROPOSAL 16 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify brow tine restriction in Units 1B and 3 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 1(B) and 3	Sept. 15 – Oct. 15 (General hunt only except in Stikine Drainage)	Sept. 15 – Oct. 15
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with <u>2</u> [3] or more brow tines on one side by registration permit only.		

ISSUE: Three brow tine 50-inch spread. This rule is wrong and is resulting in less hunters in the hunt and creating an over population of bull moose. The purpose of the hunt is to provide game resources for the people of the area and not intended to provide trophies for trophy hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The game management of these two units will continue to be a failure as it is now and will result in inadequate percent of bulls.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by providing more game for subsistence use.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The people in the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Robert M. Maxand (HQ-04F-G-052)

PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify brow tine restriction in Units 1B and 3 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 1(B) and 3 1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with <u>2</u> [3] or more brow tines on one side by registration permit only.	Sept. 15 – Oct. 15 (General hunt only except in Stikine Drainage)	Sept. 15 – Oct. 15

ISSUE: Three brow tine, 50-inch spread. This rule is too stringent and is resulting in fewer hunters participating in the hunt and an over population of bull moose. The purpose of the hunt is to provide game resources for the citizens of the area and not intended to provide trophies for trophy hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The game management of these two units will continue to be a failure as it is now and will result in inadequate ratios of bulls to cows.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by providing more game for subsistence use.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Richard L. Ballard (HQ-04F-G-053)

PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Establish a registration hunt for brown bear in Unit 3 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 2 [AND 3]	No open season.	
<u>Unit 3</u> <u>1 bear every 4 registration years by registration permit only, hunt will close by Emergency Order when 3 bears are harvested</u>	<u>Mar. 15 – May 31</u> <u>(General hunt only)</u>	<u>No open season</u>

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

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

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

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

PROPOSED BY: Wrangell Advisory Committee (HQ-04F-G-045)

PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf. Extend wolf hunting season in Unit 3 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Units 1 and <u>4-5</u> [3-5] 5 wolves	Sept. 1-Mar. 31 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1-Mar. 31
<u>Unit 3</u> <u>5 wolves</u>	<u>Sept. 1-May 31</u> <u>(General hunt only)</u>	<u>Sept. 1-May 31</u>

ISSUE: Unit 3 wolf. Current March 31 closure allows almost no harvest. Wolf predation on black bear, particularly on Kuiu Island, is significant. Harvest opportunity exists during spring bear season, Wolf population on Kuiu Island is displacing black bear.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued loss of hunting opportunity for wolf. Continued loss of black bear, deer, and moose. Assumed continued increase in wolf population.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Black bear populations, skull size and age are decreasing. Falls seasons are closed if harvest cap is rejected.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wolf, black bear, deer, and moose hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unknown.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Year round wolf season.

PROPOSED BY: Jimmie Rosenbruch (HQ-04F-G-013)

PROPOSAL 20 - 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting; and 5 AAC 92.550. Areas closed to hunting. Prohibit hunting and trapping in City of Kupreanof, Unit 3 as follows:

Prohibit hunting and trapping within the boundaries of the City of Kupreanof, as specified by the following description:

Beginning at the southeast corner of Section 5 surveyed township 59S, R79E, thence to the mid-point of the Wrangell Narrows, thence northerly and easterly following the meander of the mid-point of the Wrangell Narrows, to a point due south of the southernmost tip of Sasby Island, thence northeasterly, and westerly, southwesterly, paralleling Sasby Island at a distance of 300 yards to a point which intersects with the southern boundary line of the northeast ¼ of Section 22, T58S, R79E, thence west to the northwest corner, of the southeast one quarter of Section 21, T58S, R79E, thence south to the SW corner of the SE ¼ of Section 21, T58S, R79E, thence west to the NW corner of Section 29, T58S, R79E,

thence south to the SW corner of the NW ¼ of Section 32, T58S, R79E, thence east to the NW corner of the SE ¼ of Section 32 T58S, R79E, thence south to the SE corner of the SW ¼ of Section 5, T58S, R79E, thence east to the point of the beginning containing 3.2 square miles more or less.

ISSUE: The City of Kupreanof has enacted a city ordinance prohibiting hunting and trapping within the city limits. Because the state regulations do not have a similar closure, state enforcement officers are not able to stop people from hunting in residential areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued problems with hunting activities taking place close to where people live.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Area residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Almost no one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Prohibit hunting and trapping within a quarter mile of cabins or residences.

PROPOSED BY: City of Kupreanof, Emily Merriam, City Clerk (HQ-04F-G-056)

SITKA AREA

PROPOSAL 21 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Open brown bear season in Unit 4 earlier as follows:

Change the Unit 4 fall brown bear season from Sept. 15-Dec. 31 to Sept. 1-Dec. 31.

ISSUE: Currently, the fall brown bear season opens on Sept. 15. Historically, there has been a high percentage of females harvested during this fall season. Contributing factors for this reason are:

- 1) Most salmon runs are finished or at the tail end of the run. Typical bad weather in late September usually finishes off the last remaining fish in the stream.
- 2) Male bears leave the streams sometime in the late summer; the end of August or early September
- 3) The most active bears are the pregnant females that are forced to feed heavy to trigger the delayed implantation process.

Unit 4 brown bear females breed later in life, keep their cubs longer and have more frequency in between litter. A single female might only have as few as three or four cubs in her life make it to adulthood. It is very important that we not be harvesting these bears in the fall. Currently, Unit 4 has a 4 percent guideline harvest level with a 1.5 percent female component within the guideline harvest level. This is the lowest guideline harvest level in Alaska for an area that has the highest densities of brown bear in the world. By changing the fall season to open on September 1, when there are more fish in the streams, the weather is better and there are more large male bears available for harvest, I believe we can protect the pregnant females while at the same time be harvesting trophy quality males.

At this time Unit 4 guides are limited in the number of hunts that they can provide by a Forest Service permitting process. The reason September 15 was implemented in 1979 was to make the harvest more restrictive to prevent an overharvest. The Forest Service permitting process circumvents this necessity. Traditionally, the resident component of harvest has been low and most bears taken by residents has been while in the field for other activities like deer hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A continued high harvest of female bears will occur.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters can take more large male bears and female bears will be able to produce more offspring.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, the resource will be better off for it and the public will have more bear for all purposes.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Scott Newman

(HQ-04F-G-017)

JUNEAU-DOUGLAS AREA

PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer. Establish archery only deer hunt in Unit 1C as follows:

Open deer season in Unit 1C on Douglas, Lincoln, Shelter, and Sullivan Islands from July 15 – July 31 for archery only, IBEP required, with a bag limit of four bucks.

ISSUE: A safe experience for archers to hunt deer in southeast and new bow hunting opportunity.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? While hunting these islands, archers are in direct competition with rifle hunters, which has resulted in some unsafe and dangerous situations. Some archers choose not to hunt these areas in fear of accidentally being shot, while moving through the area in camouflage clothing.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All bow hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer. It takes away from no one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Opening archery only in these areas Aug. 1 – Aug. 31. It would take away from people who would choose to hunt with a firearm in an exciting season.

PROPOSED BY: Mike Collins (HQ-04F-G-069)

PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC 85.040 Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Reduce bag limit to billy only in portion of Unit 1D east of Haines Highway as follows:

In Unit 1D east of the Haines Highway, change the bag limit to billy-only, no nannies or kids.

ISSUE: I would like to see the east side of the Haines Highway a billy-only hunt. It is easy access and too many nannies are killed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The goat herd will diminish to nothing with all the nannies that are taken.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The herd will grow and prosper. There were 4 nannies shot in a 16 group goat herd on Tukgahgo Mountain last year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters with morals and who do not mind being held accountable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Lazy hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Kevin R. Shove (HQ-04F-G-001)

PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC 85.040 Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Limit goat hunting in a portion of Unit 1D to youth hunters only as follows:

For the area east of the Haines Highway, west of the Chilkoot River, and within 10 miles of the City of Haines, provide for a youth hunting opportunity by limiting goat hunting in the area to youth hunting only.

ISSUE: This area is way too easy to access for adult hunters. The trail system is highly developed and the goats are habituated to hikers. I also think this area should have its own quota, independent of the rest of Unit 1D.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Youth hunters and hikers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Lazy adult hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? If ADF&G needs to limit the numbers further, make it a billy-only hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Gordon Whitermore (HQ-04F-G-002)

PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Establish archery only goat hunt in Unit 1C as follows:

Archery only, IEBP required, Unit 1C drainages of the Chilkat Range south of the south bank of the Endicott River. Resident and nonresident, one goat by permit RG015, Aug. – Aug. 31.

ISSUE: Opening archery only goat hunt to the Chilkat Range.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bow hunters will compete in areas with hunters with firearms.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This will give bow hunters another goat hunt opportunity. Bow hunting can sometimes take several extra days to get into an acceptable shooting range and the weather is usually more conducive to a successful bow hunt at that time of year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bow hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Mike Collins

(HQ-04F-G-066)

PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Open archery only goat hunt in Unit 1C earlier as follows:

Open the archery only area Aug. 1, one goat by bow and arrow only, by permit RG014.

ISSUE: Opening the archery only goat area sooner when the weather makes it more accessible.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Limits access due to low clouds at the time of year as it is now.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It would improve the hunt experience, mainly because the weather is more forgiving at that time of the year. More archers will have the opportunity to do a goat hunt with archery equipment. Hunting with a bow may take several extra days of stalking to get within the range it takes to harvest a goat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All bow hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. It is already archery only.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Mike Collins

(HQ-04F-G-070)

PROPOSAL 27 - 5 AAC 85.045(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
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 status-quo proposal is necessary to continue the any-moose hunting season at Nunatak Bench in Unit 5A. The Nunatak Bench hunt area is separated from adjacent moose habitat by fiords and glaciers, likely allowing for little immigration or emigration by moose. We manage this population separately from the remainder of Unit 5A. Because of the isolated and limited amount of moose habitat, we have allowed maximum hunter opportunity through an either sex hunt, thereby aiding in our goal of limiting herd growth beyond the carrying capacity of the area.

The Nunatak Bench strategic moose management plan calls for a post-hunt population of a maximum of 50 moose, and a harvest of 5 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. The most recent survey during December 2003 revealed 25 moose. During the 1997–2003 hunting seasons, an average of 11 permits were issued while 4 persons actually hunted each season. An average of 8 days of hunting were expended each year to kill 0–3 moose, with an average annual harvest of 1.6 moose. Four cows and 7 bulls made up the harvest during the past 7 seasons.

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? Adopting this proposal will provide more moose hunting opportunity.

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-04F-G-64)

PROPOSAL 28 - 5 AAC 085.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season at Berners Bay.

	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Units and Bag Limits		

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. ADF&G has been 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. 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.

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 8 bull permits and 0 antlerless permits. In 2003 there were 8 bull permits issued, but 0 cow permits based on low aerial survey counts and especially low calf numbers. The most recent survey on November 19, 2003 revealed 81 moose, 13 of which were calves. We again issued only bull permits for fall 2004, but will likely reinstate a cow hunt in fall 2005.

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 department survey results. 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 0-7 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? Adopting this proposal will provide more moose hunting opportunity.

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.

PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 085.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits or moose. Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in the Gustavus area.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
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 by drawing permit only; up to 100 permits may be issued	Nov. 15–Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	Nov. 15–Nov. 30

ISSUE: This proposal would continue the antlerless moose season in the Gustavus portion of Unit 1C. ADF&G biologists counted 404 moose during an aerial survey in this area in December of 2003, and estimate the population to be in excess of 450 animals. This is a dramatic increase from the first complete survey in 1998 when 185 animals were counted. This area contains only 6–8 square miles of productive winter range and likely cannot support these numbers of moose over the long-term. ADF&G biologists conducted spring browse utilization surveys in 1999–2004, and documented 85–95 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.

During the fall 2003 antlerless hunt, ADF&G biologists were able to gather rump fat measurements and reproductive tracts from more than 20 harvested cow moose. In addition, capture operations in December of 2003 and April of 2004 accounted for an additional 21 cow moose being measured for rump fat and assessed for pregnancy. The rump fat indices for both pre and post winter were very low in comparison to similar measurements taken from moose in other populations throughout the state. 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.

During the past four years hunters have killed an average of 46 bull moose at Gustavus. In addition 10 and 30 cow moose were harvested under drawing permits during November 2002 and 2003 respectively. We have issued an additional 60 antlerless moose permits for fall 2004. Although the fall 2000 Board of Game 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. In 2003, 35 antlerless permits were issued and 30 cow moose and 3 calf moose were harvested.

During the 2002 Board of Game meeting, the board adopted a proposal to allow ADF&G to issue "up to" 35 antlerless moose permits. This number was increased to 100 during the spring 2004 Board of Game meeting when the antlerless reauthorizations were addressed.

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? Adopting this proposal will provide more moose hunting opportunity.

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-04FS-G-063)

PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Open archery only registration permit hunt for moose in Unit 1C as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 1(C), that portion west of Excursion Inlet and north of Icy Passage	No open season	No open season
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 bull by registration	Sept. 15-Oct. 15	Sept. 15-Oct. 15

permit only; or	(General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 35 permits may be issued; or	Nov. 15-Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	Nov. 15-Nov. 30
<u>1 bull by bow and arrow only, by registration permit only; or</u>	<u>Sept. 1-Sept. 14</u>	<u>No open season</u>
<u>1 moose by bow and arrow only, by registration permit only</u>	<u>Nov. 1-Nov. 14</u>	<u>No open season</u>

(ADF&G to determine the type, antlerless, bull or any moose based on harvest and drawing permit applications.)

ISSUE: Archery hunting in the Gustavus hunt area moose hunt is dangerous under the present conditions due to the intense competition and number of firearms hunters in a relatively confined area. Due to inherent range limitations archery hunters are severely disadvantaged in harvesting the resource. This proposal addresses the safety issues and provides for a more equitable opportunity for archery hunters to harvest the resource.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Archery hunters will continue to be severely disadvantaged in the hunt and the potential for a fatality exists because of the high level of concealment and camouflage utilized by archery hunters to gain the required proximity to the animals.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal directly addresses the safety of the harvest for one group of hunters and the quality of the hunting experience. It also allows ADF&G an additional management tool and opportunity to adjust the harvest in the Gustavus area to maintain a healthy population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Archery hunters will benefit from the increased safety and opportunity. ADF&G will benefit from the management opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one should be damaged.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Leave as is was rejected because of the safety issues that effectively eliminate archery hunting in this area.

PROPOSED BY: John D. Cooper (HQ-04F-G-004)

PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Separate Gustavus area moose hunt from registration hunt RM046 in Unit 1C as follows:

Separate out the area west of Excursion Inlet and north of Icy Passage (Gustavus hunt area) from the remainder of Unit 1C for the antlered moose season. Give the Gustavus hunt area and the remainder of Unit 1C different registration hunt numbers.

ISSUE: Bull moose hunt RM046 hunt includes Gustavus hunt area with the remainder of Unit 1C. Inclusion of other areas in RM046 will, and has, confused restrictions (i.e. four-wheeler use) and will cause logistical problems if an orientation requirement is adopted.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Special requirements pertaining only to the Gustavus hunt area will have to be delineated if a hunter uses the other areas in this registration hunt.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No improvement; basically this is a house cleaning proposal so that present and future requirements can be isolated to a specific area with unique hunt characteristics.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Regulators, biologists, and game law administrators would benefit. Regulations would be simplified for user groups in these hunt areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None concerning this problem were discussed at the July 17 Gustavus meeting.

PROPOSED BY: Mark Ortega and five Gustavus residents (HQ-04F-G-019)

PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Alter season dates for RM046 moose hunt in Gustavus area, Unit 1C as follows:

Move the antlered moose season from Sept. 15 – Oct. 15 to Oct. 1 – Nov. 1 for the area west of Excursion Inlet and north of Icy Passage (Gustavus hunt area).

ISSUE: Sandhill cranes arrive at the Sandhill Crane Critical Habitat Area at the same time as the season opening; disruption of crane southerly migration is occurring. A fair number of cow moose are being breed during their second estrus; leading to smaller calves.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Sandhill Crane Critical Habitat Area may be closed to moose hunting to protect this resource. Calf survival rates will be lower if late breeding continues.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Major period of crane usage of the crane critical habitat area will not have

hunter disturbances. Cow moose will have the opportunity to breed earlier; leading to more mature calves. Hunt quality will increase due to overall cooler temperatures.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? User groups of this resource will benefit from less area restrictions; more moose, and higher hunt quality. Non-consumptive users viewing the southerly crane migration.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Seasonal Gustavus residents who want to participate in this hunt before they move south.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None concerning this problem were discussed at the July 17 Gustavus work session.

PROPOSED BY: Steve Wilson and 57 Gustavus residents (HQ-04F-G-072)

PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Require safety orientation for participation in Gustavus area moose hunt, Unit 1C as follows:

All hunters who wish to register for the bull moose hunt within the Gustavus area must attend a hunter orientation and safety class prior to obtaining the registration permit. This orientation class will be held in Gustavus two days prior to the beginning of the hunt and during the first week of the hunt (hours to be established later). The class would include a map of Gustavus including the roads and housing areas, a discussion of the specific area of the map, an orientation video of the Gustavus area including the Glacier Bay National Park boundaries, and a lecture on the specific safety issues and special regulations for the hunt.

ISSUE: The registration hunt for bull moose within the Gustavus city limits brings a great number of hunters into this roughly 3-mile by 10-mile area. Many hunters who register for this hunt are unfamiliar with the terrain and with the location of businesses and homes. Citizens of Gustavus have expressed their uneasiness with the concentration of hunters and the lack of preparation these ‘out of town hunters’ have for the hunt in this region. This hunt is unique in that the entire hunt area is within the City of Gustavus and safety concerns have become acute among the residents.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It seems likely that at some future time, there will be an injury, death or property damage to some resident or local business of Gustavus. This proposal, when accepted will help assure the hunt continues but the safety issue is addressed. If the safety issue is not addressed in some measure, the city council of Gustavus may be forced to limit hunting in certain areas forcing more hunters into an even smaller area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This orientation would improve the quality of the hunt for most hunters by identifying the areas of least population concentration while helping to assure the residents of the community that things are being done to improve the safety of both hunters and the families of folks who live in Gustavus.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents of Gustavus would benefit from this regulation through increased safety for themselves, their property and all hunters. Hunters would benefit from the increased quality of the hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Every hunter, local resident and non-resident, would be subjected to the required attendance at the orientation class each year. The orientation class would take approximately one hour of time and would be available within the City of Gustavus during normal working hours.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A proposal was written to open the first two weeks of the bull hunt to archery only with the rifle hunt commencing on Oct. 1 of the year. It was determined that while safer this proposal may be too limiting for all hunters of Alaska. Private property owners have been encouraged to put up signs requesting hunters to respect the property. Many times these measures were ineffective. Signs showing areas of population concentrations were also established but were not heeded by some hunters.

PROPOSED BY: Kenneth L. Klawunder (HQ-04F-G-020)

PROPOSAL 34 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish archery only bull moose hunt in Unit 1C as follows:

Unit 1C west of Excursion Inlet and north of Ice Passage (Gustavus hunt area), residents only, archery only, IBEP required, one bull by permit RM043, Sept. 1 – Sept. 14.

ISSUE: Archery only bull moose harvest in southeast Alaska.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Missed opportunity for bow hunters to harvest a moose.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It will help manage and balance the herd numbers. It will provide archers with an opportunity to harvest a bull moose with archery equipment without competing with gun hunters at the same time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All bowhunters, new archers, young and older bow hunters due to the area being very accessible.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Open the season for archery only from Sept. 1 – Sept. 14 and Oct. 16 – Nov. 14.

PROPOSED BY: Mike Collins (HQ-04F-G-067)

PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish archery only antlerless moose hunt in Unit 1C as follows:

Unit 1C west of Excursion Inlet and north of Ice Passage (Gustavus hunt area), resident and non-resident, archery only, IBEP required, one antler less moose by permit DM043, Nov. 1 – Nov. 14.

ISSUE: Archery only antlerless hunt in southeast Alaska.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Missed opportunity for hunters to harvest a moose with archery equipment.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Helps keep herd in balance and gives bow hunters an opportunity to harvest a moose without being in a combat situation in a small area at the same time as gun hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Any bow hunter or archer that would like to try to harvest a moose with a bow and arrow.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Mike Collins (HQ-04F-G-068)

PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify drawing hunt for moose in Unit 1C for archery as follows:

The current cow moose drawing hunt, DM043, shall be divided into the following:

- a. 50 percent of the cow moose to be harvested during the year shall be allocated to a registration archery hunt for qualified bow hunters during the first two weeks of the normal hunt period.
- b. 50 percent or the cow moose to be harvested during the year shall be allotted to a drawing hunt for rifle hunters in the same manner the hunt are now conducted.
- c. A permit list of alternates would be activated to fulfill the number of cows not taken during the archery session.

ISSUE: There is a safety concern among the residents of Gustavus due to the number of rifle hunters who visit the city during the bull and cow moose hunts. The concerns are for the safety of families and their property within the city limits (the entire hunt area). There are no archery hunts for moose in Southeast Alaska. Gustavus is unique in that the entire hunt area is within the city limits of this small Southeast city.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A) There will continue to be a lack of opportunity for Southeast Alaskan bow hunters. B) Moose hunting in Gustavus will continue to

have safety concerns and the quality of the hunt will continue to be poor. C) A limited number of hunters will be permitted to hunt cow moose.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? It will provide an opportunity for archers to participate in a hunt in Southeast Alaska. This proposal will help alleviate the safety concerns of Gustavus residents inherent with high hunter density and the close proximity of private dwelling to the hunt area. It would provide an economic boost to the local economy. It would provide local residents with another chance to hunt moose. More hunters statewide would be able to hunt moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? It would take some of the permits from the drawing rifle hunt. Management of the hunt might be more difficult with the archery registration hunt, with more hunters and the requirement of archers to be certified.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Mike Olney (HQ-04F-G-071)

PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Close moose season or initiate a transplant program in Haines Chilkat Valley, Unit 1D as follows:

Close moose hunting season in the Haines Chilkat Valley portion of Unit 1D or initiate a moose transplant program.

ISSUE: This action would increase the moose herd to early 1960's levels over the next 5 to 10 years and to double the bull harvest over today's harvest levels within 8 to 10 years. To accomplish this we need to transplant 50 cows (hopefully pregnant) or 40 cows and 10 bulls from the Anchorage area (reason obvious) during winter when the moose are readily available and the bears are in hibernation. The moose could be tranquilized in pairs and trucked via small stock truck to Haines for release. If the trip is too long a holding pen could be constructed at Northway, the halfway point, for recuperation before the second leg of the trip continues. Twenty-five trips over a two month period would accomplish the transfer. If things went well, possibly an additional 10 or 15 moose could be transferred the following year.

History 1962 through 2003: 230 moose were harvested in the past 10 years, by contrast, 1,217 moose were harvested in the 10 years between 1963 and 1973, 702 bulls, 497 cows. Since the 1970s the winters have become more mild, the bear population has remained relatively constant, the wolf population has slowly increased, and moose habitat has increased due to the harvest of conifer trees from the valley.

Bring in your most experienced Interior region moose biologist to review the facts, study the habitat and manage the transfer.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The opening and over-harvesting of cows and calves, as well as bulls during the 1960s and 1970s has depleted the moose population to the point that it cannot now overcome the higher predator ratio and rebound to its previous 1960's levels.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? A higher moose to predator ratio would better sustain the herd (provided a predator program was in place) thus providing needed meat for local subsistence users (over 270 applications) as well as increased wildlife viewing opportunities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Cost, even though highway transportation is much less expensive than air or water transportation.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

1. Close moose season.
2. Drastically lower the predator levels.
3. Both.
4. Lower the harvest of moose and raise the harvest of predators.
5. Transplant more moose and slightly lower the predator numbers.

I feel solutions 1 thru 4 are too restrictive and could take decades to show favorable results. Therefore, I favor solution 5.

PROPOSED BY: Dave Werner (HQ-04F-G-040)

PROPOSAL 38 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Change Unit 1D brown bear hunt to registration permit as follows:

Return Unit 1D to a brown bear registration permit process for resident and nonresident hunters with a cap of 30 brown bear as the seasonal harvest limit.

ISSUE: Bear hunt selection by drawing permit as the present process.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unfair to guides and clients due to the restrictions of the drawing method.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If more large bear are harvested, cub survival would increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? By the possible taking of more bear, moose hunters would greatly benefit. The guides would benefit when a hunt had cancelled. A guide would be able to select another hunter.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Retaining the present drawing system and small number of bears allowed is both unfair to guides and non-resident hunters.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Lynn Canal Advisory Committee (HQ-04F-G-010)

PROPOSAL 39 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf. Increase wolf hunting season in Unit 1 as follows:

Unit 1, wolf season Sept. 1 - May 10.

ISSUE: Present season dates for harvesting wolves.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Due to the high incidents of moose-wolf kills, moose herd is declining.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Marketing of wolf hides would improve due to being able to harvest wolves during prime fur time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wolf hunters would benefit and there might be less predation upon moose calves and adult moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Shorter hunts do not allow the harvest of wolves during prime fur time. Rejected.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Lynn Canal Advisory Committee (HQ-04F-G-011)

PROPOSAL 40 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions. Allow hunting from a boat in freshwater in Unit 5 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 5 AAC 92.080:

...

(9) from a boat in Units 1-5; however, a person with physical disabilities, as defined in AS 16.05.940, may hunt from a boat under authority of a permit issued by the department.
Additionally, a hunter may take big game from a boat in fresh waters of Unit 5.

ISSUE: The practice of taking big game from a boat in Units 1-5 was prohibited to reduce wounding loss from hunters shooting from rough salt waters. In Unit 5, many of our transportation and hunting opportunities are on calm streams and lakes but we are prohibited from shooting while in a boat. Sight distances and conditions usually allow for ethical harvests on fresh waters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Reasonable opportunities for harvest of big game are lost while hunters try to get to shore for a legal shot.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It would allow hunters to take big game in a reasonable and ethical manner that has long been traditional in Yakutat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Big game hunters in Unit 5.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I am not aware of any person or group that would suffer from this change in regulation.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered including Units 1-4 in this proposal but am not familiar enough with the terrain and practices to include the other units.

PROPOSED BY: Jim Capra (HQ-04F-G-031)

PROPOSAL 41 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Add Unit 1C to the list of units where bear baiting is allowed 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 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 only as follows:
- (A) in Units 1(A), 1(B), **1(C)**, 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;

ISSUE: Black bear baiting in Unit 1C is not permitted. Black bear baiting should be permitted as a hunting method in Unit 1C.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Baiting is one of the most effective means of appraising a bear prior to taking the bear. Baiting in accordance with the remainder of the black bear baiting regulations should cause no injury or damage to occupied property nor will it tend to

create bear problems in the occupied areas. Baiting could very well draw problem bears away from the occupied area where they could be harvested. Unit 1C is denied an effective hunting method and management tool and will continue to be denied the hunting opportunity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposal would improve the results of some hunting efforts, particularly trophy hunting, and could reduce the number of problem bears.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters would benefit for certain due to increased opportunity and ability to select bears for harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The proposal does not damage any individual or group with respect to hunting privileges or opportunities, nor does it injure any group in any respect.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The only other solution is no action. No action does not resolve the problem.

PROPOSED BY: John D. Cooper (HQ-04F-G-006)

PROPOSAL 42 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions. Allow bear baiting in all of Unit 1C as follows:

Open bear baiting in all of Unit 1C, under the guidelines already set in the regulations for black bear baiting requirements, Apr. 15 – June 30 and Sept. 1 – Sept. 30 by registration permit.

ISSUE: Bear baiting in Unit 1C.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Lessens opportunity that some hunters would have to harvest a bear in Unit 1C.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This is a harvesting and management tool. You can study and pick the animal you would like to harvest. More harvest of males and also selecting a larger animal when the opportunity presents itself.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters, wildlife watchers, photographers, and researchers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Mike Collins (HQ-04F-G-065)

PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting. Allow archery hunting within the Juneau Road System Closed Area and Mendenhall Lake Closed Area in Unit 1C as follows:

5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting. (a) The following areas are closed to hunting as specified:

Unit 1(C):

(A) Unit 1(C) is closed to the taking of snow geese;

(B) in the Juneau area, that area between the coast and a line one-fourth mile inland of the following road systems is closed to the taking of big game, **except that archery hunting is allowed provided that the hunter is at least one hundred yards from any dwelling, road or visitor center, is an Alaska resident, and holds an IBEP certification:**

(i) Glacier Highway from Mile 0 to Mile 23.3 at Peterson Creek;

(ii) Douglas Highway from the Douglas city limits to Milepost 7 on the North Douglas Highway;

(iii) Mendenhall Loop Road; and

(iv) Thane Road;

(C) the area within one-fourth mile of Mendenhall Lake, the U.S. Forest Service Mendenhall Glacier Visitor's Center, and the Center's parking area, is closed to hunting, **except that archery hunting is allowed provided that the hunter is at least one hundred yards from any dwelling, road or visitor center, is an Alaska resident, and holds an IBEP certification:**

(D) the area of Mt. Bullard bounded by the Mendenhall Glacier, Nugget Creek from its mouth to its confluence with Goat Creek, and a line from the mouth of Goat Creek north to the Mendenhall Glacier, is closed to the taking of mountain goat;

(E) Auke Lake is closed to the taking of waterfowl;

(F) Mt. Juneau drainage, bounded by the Glacier Highway, Salmon Creek and its reservoir, a line from the head of the Salmon Creek drainage to the head of Granite Creek, and down Granite Creek and Gold Creek to the Glacier Highway, is closed to the taking of mountain goat;

ISSUE: Bow hunter access to game in urban areas of Juneau where the existing regulations (Juneau Road System Closed Area and Mendenhall Lake Closed Area) are more restrictive than necessary and create no hunting areas that contribute to the garbage bear and other problems in Juneau.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The existing regulations will remain and bow hunters will be denied hunting opportunities and public nuisances such as garbage bears will remain a public expense rather than becoming part of a public asset.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposal allows more area for controlled harvest of the game resources and the ability to harvest as game some animals that would otherwise be destroyed as hazards to other humans.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Archers and the taxpaying public will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The proposal actually injures no individual or group. Some individuals may have a negative reaction to additional hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The other two solutions are to continue the periodic destruction of garbage bears by law enforcement which is expensive and a misuse of officer time or to allow all hunting in the defined corridor. Firearm hunting in the corridor requires the concurrence of the City and Borough of Juneau, which is not likely, and has legitimate safety issues related to the discharge of firearms in close proximity to dwellings. The two solutions were rejected because of safety and cost.

PROPOSED BY: John D. Cooper (HQ-04F-G-003)

PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 92.520. Closures and restrictions in state game refuges. Prohibit hunting within one-quarter mile of a home or road in the Mendenhall Wetlands State Game Refuge as follows:

5 AAC 92.520. Closures and restrictions in state game refuges.

(a) Unit 1: The Mendenhall Wetlands State Game Refuge, as described in AS 16.20.034, is closed to hunting, except for waterfowl including snipe and crane during established seasons; **a person may not hunt within one quarter mile of a road or residence**, a person may not use any off-road or all-terrain vehicle, motorcycle, or other motorized vehicle, except a boat within the refuge; a hunter who is 15 years old or younger must be accompanied by an adult, or must have successfully completed a certified hunter education course; before hunting, all hunters must register annually with the department and demonstrate an understanding of informational materials provided at the time of registration; a person convicted of a hunting violation within the Mendenhall Wetlands State Game Refuge is not eligible to register to hunt in the refuge the following year; a hunter on the refuge shall present in the field, upon request, proof of registration.

ISSUE: Waterfowl hunters shooting residents and their houses adjacent to the Mendenhall Wetlands Refuge. The education program the board and department established in 2002 has not been effective in reducing serious problems.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued confrontation between residents and hunters. Continued damage to property. Lack of law enforcement encourages ignoring present regulations. Increased liability for ADF&G and City and Borough of Juneau.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No way to legislate quality of waterfowl harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The city and state eliminate conflict and liability. Homeowners are safe within their own yards.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Waterfowl hunters too lazy to walk a quarter mile from the road or city residences, despite having many thousands of square miles to choose from.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I proposed building other recreation cabins for sportsmen. This is yet to be rejected.

PROPOSED BY: Glen Wright (HQ-04F-G-041)

PROPOSAL 45 - 5 AAC 92.530. Management areas. Modify the Douglas Island Management Area in Unit 1C as follows:

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

....

(23) Douglas Island Management Area:

- (A) the area consists of Douglas Island in Unit 1(C);
- (B) except as specified in (C) of this paragraph, hunting and trapping of wolves is prohibited in the Douglas Island Management Area;
- (C) if the department estimates that the preseason wolf population in the Douglas Island Management Area is seven or more wolves, the department will open the area to the hunting and trapping of wolves during which no more than 30 percent of the preseason wolf population may be harvested per regulatory year; however, if the department confirms that wolves are present in the Douglas Island Management Area, and the deer harvest over two succeeding years falls more than 35 percent below the historic harvest, averaged over the preceding 10 years, and hunting effort has remained approximately the same, wolf hunting and trapping will be allowed to the extent determined by the department that will maintain both wolf and deer populations;
- (D) all trappers must register with the department and receive a permit before entering the field, by submitting to the department
 - (i) proof of having successfully completed a department approved trapper orientation course;
 - (ii) a trapper registration number; and
 - (iii) information on the location where the trapping will occur;
- (E) in addition to the requirements of (D) of this paragraph,
 - (i) trapping methods for wolves are limited to foothold traps;
 - (ii) the use a snare with a cable diameter of 3/32 inch or larger that is set out of water is prohibited;
 - (iii) a hunter or trapper who takes a wolf in the management area must report the harvest to the department's division of wildlife conservation office in Douglas within 48 hours of taking the wolf;
 - (iv) the department may place further restrictions on methods and means and impose additional registration requirements on trappers to further assist in the conservation of wolves and collect information about wolves within the management area;
 - (v) a person convicted of a violation of this paragraph is not eligible to register to trap in the Douglas Island Management Area in the following year;

The board should re-evaluate the Douglas Island Management Area, and if found ineffective, the plan should be modified or repealed.

ISSUE: The Douglas Island Management Plan for wolves needs to be reevaluated. It is not effective as it is now written. Many consider that it does not provide adequate protection for the wolf population, while others consider that island deer populations are not adequately protected. The department has indicated that it can not effectively monitor the wolf population to properly implement the plan. We ask that the Board of Game reevaluate the plan and the regulation for the management area in light of new recommendations from the public and arrive at a more effective solution.

We will provide the Board of Game with all the testimony the Juneau-Douglas Advisory Committee received on this issue and we have developed a subcommittee of public and advisory committee members to try and develop a proposed solution that we will present or provide the subcommittee information and meeting notes.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Controversy in Juneau will continue to exist. A management plan that ADF&G does not have the resources to implement will exist on the books resulting in effect a total closure of Douglas Island to the taking of wolves permanently.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Community of Juneau will benefit by trying to find a compromise that reflects the community and both sides of the issue—protection for the wolves and not harming the deer population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Asking that the management plan be rescinded—did not reflect the community as a whole.

PROPOSED BY: Juneau-Douglas Advisory Committee (HQ-04F-G-009)

PROPOSAL 46 - 5 AAC 92.530(23). Management areas; 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf; and 5 AAC 84.270(13). Furbearer trapping. Modify Douglas Island Management Area and modify bag limit for wolf in Unit 1C as follows:

Open the Douglas Island portion of Unit 1C for the taking of wolves with a trapping season of Nov. 10 – Mar. 31 and a seasonal harvest limit of five animals; and with a hunting season of Nov. 10 – Mar. 31 and a seasonal harvest limit of five animals. Hunters and trappers taking a wolf must report to the Department of Fish and Game within five days of taking.

ISSUE: Reversal of a very expensive and complex management program for wolves on Douglas Island that could threaten the deer populations should a pack of wolves become established. We desire that Douglas Island be reopened to the taking of wolves by hunting and trapping.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Harvesting of wolves can only be accomplished on Douglas Island following a complex and expensive data collection system by the department on the wolf population and deer population heavily used by Juneau residents.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Heavily used deer population and transient wolf population balance that has existed for many years is reestablished and management costs are greatly reduced.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters that annually use Douglas Island for deer hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals that desire to have an observable established wolf population on Douglas Island.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Return regulations on Douglas Island to those in the remainder of Unit 1C. We chose to compromise in order to bring this issue between user groups hopefully to a close.

PROPOSED BY: Territorial Sportsmen, Inc. (HQ-04F-G-018)

PROPOSAL 47 - 5 AAC 92.530(23). Management areas; 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf; and 5 AAC 84.270(13). Furbearer trapping. Modify Douglas Island Management Area and modify bag limit for wolf in Unit 1C as follows:

A solution to this problem would be to open the season, establish bag limits, harvest caps, and deer harvest criteria to best maintain current deer harvest levels. These solutions would enable the ADF&G to manage wolves on Douglas Island without having to assess that seven or more wolves exist on the island before opening the season, therefore placing less demands on department staff and monetary resources. Placing bag limits and harvest caps would better allow the department to manage wolves for all user groups. All of these management tools should decrease the risk that deer harvest levels would decrease due to wolf predation.

The new regulation would reads as follows: Unit 1C, Douglas Island only, will be opened to the hunting and trapping of wolves. Bag limits will be three (total) for residents and nonresidents with a harvest cap of three. Sealing will take place 72 hours after harvest/take.

If, in the judgment of the ADF&G, one or more wolves are present on Douglas Island and the deer harvest declines for three consecutive years and hunter effort does not substantially decrease, the harvest cap will be removed for that trapping/hunting season and the following trapping/hunting season.

ISSUE: There are three problems:

- A. Due to the lack of staff and monetary resources it is unfeasible for the ADF&G to manage wolves on Douglas Island as the current regulation directs.
- B. Many Douglas Island deer hunters are concerned that under the current regulation, which closes Douglas Island to wolf hunting and trapping until seven or more wolves are known to exist on the island, that annual deer harvest levels could decrease before the ADF&G declares an open season.
- C. Trappers and hunters are currently unable to harvest/take wolves on Douglas Island because the season is closed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If these problems are not solved, the ADF&G will be unable to feasibly manage wolves on Douglas Island for all user groups. Many Douglas Island deer hunters will question the ADF&G's ability to manage sustainable deer populations and maintain current annual deer harvest levels on Douglas Island. Lastly, wolf trappers and hunters will not be able to harvest/take wolves on Douglas Island until seven or more wolves are known to exist on the island.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes and no. Our proposal provides hunters/trappers of wolves annual open seasons. The proposal also manages wolves on Douglas Island for consistent levels of annual deer harvests. Our proposal does not necessarily provide the non-consumptive user group opportunities to enjoy and appreciate wolves on Douglas Island because it is historically rare for a family group of wolves to exist on Douglas Island. In January 2002, one trapper wiped out seven family group members. This was the first family group that had been known to exist on Douglas Island in 20-25 years. There was significant local outrage regarding this legal harvest because at the time, wolves on Douglas Island were not managed for all user groups. Another factor that contributes to the rarity of wolves existing on Douglas Island is the Juneau infrastructure which likely impedes migration between the mainland and Douglas Island. Major facets of this infrastructure include: the four-lane Egan Drive, the Juneau International Airport, shipping and boating traffic in Gastineau Channel, a population of 30,000 people, buildings, houses, etc. Reopening the hunting/trapping season for wolves on Douglas Island will likely make the re-establishment of a family group of wolves on the island more difficult.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups including Douglas Island deer hunters are likely to benefit from this solution. The non-consumptive user group will benefit in that extirpation is unlikely to reoccur and there will be some protection for wolves on Douglas Island so that all user groups will be represented. Prior to December 2002, the non-consumptive user group was not represented on Douglas Island.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No user group is likely to suffer with our solution.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered lower bag limits and harvest caps but chose the current numbers after discussions with representatives of other local user groups including Douglas Island deer hunters. These numbers are also congruent with management practices communicated by an ADF&G wolf biologist. These management practices were discussed in meetings of the 'wolf subcommittee' which was established by the Juneau Douglas Fish and Game Advisory Committee. We also considered a seven day sealing period but thought this would

increase the risk of greater harvest/take before notification by the ADF&G that bag limits and harvest caps had been met. We also believed that a seven day sealing period would be unnecessary due to Douglas Island's close proximity to Juneau.

PROPOSED BY: Voices for Douglas Island Wildlife (HQ-04F-G-048)

PROPOSAL 48 - 5 AAC 92.530(23). Management areas. Repeal Douglas Island Management Area for wolf in Unit 1C as follows:

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

....

[(23) DOUGLAS ISLAND MANAGEMENT AREA:

- (A) THE AREA CONSISTS OF DOUGLAS ISLAND IN UNIT 1(C);
- (B) EXCEPT AS SPECIFIED IN (C) OF THIS PARAGRAPH, HUNTING AND TRAPPING OF WOLVES IS PROHIBITED IN THE DOUGLAS ISLAND MANAGEMENT AREA;
- (C) IF THE DEPARTMENT ESTIMATES THAT THE PRESEASON WOLF POPULATION IN THE DOUGLAS ISLAND MANAGEMENT AREA IS SEVEN OR MORE WOLVES, THE DEPARTMENT WILL OPEN THE AREA TO THE HUNTING AND TRAPPING OF WOLVES DURING WHICH NO MORE THAN 30 PERCENT OF THE PRESEASON WOLF POPULATION MAY BE HARVESTED PER REGULATORY YEAR; HOWEVER, IF THE DEPARTMENT CONFIRMS THAT WOLVES ARE PRESENT IN THE DOUGLAS ISLAND MANAGEMENT AREA, AND THE DEER HARVEST OVER TWO SUCCEEDING YEARS FALLS MORE THAN 35 PERCENT BELOW THE HISTORIC HARVEST, AVERAGED OVER THE PRECEDING 10 YEARS, AND HUNTING EFFORT HAS REMAINED APPROXIMATELY THE SAME, WOLF HUNTING AND TRAPPING WILL BE ALLOWED TO THE EXTENT DETERMINED BY THE DEPARTMENT THAT WILL MAINTAIN BOTH WOLF AND DEER POPULATIONS;
- (D) ALL TRAPPERS MUST REGISTER WITH THE DEPARTMENT AND RECEIVE A PERMIT BEFORE ENTERING THE FIELD, BY SUBMITTING TO THE DEPARTMENT
 - (I) PROOF OF HAVING SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED A DEPARTMENT APPROVED TRAPPER ORIENTATION COURSE;
 - (II) A TRAPPER REGISTRATION NUMBER; AND
 - (III) INFORMATION ON THE LOCATION WHERE THE TRAPPING WILL OCCUR;
- (E) IN ADDITION TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF (D) OF THIS PARAGRAPH,
 - (I) TRAPPING METHODS FOR WOLVES ARE LIMITED TO FOOTHOLD TRAPS;
 - (II) THE USE A SNARE WITH A CABLE DIAMETER OF 3/32 INCH OR LARGER THAT IS SET OUT OF WATER IS PROHIBITED;
 - (III) A HUNTER OR TRAPPER WHO TAKES A WOLF IN THE MANAGEMENT AREA MUST REPORT THE HARVEST TO THE DEPARTMENT'S DIVISION OF WILDLIFE CONSERVATION OFFICE IN DOUGLAS WITHIN 48 HOURS OF TAKING THE WOLF;

(IV) THE DEPARTMENT MAY PLACE FURTHER RESTRICTIONS ON METHODS AND MEANS AND IMPOSE ADDITIONAL REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS ON TRAPPERS TO FURTHER ASSIST IN THE CONSERVATION OF WOLVES AND COLLECT INFORMATION ABOUT WOLVES WITHIN THE MANAGEMENT AREA;

(V) A PERSON CONVICTED OF A VIOLATION OF THIS PARAGRAPH IS NOT ELIGIBLE TO REGISTER TO TRAP IN THE DOUGLAS ISLAND MANAGEMENT AREA IN THE FOLLOWING YEAR;]

ISSUE: I would like the board to repeal 5 AAC 92.530(23) which establishes the Douglas Island Management Area (DIMA) for the special protection of wolves.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Deer populations on Douglas Island will be reduced for no justifiable or rational reason.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Implementing this proposal would have a positive affect on the Douglas Island deer population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who harvest Douglas Island deer as a food resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No one.

PROPOSED BY: William Rolfzen (HQ-04F-G-049)

SOUTHEAST REGIONWIDE

PROPOSAL 49 - 5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits deer. Create a July archery hunt for deer in Units 1A, 1B, 1C, and 4 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
<u>Unit 1(A), 1(B), and 1(C)</u> <u>2 bucks, by bow and arrow only, IBEP required</u>	<u>July 15-July 31</u>	<u>No open season</u>
<u>Unit 4</u>	<u>July 15-July 31</u>	<u>No open season</u>

3 bucks, by bow and arrow only, IBEP required

ISSUE: The opening of deer season in Units 1 and 4 are periods of intense hunting pressure where the archery hunters are outranged by the firearms hunters. Due to considerations of concealment that are necessary for a successful archery hunt, the archery hunters are potentially endangered during this intense period. Because of the vastly different ranges at which kills can be made, the rifle hunters frequently take deer that are being stalked by archers. This proposal addresses the safety issues and provides a balance on the equity of opportunity issues.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The existing conditions will remain, which discourages archery hunting and reduces the number of people participating in the deer season.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposal improves the quality of the archery hunt for early season deer and provides an option to the archery hunters to avoid the existing conditions at season opening.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Archery hunters interested in pursuing early season bucks will benefit by the early season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Firearms hunters will suffer the loss of the deer taken by the archery hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Reducing the length of the general deer season or interrupting the season for an archery only season were considered and rejected as unmanageable for law enforcement and overly onerous on firearms hunters. Extending the season on the winter end was not accepted due to the normal weather at that time of year not allowing the quality of hunt that the early opening allows.

PROPOSED BY: John D. Cooper (HQ-04F-G-005)

PROPOSAL 50 - 5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer. Require waterproof tags to be attached to deer harvested 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. The cost of the tag shall be paid by the person receiving the tag.

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. We feel strongly that this will increase the compliance of tagging harvested deer in Southeast.

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-04F-G-044)

PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify brow tine restriction in Units 1-5 as follows:

Allow a bag limit of moose with two brow tines for all Southeast Alaska.

ISSUE: Three brow tine regulation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The harvest level is down and every year, a few illegal moose are brought in.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Very few moose in the Stikine area get to 50-inch or three brow tine antlers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters in Stikine or all Southeast.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The bag limit of 50-inch or three brow tines has not worked.

PROPOSED BY: Jerry Buethe (HQ-04F-G-030)

PROPOSAL 52 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify brow tine restriction in Units 1 and 3 as follows:

For the Stikine River and the rest of Units 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, and 3, moose bag limit spike-fork, 36-inches or two brow tines on one side. This should not apply to Berners Bay which is a transplanted Alaska Yukon moose.

ISSUE: The moose in Southeast Alaska are a Canadian moose, not an Alaska Yukon moose and using horn restrictions for the Alaska Yukon moose will never work as the Canadian moose horns are significantly smaller and should be adjusted for.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose kill of mature bulls will remain abnormally low.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This will increase the cow to bull ratio.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents of Southeast Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Michael N. Stough (HQ-04F-G-051)

PROPOSAL 53 - 5 AAC 84.270(2). Furbearer trapping. Extend trapping season for coyote in Units 1C, 1D, and 4 as follows:

Open season for coyotes in Units 1C and 1D, Dec. 1 – Feb. 28.

Open season for coyotes in Unit 4, Dec. 1 – Feb. 28 or open later as the Board of Game sees fit.

ISSUE: The trapping season for coyotes in Units 1C, 1D, and 4 ends too early in the year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We risk the underutilization of our furbearing resource which conflicts with ADF&G’s mission statement and goals.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It seeks to maximize the opportunity and economic benefits of our furbearing resources.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Extend the season for Units 1-4, to simplify the regulation booklet, but I cannot say the proposed regulation is applicable to Southeast Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: Nathan J. Soboleff (HQ-04F-G-032)

PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 84.270(4) . Furbearer trapping. Extend trapping season for fox in Units 1C, 1D, and 4 as follows:

Open season for red fox in Units 1C and 1D, Dec. 1-Feb. 28.
Open season for red fox in Unit 4, Dec. 1-Feb. 28 or open later as the Board of Game sees fit.

ISSUE: The trapping season for red fox in these units ends too early in the year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We risk the underutilization of our furbearing resources which conflicts with ADF&G's mission statement and goals.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It seeks to maximize access to and the economic benefits of our furbearing resources.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Extend the season for Units 1-4 to simplify the regulation book, but I cannot speak to the applicability of extending the season in southern Southeast Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: Nathan J. Soboleff (HQ-04F-G-033)

PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 84.270(5). Furbearer trapping. Extend trapping season for lynx in Units 1C, 1D, and 4 as follows:

Open season for lynx in Units 1C and 1D, Dec. 1-Feb. 28.
Open season for lynx in Unit 4, Dec. 1-Feb. 28 or open later as the Board of Game sees fit.

ISSUE: The trapping season for lynx in Units 1C, 1D, and 4 ends too early in the year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We risk underutilizing our furbearing resources which conflicts with ADF&G's mission statement and goals.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It seeks to maximize the access to and economic benefit of our furbearing resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Extend the season for the lynx in Units 1-4 but I do not know if extending the season in southern Southeast Alaska would be applicable.

PROPOSED BY: Nathan J. Soboleff

(HQ-04F-G-034)

PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 84.270(6). Furbearer trapping. Extend trapping season for marten in Units 1C, 1D, and 4 as follows:

Open season for marten in Units 1C and 1D, Dec. 1-Feb. 28.

Open season for marten in Unit 4, Dec. 1-Feb. 28 or later as Board of Game sees fit.

ISSUE: The trapping season for marten in Units 1C, 1D, and 4 ends too early.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We risk underutilizing our furbearing resources which conflicts with ADF&G’s mission statement and goals.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It seeks to maximize the access to and economic benefit of our furbearing resource

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Extend the season in Units 1-4 but I do not know if extending the season in southern Southeast Alaska is a good thing.

PROPOSED BY: Nathan J. Soboleff

(HQ-04F-G-035)

PROPOSAL 57 - 5 AAC 84.270(7). Furbearer trapping. Extend trapping season for mink and weasel Units 1C, 1D, and 4 as follows:

Open season for mink and weasel in Units 1C and 1D, Dec.1-Feb. 28.

Open season for mink and weasel in Unit 4, Dec. 1-Feb. 28 or later as the Board of Game sees fit.

ISSUE: The trapping season for mink and weasel in Units 1C, 1D, and 4 ends too early in the year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We risk underutilizing our furbearing resources which conflicts with ADF&G’s mission statement and goals.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It seeks to maximize the access to and economic benefits of our furbearing resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Extend the season in Units 1-4 but I do not know if extending the season in southern Southeast Alaska would be a good thing or not.

PROPOSED BY: Nathan J. Soboleff (HQ-04F-G-036)

PROPOSAL 58 - 5 AAC 84.270(8). Furbearer trapping. Extend trapping season for muskrat in Units 1C, 1D, and 4 as follows:

Open season for muskrat in Units 1C and 1D, Dec. 1-Feb. 28.
Open season for muskrat in Unit 4, Dec. 1-Feb. 28 or later as the Board of Game sees fit.

ISSUE: The trapping season for muskrat in Units 1C, 1D, and 4 ends too early in the year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We risk underutilizing our furbearing resources which conflicts with ADF&G’s mission statement and goals.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It seeks to maximize the access to and economic benefit of our furbearing resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Extend the season for the muskrat in Units 1-4 but I can not speak to the applicability of extending the season in southern Southeast Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: Nathan J. Soboleff (HQ-04F-G-037)

PROPOSAL 59 - 5 AAC 84.270(9). Furbearer trapping. Extend trapping season for land otter in Units 1C, 1D, and 4 as follows:

Open season for land otter in Units 1C and 1D, Dec. 1-Feb. 28.
Open season for land otter in Unit 4, Dec. 1-Feb. 28 or later as the Board of Game sees fit.

ISSUE: The trapping season for land otter in Units 1C, 1D, and 4 ends too early in the year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We risk underutilizing our furbearing resources which conflicts with ADF&G’s mission statement and goals.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It seeks to maximize the access to and economic benefit of our furbearing resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Extend the season in Units 1-4 to simplify the regulations but I do not know how applicable it would be to extend the season in southern Southeast Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: Nathan J. Soboleff (HQ-04F-G-038)

PROPOSAL 60 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf. Lengthen wolf hunting season in Unit 1 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Units [1] and 3-5 5 wolves	Sept. 1-Mar. 31	Sept. 1-Mar. 31
<u>Unit 1</u> <u>5 wolves</u>	<u>Aug. 1-Apr. 30</u>	<u>Aug. 1-Apr. 30</u>

ISSUE: Moving the season back to an Aug. 1 start will allow the hunter (deer and goat season opens Aug. 1) to take a wolf if they want to. The wolf kill in the past when the season opened on Aug. 1 was minimal and usually incidental to deer or goat hunting. Moving the season back to an April 30 closing will also allow the hunter (spring bear) to take a wolf if they want to. Also in the past when season closed in April, the wolf kill was minimal and usually incidental to a bear hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Some hunters will miss a rare opportunity at taking a wolf.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who hunt Unit 1 during the early fall and early spring hunts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Jonnie Laird (HQ-04F-G-039)

PROPOSAL 61 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf. Extend wolf hunting season in Units 1-3 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Units [1 AND 3] <u>4-5</u> 5 wolves	Sept. 1-Mar. 31	Sept. 1-Mar. 31
[UNIT 2 5 WOLVES]	DEC. 1-MAR. 31	DEC. 1-MAR. 31
<u>Units 1-3</u> <u>5 wolves</u>	<u>Sept. 1-Apr. 30</u>	<u>Sept. 1-Apr. 30</u>

ISSUE: Season closures in Units 1-3 that eliminated wolf hunting opportunities in April. Wolf populations in these units are high. An April season closure is not needed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Lost wolf hunting opportunities for spring black bear hunters.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wolf hunters, bear and deer hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Southeast Alaska Guides Association (HQ-04F-G-015)

PROPOSAL 62 - 5 ACC 92.170(b)(4). Sealing of marten, lynx, beaver, otter, wolf, and wolverine. Repeal the following sealing requirement for wolves in Units 1 - 5.

5 ACC 92.170(b)(4). Sealing of marten, lynx, beaver, otter, wolf, and wolverine.

[(4) THE RADIUS AND ULNA OF THE LEFT FORELEG MUST REMAIN NATURALLY ATTACHED TO THE HIDE OF ANY WOLF TAKEN IN UNITS 1 – 5 UNTIL THE HIDE IS SEALED.]

ISSUE: In order to facilitate a department evaluation of the age structure and intensity of wolf harvest in Region I, in 1996 the board adopted this regulation. The department has now collected seven years of data on the age structure of the wolf harvest and believes that the requirement is no longer necessary.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters and trappers will remain burdened by the requirement to leave the radius and ulna of the left foreleg naturally attached to the hide until after the hide is sealed.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and trappers who will be allowed to complete the skinning process prior to sealing.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04F-G-060)

PROPOSAL 63 - 5 AAC 92.010(f). Harvest tickets and reports. Require unused deer harvest tickets be carried while hunting, and used in sequential order.

5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets and reports.

...

(f) For deer, a person may not hunt deer, except in a permit hunt, unless the person has in possession a deer harvest ticket. **All unused deer harvest tickets must be carried while hunting deer in Units 1-5 and must be validated in sequential order, beginning with harvest ticket number one.**

ISSUE: Region I deer hunters are currently issued deer harvest tickets in blocks of 6 tickets per person. There is currently no requirement for hunters to use deer harvest tickets in sequential order (i.e., begin with #1 and continue through #6). The lack of such a requirement has been exploited by some individuals as a means of circumventing area specific bag limits for deer.

Because bag limits for deer vary across the Region, some people deliberately use harvest tickets out of sequence as a means of circumventing bag limit restrictions. The regulations currently prohibit a person from hunting a species in an area if the bag limit for that area is less than the number of animals of that species the hunter has already taken elsewhere in the state. In the Petersburg Area, for example, some hunters harvest one or more deer elsewhere in the Region while holding back tag #1 for later use on Mitkof Island, which has a restrictive one buck bag limit. In the absence of a requirement that deer harvest tickets be used in sequence, enforcement personnel have no way of evaluating whether or not a person has already exceeded the bag limit for deer in the area they are currently hunting. Under such a provision only tags #1 and #2 would

be good in an area with a 2-deer bag limit, tags #1 - #4 would only be good in areas with a 4-deer bag limit, and so on. There is currently no restriction on a person using tag #6 in an area with a 1-deer limit. Requiring hunters to use their deer harvest tags in sequence will assist Alaska Bureau of Wildlife Enforcement (ABWE) personnel in identifying those who violate the bag limits for deer.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to experience abuses of the restriction on harvesting deer beyond unit-specific bag limits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? n/a.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The resource and law abiding hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who violate bag limit restrictions for deer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-04F-G-061)

PROPOSAL 64 - 5 AAC 92.132. Bag limit for brown bears. Clarify brown bear bag limit as follows:

Any black or brown bear wounded and not recovered in Units 1-4 is considered taken for current regulatory year. Brown bear wounded loss does not count against four year take. Wounded defined as any blood or sign of hit by hunting projectile.

ISSUE: Unaccounted loss of black and brown bear in Units 1-4 due to wounding and not recovered.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued unaccounted harvest of black and brown bear in Units 1-4. Field conditions in Units 1-4 make follow up of wounded bear nearly impossible.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Significant unrecorded wounding loss occurs with both black and brown bear in Units 1-4.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Opportunity for continued bear hunting in Units 1-4 at current levels.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who wish to continue to hunt after wounding bear.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Jimmie Rosenbruch

(HQ-04F-G-012)

PROPOSAL 65 - 5 AAC 92.200. Purchase and sale of game. Eliminate sale of brown bear fur for handicraft for Units 1, 4, and 5 as follows:

You may not buy, sell, or barter any part of a black or brown/grizzly bear except an article of handicraft made from the fur of a black bear or the fur of a brown/grizzly bear only in game management units intensively managed for the increase of moose and caribou.

ISSUE: Sale of handicrafts from fur of brown bears will result in unwanted increased harvest of brown bears in units without a predation problem such as Units 1, 4, and 5.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Brown bear allocation has been established over the last 50 years thru an evolutionary process and brown bear population is fully allocated at this time. Any increase would disrupt the brown bear management plan.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All efforts of people, agencies, and organizations involved from the brown bear management team.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Bear viewers, resident hunters, non-resident hunters, land holders, subsistence users, and economies of those industries in place, local economies, state economy, brown bear management plan team effort and Board of Game which adopted Brown Bear Management Plan.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The original proposal was not intended to be statewide, only those areas for intensive management.

PROPOSED BY: Southeast Alaska Guides Association

(HQ-04F-G-016)

PROPOSAL 66 - 5 AAC 92.200. Purchase and sale of game. Eliminate sale of brown bear fur for handicraft for Units 1, 4, and 5 as follows:

Eliminate authorization of sale of fur from brown bear for handicrafts. Limit authorization to areas where the Board of Game and ADF&G have identified with intensive management for need to increase harvest of bears.

ISSUE: Sale of handicrafts from fur of brown bear was passed March 2004 by the Board of Game for statewide.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Danger of over harvest of brown bear in units with easy access like Units 1, 4, and 5 where moose and caribou populations do not reside or are stable and more bears need not be harvested.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, without such action, there's a high danger of over harvest of brown bear and emergency closures.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident and non-resident hunters, subsistence hunters, bear viewers, local and state economies.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who would shoot bear only for use in the sale of handicraft items.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The original proposal submitted for the Spring 2004 Board of Game meeting was intended only for areas of intensive management, not statewide.

PROPOSED BY: Neil Webster (HQ-04F-G-073)

PROPOSAL 67 - 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting, 5 AAC 92.550. Areas closed to trapping, and 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled Use Areas. The Board of Game has requested a statewide review, by Region, of the original history of, reasons for, and boundaries of, all closed and controlled use areas in order to ascertain the continued need for each area. After publication of this proposal to allow public comment, the Board may repeal or modify any of the following:

5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting. (a) The following areas are closed to hunting as specified:

(1) Unit 1(A)

(A) in the Ketchikan area, a strip one-fourth mile wide on each side of the Tongass Highway system, including the Ward, Connel, and Harriet Hunt Lake Roads, is closed to the taking of big game;

(B) in the Hyder area, the Salmon River drainage downstream from the Riverside Mine, excluding the Thumb Creek drainage, is closed to the taking of bears; (*The department intends to amend this proposal to clarify the description of the area by modifying the western boundary.*)

(2) Unit 1(B)

(A) the Anan Creek drainage within one mile of Anan Creek downstream from the mouth of Anan Lake, including the area within a one mile radius from the mouth of Anan Creek Lagoon is closed to the taking of black bears and brown bears;

(3) Unit 1(C)

(A) Unit 1(C) is closed to the taking of snow geese; (*This appears to be in error; the snow geese closure was removed many years ago. The department intends to amend this proposal and remove this reference.*)

(B) in the Juneau area, that area between the coast and a line one-fourth mile inland of the following road systems is closed to the taking of big game:

- (i) Glacier Highway from Mile 0 to Mile 23.3 at Peterson Creek;
 - (ii) Douglas Highway from the Douglas city limits to Milepost 7 on the North Douglas Highway;
 - (iii) Mendenhall Loop Road; and
 - (iv) Thane Road;
- (C) the area within one-fourth mile of Mendenhall Lake, the U.S. Forest Service Mendenhall Glacier Visitor's Center, and the Center's parking area, is closed to hunting;
- (D) the area of Mt. Bullard bounded by the Mendenhall Glacier, Nugget Creek from its mouth to its confluence with Goat Creek, and a line from the mouth of Goat Creek north to the Mendenhall Glacier, is closed to the taking of mountain goat;
- (E) Auke Lake is closed to the taking of waterfowl;
- (F) Mt. Juneau drainage, bounded by the Glacier Highway, Salmon Creek and its reservoir, a line from the head of the Salmon Creek drainage to the head of Granite Creek, and down Granite Creek and Gold Creek to the Glacier Highway, is closed to the taking of mountain goat;
- (4) Unit 1(D)
- (A) a strip one-fourth mile wide on each side of the Lutak Road between Mile 7 and Chilkoot Lake, and from the Chilkoot River bridge to the end of the Lutak Road spur at the head of Lutak Inlet, is closed to the taking of big game;
- (5) Unit 3
- (A) a strip one-fourth mile wide on each side of the Stikine (Zimovia) Highway from the Wrangell city limits to the Tongass National Forest Boundary is closed to the taking of big game;
- (B) in the Petersburg vicinity, a strip one-fourth mile wide on each side of the Mitkof Highway from Milepost 0 to the Crystal Lake campground is closed to the taking of big game, except wolves;
- (C) the Petersburg Creek drainage on Kupreanof Island is closed to the taking of black bears;
- (D) Blind Slough, draining into Wrangell Narrows, and a strip one-fourth mile wide on each side of Blind Slough, from the hunting closure markers at the southernmost portion of Blind Island to the hunting closure markers one mile south of the Blind Slough bridge, are closed to all hunting; the remainder of Blind Slough and its drainage is closed to the taking of snow geese only. *(This appears to be in error; the snow geese closure was removed many years ago. The department intends to amend this proposal and remove this reference)*
- (6) Unit 4
- (A) in the Sitka area, a strip one-fourth mile wide on each side of all state highways is closed to the taking of big game;
- (B) the Seymour Canal Closed Area (Admiralty Island), including all drainages into northwestern Seymour Canal between Staunch Point and the southernmost tip of the unnamed peninsula separating Swan Cove and King Salmon Bay, and including Swan and Windfall Islands, is closed to the taking of bears;
- (C) the Salt Lake Closed Area (Admiralty Island), including all lands within one-fourth mile of Salt Lake above Klutchman Rock at the head of Mitchell Bay, is closed to the taking of bears;

(D) Port Althorp (Chichagof Island), that area within the Port Althorp watershed south of a line from Point Lucan to Salt Chuck Point (Trap Rock), is closed to the taking of brown bears;

(E) Mitchell Bay (Admiralty Island), that area including Mitchell Bay, Kootznahoo Inlet, Kanalkoo Bay, and Favorite Bay, and all adjacent land within 660 feet of mean high tide, is closed to the taking of brown bears;

(F) the Bear Cove Closed Area (Baranof Island), which consists of all of Bear Cove in Silver Bay, from the mouth of the unnamed creek exiting Bear Lake located approximately one-half mile southeast of BM “Virgo”, along the coast to the point of land at BM “Ranus,” including the entire shoreline of Bear Cove within one-fourth mile of mean high tide line, is closed to the taking of brown bears;

5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. In the following areas, access for hunting is controlled as specified:

(1) Unit 4

(A) Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area:

(i) the area consists of that portion of Unit 4 on Chichagof Island north of Tenakee Inlet and east of the drainage divide from the northwest point of Gull Cove to the Port Frederick Portage, including all drainages into Port Frederick and Mud Bay;

(ii) the area is closed to the use of any motorized land vehicle for brown bear hunting, including the transportation of brown bear hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of brown bears, except as provided under terms of a registration hunt permit;

5 AAC 92.550. Areas closed to trapping. The following areas are closed to the trapping of furbearers as indicated:

(1) Unit 1(C) (Juneau area):

(A) a strip within one-quarter mile of the mainland coast between the end of Thane Road and the end of Glacier Highway at Echo Cove;

(B) Auke Lake and the area within one-quarter mile of Auke Lake;

(C) that area of the Mendenhall Valley bounded on the south by the Glacier Highway, on the west by the Mendenhall Loop Road and Montana Creek Road and Spur Road to Mendenhall Lake, on the north by Mendenhall Lake, and on the east by the Mendenhall Loop Road and Forest Service Glacier Spur Road to the Forest Service Visitor Center;

(D) a strip within one-quarter mile of the Douglas Island coast along the entire length of the Douglas Highway and a strip within one-quarter mile of the Eaglecrest Road;

(E) that area within the United States Forest Service Mendenhall Glacier Recreation Area;

(F) a strip within one-quarter mile of the following trails as designated on United States Geological Survey maps: Herbert Glacier Trail, Windfall Lake Trail, Peterson Lake Trail, Spaulding Meadows Trail (including the loop trail), Nugget Creek Trail, Outer Point Trail, Dan Moller Trail, Perseverance Trail, Granite Creek Trail, Mt. Roberts Trail and the Nelson Water Supply Trail, Sheep Creek Trail, and Point Bishop Trail;

(G) the area described as the Mendenhall Wetlands State Game Refuge in AS 16.20.034 is closed to trapping; the use of off-road or all-terrain vehicles, motorcycles, or other motorized vehicles (except boats) within the boundaries of Mendenhall Wetlands State Game Refuge is prohibited at all times;

(2) Unit 2-Prince of Wales Island Area:

(A) Joe Mace Island Marine Park, a small island off Point Baker on Prince of Wales Island. (This appears to be a technical error; this closure does not appear in codified, but the Board closed the area in 1991. Department publications have referenced the closure since 1992, and the department intends to amend this proposal to correct the reference in codified language.)

ISSUE: The Board of Game has requested a review of the history and discussion concerning the continuing need for all closed areas and controlled use areas in Units 1-5. Many closed and controlled use areas were created long ago to address specific problems and concerns. In some cases, the original reason for setting a controlled use or closed area may no longer exist. Alternatively, in other cases, stronger reasons may now prove the worth of retaining those areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? All lands designated as being closed areas or controlled use areas will remain unchanged and there will be no intentional review of these areas. Otherwise, the only way changes can occur is if the public, advisory committees, other agencies or the department propose changes to specific areas.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who wish to hunt or trap in the closed areas, or use motorized access in the controlled use areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who wish the areas to remain closed.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: At the request of the Board of Game (HQ-04F-G-057)

REGIONS II, III, AND V

Note: A petition was accepted at the March 2004 meeting and the following proposal was scheduled for consideration at this meeting by the board.

PROPOSAL 68 - 5 AAC 92.080 (4). Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Allow use of snowmachines for taking wolves in all of Unit 18 as follows:

5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. The following methods of taking game are prohibited:

....

(4) unless otherwise provided in this chapter, from a motor-driven boat and a snowmachine unless the motor has been completely shut off and the progress from the motor's power has ceased, except that

- (A) A motor-driven boat may be used to take caribou in Units 23 and 26, a snowmachine may be used in Units 22 and 23 to position caribou to select individual caribou for harvest, provided that animals are not shot from a moving snowmachine, and a snowmachine may be used to take wolves in wolf control implementation areas specified in 5 AAC 92.125(2) , (3), (5), and (6); in Unit 19, a snowmachine may be used to take wolves provided that animals are not shot from a moving snowmachine;
- (B) A snowmachine may be used in Units 22 and 23 to position caribou to select individual caribou for harvest, provided that animals are not shot from a moving snowmachine,
- (C) A snowmachine may be used to take wolves in wolf control implementation areas specified in 5 AAC 92.125(2), (3), (5), and (6);
- (D) in Unit 18, [WITHIN THE LOWER KUSKOKWIM CLOSED AREA] and Unit 19, a snowmachine may be used to take wolves provided that animals are not shot from a moving snowmachine;

ISSUE: We are requesting that the board allow the use of snowmachines to take wolves in Unit 18. Several issues were not fully addressed in previous board deliberation:

- 1) The Lower Yukon moose population is still growing and should be allowed all possible opportunity to achieve potential – (high and growing subsistence need in area). Current Lower Yukon moose pop levels show no signs of stressing or affecting habitat capability for sustained (K) yield. Unit 18 residents routinely conducted “wolf patrols” (recognized in department’s analysis and recommendations as not detrimental to maintaining integrity of wolf populations) during previous moratorium in specific, purposeful efforts to help moose numbers grow in that area. This activity is considered essential for continued success of herd growth.
- 2) The moose hunting moratorium in Lower Kuskokwim will further effort, need and dependence by those residents to hunt in the lower Yukon drainage. This is even more pertinent given the lack of traditional alternatives for Unit 18 residents with substantial depletion and decline of moose numbers in Units 19A and 19B. (Ref. Central Kuskokwim Moose Management Planning Committee report, recommended alternatives, and subsequent board action significantly reducing or eliminating subsistence and other opportunities for everyone who has historically utilized the Units 19A and 19B moose population).
- 3) Recent State and Federal actions in Unit 21E have further restricted (or eliminated) opportunity for Unit 18 residents to obtain moose in that area which were formerly available alternatives.
- 4) Unit 18 residents have had and continue to have shared direct dependence on the harvest/use of game resources throughout the region between Kuskokwim and Yukon River drainages, i.e. when Lower Yukon moose moratorium was in place and population was being further established, hunters from those villages routinely came across to harvest caribou in the Kuskokwim area. Kuskokwim village residents have routinely hunted moose on the Yukon in Units 18 and 21E above Mountain Village as well.
- 5) ADF&G expressed no opposition to including Yukon drainage in the proposal.

We ask for your positive response by instating the proposal as originally sponsored by the Lower Yukon and Lower Kuskokwim Advisory Committees, to authorize the taking of wolves from snowmachines in both these drainages of Unit 18.

Wolf numbers have increased in Unit 18 and local hunters believe that increased wolf harvest is necessary in order to protect moose populations. Also, using snowmachines is common in Unit 18 and adopting this proposal would recognize this accepted practice to occur legally throughout the area.

Wolves produce an annual surplus through high birth rates that would more fully be utilized if this method were legal. Wolf populations are not threatened by this method because refuges from this type of hunting method exist in space, vegetation, topography, and weather.

Support for a moose hunting moratorium on the Kuskokwim was given by some villages only on the condition that the restrictions governing snowmachine hunting for wolves be lifted. Adopting this proposal would significantly help garner public acceptance for the moose hunting moratorium.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The wolf population would continue to grow and may grow to the point where it could threaten continued growth of caribou, moose, and muskox populations in Unit 18. Wolf hunting opportunity would be curtailed and a harvestable surplus would not be fully utilized.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? There would be little effect on the quality of the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Benefits would go to fully utilize the wolf resource itself and to better utilize potential larger ungulate populations. Those who advocate compliance with the moose moratorium would be better able to persuade others to comply with the regulations. The practice of using snowmachines is common and this regulatory change would legalize a method that is accepted locally. By these three reasons, Unit 18 wolf trappers and hunters as well as Unit 18 moose hunters would benefit.

Adopting this proposal would help moose numbers increase in Unit 18 through compliance with a moose hunting moratorium on the Kuskokwim, and through a decrease in wolf predation unitwide. As Unit 18 moose numbers increase, hunting pressure in adjacent Units 19 and 21E would diminish. Public planning efforts to address user conflicts are taking place in both these areas and this proposal has the potential to ease those conflicts. Therefore, Unit 19 and 21E hunters (including subsistence hunters, sport hunters, and their guides and transporters) would also benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to this method would cite the potential to eliminate wolves from an area. This is clearly not the case in Unit 18 because the wolf population has grown even though use of snowmachines has been a long-standing practice, and is recognized as a viable and effective management tool - especially when there is no biological concern. Others will oppose this proposal because it is not an acceptable method by "fair chase" (i.e. lower 48/urban, recreational, commercial or animal welfare/ideology) standards. Concern and assertions of mental anguish may be made that those value systems and beliefs are important enough to take precedence and supersede efforts to provide for subsistence needs, or recognition of hardships endured by dependent consumptive users to build this moose population to its potential in providing for needs

and desires of all Alaskans in pursuit of sustained yield, diversity of use and reasonable subsistence opportunity.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Emmonak Tribal Council and Orutsarmiut Native Council (HQ-04F-G-074)

PROPOSAL 69 – 5 AAC 92.125. Wolf Predation Control Implementation Plans. Create a wolf and/or brown bear predation control implementation plan for the Upper Yukon/Tanana control area.

5 AAC 92.125. Wolf and Brown Bear Predation Control Implementation Plans.

(X) an Upper Yukon/Tanana wolf and brown bear predation control area is established and consists of all of Units 12 (approximately 10,000 square miles) and 20(E) (approximately 10,680 square miles); in accordance with 5 AAC 92.115, the commissioner or the commissioner's designee may conduct a wolf and/or brown bear population reduction or population regulation program in the Upper Yukon/Tanana wolf and/or brown bear 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 objectives of 4,000 – 6,000 moose with a sustainable annual harvest of 250 – 450 in Unit 12, and 8,000 – 10,000 moose with a sustainable annual harvest of 500 – 1,000 in the Fortymile and Ladue River drainages of Unit 20(E);

(B) when the commissioner or the commissioner's designee conducts a wolf and/or brown bear population reduction or population regulation program, the program must be conducted in the following manner to achieve the objectives in (A) of this paragraph:

(i) for up to five years beginning January 1, 2005, the commissioner may reduce the wolf and/or brown bear population in Units 12 and 20(E); however, the commissioner may not reduce the Unit 12 wolf population to fewer than 50 wolves, the Unit 20(E) wolf population to fewer than 60 wolves, or the Unit 12 or Unit 20(E) brown bear populations by more than 25% of the pre-control estimated total brown bear population; brown bear population estimates are based on extrapolations from past research in Unit 20(E) and in similar habitats with similar bear food resources in Unit 20(A);

(ii) initially, the commissioner may focus bear control efforts in approximately 3,200 square miles or less of the control area; however, the commissioner may not reduce the number of bears in the focus area by more than 60% of the pre-control extrapolated estimate; estimates are based on extrapolations from past research in Unit 20(E) and in similar habitats with similar bear food resources in Unit 20(A); after periodic evaluation of the efficacy of the program the Board of Game may modify in board findings the size or location of the focus area or add additional areas;

(iii) the commissioner shall reduce the wolf and/or bear populations in an efficient manner, but as safely and humanely as practical;

(iv) 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;

(v) the commissioner shall reduce the bear population by means and direction included in the Board of Game Bear Conservation and Management Policy (2004-147-BOG);

(C) take of wolves and/or brown bears in Unit 12 and Unit 20(E) during the term of the program may occur as provided in hunting regulations set out elsewhere in this title, including the use of motorized vehicles as provided for in 5 AAC 92.080; however, if the wolf population is reduced to 50 in Unit 12 or 60 in Unit 20(E), the commissioner shall stop all taking of wolves in that unit until the wolf population increases, or if the brown bear population is reduced by more than 25% of the pre-control estimated populations within Unit 12 or Unit 20E, the commissioner shall stop all taking of brown bears in that unit until an assessment is completed of the program's effectiveness in providing a reasonable increase in moose survival and in minimizing the long-term effects on the bear population and the potential for its recovery;

(D) annually, the department shall provide to the Board of Game, at its spring meeting, a report on program activities conducted during the preceding 12 months, including implementation activities, the status of prey and predator populations, program effectiveness, and recommendations for changes to and continuation of the program;

(E) justification for the program, and wildlife population and human-use information, is as follows:

(i) the board determined the moose populations in Unit 12 and portions of Unit 20(E) 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 12 and Unit 20(E) consistent with multiple uses and principles of sound conservation and management of habitat and all wildlife species in the area;

(ii) the wolf and/or brown bear predation control area is established as an effort to increase the moose populations in Units 12 and 20(E);

(iii) during 1981 – 2003, the department conducted nine moose density estimation surveys within Unit 12 and ten in Unit 20(E); based on the surveys conducted in 2003, the population estimate for Unit 12 was 2,900 – 5,100 moose (plus or minus 22 percent at a 90 percent confidence interval), or 0.5 – 0.9 moose per square mile of suitable moose habitat (6,000 square miles); population estimates for various portions of Unit 20(E) indicate a 2003 population size estimate of 4,000 – 4,800 for the entire unit, or 0.5 – 0.6 moose per square mile of suitable moose habitat (8,000 square miles);

(iv) high moose densities in Unit 12 and Unit 20(E) supported a long hunting season and a bag limit of one moose during the 1960s; as declines began in the early 1970s hunting for cows was closed; seasons in both units were shortened in 1973 and closed in Unit 20(E) during 1977 – 1981; for both units a ten-day bulls-only season was held during 1982 – 1990, and lengthened to 15 days, including antler restrictions during 1991 – 2004, with up to an additional 30 days in limited portions of the units;

(v) for residents, in 2004, in a portion of Unit 12 drained by the Little Tok River, the moose season is open for 5 days in August and 10 days in September for 1 bull with antler restrictions; for a portion of southeast Unit 12, the season is open for the month of September for 1 bull with antler restrictions; for the remainder of Unit 12, the

season is open for 5 days in August and 10 days in September for one bull; for residents, in 2004, in the portion of Unit 20(E) draining into the Middle Fork of the Fortymile River upstream from and including the Joseph Creek drainage the season is open for 5 days in August and 10 days in September with a bag limit of one bull; in the remainder of Unit 20(E), for residents, the season is open for 5 days in August and 10 days in September by registration permit with the stipulation that a registration permit for caribou in Unit 20(E) may not be held at the same time, and, during the month of November, by drawing hunt, all with a bag limit of one bull; for non-residents in both Units 12 and 20(E), only September seasons are open with the same registration permit requirements as for residents with a bag limit of 1 bull with antler restrictions; no drawing permits are available for non-residents;

(vi) reported moose harvest in Unit 12 ranged from means of 175 in the mid-1960s, to 157 in the early 1970s and to 127 during 1999 – 2003; in Unit 20(E), reported harvest ranged from means of 120 in the mid-1960s, to 93 in the early 1970s, and to 148 during 1999 – 2003;

(vii) habitat availability or quality for moose in Unit 12 and Unit 20(E) are not currently primary limiting factors; all indications are that moose habitat in this area is capable of sustaining 1.0 – 1.5 moose per square mile; wildfires are common and fire suppression efforts are limited; over 1600 square miles of habitat in Unit 20(E) were burned in 2004 alone, which may benefit future moose productivity and recruitment;

(viii) in a 1984 study conducted in central Unit 20(E), where wolves had been reduced during a predator control program prior to the study, wolves killed 12 – 15 percent of moose calves that were born, grizzly bears killed 52 percent and black bears killed 3 percent; most grizzly bear predation occurred during the six weeks following calving, while wolf predation on all sex and age classes occurred throughout the year; mean early winter ratios of 22 calves:100 cows, observed during aerial surveys in 1981 – 1988, suggests brown bear predation was important; there has been little change in this pattern since 1988, indicating that brown bear predation remains a major factor in maintaining early winter ratios of 10 – 27 calves:100 cows during 1997 – 2003 in Unit 20(E); in most portions of Unit 12, observed early winter ratios during the same period were 15 – 41 calves:100 cows, indicating bear predation was less important than in Unit 20(E);

(ix) since 1980, the early-winter wolf population in Units 12 and 20(E) has been estimated using extrapolation of density estimates derived from data collected during intensive winter aerial surveys, information from interviews with local trappers and trapping records; the early-winter wolf population size estimates for 2002-2003 were 181 – 194 wolves in Unit 12 and 245 – 260 in Unit 20(E); the increasing numbers of caribou in the Fortymile herd and the winter migration of the Nelchina herd through Units 12 and 20(E) during the past 5 years appear to have allowed the wolf population in northern Unit 12 and Unit 20(E) to increase in recent years; wolf densities in northern and western Unit 20(E) are expected to further increase as packs sterilized under the Fortymile non-lethal wolf control program are replaced by unsterilized packs; due to the migratory patterns of these caribou herds, caribou are absent from much of Unit 12 and the southern portion of 20(E) for most of the year, resulting in higher wolf predation rates on moose during periods when caribou are absent; if the wolf population in Unit 20(E) increases as expected and moose numbers remain stable or

decline, additional wolf predation would likely continue to depress the moose population; moose can be expected to persist at low densities with little expectation of increase, unless predation is reduced; in Unit 20(E) the impacts of brown bear predation on adult moose is likely low to moderate and the impact of black bear predation on moose is relatively inconsequential; in Unit 12 the impact of black bear predation on moose is likely low to moderate;

(x) brown bear population size estimates in 2002 were 350 – 425 bears in Unit 12 and 475 – 550 in Unit 20(E), based on extrapolation of density estimates obtained in Unit 20(E) during 1986 and intensive research studies conducted 100 miles to the west in Unit 20(A) during 1981 – 1998; black bear density has not been estimated in either Unit 12 or 20(E);

(xi) brown bear hunting seasons are longer and less restrictive than during the 1970s when the bear population was lightly harvested; in Unit 12, the \$25 tag fee requirement was waived during 1984 and 1985, but has been in effect since; bag limit was 1 bear every 4 years from the 1960s – 1984 and 1990 – 1991, and 1 bear per year in 1984 – 1990, and in 1992 – 2004; in Unit 20(E), the \$25 tag fee requirement was waived from 1984 – 1992, and excluding the portion of Unit 20(E) in the Yukon-Charlie Rivers National Preserve, from 2002 – 2004; the bag limit was increased to 1 bear per year in 1982 – 2003 and to 2 bears per year in 2004;

(xii) brown bear harvest in Unit 12 varied from a mean of 17 during 1966 – 1981, to 22 during 1982 – 1988, and to 18 during 1989 – 2002; in Unit 20(E) harvest varied from a mean of 3 during 1966 – 1981, to 19 during 1982 – 1988, and to 14 during 1989 – 2002;

(xiii) since 1971, harvest of bears in portions of Unit 12 may have resulted in reductions of brown bear numbers and maintenance at a reduced population size; in combination with a large fire and heavy trapping pressure on wolves, this may have resulted in improved calf survival;

(xiv) hunting and trapping of wolves in the area has not exceeded sustainable levels; 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;

(xv) in Unit 20(E), longer, less restrictive brown bear seasons and bag limits since 1982 have not resulted in harvest sufficient to reduce bear numbers, and moose calf survival remains low; a bag limit of 2 bears/year was adopted in 2004, but its potential to reduce the bear population is in question; if the bear population is to be reduced to achieve prey population objectives, other measures beyond increasing the bag limit and season length, as described in the Bear Conservation and Management Policy, will have to be employed.

ISSUE: The Alaska Board of Game requested ADF&G staff to prepare a wolf and/or brown bear predation control implementation plan for an Upper Yukon/Tanana predation control area. The Board's request was in response to testimony and proposals from the Upper Tanana/Fortymile Advisory Committee and the public at the Board's February-March 2004 meeting. At that meeting a great deal of concern was expressed about predation on moose and failure to achieve Intensive Management objectives. The intent of this proposed plan is to reduce

predation on moose and increase the number of moose available for human consumptive uses in Units 12 and 20(E) as required by the state Intensive Management law (A.S. 16.05.255(e)-(g)).

Moose populations in portions of Unit 12 and in all of Unit 20(E) have been at low densities since the late 1970's. The problem being addressed by the plan is long-term, chronically low moose populations that will likely remain in Low Density Dynamic Equilibrium indefinitely unless predation is reduced. In Unit 12, recent surveys indicate wolf and brown bear predation is likely an important factor maintaining that equilibrium. However, the relative importance of each predator in different sections of the unit is unclear. In Unit 20(E), research conducted during the 1980s and recent surveys indicate moose have been held at low densities by brown bear predation on calves and by wolf predation on all sex and age classes throughout the year.

Liberal seasons and bag limits for brown bears and wolves have not resulted in population reductions of either predator that would be sufficient to improve moose survival in most areas. The possible exception is brown bears in portions of Unit 12, where harvest appears to have reduced numbers.

Habitat availability or quality are likely not important factors limiting moose populations. Consistently high twinning rates have been observed during research projects in Unit 20E and during spring twinning surveys. In addition, large fires over the past 30 years have substantially improved overall moose habitat.

Restrictive moose hunting regulations since the 1970s have maintained a relatively stable harvest, within sustainable levels, despite increases in hunter demand. However, hunter demand is expected to continue increasing and moose populations may be declining. Even more restrictive regulations will likely be required over the next 2-4 years, including the possibility of allocation through Tier II permits, if calf and adult moose survival are not improved.

Intensive Management (IM) objectives for moose in these two units have not been achieved. The only possible exception is in Unit 12, where the IM population objective is 4,000–6,000 and the most recent estimate of 2,900–5,100 overlaps the range of the objective. However, the Unit 12 IM harvest objective is 250–450, while the reported harvest averaged only 127 during 1999–2003. In Unit 20(E) the IM objectives only apply to the Fortymile and Ladue River drainages. The population objective is 8,000–10,000 in these areas, while the most recent population estimate for all of Unit 20(E) is 4,000–4,800. The IM harvest objective for the Fortymile and Ladue River drainages is 500–1,000 and the reported harvest in all of Unit 20(E) averaged 148 during 1999–2003.

Progress will likely not be made towards achieving IM objectives unless moose survival is improved by reducing numbers of wolves and brown bears through a predator control program. The program should be focused in areas where: the contribution of each predator is most clearly understood; predator and prey populations can be monitored; the effort has the greatest potential for effectiveness (calving or wintering areas, depending on predator species); human use patterns and access indicate the greatest potential harvest of moose can be realized; and predators can be effectively reduced without jeopardizing their population viability. All of these factors will increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the program.

This proposed predation control implementation plan provides the framework for the Board to consider a program to initiate progress towards the IM objectives for moose in Units 12 and 20(E). The Division of Wildlife Conservation is committed to working with the Board and the public to review these plans through the Board process.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose populations in Units 12 and 20(E) will probably remain at low density and progress will not be made towards achieving IM population and harvest objectives.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Quality of the moose resource will be improved because more animals will likely be available for all user groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Consumptive users will benefit from increased harvest opportunity. Nonconsumptive users will benefit from enhanced opportunity to view and photograph moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Groups who are opposed to predator control will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Other solutions considered included: nonlethal predator control, additional restrictions on moose hunters, and liberalized predator hunting and trapping regulations.

PROPOSED BY: At the request of the Board of Game (HQ-02S-G-058)

STATEWIDE

Note: This proposal was deferred from the March 2004 meeting. It was previously listed as Proposal 22.

PROPOSAL 70 - 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)

Note: This proposal was deferred from the March 2004 meeting. It was previously listed as Proposal 28.

PROPOSAL 71 - 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)

Note: This proposal was deferred from the March 2004 meeting. It was previously listed as Proposal 31.

PROPOSAL 72 - 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)

Note: This proposal was deferred from the March 2004 meeting. It was previously listed as Proposal 32.

PROPOSAL 73 - 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)

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

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

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

