

Proposal 50

Public Proposal

Effect of Proposal :

Provide clarification for allowing guides to register additional guide use areas for taking predators, and to restrict the take of predators in those guide use areas as necessary.

Recommendation :

The department is neutral on the allocation of hunting opportunity between guided and unguided hunters. The board cannot adopt a regulation that is inconsistent with state statute – the desired change can only be made by the legislature.

Background

Proposal 50

- ▣ **AS 08.54.750(E) (e) Notwithstanding (b) of this section, a registered guide-outfitter who is registered in three guide use areas may also register for and conduct big game hunting services for wolf, black bear, brown bear, or grizzly bear in guide use areas within a game management unit or portion of a game management unit where the Board of Game has identified predation by wolf, black bear, brown bear, or grizzly bear as a cause of the depletion of a big game prey population or a reduction of the productivity of a big game prey population that is the basis for the establishment of an intensive management program in the game management unit or portion of the game management unit or for the declaration of the biological emergency in the game management unit or portion of the game management unit. A registered guide-outfitter may only conduct hunts in a guide use area under this subsection for the big game species identified by the Board of Game as the cause of the depletion or reduction of productivity of a big game prey population.**

Background

Proposal 50

- ▣ The statute (AS 08.54.750€) that allows guides to register additional guide use areas provides additional guiding opportunity for predator populations that limit prey species.
- ▣ Two boards (Board of Game, Big Game Commercial Services Board) and two departments (Fish and Game and Department of Community, Commerce, and Economic Development) have a role in implementation of this statute.
- ▣ Administrative changes in these government bodies over time affected how the statute has been applied.
- ▣ The statute limits the use of extra guide use areas to wolf, bear, and brown bear populations that occur within established predator control areas or are the basis for a biological emergency.

Background

Proposal 50

- ▣ This proposal would allow guides, who have registered additional guide use areas in Units with predator control programs to guide all species of predators in the additional area unless the board has made a specific exclusion for that predator in regulation.
- ▣ It is unlikely that the resulting increase in harvest of predators will have a positive effect on the status of the identified prey populations.
- ▣ As identified by the proposal, the application of this statute to all wolf and bear populations within a predator control area may not be desirable for all situations.
- ▣ The department recommends that the biological and social implications and the potential effect on management strategies for each areas be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Proposal 50

Public Proposal

Effect of Proposal :

Provide clarification for allowing guides to register additional guide use areas for taking predators, and to restrict the take of predators in those guide use areas as necessary.

Recommendation :

The department is neutral on the allocation of hunting opportunity between guided and unguided hunters. The board cannot adopt a regulation that is inconsistent with state statute – the desired change can only be made by the legislature.

Proposal 51

Public Proposal

Effect of Proposal :

If this proposal is adopted a predator control program's status would be activated or suspended at the turn of the regulatory year, July 1, instead of the calendar year, January.

Recommendation :

The department is neutral on when the activity status of a program is determined, provided that it is recognized that the decision to apply a program's predator reduction techniques may change as new information becomes available.

Background

Proposal 51

- ▣ This proposal addresses the ability of a guide to register for additional guide use areas in “active” IM program areas, which provide additional guiding opportunity for predator populations that limit prey species.
- ▣ The activity status of an IM program is defined in 5AAC92.116(C) and is currently determined based on the calendar year.
- ▣ Annually in December ADF&G issues a memo regarding IM program status to the Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development, which oversees guides and transporters, prior to the renewal of guide use area registration for the following year.
- ▣ If this proposal is adopted, the ADF&G would produce the same memo in June, six months earlier. This does not require a regulation change and can be done under the department’s administrative authority.

Background

Proposal 51

- ▣ IM programs are adopted in regulation for a specified period of time using an expiration date.
- ▣ Some programs are not implemented for a variety of reasons, including the suspension of a program after achieving the predator reduction objective.
- ▣ Identifying both active and inactive programs has been an important tool for describing program status and for determining the application of predator reduction techniques.
- ▣ The department recommends that the biological and social implications and the potential effect on management strategies for each areas be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Proposal 51

Public Proposal

Effect of Proposal :

If this proposal is adopted a predator control program's status would be activated or suspended at the turn of the regulatory year, July 1, instead of the calendar year, January.

Recommendation :

The department is neutral on when the activity status of a program is determined, provided that it is recognized that the decision to apply a program's predator reduction techniques may change as new information becomes available.

Proposal 52

Public Proposal

Effect of Proposal :

This proposal would eliminate nonresident hunting seasons for the target species, specifically moose and caribou, in an area that has a current Intensive Management (IM) Plan in regulation until the minimum IM objectives for the target prey species population size and or harvest are being met.

Recommendation :

The department is neutral on this proposal to allocate harvest to residents when the population is below IM objectives and a formal IM program is in regulation.

Background

Proposal 52

- ▣ IM programs are developed to meet population and harvest objectives for caribou, moose, or deer populations that have been identified as important for high levels of human consumptive use.
- ▣ During the program development process, the department prepares draft Feasibility Assessments and Operational Plans that are reviewed by the board.
- ▣ Codified regulations are adopted for programs that are feasible and have a reasonable chance of success.
- ▣ While many populations of moose, caribou, and deer have a positive IM finding, the majority do not have a formal IM program.

Background

Proposal 52

- ▣ This proposal only affects two of the three species the board has identified as important for providing high levels of human harvest.
- ▣ The department recommends that the board consider amending the proposal if adopted to include deer, or to specify why deer were not included.

Proposal 52

Public Proposal

Effect of Proposal :

This proposal would eliminate nonresident hunting seasons for the target species, specifically moose and caribou, in an area that has a current Intensive Management (IM) Plan in regulation until the minimum IM objectives for the target prey species population size and or harvest are being met.

Recommendation :

The department is neutral on this proposal to allocate harvest to residents when the population is below IM objectives and a formal IM program is in regulation.