

## **Hunting Permits & Harvest Tickets**

---

**PROPOSAL 24 – 5 AAC 92.044(10). Permit for hunting bear with the use of bait or scent lures.** Define the term “equipment” for bear baiting as follows:

5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting bear with the use of bait

(10) a permittee must remove bait, litter, and equipment from the bait station site when hunting is completed; **for the purposes of this section "equipment" is defined as barrels, tree stands, game cameras, and other items that may be left in the field for use at a bear bait station. Tree stands may be left in the field year-round with permission of the landowner or land manager.**

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** The Board of Game needs to define "equipment" as tree stands, game cameras, and other equipment that may be left in the field as hunting equipment.

The Department of Natural Resources has decided that all hunters will need a permit to leave a stand or camera in the field for more than 14 days in the same location, requiring a fee. We are hoping for an administrative resolution but this proposal is a placeholder in case there is not one reached.

**PROPOSED BY:** Aaron Bloomquist (EG-F17-103)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 25 – 5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets and reports.** Require harvest tickets for all brown bear hunts statewide as follows:

Create a harvest ticket for brown bear and require it to hunt them statewide.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** Brown bear/grizzlies are one of the premier game animals in Alaska and the Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) have no way of telling how many people actually hunt them every year. I think it is vital the ADF&G start keeping track of how many people hunt bears and how much effort is put in hunting them. With much milder winters we seem to have a growing bear population statewide. By tracking how many bears are being seen by hunters, how many are being harvested and how much effort is made to hunt them, ADF&G will have a lot better idea of what is going on out in the field and how to best manage them. We have a statewide requirement for black bear harvest tickets. I see no reason we shouldn't have one for brown bear.

**PROPOSED BY:** Dan Montgomery (EG-F17-069)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 26 – 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.** Animals harvested under auction and raffle permits will not count against the regular bag limit as follows:

Amend 5 AAC 92.050 to include a new subsection to read:

**Permits issued under AS 16.05.343 do not count against the regular bag limit for nonresidents or residents for any big game species.**

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?  
Auction and raffle big game tags (governor’s tags).**

I propose that the Alaska auction and raffle big game tags issued under Alaska Statute 16.05.343 not be subject to the normal bag limit regulations.

Auction and raffle big game tags are fundraisers for both the State of Alaska and for the nonprofit organization offering the tag. These tags are different and special and should not be subject to the normal bag limits of the general season, drawing, and registration types of hunts. This would apply to either one-year, four-year, ten-year, or lifetime bag limits, whichever applies to the species of big game tag being auctioned or raffled.

Auction and raffle tags should be treated differently and looked at as a separate means of obtaining a tag. For example, if the same person wanted to purchase the Unimak brown bear tag at auction every year, the way the system is now, he would not be able to do this, as he is held to the “one in four” brown bear bag limit rule. I believe a person should be able to buy the Unimak brown bear auction tag every year if he is able and desires to. Another example would be if a person wanted to purchase the Chugach Dall sheep tag but couldn’t because he is a nonresident and had hunted sheep in Alaska within the last four years.

Making auction and raffle tags not subject to the bag limit requirements for all “normal” tags would add substantial value to the tags. Both the state and the nonprofit organization would stand to benefit from this. Under 5 AAC 92.050 the Board of Game (board) has already authorized this for the Delta bison (Unit 20D) governor’s tag. We see no reason why the board could not include all governor’s tag permits issued under AS 16.05.343 for any species within this regulation.

**PROPOSED BY:** Frank Noska IV (HQ-F17-017)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 27 – 5 AAC 92.050(a) Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.** Modify the required permit hunt procedures for applying for drawing permits as follows:

5 AAC 92.050(a)(2) except as provided in 5 AAC 92.061 and 5 AAC 92.069, a person may not  
(A) apply for more than six drawing permit hunts for the same species per regulatory  
year[, WITH NO MORE THAN THREE FOR BULL MOOSE HUNTS];

...

5 AAC 92.050(a)(3) the commissioner shall void all applications by one person for more than six hunts for the same species, [OR THREE HUNTS FOR BULL MOOSE AS DESCRIBED IN (2)(A) OF THIS SUBSECTION,] and all applications by one person for more than one moose hunt for a nonresident in Unit 23;

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** In 2012 the Board of Game (board) increased the number of moose hunts applicants could apply for to six, but limited the number of bull hunts to three to encourage applicants to apply for antlerless hunts. When the board made the increase, the provision that required all applications be invalidated for that species remained in place, and the result was many applicants unknowingly invalidated all of their chances at any moose hunts.

The restriction on the number of bull moose hunts a person can apply for has resulted in a large number of invalidated applications. The recent change to allow applicants to apply for each hunt more than once exacerbated this problem to the point that corrective actions had to be taken.

The Department of Fish and Game believes the restriction is no longer necessary and requests the board consider removing the restriction. The original issue the board attempted to address in 2012 was undersubscribed antlerless moose hunts, and the department has started to identify those and submit proposals to change them to registration hunts where appropriate.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F17-028)

\*\*\*\*\*

*Note: The following proposal requests a change to a Board of Game Policy #2007-173-BOG. Although it does not propose a regulatory change, it is included in the proposal book for public comment for the board's consideration.*

**PROPOSAL 28 – 2007-173-BOG. Nonresident drawing permit allocation policy.** Modify the Board of Game nonresident drawing permit allocation policy as follows:

Possible new language: *“Allocations to nonresident hunters will be based on a subunit by subunit basis so that resident hunters always have a definitive hunting and harvest priority.”*

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?**  
**Nonresident Drawing Permit Allocation Policy.**

We ask that the Board of Game (board) review and revise the 2007-173-BOG finding that sets policy on how the board will allocate draw permits to nonresidents. The current language in the finding states that: *“Allocations will be determined on a case by case basis and will be based upon the historical data of nonresident and resident permit allocation over the past ten years.”*

This policy does not state if harvest data or participation data will be used, and is unclear what takes place for a new draw permit hunt where we have not had any previous “permit allocation” data.

Another concern is that if it is the board’s intent to use past historical harvest and/or participation data to determine nonresident allocations for future draw-permit hunts, in many cases—for Dall sheep, for example—nonresidents would end up receiving the majority of the permits.

In Unit 19C, the board has allowed unlimited nonresident sheep hunting opportunity for the past ten years, and nonresident hunters have taken up to 80% of the annual sheep harvest and make up more than half of all hunters. The current policy, if the board should ever put nonresidents on a draw-only permit hunt in Unit 19C, would give nonresidents a priority.

There was a moose draw permit hunt instituted in 2008 by the board (DM 809, 810, 811) in which nonresidents receive 50 percent of the permits. Should a proposal be submitted from resident hunters to reduce that nonresident allocation, the board’s current policy only ensures that unfair allocation to nonresident hunters be kept in place.

We would like the Board of Game to institute a new finding and policy on nonresident permit allocations that stipulates that residents will always receive a definitive harvest and participation priority over nonresidents.

**PROPOSED BY:** Resident Hunters of Alaska (EG-F17-075)  
\*\*\*\*\*

*Note: The Board of Game repealed this requirement at the February 2017 Interior/Northeast Arctic Region Meeting.*

**PROPOSAL 29 – 5 AAC 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit.** Remove the bag limit restriction for resident relatives accompanying nonresident relatives within the second degree of kindred as follows:

I ask the Board of Game to remove this "shared bag limit" restriction.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** I would like to address the newly adopted regulation, to have “shared bag limits” between residents and their second degree relative. Guides do not have a similar restriction placed on them during a hunting season, and will often guide more than one client successfully to harvest the same species within the same year. Not only are they allowed to have more than one successful client in a given year, they are also allowed their own bag limit. The “shared bag limit” rule only applies to two categories of people: residents of Alaska, and their nonresident kindred.

This regulation also lacks significant conservation basis. It is designed to specifically target the “guide-required” species such as sheep, and instances of “doubling up” on them are very rare indeed. Removing this possibility also removes the incredible memories of such a trip.

Perhaps much more importantly, this rule could be opening the door to future unintended regulations on Alaskan families. While many people may not care very much about limiting access to sheep hunting, opinions could be very different when these rules are extended to other species. Using the “shared bag limits” of the current guide-required species as an example, these

same rules may soon be applied to moose, caribou, etc. **If you believe in the amazing power of maintaining family bonds through shared hunting experiences, I beg you to be a proponent of keeping nonresident second degree kindred hunting rights intact, for all species of Alaska.**

**PROPOSED BY:** Chris Harper

(EG-F17-053)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 30 – 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures, and 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit.** Allow nonresident hunters to harvest brown bear, sheep or goat on behalf of their Alaska resident second degree of kindred relative’s permit as follows:

5 AAC 92.050(a) is amended to read:

(a) The following conditions and procedures for permit issuance apply to each permit hunt:

(1) the applicant or the applicant’s agent shall complete the application form; two hunters may apply as a party in a drawing permit hunt, and if drawn, both applicants will receive a permit; a permit application that is incomplete, or that does not include, if required, an Alaska big game hunting license number, or that contains a false statement, is void; the applicant must obtain or apply for an Alaska big game hunting license before submitting a drawing permits application; and

(A) to apply for a drawing permit hunt, for any hunt that requires a registered or master guide, a nonresident or a nonresident alien must contract a qualified registered guide or master guide as their agent to submit the application and provide hunting services; the contracting registered guide or master guide, shall provide, at the time of application, their current unique verification code that has been issued to them pursuant to 12 AAC 75.260(d);

**(B) in a drawing permit hunt for brown bear, grizzly bear, mountain goat, or sheep where there is no resident draw for that species in that area** the requirement in 5 AAC 92.050(a)(1)(A) does not apply if the applicant is a nonresident and will be accompanied by a resident over 19 years of age who is a spouse or a relative within the second degree of kindred, as described in AS 16.05.407(a);

**(C) in a drawing permit hunt for brown bear, grizzly bear, mountain goat, or sheep where there is a resident draw for that species in that area a nonresident that will be accompanied by a resident over 19 years of age who is a spouse or a relative within the second degree of kindred, as described in AS 16.05.407(a), may not apply for a drawing permit;**

...

(F) an individual who is a successful applicant for a specific drawing permit hunt is ineligible to apply for a **drawing** permit for that specific hunt the following year **except a resident individual may apply for a drawing permit for that specific hunt the following year**

**when a nonresident who is a spouse or relative within the second degree of kindred, as described in AS 16.05.407(a), takes a brown bear, grizzly bear, mountain goat, or sheep under the resident's drawing permit as described in 5 AAC 92.130(k) for that specific hunt;**

...

(4) permit issuance:

5 AAC 92.130 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

**(k) a brown bear, grizzly bear, mountain goat, or sheep may be taken by a nonresident under the drawing permit of a resident relative when personally accompanied by that resident relative, as described in AS 16.05.407(a)(2) and will count as the bag limit of the nonresident only.**

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** The intent of this proposal is to allow a nonresident hunter to harvest a brown bear, sheep, or goat on behalf of their Alaska resident second degree of kindred relative's permit. This would be done similar to the way a youth, under the age of ten, is allowed to harvest big game on behalf of another licensed hunter, however, the nonresident relative's harvest WOULD NOT count against the resident's bag limit. There are several brown bear, sheep, and goat permit hunts in the state that offer extremely restricted nonresident participation, however, under this proposal, the nonresident hunter who is hunting on behalf of his Alaska resident second degree of kindred relative's permit would still be able to participate in the hunt. The intent is not that the permit be transferred to the nonresident, but that the harvest would be done using the Alaska resident's hunt permit by either the resident or their bonafide family member.

Since the nonresident hunter who is hunting for either brown bear, sheep, or goats with a second degree of kindred resident relative would be harvesting the animal on behalf of the resident relative's permit, the nonresident does not need to apply for a drawing permit for brown bear, sheep, or goats and would be prohibited from doing so. They would still be allowed to apply for all other drawing permits.

The nonresident would still be required to purchase a nonresident hunting license and the appropriate big game tag.

When a nonresident harvested a brown bear, sheep, or goat on behalf of an Alaska resident second degree of kindred relative's permit, the harvest WOULD NOT count against the bag limit of the Alaska resident. The Alaska resident would still be able to harvest the same species under a general season tag where available in the same regulatory year. The Alaska resident WOULD BE allowed to apply for the same permit hunt the next year.

**We also request that the any harvest of brown bear, sheep, or goat by a nonresident hunter on behalf of their Alaska resident second degree of kindred relative's permit be tracked on the Hunt Report Card.**

This proposal DOES NOT affect the harvest of non-guide required species, i.e. moose, caribou, elk, black bear, deer, etc...

This proposal is not designed as a restriction. This proposal is designed to offer benefits to residents wishing to hunt with their nonresident relatives while clarifying allocations for hunts that offer extremely limited opportunities for nonresident participation.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Professional Hunters Association (EG-F17-102)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 31 – 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.**

Establish a preference point system for drawing hunts as follows:

Review and change the actual computer methodology of drawing hunt permits to incorporate the concepts of fairness given below. Specifically incorporate the concept that no one could draw more than one hunt before all applicants had a chance to draw and some type of preference for those who failed to draw in any given year. Also incorporate a preference for Alaskan residents in the drawing hunts similar to what other states do for their residents. These concepts should not be difficult to incorporate into a computer program.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** The current drawing hunt permit methodology could be better. There are instances where one individual will be drawn for several hunts in a single year while other applicants do not get drawn at all. In some cases, recipients of multiple hunts cannot use all of the hunts they have been awarded because those hunts overlap. About ten (or so) years ago the Board of Game passed a provision for bonus or preference points for drawing hunts but that was ignored by ADF&G or dropped as being impractical. I believe the entire drawing hunt system should be reviewed and changed. It would not be difficult to be certain that no individual was drawn for more than one hunt until everyone had drawn and there were unsubscribed hunts remaining at which point second or even third computer runs could award additional hunts to applicants who had already drawn one or more hunts. In addition, a priority system should be established so that individuals who had failed to draw anything in previous years would have increased opportunity to draw in future years. Resident hunters should receive some percentage preference in the drawing hunts as is done in nearly all other states that have drawing permit hunts.

**PROPOSED BY:** John Frost (EG-F17-086)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 32 – 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.**

Establish a bonus point system for bison and muskox drawing hunts as follows:

I suggest the Board of Game come up with a bonus point system for both bison and muskox similar to many of the western states. Each year an individual does not get drawn, he or she will get a bonus point. The following year, the hunter will get his or her name in the hat twice instead of once. Every unsuccessful year an application is submitted, the hunter gets his or her name in the hat an equal number of times to unsuccessful attempts. Individuals may be able to apply for a

hunt after he or she will be the age ten or older at the time of the hunt. Bonus points will be lost after someone successfully draws the hunt or the species is not applied for two consecutive years.

Bonus points allow everyone a chance to win but is weighted toward individuals who have been applying longer. Bonus points also help the state to generate more income since it encourages individuals to have the maximum points possible. Most western states make millions from applications alone.

Within this system, the Alaskan resident would have a large preference to our wildlife resources (bison and muskox). Currently, Alaskan residents have no preference for muskox or bison in the drawing applications. This proposal would allow a strong preference to residents, potentially limiting nonresidents to only one tag every two to three years depending on the data and what the Board of Game decides. A nonresident should never have an equal or close to equal opportunity to a limited wildlife resource where the Alaskan resident draw odds are greater than 1%.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** Draw-only permit hunts for both residents and nonresidents reflect a need to limit the number of hunters afield for reasons that could be related to conservation, trophy-quality, hunt aesthetics, crowding etc. Whatever the rationale for a draw-only hunt for all user groups, and whatever the species, resident hunters should have a clear and substantial priority to draw a permit and an opportunity to hunt. Resident hunters don't currently have that preference. Currently, we have bison and muskox draw-only hunts for both residents and nonresidents that allow equal opportunity for a nonresident to draw a permit. Examples are: DI 403 and DX 001. If an individual hunter lives in Alaska, Florida, Montana, or Texas, each individual hunter has equal odds to our extremely limited Alaskan resource. The DI 403 Delta bison permit had 14,126 applicants for 50 permits in 2016 for a percent chance of drawing for all applicants. The DX 001 Nunivak Island muskox permit had 860 applicants for ten permits in 2016 for a one percent chance of drawing. These rare and highly sought after draw permit hunts should not allow nonresidents an equal opportunity to draw. Currently, the nonresident draw percentage for Delta bison is about one percent. That is the same odds of drawing as a resident. That is not fair to the resident hunter who has been putting in for decades for that permit, who lives here and contributes all year to the economy, and does not have reciprocal hunting opportunities in any of the western states.

**PROPOSED BY:** Brad Sparks (EG-F17-088)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 33 – 5 AAC 92.069. Special provisions for moose drawing permit hunts.** Establish a ten percent nonresident moose drawing permit allocation as follows:

Where we currently have or in future may have draw-only permit hunts for both residents and nonresidents for moose, the nonresident allocations should reflect constitutional intent to maximize the benefit to resident Alaskans and be no more than “**up to ten percent maximum**” of the available number of permits.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?**



**Draw permit allocations for moose when both residents and nonresidents are restricted to draw-only permit hunts.**

Draw-only permit hunts for both residents and nonresidents reflect a need to limit the number of hunters afield for reasons that could be related to conservation, trophy-quality, hunt aesthetics, crowding etc.

Whatever the rationale for a draw-only hunt for all user groups, resident hunters should have a clear and substantial priority to draw a permit and an opportunity to hunt. Resident hunters don't currently have that preference for moose statewide.

Many draw-only moose permit hunts allow an equal opportunity for nonresidents to apply for a set number of permits. Other hunts allocate from 25 to 50 percent of available moose draw permits to nonresidents. These types of allocations often take place in units where the Board of Game has a positive finding for customary and traditional uses of moose that goes hand in hand with state law that declares that "the taking of moose...by residents for personal or family consumption has preference over taking by nonresidents."

This type of allocation of moose hunting opportunity to nonresident hunters does not in any way comport with requirements in our state constitution to manage our wildlife resources for the common use and maximum benefit of Alaskans. Whatever label is attached to a moose hunt (e.g. subsistence, sport, trophy), residents should have a clear and substantial priority opportunity to participate in that hunt.

**PROPOSED BY:** Resident Hunters of Alaska (EG-F17-077)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 34 – 5 AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep drawing permit hunts; 92.061. Special provisions for Unit 8 brown bear permit hunts; 92.069. Special provisions for moose drawing permit hunts; and 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.** In drawing hunts with a separate allocation for residents and nonresidents, all nonresident permits will be issued from the nonresident allocation as follows:

All nonresidents shall be placed in the nonresident pool of drawing tags for hunts with a separate allocation to nonresidents and residents.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?  
Nonresident second degree of kindred in resident drawing pools.**

Alaska's must-be-guided law (AS 16.05.407/408) was created in 1967, and would not have passed without the inclusion to allow nonresident hunters to hunt with a resident relative within second degree of kindred (2DK) in lieu of having to hire a guide.

The guide industry has pushed for years to separate out 2DK hunters from guided hunters and in some cases, like Kodiak, the nonresident 2DK hunters are in the resident pool of tags. All nonresident hunters should be treated equally according to our must-be-guided law. All

nonresident hunters should be in the same pool of nonresident tags under draw permit hunts with a separate allocation to nonresidents.

Regardless of the level of 2DK hunters for must-be-guided species, a nonresident hunter is a nonresident hunter, period. Alaska’s must-be-guided law never intended for one class of nonresident hunters (2DK) to be singled out and separated from the other (guided). There is currently a push by the guide industry to remove the 2DK provision with a new regulation eliminating 2DK nonresident tags entirely; all 2DK hunters in the future will only be allowed to hunt with a resident relative who has drawn a resident tag. The resident relative would essentially forfeit his or her tag and give it to their nonresident relative. That would be worse than putting all 2DK nonresident hunters in the resident pool of tags because it would prevent a resident and nonresident 2DK hunter from both drawing a tag and both having an opportunity to harvest an animal together.

Again, this is not what our must-be-guided law intended. Legislators realized that most nonresidents hunting must-be-guided species would hire a guide. They included the 2DK provision not as a benefit to certain nonresidents over others, but as a way of carrying on family hunting traditions and opportunities. 2DK hunters should never be dependent on a resident relative to put in and draw a tag in order to hunt with them in Alaska. A nonresident 2DK hunter should be given the same opportunity to draw a tag as a nonresident guided hunter, within the nonresident pool of tags.

Treat all nonresidents equally as our must-be-guided law intended.

**PROPOSED BY:** Resident Hunters of Alaska (EG-F17-100)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 35 – 5 AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep drawing permit hunts; 92.061. Special provisions for Unit 8 brown bear permit hunts; 92.069. Special provisions for moose drawing permit hunts; and 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.** Allow nonresidents and residents to apply as a party for hunts having separate permits for residents and nonresidents as follows:

My proposal is that for any such drawing with separate permit codes for residents/nonresidents, hunters be allowed to apply as a party regardless of residency status. A pair of hunters consisting of one resident and one nonresident will only be issued those respective permits if, when their draw number is reached, there is still at least one tag available for both the resident and nonresident in their respective allocative pools. This should apply not only to Unit 14C, but any drawing hunts statewide that separate resident and nonresident permit pools.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** There are certain drawing hunts that designate allocation amounts to residents and nonresidents, but are effectively the same hunt (locations, dates, methods, etc.). They sometimes have separate hunts codes for each, such as the Dall sheep permits in Unit 14C. This removes the ability of any resident-nonresident pair of hunters to submit a “party application” in hopes of hunting together in those areas.

**PROPOSED BY:** Chris Harper (EG-F17-054)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 36 – 5 AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep and mountain goat drawing permit hunts.** Change nonresident general sheep hunts to drawing permit hunts with a ten percent permit allocation cap as follows:

In areas where general season sheep hunting opportunity is allowed for both residents and nonresidents, limit all nonresident sheep hunters to draw-only hunts.

Set allocations so that participation rates of nonresidents do not exceed ten percent of the total participation rates of residents in any individual subunit, based on the last three years of historical data.

This solution will benefit the sheep resource and all resident sheep hunters if adopted.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?**

**Unlimited nonresident sheep hunting opportunity and high nonresident sheep harvest rates.**

This proposal follows a decade of proposals from resident hunters asking the Alaska Board of Game (board) to limit nonresident sheep hunters. The nonresident harvest rates of 60-80 percent of our Dall sheep in some areas of the state and the problems associated with that level of nonresident mostly-guided competition are well known to the board. The board has continually stalled taking any action on resident hunter proposals to address these problems while publicly testifying in complete agreement that these problems exist and are harming resident hunters.

These problems don't occur in all areas of the state but the board has made it clear that any solutions must be statewide in nature and not through regional proposals that seek to deal with the problems on a subunit by subunit basis.

All along the board has said that the problem is not one of too many nonresident sheep hunters, most of whom must hire a guide, rather it was a problem of "too many guides," and thus the board only supports the guide-industry preferred solution to limit guides. This "Guide Concession Program" that would be under the auspices of the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) has already cost the state a half-million dollars in planning and meetings, and finally as it made its way through the legislature with yet still a million-dollar fiscal note, it did not pass out of committee. It has not been revived and with our current budget situation it is a non-starter. The guide industry has been lobbying the legislature for one million dollars in federal funds to start up the Guide Concession Program, and we simply cannot believe that yet again guides are asking for a subsidy from not only Alaskan taxpayers, but now from every American citizen.

The Board of Game has claimed for nearly ten years that the Guide Concession Program is their preferred solution. And the board still alludes they will wait for the concession program to be implemented before putting nonresident sheep hunters on draw hunts with a limited allocation. In the face of known problems we ask again for the board to act to protect the resource and give resident sheep hunters the hunting priority our constitution demands.

**This proposal is exactly what the Department of Natural Resources Recommended as an alternative to the Guide Concession Program (GCP).**

From DNR Alternatives:

*“The first BOG alternative to the GCP is for the board to further restrict non-resident hunting opportunity. This could be accomplished by expanding the drawing and/or registration permit systems for non-residents, while simultaneously reducing or eliminating non-resident general harvest seasons and bag limits. This alternative would help to address the issues of quality of experience and conflicts between users by decreasing the number of non-resident hunters in the field. It may also address wildlife conservation concerns in cases where overharvest is an issue.”*

**PROPOSED BY:** Resident Hunters of Alaska (EG-F17-079)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 37 – 5 AAC 92.008(5). Harvest guideline levels.** Limit nonresident sheep harvest to no more than ten percent of total harvest per subunit as follows:

Amend 92.008 by adding a new subsection to read:

**(5) Dall sheep: the annual harvest of Dall sheep by nonresident hunters shall be managed so that in any given three-year period the average annual harvest does not exceed 10 percent of the total sheep harvest for any individual subunit.**

All nonresident sheep hunts will be draw-only hunts with an allocation set subunit by subunit under 5 AAC 92.008 so that harvest levels do not exceed ten percent of the total sheep harvest per subunit based on using the last three years of historical harvest data.

This solution will benefit the sheep resource and all resident sheep hunters if adopted.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?**

**Unlimited nonresident sheep hunting opportunity and high nonresident sheep harvest rates.**

This proposal follows a decade of proposals from resident hunters asking the Alaska Board of Game (board) to limit nonresident sheep hunters. The nonresident harvest rates of 60-80 percent of our Dall sheep in some areas of the state and the problems associated with that level of nonresident mostly-guided competition are well known to the board. The board has continually stalled taking any action on resident hunter proposals to address these problems while publicly testifying in complete agreement that these problems exist and are harming resident hunters.

These problems don't occur in all areas of the state but the board has made it clear that any solutions must be statewide in nature and not through regional proposals that seek to deal with the problems on a subunit by subunit basis.

All along the board has said that the problem is not one of too many nonresident sheep hunters, most of whom must hire a guide, rather it was a problem of “too many guides,” and thus the

board only supports the guide-industry preferred solution to limit guides. This “Guide Concession Program” would be under the auspices of the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and has already cost the state nearly a half-million dollars in planning and meetings, and finally as it made its way through the legislature with yet still a million-dollar fiscal note, it did not pass out of committee. It has not been revived and with our current budget situation it is a non-starter. The guide industry has been lobbying the legislature and our congressional delegation for one million dollars in federal funds to start up the Guide Concession Program, and we simply cannot believe that yet again guides are asking for a subsidy from not only Alaskan taxpayers, but now from every American citizen.

The Board of Game has claimed for nearly ten years that the Guide Concession Program is their preferred solution. Let’s stop waiting for something that is so costly and unlikely to be implemented. In the face of known problems we ask again for the board to act to protect the resource and give resident sheep hunters the hunting priority our constitution demands.

**This Proposal is exactly what the Department of Natural Resources Recommended as an Alternative to the Guide Concession Program (GCP)**

From DNR Alternatives:

*“The second BOG [Board of Game] alternative to the GCP is for the board to establish a specific harvest level for non-resident hunters. The BOG would allocate a percentage of the harvestable surplus, such as 10%, to non-residents, potentially statewide and for all species, and the vehicle for this system would likely be drawing permits. This is different than the first alternative in that the allocation to non-residents would be fixed at a percentage of surplus rather than just reducing opportunity as needed.”*

**PROPOSED BY:** Resident Hunters of Alaska (EG-F17-074)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 38 – 5 AAC 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit.** Implement a sliding scale bag limit for Dall sheep hunting for residents as follows:

I propose a resident sliding scale harvest based on age of the ram harvested such as: A Resident Ram Harvest Age Index. If a harvested ram is ten years or older, the hunter may hunt sheep the following year. If the ram is nine years old, the hunter cannot hunt sheep the following year (sits out a year). If the ram is eight years old, the hunter cannot hunt sheep for the next two years (seasons). If the ram is seven years old, the hunter cannot hunt sheep for three years. If the ram is six years or younger, the hunter cannot hunt sheep for five years. In each case, age is the criterion for when they may get a tag to hunt sheep again, regardless of whether it is full curl or not. Full curl would still apply for a legal sheep and because of the sliding scale penalizing hunters for taking younger rams even though legal by full curl standards or the eight annuli requirements, hunters would be more selective in order to be able to hunt without a break. This does not directly diminish hunter opportunity, but requires hunters to select towards older rams that are more likely to succumb to winter mortality.

The positives from such a system are: 1. Creates more selectivity, 2. Leaves more sheep on the mountain, 3. Encourages shooting older rams, 4. Strongly discourages shooting of sub-legal and younger rams, 5. Those that choose to harvest a young ram that is legal by full curl standards, shoot knowing that if it has less than ten annuli, they will have to sit out X number of years depending on the age of the ram. This will help towards leaving more mature rams on the mountain and allow some rams that become large at a younger age to possibly survive another year or two. 6. It still allows opportunity based on choice by the hunter and may help with crowding since some will be sitting out for having harvested a younger ram. 7. It could also be managed such that when a hunter harvests a sub-legal ram which is his first ram ever harvested, he could keep the ram provided it was over 7/8 curl and at least seven years of age. This is more lenient than the current regulation, but would only apply for a hunter's first ram. This would cut down on litigation for the state, help keep from having rams left in the field, create better relations with new hunters and at the same time be restrictive since they will have to sit out a number of years based on the ram's age. To further cut down on hunters leaving sheep in the field, convicted offenders of such an offense would receive a lifetime ban on hunting Dall sheep in Alaska.

If this Age Index Harvest Scale seems too harsh, the age side could be slid up one notch to read: If a hunter harvests a nine year or older ram, the hunter would be eligible to hunt sheep the following year, etc., but I personally would prefer the original scale. If this scale approach appears to have merit, relaxing it would be better than discarding it altogether.

Finally, and this has nothing to do with this proposal, but does address nonresidents harvesting fewer rams than they currently harvest, which is 45% some years. It is time that the GCP (Guide Concession Program) be resurrected and supported by such organizations as RHAK (Resident Hunters of Alaska), APHA (Alaska Professional Hunter's Association) and WSF (Wild Sheep Foundation), and get HB 158 passed. This would give the needed control of too many guides in an area and unlimited harvest by nonresidents. I believe the only way to avert going to an all draw for sheep is to go to the age index I am proposing and having a Guide Concession Program. If we do nothing and go to an all-draw for sheep, everyone loses. Nonresidents will go to a percentage allocation and residents will seldom draw the area they really would like to hunt. We have all been too selfish and the time has come to act responsibly for the sake of the resource and quit being greedy.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** The issue is harvesting too many young and marginally legal rams yearly; both resident and nonresident hunters. Our sheep populations are significantly diminished mainly due to changes in weather that causes melting and refreezing icing conditions in the winter. Our harvest levels have steadily fallen to less than 50% of harvests in the late 80s into the early 90s. The fight has become a resident vs. nonresident harvest issue. Neither side seems willing to give to help keep more sheep on the mountain. Since residents comprise 90% of sheep hunters in the field and I believe that most sheep hunters really want a quality older ram, why not raise the standard by which they are harvested; somewhat like is done in many moose areas? Hunters would become more selective.

**PROPOSED BY:** Lewis Bradley (EG-F17-027)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 39 – 5 AAC 5 AAC 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit.** Implement a sliding scale bag limit for Dall sheep hunting for residents and nonresidents as follows:

**5 AAC 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit**

Modify the statewide Dall sheep bag limit as follows

**(k) Statewide Dall sheep bag limit, unless otherwise provided in 5 AAC 85-92:**

**One “full-curl ram” ten years old or older annually, however, if the ram taken is under ten years old**

	<u>Years off from sheep hunting</u>	
	<u>Residents</u>	<u>Nonresidents</u>
<u>9 year old</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>8 year old</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>7 year old</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>6 years or younger</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>Any sub legal</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>lifetime</u>

**Sublegal is determined by ADF&G staff and does not require criminal charges.**

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** Virtually all sheep hunters agree that it is advantageous to have more older rams on the mountain. I would ask the Board of Game to implement a "sliding scale" bag limit for Dall sheep statewide, except areas where the bag limit is "any ram". This scale would encourage the take of older rams and greatly discourage the take of any sheep close to sublegal.

An alternative would be to only implement the sublegal portion of this proposal which would be much simpler. Reported sublegal harvest has held steady around ten percent for years. There is also a significant portion of rams that are sublegal that are not charged criminally. These rams could have consequences under this system if the district attorney does not decide to charge or ADF&G decides not to forward for charges. I would suggest a panel of at least three ADF&G employees determine these cases.

**PROPOSED BY:** Aaron Bloomquist

(EG-F17-105)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 40 – 5 AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep and mountain goat drawing permit hunts.** Allow nonresidents that have successfully harvested a Dall sheep in the last three years to apply for Dall sheep permits annually as follows:

I propose that if any hunter currently under the “one sheep every four regulatory years” restriction be allowed to apply for and be included in the drawing for Dall sheep drawing permits. This will need to be an additional section under 5 AAC 92.057, to provide clarity in this unique situation.

If this proposal is accepted by the Board of Game, there are several important points to consider:

The majority of the time, as proven by my friends and family, this will simply result in monetary donation and funding to ADF&G, as the odds remain low of actually drawing a permit. Denying this proposal would result in some lost revenue to ADF&G.

An option for the board to consider on this proposal:

If a permit is successfully drawn within this window, the hunter will only be issued the permit if he or she voluntarily gives up all other big game hunting rights in Alaska that year. This would allow for a dream hunt to occur, while reducing competition for all other hunts.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** I would like to address the inability of a few nonresident hunters to apply for highly coveted Dall sheep permits. According to the most recent Drawing Permit Hunt Supplement, the odds of successfully drawing a permit for Dall sheep remain very low. The majority of these permits have drawing odds between zero and five percent. Except for the lucky few, these tags for most people are either once-in-a-lifetime, or never-in-a-lifetime. Therefore, everyone should be able to apply for these highly coveted tags.

The only people who are excluded from this, I believe, are those nonresidents who successfully harvested a sheep in Alaska in the prior three years. Residents who have successfully taken sheep are not excluded from applying. Just because a hunter has had success in the past, he or she should not be excluded from a potential opportunity of a lifetime.

**PROPOSED BY:** Chris Harper (EG-F17-052)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 41 – 5 AAC 92.012. Licenses and tags.** Exempt rural subsistence hunters from the requirements for obtaining a waterfowl conservation tag as follows:

The Native Caucus of the Alaska Migratory Bird Co-Management Council (AMBCC) would like the Alaska Board of Game to consider establishing an exemption from the regulation requiring all hunters under the age of 18 to purchase an Alaska Waterfowl Conservation Tag (State Duck Stamp). This would exempt rural Alaska subsistence hunters from having to purchase the waterfowl conservation tag in order to participate in the federal spring-summer subsistence harvest season for migratory birds.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** The Native Caucus of the Alaska Migratory Bird Co-Management Council (AMBCC) requests that the board exercise its authority under Alaska Statute 16.05.340 to promulgate a regulation exempting people who live in eligible areas (as defined by 50 C.F.R. § 92.5(a)) and who engage in subsistence hunting of migratory birds from the requirement that they obtain a state waterfowl conservation tag, or duck stamp, for waterfowl hunting for the subsistence harvest season for migratory birds. In the alternative, the Native Caucus requests the board take any action within its power to exempt



subsistence hunters from having to obtain a state duck stamp in order to participate in the subsistence harvest of migratory birds.

Under AS 16.05.340(a)(17)(B), the board can by regulation exempt the requirement of a waterfowl conservation tag for waterfowl hunting in areas of the state not likely to benefit from the programs described in AS 16.05.130(b)(2)-(4).

AS 16.05.130(b)(2)-(4) provides that money accruing to the state from waterfowl conservation tag fees from hunters may not be diverted to a purpose other than...

(2) the acquisition, by lease or otherwise, of wetlands that are important for waterfowl and public use of waterfowl in the state;

(3) waterfowl related projects approved by the Commissioner;

(4) the administration of the waterfowl conservation program...

In 2014, Congress amended the Duck Stamp Act to exempt the customary and traditional subsistence harvest of migratory waterfowl in Alaska from the Act's requirements that all hunters purchase and carry federal duck stamps. Federal law now exempts rural Alaskan residents engaged in subsistence uses of migratory waterfowl from having to obtain a federal duck stamp. *See* 16 U.S.C. § 718a(a)(2)(D). Given the preemptive nature of federal law over the management and regulation of migratory birds, state laws and regulations should be consistent with those federal requirements, and should not require obtaining a state duck stamp in order to engage in subsistence uses of migratory waterfowl.

Furthermore, included areas within Alaska where subsistence migratory bird hunting is allowed under 50 C.F.R. § 92.5(a) will not benefit from the programs described in AS 16.05.130(b)(2)-(4).

Finally, requiring that subsistence users obtain a state duck stamp is inconsistent with the subsistence way of life and customary subsistence practices. Alaska native hunters have long viewed the subsistence harvest of migratory birds and their eggs as a community tradition, as people often hunt or egg together as a family, and community members often hunt and egg for other community members who cannot. Migratory birds and their eggs are widely shared and distributed throughout the community, as well. Requiring the purchase of a duck stamp in order to participate is alien to these customary and traditional harvests.

Compliance with this requirement also places an extra administrative burden upon subsistence users, many of whom live in remote areas, and creates a financial hardship for those who can least afford it. The requirement is also inconsistent with customary and traditional practices.

Unless the board takes action, the customary and traditional harvest of migratory birds and their eggs will be deprived of an important part of its customary and traditional character, as hunters and egg gatherers find themselves subjected to a regulatory requirement that makes little sense in the context of this unique harvest.

**PROPOSED BY:** Native Caucus of the Alaska Migratory Bird Co-Management Council  
(EG-F17-083)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 42 – 5 AAC 92.069. Special provisions for moose drawing permit hunts; 92.XXX. New regulation.** Remove the nonresident guide requirement for moose and black bear hunts as follows:

Remove moose and black bear from the list of must-be-guided species.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?**  
**Remove moose and black bear from the list of must-be-guided species under AS 16.05.407.**

The Board of Game (board), without legislative approval, has added moose and black bear to the list of must-be-guided species for nonresidents in certain parts of the state under AS 16.05.407.

The legislature never intended for the board to have the authority to add species to the must-be-guided list. When the board has done this, it is essentially a separate allocation to guides that often negatively affects resident hunter opportunity.

A prime example is the must-be-guided requirement for moose for the DM 809/810/811 Upper Nowitna draw permit hunt. The board in 2008 passed a proposal from a guide with exclusive rights to guide in the Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge that allocated half of the permits to nonresident hunters, with 70% of the nonresident permits required to hire that specific guide. A 50% allocation to nonresident moose hunters for any moose draw permit in Alaska is completely unacceptable. And it only happened because of the must-be-guided requirement for moose in that area.

The board has also added black bear to the list of must-be-guided species in parts of southeast Alaska, using conservation as a rationale for doing so when the board has the authority and duty to limit all nonresident black bear hunters if there is a conservation concern.

The addition of moose and black bear to the list of must-be-guided species is a subsidy to guides that sets a bad precedent that can harm resident opportunities and lock up access to areas where guides are guaranteed this new client base.

**PROPOSED BY:** Resident Hunters of Alaska (EG-F17-078)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 43 – 5 AAC 92.011. Taking of game by proxy.** Allow the taking of emperor geese by proxy hunting as follows:

We request the Board of Game allow proxy hunting under this section for emperor geese statewide.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** In 2017, the fall-winter hunt of emperor geese is opened to all Alaska residents following over 30 years of closure. The State of Alaska was allotted an annual statewide harvest quota of 1,000 birds under the federal framework. The Board of Game (board) divided the statewide quota into smaller individual quotas in each of seven hunt areas across the range of emperor geese. The fall-winter hunt is administered as a registration permit hunt that allows the harvest and possession of one emperor goose per hunter per season. Registration permits are dispensed on-demand and hunt areas will be closed by emergency order when quotas are achieved.

Despite the fall-winter hunt being opened to all Alaska residents, regulations do not contain a provision for individuals that are incapable of participating in the emperor goose hunt because of their age or physical disability. Current regulation would allow a hunter to gift their emperor goose to another individual, but at a cost of forfeiting their one bird allowed for the season.

The Native Caucus of the Alaska Migratory Bird Co-Management Council (AMBCC) requests the board permit proxy hunting of emperor geese. This would allow both a proxy hunter and beneficiary the opportunity to obtain an emperor goose. A resident hunter holding a valid hunting license may take specified game for another resident who is blind, physically disabled, or 65 years of age or older, as authorized by Alaska Statute 16.05.405 and 5 AAC 92.011.

**PROPOSED BY:** Native Caucus of the Alaska Migratory Bird Co-Management Council  
(EG-F17-047)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 44 – 5 AAC 92.011. Taking of game by proxy.** Allow the take of moose by proxy in moose hunts having antler restrictions as follows:

Allow proxy hunting for antler restricted bull moose hunts statewide.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** The statewide elimination of proxy hunting for antler restricted bull moose hunts has had the unintended consequence of eliminating an important Alaskan cultural tradition of harvesting game for family and friends that need assistance. While proxy hunting may not be right for all antler restricted bull moose hunts, it would be very helpful in some units where the majority of moose are taken in antler restricted general season hunts. In particular, if proxy hunting were once again allowed in the Unit 13 general season moose hunt, there would be significantly less interest in the community hunt structure which allows open designated hunting amongst community members.

The statewide regulation should be changed back to allow for proxy hunting in all antler restricted bull moose hunts. If proxy hunting is not wanted in some units or regions, it should be eliminated on a unit by unit basis.

**PROPOSED BY:** Rebecca Schwanke  
(EG-F17-110)

\*\*\*\*\*