

# MEMORANDUM

## State of Alaska Department of Law

TO: Kristy Tibbles  
Executive Director  
Alaska Board of Game

DATE: March 19, 2025

FILE NO:

FROM: Cheryl Rawls Brooking *CB*  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
Kimberly Del Frate *AD*  
Assistant Attorney General  
Natural Resources Section  
Department of Law

TEL. NO: 269-5232

SUBJECT: March 2025  
Statewide  
Board of Game meeting

### GENERAL COMMENTS

**In general, ethics disclosures:** Before staff reports begin on any new agenda item, or, if preferred, at the very beginning of the meeting, Ethics Act disclosures and determinations must be made under AS 39.52.

**In general, record-making:** It is very important that Board members carefully explain and clearly summarize on the record the reasons for their actions and the grounds upon which the actions are based. The Alaska Supreme Court has stressed the importance of a clear record to facilitate the courts in determining that the Board's actions are within its authority and are reasonable. A clear record also assists the public in understanding the Board's rationale. If Board members summarize the reasons for their actions before they vote, it will help establish the necessary record.

In considering each proposal, and the specific requirements that apply in some cases, such as with the subsistence law, it is important that the Board thoroughly discuss and summarize on the record the basis and reasons for its actions. Consistency with past approaches is another important point for discussion. If a particular action does not appear to be consistent, Board members should discuss their reasons for a different approach.

The Alaska Administrative Procedure Act requires that State agencies, including the Board of Game, "[w]hen considering the factual, substantive, and other relevant matter, ... pay special attention to the cost to private persons of the proposed regulatory action." AS 44.62.210(a). This requirement to pay special attention to costs means, at a minimum, that the Board should address any information presented about costs, or explicitly state that no such information was presented, during deliberation of any proposal likely to be adopted. In our view, this requirement does not go so far as to mandate that the Board conduct an independent investigation of potential costs, nor does it require that cost factor

into the Board's decision more than, for example, conservation concerns might. However, it does require the Board to address and "pay special attention to" costs relevant to each regulation adopted.

**In general, written findings:** If any issue is already in court, or is controversial enough that you believe it might result in litigation, or if it is complex enough that findings may be useful to the public, the Department, or the Board in the future, it is important that the Board draft and adopt written findings explaining its decisions. From time to time, the Department of Law will recommend that written findings be adopted, in order to better defend the Board's action. Such recommendations should be carefully considered, as a refusal to adopt findings, in these circumstances, could mean that the Board gets subjected to judicial oversight and second-guessing which might have been avoided. The Alaska Supreme Court has stressed the importance of an adequate decisional document, or written finding, to a determination that the Board has acted within its authority and rationally in adopting regulations, and has deferred to such findings in the past.

**In general, subsistence:** For each proposal the Board should consider whether it involves or affects identified subsistence uses of the game population or sub-population in question. If action on a proposal would affect a subsistence use, the Board must be sure that the regulations provide a reasonable opportunity for the subsistence uses, unless sustained yield would be jeopardized. If the Board has not previously done so, it should first determine whether the game population is subject to customary and traditional uses for subsistence and what amount of the harvestable portion, if any, is reasonably necessary for those uses. *See* 5 AAC 99.025 for current findings on customary and traditional uses and amounts reasonably necessary for subsistence uses. The current law requires that the Board have considered at least four issues in implementing the preference:

- (1) Identify game populations or portions of populations customarily and traditionally taken or used for subsistence; *see* 8 criteria at 5 AAC 99.010(b);
- (2) determine whether a portion of the game population may be harvested consistent with sustained yield;
- (3) determine the amount of the harvestable portion reasonably necessary for subsistence uses; and
- (4) adopt regulations to provide a reasonable opportunity for subsistence uses.

Reasonable opportunity is defined to mean "an opportunity, as determined by the appropriate board, that allows a subsistence user to participate in a subsistence hunt or fishery that provides a normally diligent participant with a reasonable expectation of success of taking of fish or game." AS 16.05.258(f). It is not to be construed as a guarantee of success.

The amount of the harvestable portion of the game population that is reasonably necessary for subsistence uses will depend largely on the amount of the game population used for subsistence historically and the number of subsistence users expected to participate. This may require the Board to determine which users have been taking game for subsistence purposes, and which ones have not. Once the Board has determined the amount reasonably necessary for subsistence uses, the Board should by regulation provide an opportunity that allows the predicted number of normally diligent participants a reasonable expectation of success in taking the subject game. The Board may base its determination of reasonable opportunity on all relevant information including past subsistence harvest levels of the game population in the specific area and the bag limits, seasons, access provisions, and means and methods necessary to achieve those harvests, or on comparable information from similar areas.

If the harvestable portion of the game population is not sufficient to provide for subsistence uses and any other consumptive uses, the Board is required to eliminate non-subsistence uses in order to provide a reasonable opportunity for subsistence uses. If the harvestable portion of the game population is still not sufficient to provide a reasonable opportunity for all subsistence uses, the Board is required to eliminate non-subsistence consumptive uses and distinguish among the subsistence users based on the following Tier II criteria:

- (1) The customary and direct dependence on the game population by the subsistence user for human consumption as a mainstay of livelihood; and
- (2) the ability of the subsistence user to obtain food if subsistence use is restricted or eliminated. AS 16.05.258.

**In general, intensive management:** Under AS 16.05.255 (e), (f) and (g), the Board should assure itself that the steps outlined below have been followed when acting on proposals dealing with ungulate populations.

**First** - Determine whether the **ungulate** population is **important for high levels of human consumptive use**. The Board has already made many of these determinations. See 5 AAC 92.108. However, these past findings do not preclude new findings, especially if based on new information.

– If so, then subsequent intensive management analysis may be required.

– If not, then no further intensive management analysis is required.

**Second** - Is the ungulate population **depleted** or will the Board be **significantly reducing the taking** of the population? See 5AAC 92.106(5) for the Board's current definition of "significant" as it relates to intensive management.

The Board must determine whether depletion or reduction of productivity, or Board action, is likely to cause a significant reduction in harvest.

- If either is true, then subsequent intensive management analysis is required.
- If not, then further intensive management analysis is not required.

**Third** - Is intensive management appropriate?

(a) If the population is depleted, has the Board found that consumptive use of the population is a preferred use? Note that the Legislature has already found that “providing for high levels of harvest for human consumption in accordance with the sustained yield principle is the highest and best use of identified big game prey populations in most areas of the State ...” In the rare cases where consumptive use is not a preferred use, then the Board need not adopt intensive management regulations.

(b) If consumptive uses are preferred, and the population is depleted or reduced in productivity so that the result may be a significant reduction in harvest, the Board must consider whether enhancement of abundance or productivity is feasibly achievable using recognized and prudent active management techniques. At this point, the Board will need information from the Department about available recognized management techniques, including feasibility. If enhancement is feasibly achievable, then the Board must adopt intensive management regulations.

(c) If the Board will be significantly reducing the taking of the population, then it must adopt, or schedule for adoption at its next meeting, regulations that provide for intensive management *unless*:

1. Intensive management would be:
  - A. Ineffective based on scientific information;
  - B. Inappropriate due to land ownership patterns; or
  - C. Against the best interests of subsistence users;

*Or*

2. The Board declares that a biological emergency exists and takes immediate action to protect and maintain the population and also schedules for adoption those regulations necessary to restore the population.

## **Comments on Individual Proposals**

**Proposal 87** would amend 5 AAC 92.100(a)(3), that allows a boat to be used to retrieve a dead or injured bird, “to eliminate driving, herding, or chasing migratory birds into hunters on land, or on other boats.” The Board should consider the existing unlawful method of taking game at 5 AAC 92.080(a)(5): “except as otherwise specified, with the use of a motorized vehicle to harass game or for the purpose of driving, herding, or molesting game.”

**Proposal 100** would amend 5 AAC 92.057, which regulates sheep and goat drawing permits, to allocate nonR sheep *harvest* to 35% of harvest in each subunit and make all nonR sheep hunts drawing permits. Sample language is for 5 AAC 85, which is outside the scope of this meeting.

**Proposal 107** would reopen youth and nonR sheep hunts in U19C that were temporarily closed, reversing P204 from 2023. The suggestion that board generated proposals may not be legal is incorrect.

**Proposals 111 and 112** would amend 85.055 to allow residents to harvest any ram in Unit 19C, with limitations on future sheep hunting based on the age of the ram. The Board should address whether the future hunting restrictions would apply statewide or just in Unit 19C.

**Proposals 115 and 116** would amend 85.055 to reopen subsistence winter sheep hunt in Unit 19C for residents. This hunt remains open so there is no action to be taken by the Board.

**Proposal 118** would amend 85.055 to close nonresident sheep hunting in U19C. The Board closed nonresident sheep hunting in 2003 for five years.

**Proposal 125** would amend 5 AAC 92.044 to define “developed recreation facility” and “permanent dwelling” in Unit 15 and Unit 7. This proposal was deferred from March 2023 but was not amended to be statewide.

**Proposal 136** would amend 5 AAC 92.050 to limit bison and musk ox drawing permit hunt to once in a lifetime and only allow applicants to apply once per hunt. The proposal also suggests increasing the application fee to \$50. To the extent the proposal seeks a change in the application fee, that portion of the proposal is outside of the Board’s authority. Application fees for bison and musk ox hunts are set by the legislature in AS 16.05.346.

**Proposal 137** would amend 5 AAC 92.050 to change permit hunt applications. The proposal includes a variety of options. The Board would need to clarify which options are being adopted. A point system may violate the Constitution's Equal Access and Common Use clauses.

**Proposal 148** would amend 5 AAC 92.110(e) that currently authorizes the Commissioner to determine whether to implement a predator control plan (such authority is also found in AS 16.05.783), and authorizes the Commissioner to adopt, by regulation, additional restrictions beyond those adopted by the Board.

Conducting management activities and exercising administrative authority to implement intensive management plans are legislatively authorized powers of the Commissioner and are not regulations subject to the Administrative Procedure Act.

**Proposal 190** would amend 5 AAC 85.055 for sheep in U19C and create a guide concession pilot program area. SB 189, which established the authority to create guide concession areas under AS 16.05.262, is currently being challenged in court. The statute is still effective during the challenge, so the Board could create a pilot area subject to the outcome of the lawsuit.