ACR #1 – Establish an Intensive Management (IM) program specific to Nelchina caribou in Unit 13.

SUBMITTED BY: Robert Cyr

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.

5 AAC 92.121. Intensive Management Plans V.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM.

There is no Intensive Management (IM) program specific to Nelchina caribou in Unit 13, despite being an IM animal in an IM unit and being well below population objectives. The Nelchina caribou herd decreased to under 8,000 animals during a 3-year period of heavy snow and late springs. Although the herd is recovering, it is still at about half of the minimum population objective. The herd still has a long way to go to meet the minimum population objective of 35,000 animals. The Copper Basin Advisory Committee put in a proposal during the last Central/Southwest Region meeting (Jan 2024) for an IM program that includes Nelchina caribou but were given poor direction by ADF&G staff and authored a proposal to add caribou to the moose IM program. A couple months later, in their comments to the BOG, ADF&G said that caribou could not be added to the current moose program, and that they had to be separated. Regardless, the Board of Game directed ADF&G to author a new caribou IM feasibility study for Unit 13 caribou. ADF&G has had 22 months and at least 2 opportunities to introduce the new feasibility study to the public and the BOG, but that has not happened yet. Every year that goes by could delay the full recovery of the herd (to the population objective range) by a year or more. We have been blessed with some mild winters recently, and we hope for more, but we, and the Department, should not solely rely on hope. I understand that the majority of the herd overwintered in subunit 13A last year with acceptable survival but believe previous IM efforts in RY 23 and 24 contributed to this. No IM was conducted in 13A last winter (RY 25), and that is concerning for future years if wolf numbers increase and IM is not implemented where the caribou live. These caribou need more continuous and comprehensive IM practices to get them to the population objective. A Nelchina caribou herd habitat issue narrative was pushed for many years by ADF&G and staff expressed interest to slow the growth of the herd, but caribou metrics did not support this assertion, and it's time to promote the continued growth of the herd in all ways possible.

WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER?

Adopt a new IM program specific to Nelchina caribou, that would be authored by ADF&G.

STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

The Nelchina caribou herd is currently at about half of its minimum population objective and IM was not conducted in RY 25 where the majority of the herd wintered in, gave birth in, and summered in. The IM program was suspended in 13A during RY 25 because the moose population increased above

objectives. If there is no IM where caribou reside (some winters, almost all summers, and even migratory corridors), the herd will be negatively impacted, slowing its growth. Habitat is not a limiting factor, so let's keep the growth momentum going by reducing predation potential.

1) **To correct an error in regulation.**

2) **To correct an effect of a regulation that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted.**

3) **Does the request identify a biological concern for the population or a threat to meeting objectives for the population?**

   Yes, the cessation of IM in critical parts of Unit 13 (e.g., 13A) will delay the full recovery of the herd by up to several years. We still need another 15,000+ caribou to reach the minimum population objective.

4) **Does the request identify an unforeseen, unexpected event or effect that would otherwise restrict or reduce a reasonable opportunity for customary and traditional wildlife uses, as defined in AS 16.05.258(f)?**

   It will speed up the recovery timeline for reasonable harvest opportunities.

5) **Does the request identify an unforeseen, unexpected resource situation where a biologically allowable resource harvest would be precluded by delayed regulatory action and such delay would be significantly burdensome because the resource would be unavailable in the future?**

   Not implementing IM where the caribou herd resides ASAP will slow the recovery and reduce future harvest opportunities.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE?

Herd growth to the population objective range could be comprised and potentially delayed by a year or more.

STATE WHY YOUR ACR IS NOT PREDOMINANTLY ALLOCATIVE.

Because it is 100% biological.

IF THIS REQUEST IS ALLOCATIVE, STATE THE NEW INFORMATION THAT COMPELS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER AN ALLOCATIVE PROPOSAL OUTSIDE OF THE REGULAR CYCLE.

STATE YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISSUE THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS ACR.

I am the Vice Chair of the Copper Basin AC and an avid hunter that has subsistence hunted the Nelchina caribou herd with my family of six since 2004. The Nelchina caribou herd has been a constant for the residents of Unit 11, 12 13, as well as many resident families throughout Alaska. We need to utilize every tool to protect this vital resource. This herd recently decreased by 80%, habitat narratives have been pushed on us in lieu of IM, and it's been nearly two years since ADF&G was directed to author an IM feasibility study specific to Nelchina caribou. This needs to happen to override the highly flawed one from 2023. Stakeholders simply want the best opportunities in the toolbox for this herd to fully recover. This herd has been a staple food item for many Alaskans prior to the three consecutive bad winters.

STATE WHETHER THIS ACR HAS BEEN CONSIDERED BEFORE, EITHER AS A PROPOSAL OR AS AN ACR, AND IF SO, DURING WHICH BOARD OF GAME MEETING.

Yes, proposal 48 from the 10-17 January 2024 meeting. As previously stated, The Copper Basin AC was given bad advice by ADF&G and authored a proposal to add caribou to the current Unit 13 moose IM plan. Regardless, the BOG directed ADF&G to author a feasibility study almost two years ago now, and we are still waiting as the ACR deadline approaches.

ACR #2 – Reinstate the Petersburg Road System Closed Area.

SUBMITTED BY: Joel Randrup

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.

5 AAC 92.510(5)(B). Areas closed to hunting.

5 AAC 92.530(24). Management Areas.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM.

I am asking the Board of Game to reinstate the Petersburg Road System Closed Area. Opening the Mitkof Highway corridor (mile 8.75 to 17.22, one quarter mile on each side) to archery big game hunting has the potential to be a public safety hazard. The Petersburg Road System Closed Area was established in 1933, extended in 1964, and modified in 1976 to exclude wolves. Until passage of Proposal 67 the corridor was closed to the taking of big game, except wolves.

As hunters, we all want a clean ethical kill and for the animal to die exactly where it is shot, but we also know that is not always the case. An arrow-shot animal may not die where it is shot. Bow hunters generally wait before tracking a wounded animal which may allow it to travel unobserved some distance before it dies and is recovered. It can cross the 100-yard buffer and reach Mitkof Highway, where the posted speed is 50 mph, and cause a vehicle collision.

This newly adopted corridor also includes the boardwalk trail to Blind River Rapids and the Swan Observatory. In addition to the concern for vehicle collisions with big game, arrow-shot dangerous game, including black bears, brown bears, wolves, and the newly adopted mountain lion, could injure members of the public using these sites or recreating along the side of the highway.

Closing the corridor for public safety where there is no biological concern may be in the public's best interest and this request is for public safety and not allocative. The Board of Game has previously accepted an ACR in 2023 in which public safety was a central concern although it was also allocative. The 2004 ADFG report on closed areas recommended status quo stating that eliminating this closed area would result in public safety concerns, p.29 (only available in paper copy at the Petersburg office).

WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER?

Reinstate the Petersburg Road System Closed Area to its status as it was before the passage of Proposal 67. I am not asking for any other change to the previous regulation, and any changes can be discussed at the next regular cycle meeting for Southeast.

STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

1) **To correct an error in regulation.**

   Not applicable

2) **To correct an effect of a regulation that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted.**

   The discussion leading up to the passage of Proposal 67 at the meeting in Wrangell included bow hunting near homes and the 100-yard buffer, but there was no discussion about how far an arrow-shot animal can travel, the risk of it reaching Mitkof Highway and colliding with vehicles traveling at speed, or interactions with wounded dangerous game including mountain lion, near the Blind River Rapids trail, the Swan Observatory, with people berry picking and bird watching or other activities along the roadside.

3) **Does the request identify a biological concern for the population or a threat to meeting objectives for the population?**

   Not applicable

4) **Does the request identify an unforeseen, unexpected event or effect that would otherwise restrict or reduce a reasonable opportunity for customary and traditional wildlife uses, as defined in AS 16.05.258(f)?**

   Not applicable.

5) **Does the request identify an unforeseen, unexpected resource situation where a biologically allowable resource harvest would be precluded by delayed regulatory action and such delay would be significantly burdensome because the resource would be unavailable in the future?**

   Not applicable

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE?

Until the next regular cycle, each season in this corridor carries the possibility of a collision between a vehicle and an arrow-shot animal on Mitkof Highway, or a dangerous encounter between wounded dangerous game and the public recreating in the corridor. This ACR would address that risk before the possibility of an accident or injury occurs.

STATE WHY YOUR ACR IS NOT PREDOMINANTLY ALLOCATIVE.

This ACR restores a public safety closure on one narrow highway corridor and does not shift harvest between user groups. Bow hunters keep existing opportunities elsewhere in GMU 3, including the rest of the Petersburg Management Area.

IF THIS REQUEST IS ALLOCATIVE, STATE THE NEW INFORMATION THAT COMPELS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER AN ALLOCATIVE PROPOSAL OUTSIDE OF THE REGULAR CYCLE.

Not applicable.

STATE YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISSUE THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS ACR.

I am submitting this ACR as an individual and a resident of Alaska. I hunt, trap, and fish and I am a certified bow hunter and a member of the Petersburg AC. I was out of the country when our AC met to discuss Proposal 67 before the Southeast Region Meeting in Wrangell. At our last AC meeting in February, I brought up the idea for my ACR. There was a brief discussion, and we did not discuss it further.

STATE WHETHER THIS ACR HAS BEEN CONSIDERED BEFORE, EITHER AS A PROPOSAL OR AS AN ACR, AND IF SO, DURING WHICH BOARD OF GAME MEETING.

This ACR has not been considered before.

ACR #3 – Shorten the caribou hunting season from August 10 – March 31 to August 10 – October 31 in portions of GMU 24A and 25D.

SUBMITTED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.

5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM.

Harvest of the Hodzana Hills caribou herd (HHH) during the winter in GMUs 24A and 25D has the potential to exceed the harvestable surplus due to the following circumstances:

The HHH, which spans GMU 24A south of the South Fork Koyukuk River and that portion of GMU 25D drained by the west fork of the Dall River west of 150º W. Long., is a small, non-migratory herd of 400-600 animals, which is below the Department's management objective of 700–800 caribou. Since the HHH was first GPS collared in 2014, the Central Arctic Herd (CAH) and Porcupine Herd (PCH) have intermixed with the HHH and several collared animals from the HHH joined these larger herds and left the HHH geographic range. As a result, in total, the HHH has decreased in size by nearly 50% since 2014. Hunters have limited accessibility to the HHH due to the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area which prohibits motorized access within and across the corridor for hunting. Therefore, access to the HHH for hunting primarily occurs by hunters using highway vehicles and walking from the Dalton Highway or by hunters using airplanes. Despite a reduction in population for the HHH since 2014 and the population being below management objective, limited access still allowed for some harvest that was within harvestable surplus. The HHH has a harvestable surplus of approximately 20 animals per year depending on the most recent population count. Since 2020, an average of 8.7 HHH caribou have been harvested per year. Harvest levels below the harvestable surplus can be attributed to the limited accessibility of the HHH, with 90.4% of successful hunters accessing the herd from the Dalton Highway using a highway vehicle.

In the spring of 2026, the Department of the Interior conveyed land along the Dalton Highway Corridor, including land within GMUs 24A and 25D, to the State of Alaska. Alongside this land conveyance, a Commissioner's Finding was issued by the Department of Natural Resources authorizing winter snowmachine use from November 1 – April 15, annually, on RS 2477 trails through the Dalton Highway Management Area. Due to this change in land access coupled with the recent reduction in HHH abundance, harvest of HHH animals could exceed the harvestable surplus during the winter portion of the hunt in GMUs 24A and 25D. The board has not made a customary and traditional use determination for this herd, and should plan to do so at its next in-cycle Region 3 meeting. However, this does not preclude the board from taking action on this ACR before then for conservation purposes if it deems that this proposal meets the ACR criteria.

WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER?

This proposal seeks to shorten the caribou hunting season from August 10 – March 31 to August 10 – October 31 in the portion of GMU 24A south of an east-west line extending from the point at the south bank of the South Fork Koyukuk River at the Dalton Highway crossing near N67º 01.104', W150º 17.352', and that portion of GMU 25D drained by the west fork of the Dall River west of 150º W. Long.

STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

To correct an error in regulation.

Not applicable

To correct an effect of a regulation that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted.

Not applicable

Does the request identify a biological concern for the population or a threat to meeting objectives for the population?

Yes, biological concern, potential for overharvest.

Does the request identify an unforeseen, unexpected event or effect that would otherwise restrict or reduce a reasonable opportunity for customary and traditional wildlife uses, as defined in AS 16.05.258(f)?

Unknown; the board has not made a customary and traditional use finding for the HHH.

Does the request identify an unforeseen, unexpected resource situation where a biologically allowable resource harvest would be precluded by delayed regulatory action and such delay would be significantly burdensome because the resource would be unavailable in the future?

Yes, potential exists for overharvest of the resource due to changes in access.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE?

The number of harvested caribou could exceed the harvestable surplus for the Hodzana Hills caribou herd and reduce the long-term availability of this resource.

STATE WHY YOUR ACR IS NOT PREDOMINANTLY ALLOCATIVE.

The ACR is being submitted for conservation reasons only.

IF THIS REQUEST IS ALLOCATIVE, STATE THE NEW INFORMATION THAT COMPELS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER AN ALLOCATIVE PROPOSAL OUTSIDE OF THE REGULAR CYCLE.

STATE YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISSUE THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS ACR.

Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

STATE WHETHER THIS ACR HAS BEEN CONSIDERED BEFORE, EITHER AS A PROPOSAL OR AS AN ACR, AND IF SO, DURING WHICH BOARD OF GAME MEETING.

This ACR has not been considered before.

ACR #4 – Add wolves back into the Mulchatna Caribou Herd Intensive Management plan so they can be removed if and when appropriate as part of the active IM program.

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.

5 AAC 92.111(c) Intensive Management Plans I.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM.

The portion of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd (MCH) Intensive Management (IM) plan that included wolves was invalidated by the Alaska Superior Court in March 2026 after the court identified deficiencies in the 2022 board record. Based on the results of updated research, the department would like to add wolves back into the IM plan so they can be removed if and when appropriate as part of the active IM program to restore the abundance of the MCH.

WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER?

(c) Mulchatna Caribou Herd Predation Management Area. The Mulchatna Caribou Herd Predation Management Area is established to increase the Mulchatna Caribou Herd (MCH) within Units 9(B), 17(A), 17(B), 17(C), 18, 19(A), and 19(B) to aid in achieving intensive management (IM) objectives. The Mulchatna Caribou Herd Predation Management Area encompasses approximately 39,683 square miles, and multiple predator control areas may be utilized within the management area. The control program for this area is as follows:

(1) this is a continuing control program that was first established by the Board of Game (board) in 2011 for wolf control that was expanded in 2026 to include black and brown bear control; it is designed to increase the caribou herd's population size and human harvest by reducing wolf and bear predation on caribou and is expected to make a contribution to achieving the IM objectives for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.

(2) caribou, black bear, brown bear, **and wolf** objectives are as follows:

…

(C) **the wolf population objective for the MCH Predation Management Area is to annually reduce the number of wolves in predator control areas to a level that results in increased calf survival and recruitment while maintaining the viability of the wolf population;**

(3) findings concerning populations and human use are as follows:

(B) wolves are a major predator of caribou in the range of the MCH and are an important factor in failing to achieve these objectives;

(C) a reduction of wolf predation can reasonably be expected to aid in achieving

the objectives;

(D) reducing wolf predation is likely to be effective and feasible using recognized and prudent active management techniques and based on scientific information;

(E) reducing wolf predation is likely to be effective given land ownership patterns;

(F) reducing wolf predation is in the best interests of subsistence users;

(4) authorized methods and means are as follows:

(A) hunting and trapping of **wolves and** bears by the public in the MCH Predation Management Area during the term of the program will occur as provided in the hunting and trapping regulations set out elsewhere in this title, including the use of motorized vehicles as provided in 5 AAC 92.080;

(B) **notwithstanding any other provisions in this title, the commissioner may issue public aerial shooting permits or public land-and-shoot permits as a method for wolf removal under AS 16.05.783;**

(C) notwithstanding any other provisions in this title, the commissioner may allow department employees to conduct aerial, land-and-shoot, or ground-based lethal removal of **wolves**, black bears, and brown bears using state-owned, privately-owned, or chartered equipment, including helicopters, under AS 16.05.783;

(5) time frame is as follows:

(A) through June 30, 2028, the commissioner may authorize the removal of bears and wolves in the MCH Predation Management Area;

(B) annually, the department shall, to the extent practicable, provide to the board a report of program activities conducted during the preceding 12 months, including implementation activities, the status of caribou **and wolf** populations, and recommendations for changes, if necessary, to achieve the objectives of the plan;

(6) the commissioner will review, modify, or suspend program activities as follows:

…

(B) **if, after three years, the harvest of wolves is not sufficient to make progress towards the IM population objectives for wolves;**

….

STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

To correct an error in regulation.

No.

To correct an effect of a regulation that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted.

No.

Does the request identify a biological concern for the population or a threat to meeting objectives for the population?

Yes. The department was unable to remove wolves that were actively preying on the MCH when conducting predator removal efforts this spring, and the public was unable to participate in the public wolf removal portion of the program. While conducting bear removal activities this spring, 3 wolves and the tracks of 2 packs of approximately 6 wolves each were observed on the calving grounds but not pursued. In addition, at least 2 adult caribou and 5 caribou calves were killed by wolves during this period. The MCH is below population objectives and the inability to take wolves as part of the predator removal program is contradictory to the department and Board of Game's intent of restoring a harvestable surplus of the herd as quickly as practicable.

Does the request identify an unforeseen, unexpected event or effect that would otherwise restrict or reduce a reasonable opportunity for customary and traditional wildlife uses, as defined in AS 16.05.258(f)?

Yes. Removing wolves as part of the IM program due to a court finding was unforeseen and affects the board's ability to provide for reasonable opportunity for customary and traditional wildlife uses of the MCH

Does the request identify an unforeseen, unexpected resource situation where a biologically allowable resource harvest would be precluded by delayed regulatory action and such delay would be significantly burdensome because the resource would be unavailable in the future?

Yes. Not being able to remove wolves as part of the IM program delays the recovery of the herd needed for a harvestable surplus sufficient to allow for customary and traditional use of the population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE?

Any delay in the ability to remove wolves is undesirable, and having to wait until the regular cycle will further delay potential removal of wolves by 2 years.

STATE WHY YOUR ACR IS NOT PREDOMINANTLY ALLOCATIVE.

This request is not allocative.

IF THIS REQUEST IS ALLOCATIVE, STATE THE NEW INFORMATION THAT COMPELS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER AN ALLOCATIVE PROPOSAL OUTSIDE OF

THE REGULAR CYCLE.

This request is not allocative.

STATE YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISSUE THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS ACR.

Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

STATE WHETHER THIS ACR HAS BEEN CONSIDERED BEFORE, EITHER AS A PROPOSAL OR AS AN ACR, AND IF SO, DURING WHICH BOARD OF GAME MEETING.

This ACR has not been considered before.

ACR #5 – Establish an open season for emperor geese in 2027-2028.

SUBMITTED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.

5 AAC 85.065(a)(4)(G) Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game: Migratory game birds: Emperor geese

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM.

Federal hunting regulations for migratory game birds are established annually by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in consultation with state wildlife agencies. Alaska State hunting regulations for migratory game birds may be more restrictive than federal regulations, but never more liberal. For emperor geese, federal hunting regulations follow guidelines specified in a harvest strategy from the Pacific Flyway Council's (PFC) management plan. The harvest strategy uses a population index from a breeding pair survey conducted annually by the USFWS in the year before the regulatory year to assess population status relative to prescribed regulatory thresholds. In 2024 and 2025, population status fell below a threshold that was consistent with a closed season prescription; thus, federal and state regulations closed the hunting season for emperor geese in the 2025-2026 and 2026-2027 general seasons. In summer 2026, population status improved to above the same threshold, and therefore, was consistent with an open season for emperor geese in 2027-2028 but under a restrictive regulations package that allows a 250-bird quota allotted to the State of Alaska administered by registration permit. Accordingly, federal regulations were adjusted to authorize an open season with the restrictive quota for emperor geese in 2027-2028. This ACR asks the board to align state regulations with this recent change to federal regulations which requires the Board to reopen the emperor goose hunt in the 2027-2028 season in regulation. In addition, the PFC harvest strategy was recently revised to include changes in the prescribed federal bird quotas; if the Board authorizes an open hunting season, it should also reallocate quotas across the hunt-areas to guide the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (Department) administration of the permit hunt. The Board was responsible for the initial allocation of the federal bird quota across emperor goose hunt-areas in the state (c. 2017).

WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER?

5AAC 85.065(a)(4)(G) Units 8, 9. 10, 17, 18, 22, 23 Resident Hunters: 1 goose by registration permit only; Nonresident Hunters: 1 goose by drawing permit only; up to 25 permits may be issued.

STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

To correct an error in regulation.

N/A

To correct an effect of a regulation that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted.

N/A

Does the request identify a biological concern for the population or a threat to meeting objectives for the population?

N/A

Does the request identify an unforeseen, unexpected event or effect that would otherwise restrict or reduce a reasonable opportunity for customary and traditional wildlife uses, as defined in AS 16.05.258(f)?

N/A

Does the request identify an unforeseen, unexpected resource situation where a biologically allowable resource harvest would be precluded by delayed regulatory action and such delay would be significantly burdensome because the resource would be unavailable in the future?

Yes. If the board does not act prior to the regularly scheduled meetings a biologically allowable resource harvest will be precluded.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE?

Federal regulations authorize an open season for emperor geese in 2027-2028 with a quota of 250 geese by registration permit. Under state regulations, the 2027-2028 emperor goose season will remain closed, and the quota of 250 emperor geese allotted to the State of Alaska through federal regulation will remain unfulfilled and hunting opportunities afforded to hunters in Alaska will be forfeited. 5AAC 85.065(a)(4)(G) applies to multiple Units in multiple Regions; thus, Board consideration of changes to the regulation are best suited for a statewide board meeting, next scheduled in 2028 after the 2027-2028 hunting season.

STATE WHY YOUR ACR IS NOT PREDOMINANTLY ALLOCATIVE.

This ACR is not predominately allocative due to necessary preceding authorization by the Board to reopen the emperor goose hunt for the 2027-2028 hunting season under state regulations, aligning with parallel federal authorization.

IF THIS REQUEST IS ALLOCATIVE, STATE THE NEW INFORMATION THAT COMPELS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER AN ALLOCATIVE PROPOSAL OUTSIDE OF THE REGULAR CYCLE.

Secondary to reopening the hunt for the 2027-2028 season, this request is allocative across hunt areas. The Pacific Flyway Council Management Plan for Emperor Geese was recently revised with changes to the harvest strategy that includes a reduced federal quota of emperor geese allotted to the State of Alaska from 1,000 to 500 in a Standard regulations package and from 500 to 250 in a Restrictive regulations package. In 2017, the board allocated the federal quota across newly established hunt-

areas. The above-mentioned change to the federal quota in the harvest strategy will necessitate reallocation of the new quotas across hunt-areas by the board prior to the 2027-2028 season if an open hunting season is authorized in state regulations.

STATE YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISSUE THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS ACR.

Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

STATE WHETHER THIS ACR HAS BEEN CONSIDERED BEFORE, EITHER AS A PROPOSAL OR AS AN ACR, AND IF SO, DURING WHICH BOARD OF GAME MEETING.

This ACR has not been considered before.