

ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH & GAME

Boards Support Section

PO Box 25526

Juneau AK 99802-5526

FIRST CLASS
POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT 131
JUNEAU, AK



**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
SPRING 2002 MEETING
MARCH 8—18, 2002
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA**

FIRST CLASS MAIL

**This publication was released
by the Department of Fish and Game
produced at a cost of
\$3.02 per copy
and printed in Juneau, AK**

Because the Alaska Department of Fish and Game receives federal funding, all of its public programs and activities are operated free from discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, or handicap.

O.E.O

**U.S. Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C. 20240**

If you are a person with a disability who may need a special accommodation in order to participate in the process on the proposed regulations, please contact the Boards Support Section at (907) 465-4110 no later than February 22, 2002 to make any necessary arrangements. To correspond by text telephone (TDD) call 1-800-478-3648.

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY
REVIEWER LETTER

December 2001

DEAR REVIEWER:

The Alaska Board of Game will consider the attached book of regulatory proposals at its **Spring 2002** meeting. That meeting will be held **March 8 – 18, 2002**, at the River's Edge Resort in Fairbanks, Alaska. The proposals generally concern changes to the hunting and use of game regulations in the Interior Region. Members of the public, organizations, advisory committees, and staff timely submitted these proposals. The proposals are published essentially as they were received.

The proposals in this book are presented as brief statements summarizing the intended regulatory changes. In some cases where confusion might arise or where the regulation is complex, proposed changes are also indicated in legal format. In this format, bolded and underlined words are **additions** to the regulation text, and capitalized words or letters in square brackets [XXXX] are deletions.

Before taking action on these proposed changes to the regulations, the board would like your written comments and/or oral testimony on any effects the proposed changes would have on your activities.

You are encouraged to read all proposals presented in this book. Some regulations have statewide application and/or may affect other regions of the state. Also, some proposals recommend changes to multiple areas or regions.

In this book the proposals generally are grouped by the area to which they pertain (see Table of Contents). This proposal list is not in roadmap order for the meeting. The board will generate a roadmap for deliberations prior to the meeting, and will be available to the public. The roadmap may be changed up to and during the meeting.

After reviewing the proposals you may send written comments to:

ATTN: BOG COMMENTS
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Boards Support Section
PO Box 25526
Juneau, AK 99802-5526
Fax: 907-465-6094

Comments may be submitted at any time until the public testimony period for that proposal and/or its subject matter is closed at the meeting and deliberation by the board begins. As a practical matter, you are encouraged to have your written comments presented to the above Juneau address by **February 22, 2002**. Receipt by this date will insure that your written comments will be published in the board workbook. All comments received after February 22 will be presented to board members at the time of the meeting, but will not be printed in the board workbook. Written comments will also be accepted during the board meeting, and of course, public testimony during the meeting is appreciated.

When making written comments regarding these proposals, list the **PROPOSAL NUMBER** to which your comment pertains and specifically whether you favor or oppose the proposal. This will insure that your comments are correctly noted for the board members in relation to the proper proposal(s).

The following guidelines will assist the board in understanding your concerns:

Written comments will be copied and hole-punched to go into the board workbook. Therefore, please use 8 1/2" x 11" paper and leave at least a 1 1/2" margin on the left side and a 1-inch margin on the right, top and bottom. If typed, please make sure the print is dark. If handwritten, use dark ink and write legibly. Briefly explain why you are favor or oppose the proposal.

If you plan to testify, a written copy of your testimony is helpful, but is not required. Twenty-five copies of your written testimony are also helpful, but not required. Written testimony must be officially stamped and logged in, and will be distributed by the secretary. See page vi for "GUIDELINES: PUBLIC TESTIMONY, ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY." This document has additional information on presenting oral testimony.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES: In addition to the above, please make sure the meeting minutes reflect why the committee voted as it did. If the vote was split, include the minority opinion. A brief description—a couple of sentences—will do. Detail number in attendance (e.g., 12 of 15 members) and what interests were represented (such as subsistence, guides, trappers, hunters, wildlife viewers, etc.).

Additional copies of this proposal book may be obtained at most offices of the Department of Fish and Game and on our website at: <http://www.state.ak.us/adfg/boards/gameinfo/boghome.htm>.

You are encouraged to send your written comments to the above Juneau Boards Support Section address. If you send comments directly to a board member, please send a copy to the above Juneau Boards Support Section address so your comments can be copied and distributed to all board members.

A tentative agenda for the Spring 2002 Board of Game meeting will is shown on page ix. A roadmap showing the tentative order in which proposals will be considered will be available in February 2002. During the meeting, a recorded telephone message is available, with current updates on the board's agenda and schedule. That phone number is (800) 764-8901 (in Juneau call: 465-8901).

If you are a person with a disability who may need a special accommodation in order to comment on the proposed regulations, please contact Boards Support Section at 907-465-4110 no later than February 22, 2002.

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
 SPRING 2002 PROPOSAL BOOK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page Number</u>
Reviewer Letter	i - ii
Table of Contents	iii
Board of Game Meeting Cycle	vi - v
Guidelines for Public and Advisory Committee Testimony	vi
Board of Game Membership Roster.....	vii
Boards Support Section Staff.....	viii
Draft Agenda	ix
Proposals.....	1 - 173

PROPOSAL TOPICS

Page Number

Delta Area (Unit 20D)	1 - 15
Tok Area (Units 12 and 20E).....	15 - 26
McGrath Area (Units 19, 21A and 21E).....	26 - 47
Galena Area (Units 21B, 21C, 21D, and 24)	47 - 68
Ft. Yukon Area (Units 25A, 25B, 25D, 26B, and 26C).....	68 - 82
Fairbanks Area (Units 20A, 20B, 20C, 20F, and 25C).....	82 - 130
Dalton Highway Corridor and Regionwide	130 - 147
Southcentral Region.....	147 - 160
Arctic Region.....	160 - 165
Southeast Region	166 - 173

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME MEETING CYCLE

The board meeting cycle generally occurs from October through March. The board considers changes to regulations on a region-based schedule. Each region will be discussed on a two-year cycle. When the regional area is before the board, the following regulations are open for consideration within that region:

- Trapping Seasons and Bag Limits -- All species
- General and Subsistence Hunting Seasons and Bag Limits -- All species
(Except antlerless moose hunts as noted below)
- Wolf Control Implementation Plans
- Bag Limit for Brown Bears
- Areas Closed To Hunting
- Closures and Restrictions in State Game Refuges
- Management Areas
- Controlled Use Areas
- Areas Closed To Trapping

Regulations which are specific to an area (e.g., Permits for Access to Round Island) will be taken up when the board is scheduled to consider regulations in that region.

Two statewide regulations will be taken up annually, at the spring meeting: Reauthorization of Antlerless Moose Hunts, and Brown Bear Tag Fees. Proposals for changes to these regulations will be considered each spring.

Other statewide regulations will not be taken up every meeting cycle. Statewide regulations are scheduled to be reviewed on a four-year cycle, distributed between winter meetings scheduled to occur every other year. The list of statewide regulations and the associated meeting cycle is attached.

<u>Area</u>	<u>Cycle**</u>		
SOUTHEAST-REGION I Game Management Units: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	Fall 2003	Fall 2005	Fall 2007
SOUTHCENTRAL-REGION II Game Management Units: 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 All GMUs: Brown Bear Tag Fees Reauthorization of Antlerless Moose Hunts	Spring 2003	Spring 2005	Spring 2007
ARCTIC AND WESTERN-REGION V Game Management Units: 18, 22, 23, 26A	Fall 2004	Fall 2006	Fall 2008
INTERIOR-REGION III Game Management Units: 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, 26C All GMUs: Brown Bear Tag Fees Reauthorization of Antlerless Moose Hunts	Spring 2002	Spring 2004	Spring 2006

****THE MEETING CYCLE REPEATS ITSELF ON TWO-YEAR INTERVALS**

Alaska Board of Game Winter Meeting Schedule

STATEWIDE REGULATIONS: 5 AAC 92

CYCLE: Winter 2006, 2010, 2014, 2018, etc.

- .001 Application of this Chapter
- .002 Liability for Violations
- .004 Policy for Off-Road Vehicle Use for Hunting and Transporting Game
- .005 Policy for Changing Board Agenda
- .010 Harvest Tickets and Reports
- .011 Taking of Game by Proxy
- .012 Licenses and Tags
- .016 Muskoxen Tag Fees
- .018 Waterfowl Conservation Tag
- .019 Taking of Big Game for Certain Religious Ceremonies
- .020 Application of Permit Regulations and Permit Reports
- .025 Permit for Exporting a Raw Skin
- .027 Permit for Exporting Big Game Trophies
- .028 Aviculture Permits
- .029 Permit for Possessing Live Game
- .031 Permit for Selling Skins and Trophies
- .033 Permit for Sci, Ed, Propagative, or Public Safety Purposes
- .034 Permit to Take Game for Cultural Purposes
- .037 Permit for Falconry
- .039 Permit for Taking Wolves Using Aircraft
- .047 Permit for Using Radio Telemetry Equipment
- .104 Authorization for Methods and Means Disability Exemptions
- .110 Control of Predation by Wolves
- .165 Sealing of Bear Skins and Skulls
- .170 Sealing of Marten, Lynx, Beaver, Otter, Wolf, and Wolverine
- .200 Purchase and Sale of Game
- .210 Game as Animal Food or Bait
- .220 Salvage of Game Meat, Furs, and Hides
- .230 Feeding of Game
- .250 Transfer of Muskoxen for Sci and Ed Purposes
- .450 Description of Game Management Units
- .990 Definitions

STATEWIDE REGULATIONS: 5 AAC 92

CYCLE: Winter 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016, etc.

- .035 Permit for Temporary Commercial Use of Live Game
- .040 Permit for Taking of Furbearers with Game Meat
- .041 Permit to Take Beavers to Control Damage to Property
- .043 Permit for Capturing Wild Furbearers for Fur Farming
- .049 Permits, Permit Procedures, and Permit Conditions
- .050 Required Permit Hunt Conditions and Procedures
- .051 Discretionary Trapping Permit Conditions & Procedures
- .052 Discretionary Permit Hunt Conditions and Procedures
- .062 Priority for Subsistence Hunting; Tier II Permits
- .068 Permit Conditions for Hunting Black Bear with Dogs
- .070 Tier II Subsistence Hunting Permit Point System
- .075 Lawful Methods of Taking Game
- .080 Unlawful Methods of Taking Game; Exceptions
- .085 Unlawful Methods of Taking Big Game; Exceptions
- .090 Unlawful Methods of Taking Fur Animals
- .095 Unlawful Methods of Taking Furbearers; Exceptions
- .100 Unlawful Methods of Hunting Waterfowl, Snipe, Crane
- .130 Restriction to Bag Limit
- .135 Transfer of Possession
- .140 Unlawful Possession or Transportation of Game
- .150 Evidence of Sex and Identity
- .160 Marked or Tagged Game
- .260 Taking Cub Bears & Female Bears with Cubs Prohibited
- .400 Emergency Taking of Game
- .410 Taking Game in Defense of Life or Property

Alaska Board of Game

GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC TESTIMONY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY

If you plan to testify at this hearing, please fill out a blue PUBLIC TESTIMONY SIGN-UP CARD and turn it in to the board's staff. If you have written material for the board members, please provide at least **25 copies** to the staff; and **submit with your blue testimony card. Please be sure to have your name and date on the first page of your written material and if you have graphs, identify the source.**

When we call your name, please go to the table; state your name and whom you represent. When you are finished speaking, please wait, we may have questions regarding your comments.

Please be aware that when you testify you may not ask questions of the board members or of department staff. This is your chance to speak and to bring your issues before the board members. If the board member and/or staff need clarification, they will ask you questions.

Generally, the board allows five minutes for oral testimony if you testify for yourself, and ten minutes if you testify on behalf of an organization. The board chairman will announce the testimony length of time at the beginning of the meeting.

Advisory Committee representatives are usually allowed 15 minutes to testify, and should restrict their testimony to relating what occurred at the advisory committee meeting(s). Testimony should be a brief summary of the minutes of the meeting and copies of the minutes should be available for the board members. Personal opinions should not be addressed during Advisory Committee testimony.

PLEASE NOTE: The time limit on testimony does NOT include questions that the board members may have for you.

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

(Revised December 2001)

NAME AND ADDRESS	TERM EXPIRES
George Matz 14345 Cody Circle Anchorage, AK 99516	3/01/2004
Mike Fleagle P.O. Box 33 McGrath, AK 99627	1/301/2002
Dana Pruhs 2431 Wellington Ct. Anchorage, AK 99517	3/01/2003
Greg Roczicka, CHAIR P.O. Box 513 Bethel, AK 99559	3/01/2002
Ben Grussendorf, VICE-CHAIR 1221 Halibut Point Rd. Sitka, AK 99835	3/01/2004
Greg Streveler P.O. Box 94 Gustavus, AK 99826	3/01/2002
Julie Maier 2140 Twin Flower Drive Fairbanks, AK 99709	3/01/2003

NOTE: All written comments to proposals published in this proposal booklet must be sent to the ADF&G Boards Support Section at the address below in order to be included and published in the Board of Game's Spring 2002 board workbook. Written comments regarding the proposals in this proposal booklet may not be published if the comments are sent to individual board members.

Alaska Board of Game members may also be reached at:

ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

Boards Support Section
PO Box 25526
Juneau, AK 99802-5526
(907) 465-4110
(907) 465-6094 FAX

Boards Support Section
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
PO Box 25526
Juneau, AK 99802
(907) 465-4110
(907) 465-6094 Fax

HEADQUARTERS

Board of Fisheries

Diana Cote, Executive Director 465-6098
Art Hughes, Publication Tech. 465-4111
Trina Nguyen, Admin, Clerk 465-6097

Board of Game

Jim Marcotte, Acting Ex. Director 479-7215
<Vacant>, Regs. Specialist 465-2027
Aubrey Merritt, Admin. Clerk 465-4110

Lori VanSteenwyk, Administrative Assistant 465-6096

REGIONAL OFFICES

Arctic Region

Susan Bucknell
P O Box 689
Kotzebue, AK 99752
Phone: (907) 442-3420
Fax: (907) 442-2420

Western Region

Trim Nick
P O Box 1789
Bethel, AK 99559-1789
Phone: (907) 543-4467
Fax: (907) 543-4477

Southwest Region

Joe Chythlook
P O Box 1030
Dillingham, AK 99576
Phone: (907) 842-5142
Fax: (907) 842-5514

Interior Region

Jim Marcotte
1300 College Road
Fairbanks, AK 99701-1599
Phone: (907) 459-7215
Fax: (907) 474-8558

Southcentral Region

Sherry Wright
333 Raspberry Rd.
Anchorage, AK 99518-1599
Phone: (907) 267-2354
Fax: (907) 267-2489

Southeast Region

<Vacant>, Southeast
PO Box 25526
Juneau, AK 99802-5526
Phone: (907) 465-4110
Fax: (907) 465-6094

For updated information on the progress of an ongoing Board of Fisheries or Board of Game meeting, call: Juneau 465-8901; Outside Juneau 1-800-764-8901

Website address: <http://www.state.ak.us/adfg/boards/bordhome.htm>

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
TENTATIVE AGENDA

Interior Region

March 8 - 18, 2002

River's Edge Resort, Fairbanks, AK

NOTE: This is tentative agenda is **subject to change** throughout the course of the meeting This Tentative Agenda is provided to give a general idea to the public of the board's anticipated schedule. The board will attempt to hold to this schedule; however, the board is not constrained by this Tentative Agenda. Those of you who wish to testify must sign-up by the deadline. Public testimony will continue until those present at the meeting are heard; the board will continue working through its agenda immediately upon conclusion of public testimony. The following time blocks are only an estimate. Updated agendas will be posted in the meeting room, or call 1-800-764-8901 for a recorded message on daily progression through the meeting.

Friday, March 8

8:30 AM

OPENING BUSINESS

Call to Order; Introductions of Board Members and Staff

Board Member Ethics Disclosures

Purpose of Meeting (overview)

STAFF REPORTS

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Oral public testimony, including Advisory Committee Reports

**DEADLINE FOR SIGN-UP TO TESTIFY IS: 12 NOON, SUNDAY, MARCH 10
(Public testimony will continue until those who are present at the meeting are heard.)**

Saturday, March 9

8:30 AM

Continue public testimony

Sunday, March 10

8:30 AM

Conclude public testimony

BOARD DELIBERATIONS

Monday, March 11 through, March 18

BOARD DELIBERATIONS

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

ADJOURN

(The Board schedule will generally be: 8:30 AM - 12 noon and 1:00 - 5:00 PM with lunch from noon until 1:00 PM. This schedule is subject to change at the discretion of the chair.)

PROPOSAL 1 - 5 AAC 85.010(3). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BISON. Extend the bison season in Unit 20D as follows:

Bison in Unit 20D. Extend the season date to June 30.

ISSUE: If during the regular bison season (Oct. 1—Mar. 31) the harvest quota has not been met, those individuals with open permits would be allowed to hunt on the Delta Agricultural Project (DAP) from May 7—June 30.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Splinter groups of 10—12 animals are choosing to remain on private land through the spring and summer months rather than migrating away from the farms to their traditional calving areas. Consequently, calves are being born in the DAP. Research on wild as well as domestic animals has indicated a tendency for offspring to be born in the same locality as where the mother had been born. This being the case, it is feared that additional cows will be calving and more animals will be remaining year round on the DAP adding to the already significant crop losses caused by bison.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If the herd remains on the DAP year round, more farmers will be forced to fence their acreage thus reducing the feeding rangeland and accessible hunting areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those individuals who were not successful during the normal season will have another opportunity to harvest a bison. Also, this should reduce the bison vs. agricultural producers conflict. Bison herd will benefit because if they remain on the DAP more fences will be built reducing their feed range.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No detrimental affects are expected.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? As mentioned, fencing is being considered by landowners. This is a worst case scenario due to the tremendous investment and maintenance costs for the landowner. Fencing may also interfere with other wildlife that do not cause as much damage as the bison. Also, the department appreciated the farming area for its hunting access. Other season extension dates have been considered such as Apr. 1—May 7, however, farmers are concerned field roads would be damaged by hunter’s vehicles during “break up,” therefore the May 7—June 30 dates are being proposed.

PROPOSED BY: Delta Chapter of the Alaska Farm Bureau (I-02S-G-069)

PROPOSAL 2 - 5 AAC 92.015(b). BROWN BEAR TAG FEE EXEMPTIONS. Amend this regulation in Unit 20D as follows:

Authorize continuation of the current brown bear tag fee exemption for portions of Unit 20D for the 2002-2003 hunting season, and increase the area to include all of Unit 20D.

ISSUE: Brown bear tag fee exemptions are taken up annually by the Board of Game at their spring meeting. This proposal is to maintain the current brown bear tag fee exemption for portions of Unit 20D, and increase it to all of Unit 20D.

In 1995 Delta Advisory Committee submitted an extensive plan for intensive management to the Board of Game at the 1995 Spring board meeting. One portion of the Delta plan was the current brown bear tag fee exemption. The board has identified Unit 20D as under state definition of intensive management.

It is the opinion of the Delta Advisory Committee that the brown bear tag fee exemption is the only portion of the intensive management plan submitted by them that has had any real significance. Although the effect has been low impact in its seven years of existence, the brown bear tag fee exemption has nonetheless produced results.

One side benefit has been the opportunity it has afforded to those who might not otherwise have the opportunity to hunt. The tag fee exemption area contains two Native villages, and many people outside of those villages, for whom the \$25 tag fee is prohibitive. For many people in this area, a hunting license costs \$5, and the opportunity to hunt, not take, a brown bear is five times as much. Is there a reason for denying the people who cannot afford the bear tag an opportunity to take a bear? This appears to be discriminatory. Even with the tag fee exemptions in place, the brown bear harvest remains well within the harvest goals set by the board. In fact, not enough bears are being taken.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The brown bear tag fee exemption would be lost for Unit 20D. This logical tool of the original intensive management plan presented to the Board of Game in 1995 would be lost, as would a means of increasing calf survival for both moose and caribou in Unit 20D. Individuals who cannot afford a brown bear tag, including those who live within the tag fee exemption area, would once again be denied the opportunity to hunt brown bears. (Note: The opportunity to hunt is not directly related to success in this case, but the opportunity itself is valuable.) Hunters report finding extremely high brown bear populations during this past season throughout Unit 20D. The Delta Advisory Committee has been watching this pattern over the past five seasons and is reaching the conclusion that this is an established population trend. When brown bears are shot near the city limits of Delta Junction from spring to fall, there are too many bears. In fall of 2001, hunters watched brown bears stalking and chasing moose calves in the area where the tag fee is still required.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? In particular, hunters within and near the tag fee exemption areas who cannot afford brown bear tags. Serious brown bear hunters who can afford the tags will purchase them as this will remove the restriction forcing them to hunt only in this limited area. This will also benefit hunters in the area who may be hunting moose or caribou and are aware that they have the opportunity to take a bear without a tag. Moose and caribou hunters will benefit from

this program in future years. The tag fee exemption also supports the present intensive management program established by the Board of Game for Unit 20D.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Delta Advisory Committee feels that many of the people they represent lose the opportunity to hunt brown bear without this tag fee exemption. In addition, Delta Advisory Committee feels that the only item the Board of Game chose to implement from Delta's extensive intensive management proposal, originally made in 1995, would be lost. Bear harvest of ungulate populations, moose and caribou, would continue to increase. This is an extremely healthy brown bear population in a relatively inaccessible area, thus no one will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Relocating grizzlies to Yellowstone National Park. Not considered practical.

PROPOSED BY: Delta Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-030)

PROPOSAL 3 - 5 AAC 92.015(b). BROWN BEAR TAG FEE EXEMPTIONS. Reauthorize the current brown bear tag fee exemption for portions of Unit 20D, as follows:

(b) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in ... Unit 20(D) north of the Tanana River or east of the east bank of the Gerstle River...

ISSUE: The Unit 20D brown bear tag fee exemption must be reauthorized annually. The tag fee exemption was implemented in 1995 for portions of Unit 20D primarily to increase the harvest of brown bears for the purpose of reducing predation on moose and caribou calves (Board of Game Policy 95-85-BOG; and 5AAC 92.125(3)).

Current Unit 20D brown bear hunting regulations for those portions of Unit 20D north of the Tanana River, or south of the Tanana River and east of the Gerstle River include no tag fee, an Aug. 10-June 30 hunting season, a bag limit of one bear/year, and a requirement to have the skull and hide sealed in Unit 20D or in Tok. The southwestern portion of Unit 20D has a \$25 tag fee, a Sept. 1-May 31 hunting season, and a bag limit of one bear/four years.

The current brown bear harvest objective adopted by the Board of Game (BOG) in March 1995 is 5-15 bears/year. Brown bear harvest in Unit 20D, and in the tag fee exemption area, has increased since implementation of the tag fee exemption. Total mortality (including harvest, defense of life and property, and illegal) has ranged from 10 – 17 bears/year and total mortality has averaged 14 bears/year, which meets the objectives established by the board. Much of the increase, however, occurred in the southwest portion of Unit 20D where bear hunting regulations have not been liberalized, and where kill of DLP and nuisance bears in the vicinity of Delta Junction is significant. Harvest in the tag fee exempt area has increased from a mean of four bears/year before the exemption to seven bears/year since the exemption was implemented.

The board adopted a Macomb Caribou Herd population goal of 600-800 caribou with a sustainable harvest objective of 30-50 caribou/year by the-year 2002. The Macomb Caribou Herd population goal was not met in fall 2001 with an estimated herd size of 500–550 caribou.

The harvest objective was met with a harvest of 43 caribou; however, this actually exceeded the harvest quota which had been set at 25.

The Unit 20D moose management objectives have not been met. The board adopted a Unit 20D moose population goal of 8,000 - 10,000 moose with a sustainable harvest objective of 500–700 moose/year. The 1999–2000 Unit 20D moose population estimate is 5,551 – 7,103 moose. Reported harvest during the 2000-01 hunting season was 244 moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity for brown bears will be reduced. Also, the brown bear tag fee exemption is consistent with the board’s authorized intensive management program for the Macomb Caribou Herd in southeastern Unit 20D and for the moose population in northern and southeastern Unit 20D. Failure to extend this tag fee exemption would be inconsistent with the intent of board policy 95-85-BOG, which is to reduce bear predation on moose and caribou calves to increase the moose and caribou populations in Unit 20D.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Brown bear hunters will continue to benefit from increased hunting opportunity. Moose and caribou hunters may eventually benefit if moose and caribou populations increase enough to allow a larger harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? We are not aware of anyone who is suffering because of the current tag fee exemption, or who is likely to suffer if the exemption is renewed.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Eliminate the tag fee exemption, and thereby rely only on a longer season and a more liberal bag limit to accomplish the objective of a higher harvest of brown bears.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-039)

PROPOSAL 4 – 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE and 5 AAC 92.530. MANAGEMENT AREAS. Change this regulation in Unit 20D to establish a youth hunt, as follows:

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

(18)

Unit 20(D), that portion lying west of the west bank of the Johnson River and south of the north bank of the Tanana River, except the Delta Junction Management Area

and the Bison Range Youth Hunt Management Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side. Sept. 1 – Sept. 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side. Sept. 5 – Sept. 15

Unit 20(D) that portion within the Bison Range Youth Hunt Management Area

1 bull by drawing permit up to only; up to 75 permits may be issued **Sept. 1 – Sept. 30** **Sept. 1 – Sept. 30**

Establish the Bison Range Youth Hunt Management Area (BRYHMA) in Unit 20(D) on two field complexes of the Delta Junction Bison Range as follows:

(22)

The Bison Range Youth Hunt Management Area (BRYHMA)

(A) The area consists of two field complexes within the Delta Junction Bison Range in Unit 20(D) as follows:

(i) the Panoramic Field hunting area is located ¼ mile south of the Alaska Highway between Milepost 1404.0 and 1407.6, and bounded by a line beginning at the northeast corner (latitude/longitude 63° 53.299"/145° 14.714"), then northwest 3.5 miles to 63° 54.956"/145° 20.767", then southwest 2.4 miles to 63° 53.206"/145°23.232", then southeast 1.5 miles to 63° 52.537"/145° 20.758", then northeast 1.0 mile to 63° 53.301"/145°19.659", then southeast 2.0 miles to 63° 52.330"/145°16.075", then northeast 1.0 miles to the beginning point; and

(ii) the Gerstle Field hunting area is located ¼ mile south of the Alaska Highway between Milepost 1394.1 and 1396.8, and bounded by a line beginning at the northeast corner (latitude/longitude 63°48.984"/144°57.766"), then northwest 2.9 miles to 63° 50.242"/145° 02.874", then southwest 1.1 miles to 63°49.102"/145°04.197", then southeast 2.3 miles to 63°48.239"/145°00.339", then northeast 1.6 miles to the beginning point.

(B) The area is open to moose hunting by permit only.

ISSUE: This proposal establishes a moose drawing hunt for adult/youth pairs on 2,800 acres of the Delta Junction Bison Range (DJBR).

The DJBR is approximately 90,000 acres in size of which 2,800 acres (3 percent of the DJBR and 0.1 percent of Unit 20D) are in two sets of fields called the Panoramic Fields (1,700 acres) and Gerstle Fields (1,100 acres) located about eight miles apart. The department manages bison forage in the DJBR fields to comply with the Alaska legislature's intent to reduce bison damage to agricultural crops in the nearby Delta Agricultural Project. In 1993 the department began planting oats for bison forage in the DJBR fields and in recent years have planted 300–400 acres annually, in addition to perennial grasses. Large numbers of moose feed on the oats during the fall and moose hunters have learned to hunt moose feeding on oats in the fields. Even though spike-fork/50-inch antler restrictions are in effect, competition between hunters has become intense and so many hunters are now driving through the fields hunting that they are damaging bison forage crops, creating safety concerns for department staff, littering, and causing other problems.

This proposal will provide a solution to department concerns about large numbers of moose hunters in the DJBR fields, as well as provide opportunity for youth to develop hunting skills. Although recent legislation intended for special big game seasons to be open for children before the general season, this will not work on the DJBR for the following reasons: 1) moose hunting during August may significantly interfere with DJBR field activities during that time, 2) moose hunting activity in the fields during August may compromise bison use of the area causing bison to spend more time and cause more damage in the Delta Agricultural Project (this is not generally a problem in September), and 3) the DJBR fields are within Delta Controlled Use Area which prohibits motorized vehicles for hunting from August 5–25.

The following two bag limit options are presented for the BRYHMA hunt. Differences between the options are italicized.

Preferred Option: Moose hunting in the BRYHMA will occur by drawing permit from September 1–15 with a *bag limit of one bull moose*. Drawing permits will be issued to a party consisting of one adult (at least 21 years old) and one child (8–17 years old) as defined in AS 16.05.255(i), with the child being the permittee. The adult may only assist the child in taking a moose and any moose taken under the permit would count against the bag limit of both the child and adult. Thirty permits would be issued annually with hunting limited to three parties per field for three days each and hunting times would be assigned in the order parties were selected during the drawing process. The following permit conditions would apply: 1) children must have completed a certified hunter education course; 2) hunters must wear orange vests supplied by the department to prompt safety in the open fields and to provide identification of permitted hunters; and 3) motorized vehicles are prohibited for hunting in the fields, but may be used to retrieve carcasses only.

Alternative Option: Moose hunting in the BRCMA will occur by drawing permit from September 1–15 with a bag limit of one bull moose *having spike, fork, or 50 inch antlers-fork or 50–inch antlers or antlers with four or more brow tines on at least one side*. Drawing permits

will be issued to a party consisting of one adult (at least 21 years old) and one child (8–17 years old) as defined in AS 16.05.255(i), with the child being the permittee. The adult may only assist the child in taking a moose and any moose taken under the permit would count against the bag limit of both the child and adult. Thirty permits will be issued annually with hunting limited to three parties per field for three days each and hunting times would be assigned in the order parties were selected during the drawing process. The following permit conditions would apply: 1) children must have completed a certified hunter education course; 2) *hunters must view a video-tape at the Delta Junction office about identifying legal bulls*; 3) hunters must wear orange vests supplied by the department to prompt safety in the open fields and to provide identification of permitted hunters; and 4) motorized vehicles would be prohibited for hunting in the fields, but could be used to retrieve carcasses.

If this proposal is adopted, the department will also evaluate developing rustic camping facilities within the DJBR fields so that adults can also take the opportunity to teach children camping skills during the hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Concerns about damage to bison forage, safety, crowding, and interference with DJBR operations will continue and probably become increasingly worse.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will provide a high quality hunting opportunity for children to learn hunting skills, thus promoting a new generation of hunters. It will also reduce hunting pressure and thus the impact of moose hunters on bison forage crops on the DJBR allowing the department to better meet legislative intent for the DJBR.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Children that receive permits will benefit. Also the department will benefit by reducing damage to bison forage crops and other problems associated with large numbers of moose hunters in the DJBR fields. Bison hunters will benefit during the Delta bison hunting season because reduced damage to bison forage will provide bison hunters a greater opportunity to hunt bison on state land instead of private land. Farmers in the Delta Agricultural Project will benefit because reduced damage to bison forage will encourage bison to spend more time on the DJBR instead of in farm fields.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Moose hunters that hunt in the Panoramic and Gerstle Fields of the DJBR will lose 2,800 acres of hunting area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The department has considered the following options to address this issue:

1. Take no action.
2. Establish a closed area that prohibits all moose hunting in the DJBR fields.
3. Establish a controlled use area that prohibits the use of motorized vehicles in the DJBR fields.
4. Establish a management area with hunting by drawing permit in the DJBR fields, without restricting permits to children only.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-038)

PROPOSAL 5 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation in Unit 20D as follows:

Increase the total potential moose harvested in the Delta Junction Management Area from 10 to 30.

ISSUE: The maximum number of moose allowed to be harvested in the Delta Junction Management Area has been ten for a number of years, and all ten have been harvested with no impact upon the population. Changing the maximum to 30 allows for more flexibility on the part of the area biologist but does not mean that 30 permits will be issued.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Area biologist will continue to be allowed a maximum of ten permits for an area containing hundreds of square miles, and a very healthy moose population.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will benefit if the biologist chooses to issue more permits. The possibility of getting a permit will be enhanced if more permits are issued.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one would suffer under this proposal.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Delta Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-027)

PROPOSAL 6 - 5 AAC 92.530(9). MANAGEMENT AREAS and 5 AAC 85.045(8). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend these regulations in Unit 20D as follows:

Open a nonresident moose hunting season for the Tok Management Area of Unit 20D. Make a five mile (no hunting of moose) corridor on the south side of the Alaska Highway for nonresidents. Season dates: Sept. 5—Sept. 15 (four brow tines or 50-inch).

ISSUE: Open a nonresident moose season for the Tok Management Area of Unit 20D.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A continued area of no nonresident hunting. Limited access of area for nonresidents.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nonresident hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-037)

PROPOSAL 7 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.
Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Change brow tine restrictions for Unit 20D from four brow tines to three brow tines. That is, where a four brow tine restriction is presently in place, it would become a three brow tine restriction.

ISSUE: Antler restrictions in Unit 20D. Four brow tine restriction should be changed to three brow tines.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to remove four brow tine bulls from the breeding stock. The prime determiner as to whether or not to shoot a moose is whether or not it has four brow tines. This means that bulls with four or more brow tines have much less chance of surviving to breed. This is changing the genetic makeup of Unit 20D-South bull moose. Hunters report seeing fewer and fewer four or more brow tine moose. Hunter selection for this genetic variable results in decreasing the percentage of four or more brow tine moose in the Unit 20D-South area, and in turn reduces the number of breeding bulls carrying the genetics for four or more brow tines. In addition, with a four brow tine restriction the harvest objective is unlikely to be met. A three brow tine restriction would increase the possibility of meeting the harvest objective. There is currently no biological reason for limiting the hunt to four brow tine bulls as there is a healthy and substantial herd. The moose population in this small area is large, and bull:cow ratio indicates that an any bull season is practical, as long as the harvest is limited to maintain numbers.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose whose genetics favor four or more brow tines, as well as hunters who struggle under the four brow tine/50-inch restrictions. There will be fewer hunters who inadvertently break the law by killing animals under 50 inches, and therefore fewer animals abandoned and left to waste. This would make it easier for both the court system and enforcement.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The biggest concern regarding this proposal is controlling the harvest. To prevent an overharvest in this small area, it may be necessary to either shorten the season by opening it later, or to close it by emergency order after a predetermined harvest has occurred.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Make season open for any bull, but this would be too big a change done too quickly. It may be possible in the future. However, a means of harvest control would need to be implemented.

PROPOSED BY: Nat Good (I-02S-G-064)

PROPOSAL 8 - 5 AAC 85.060(1). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR FUR ANIMALS. Amend this regulation in Unit 20D as follows:

Unit 20D to have a year round season on coyotes with no bag limits and no closed season.

ISSUE: Coyotes, once relatively rare in Unit 20D, are now found almost everywhere, and in packs. With small game, once abundant, (i.e., rabbits, grouse and ptarmigan) now almost extinct in Unit 20D, these small predators remain overly abundant. Their focus has changed to larger species, such as moose, sheep and caribou, and in particular their young. Coyotes are playing a proportionately significant role in the Unit 20D predator problem.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Coyotes will continue to proliferate until they eliminate their own food source. Coyote survival depends upon reducing their numbers to a level which the prey species can feed.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will benefit from decreased predation on the ungulate populations, but perhaps even more important, the coyotes themselves will have a healthier population as well, and avoid starvation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Failure to do something about the overly abundant coyote population will result in starving coyotes. Otherwise, no one will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Adjusting trapping seasons, but with fur prices at such low levels this would not be effective enough.

PROPOSED BY: Delta Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-028)

PROPOSAL 9 - 5 AAC 92.125(3). WOLF PREDATION CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN. Amend this regulation to include the following:

Macomb Caribou Herd Recovery Plan: Plan to be implemented and expedited by local department personnel. Delta Advisory Committee, a local group, would help with planning and direct input of local advice and information.

This effort would involve a wolf sterilization program for Unit 20D. The Fortymile Caribou Management Plan has shown that this approach is effective in terms of limiting wolf numbers, and

allowing for caribou herd growth. Alaskans are now reaping the benefits of the sterilization effort. Local efforts can now be made using the Fortymile sterilization approach as a model.

There are five packs of wolves which prey on this caribou herd, so cost of sterilization would not be prohibitive in comparison with the Fortymile effort.

Trapping of wolves is another possibility, but local trappers do not concentrate their effort on this region, due to inaccessibility. In addition, fur prices are low, and fuel prices are high, making isolated trapping more expensive than the trapper can make. It would be possible to create a trapper incentive to make trapper efforts profitable.

It is obvious that non-lethal wolf sterilization works, and is more acceptable to the public.

ISSUE: Extreme predator-prey relationship in southeast Unit 20D, which is the breeding and calving grounds of the Macomb Caribou Herd. This area has been identified by the Board of Game for intensive management, and also for active management of wolf populations. Although the Macomb herd is small, currently numbering around 500 animals, it is very important to those who live in this area and have hunted them over the years.

The population objective for the Macomb herd is 600 to 800 animals. For two consecutive years the caribou calf survival ratio has been 11 calves per 100 cows. In other words, of approximately 300 calves born last spring, only 33 survived. According to department personnel, a caribou herd cannot maintain its population with only 11 percent recruitment.

On the day of the 2001 fall caribou count, two kills were reported by the department, one by wolves and the other a bear kill. Preliminary moose survey reports indicate low moose calf survival in southeast Unit 20D for calves born in the spring of 2001. The brown bear tag fee exemption has been a helpful tool, but the bear population continues to grow. Hunters report seeing numerous grizzlies, and trappers report seeing very little small game in this area, also indicating a high predator population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Predator populations will continue to grow, continuing to decimate the ungulate populations, such as moose, sheep, and caribou. The Macomb Caribou Herd will not reach its population objective unless something is done about the predator/prey relationship. This herd, which boasts a bull:cow ratio of approximately 50 bulls per 100 cows, will go to feed the wolves over the next few years. Hunters will have little or no opportunity to harvest caribou from the Macomb herd. With no predator control, the caribou, sheep and moose populations of southern Unit 20D and Tok management areas will continue to decline.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? With a goal of increasing the herd to its population objective, this increases the quality of the hunt by not only making it possible to have a hunt, but making the population large enough to improve the possibilities of hunter success, thereby improving the quality of the hunt. The quality of the herd is also enhanced by an increase in its numbers, thereby affecting the viability of the herd's existence.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The caribou herd, hunters and their families, photographers, hikers, moose and sheep hunters will all benefit in the years to come. With an increase in herd size, predators will also benefit as their health and numbers are enhanced by an increase in prey populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one is likely to suffer as a result. There may be those who object to sterilization as a means of population control, but it is an accepted and effective means to an end.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1. No closed season on wolves. 2. Lethal wolf control. 3. Wolf sterilization appears to be more politically correct.

PROPOSED BY: Delta Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-029)

PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 92.540. CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this regulation in Unit 20D as follows:

Macomb Plateau Controlled Use Area is hereby removed from designation of controlled use area.

ISSUE: Macomb Plateau Controlled Use Area in Unit 20D. Change the designation of controlled use to free access.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Other areas are being overused which impacts animal numbers and habitat, while this area remains largely underused.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters and outdoors people who are functionally denied access to a large area in the fall of the year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. It is primarily used by a few horsemen who have the means to access an even more remote part of the controlled use area. I know. I am one of the horsemen who use it.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Arron Atchley (I-02S-G-035)

PROPOSAL 11 - 5 AAC 92.540(3). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Change the boundary of the Delta Controlled Use Area in units 13B, 20A, and 20D, as follows:

This proposal adjusts the boundary of the Delta Controlled Use Area to include an easily accessible caribou hunting area for the Macomb Caribou Herd.

(3) Units 13 and 20

(A) the Delta Controlled Use Area;

(i) the area consists of those portions of Units 13(B), 20(A), and 20(D) beginning at the confluence of Miller Creek and the Delta River then west to VABM Miller, then west to include all drainages of Augustana Creek and Black Rapids Glacier, then north and east to include all drainages of McGinnis Creek to its confluence with the Delta River, then east in a straight line across the Delta River to **the east bank of the Delta River, then north along the east bank to a point opposite the intersection of the Alaska and Richardson Highways then east in a straight line to the intersection of the Alaska and Richardson Highways** [MILE 236.7 RICHARDSON HIGHWAY, THEN NORTH ALONG THE RICHARDSON HIGHWAY TO ITS JUNCTION WITH THE ALASKA HIGHWAY], then east along the Alaska Highway to the west bank of the Johnson River, then south along the west bank of the Johnson River and Johnson Glacier to the head of the Canwell Glacier, then west along the north bank of the Canwell Glacier and Miller Creek to the Delta River.

ISSUE: The Macomb Caribou Herd is small and road accessible. After a customary and traditional use determination was made for the Macomb Caribou Herd, the hunt was changed from drawing permit in 1989 to registration permit in 1990. In recent years, the Macomb Caribou Herd has had a harvest quota of only 25 caribou/year. Several factors have made managing the small harvest quota difficult including 1) reduced hunter opportunity for other road accessible caribou herds, 2) a change in herd distribution making Macomb caribou more accessible to hunters with off-road vehicles, and 3) increased incidental harvest as numbers of moose hunters increase. In three of the last four hunting seasons, it has been necessary to close the Macomb herd registration permit hunt by emergency order after only one to three days of hunting.

During the 2001 hunting season, the harvest quota of 25 bulls was exceeded on opening day. By the time an emergency order became effective and closed the hunting season after three days, 43 caribou were reported taken, exceeding the harvest quota by 18 caribou (72 percent). Managing this small, road accessible herd, with a small harvest quota, has been very difficult by registration permit and also results in a high level of dissatisfaction for hunters due to the uncertain nature of the hunting season. Hunting of the Macomb herd is also developing into an unsatisfactory hunt as hunters rush to kill a caribou before the season is closed by emergency order.

This change is intended to reduce the necessity of managing the Macomb Caribou Hunt by emergency order. It adjusts the boundary of the Delta Controlled Use Area (DCUA) to include an easily accessible caribou hunting area. The department intends to also adjust the registration hunt season date to Aug. 15 – Aug. 25, making the hunt nonmotorized within the Macomb Plateau Controlled Use Area and DCUA, which is the majority of the hunt area. The boundary change is necessary because some Macomb caribou use the area south of Delta Junction between the Richardson Highway and Delta River, which is currently outside of the DCUA. To include these caribou within the nonmotorized hunt, this boundary change is needed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A small number of Macomb caribou will be available to hunt with motorized vehicles, outside of the DCUA. This harvest may contribute to an overharvest of this small herd that has a small harvest quota.

Also, much of the area included in this proposal is within a portion of the Ft. Greely Military Reservation that is open for hunting. Because caribou in this area are very visible from the road system, and because military personnel can hunt this area without a hunting license, we anticipate significant interest in hunting this area by military personnel in particular, which may contribute to an overharvest without this regulation change.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Users of the Macomb Caribou Herd will benefit by having the hunt managed on a predictable basis rather than by emergency order.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Because DCUA vehicle restrictions apply to hunting of big game only from August 5–25, the only hunters impacted by this change would be the caribou hunters it addresses and a very few bear hunters. However, bear hunting effort in this area is very light and within the last five years no brown or black bears have been killed by hunters in this area during the effective dates.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The only other solution considered was to make no change, but this will subject the Macomb Caribou Herd to the potential for overharvest.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-040)

PROPOSAL 12 - 5 AAC 92.540. CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Airboats may not be used for moose hunting or to transport moose, moose hunters, or moose hunting equipment outside of navigable waterways in areas: Unit 20B south of the south bank of the Salcha R; Unit 20D north of the north bank of the Tanana River.

ISSUE: Considerable increase of airboat hunting in large swampy drainages which were inaccessible during moose hunting season previous to new technology, i.e., bottom coatings, multi blade variable pitch propeller, increased horsepower, etc. The new airboats can motor far beyond the limits of the best track rigs to areas even a float plane cannot utilize.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Overharvest in these areas resulting in lower moose populations there and in more accessible hunting area which rely on surplus animals from healthy previously unhunttable populations in these swampy flats.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All big game hunters who access their areas by conventional means.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The airboat traveler who is hunting big game other than moose would not be allowed to take a moose should this opportunity arise, in the affected areas.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Totally prohibiting airboats in this area during moose season; they have been used prior to the new technology on navigable waterways long enough to be considered "traditional." Restrictions prohibiting hunting the same day as traveling by airboat outside of navigable waterways could present enforcement problems.

PROPOSED BY: Jack E. Windsor (I-02S-G-001)

PROPOSAL 13 - 5 AAC 85.020(11). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR. Amend this regulation as follows:

Extend Unit 12 grizzly bear season to Aug. 10—June 30.

ISSUE: Align the grizzly bear season in Unit 12 with that of Unit 20C.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? As it stands now, sheep hunters hunting from Aug. 10—Aug. 31 cannot harvest a grizzly bear. By aligning the seasons, it will give sheep hunters the opportunity to harvest a grizzly.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sheep hunters and ungulates.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-038)

PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 92.015. BROWN BEAR TAG FEE EXEMPTIONS. Amend this regulation in Unit 20E as follows:

Eliminate the tag fee requirement for grizzly bear in Unit 20E.

ISSUE: Eliminate the tag fee requirement for grizzly bear in Unit 20E.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A continued missed opportunity by hunters to harvest grizzly bears because of the tag fee. Moose calf survival will stay low resulting in low recruitment for the future.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-039)

PROPOSAL 15 - 5 AAC 92.015(b). BROWN BEAR TAG FEE EXEMPTION. Wave the resident tag requirement in Unit 20E as follows:

A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in...Unit 20E.

ISSUE: Grizzly bear tag fee exemption for Unit 20E. Currently, residents must purchase a \$25 tag prior to harvesting a grizzly bear in Unit 20E. This decrease opportunistic bear harvest. Often, hunters miss opportunities to harvest grizzly bears when hunting for other species if they do not have a tag in possession.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunter opportunity to harvest grizzly bears in Unit 20E will continue to be impaired due to the tag fee currently in effect. Bear populations are healthy throughout Unit 20E and grizzly bears are major predators of the Fortymile caribou herd. Hunters would like the opportunity to harvest more bears, but have been curtailed from doing so by the tag fee.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All resident grizzly bear hunters in Unit 20E.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No negative effects anticipated.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Another solution might be replacing the grizzly bear tag fee with some type of sealing fee that could be paid when, and only when, a bear is actually harvested. Hunters that are disgruntled at having to prepay to harvest a grizzly they may never see would be happy to pay upon actual harvest of a grizzly bear. Currently, there is not a regulation to allow for this option, thus we request suspension of the tag fee.

PROPOSED BY: Eagle Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-082)

PROPOSAL 16 - 5 AAC 85.025(7) and (15). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR CARIBOU. Amend this regulation as follows:

Unit 12: Residents: one bull by Tier II permit, Oct. 21 – Mar. 31. Season dates and hunt area will be set by the department.

Unit 20E: Residents: one bull by Tier II permit, Oct. 21 – Mar. 31. Hunt area set by the department.

ISSUE: Extend the Nelchina caribou hunt in to units 12 and 20E. Thousands of Nelchina caribou have spent six to seven months in Unit 12 since 1981 and Unit 20E since 1997. This continued use of this area should be incorporated in Nelchina caribou hunt management. This change would benefit all Nelchina Tier II recipients and not change the harvest because it would be under the same allocation set by ADF&G.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued loss of hunting opportunity by Nelchina caribou Tier II hunters during the winter. Area closures can be enacted to ensure protection to other herds sharing the same wintering areas.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Tier II hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Separate Unit 12 Tier II hunt for Nelchina caribou, did not reject - possibly situation for people of Upper Tanana.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-006)

PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 85.025(15). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR CARIBOU. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Winter harvest allocations for the Fortymile herd should mirror the fall harvest allocations to allow for equitable harvest of caribou. Those allocations are: 50 percent for Unit 20E (Tok, Taylor Highway), 35 percent for Unit 25C (Steese Highway, Central), and 15 percent for Unit 20D (Salcha, Goodpaster).

ISSUE: Fortymile caribou herd winter harvest allocations (December 1 - February 28). Currently, the winter caribou harvest quota for the Fortymile caribou herd is not partitioned among subunits 20E, 25C, 20D as is the fall quota. In the past, this has resulted in an unequitable distribution of harvest. For example, winter 2001. Most of the winter quota for the Fortymile herd was shot on

the Steese Highway in two days this year. This gave residents hunting in other subunits very limited opportunity to harvest Fortymile caribou.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunter opportunity to harvest Fortymile caribou during the winter seasons will continue to be sporadic and poorly distributed.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All residents that harvest caribou throughout the range of the Fortymile herd. Harvest will remain the same, but be more uniformly distributed among hunter groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No negative effects anticipated. Hunters can still harvest the same amount of caribou, but they will not be able to do it in huge numbers, in one location, in a matter of days.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No others considered for this proposal.

PROPOSED BY: Eagle Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-080)

PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reduce the length of the moose season in northern Unit 20E to coincide with the season dates in most of Unit 20E, as follows:

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

(18)

Unit 20(E), that portion within the Ladue River Controlled Use Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:
1 bull per regulatory year,
only as follows:

1 bull by registration permit only;	Aug. 24-Aug. 28 Sept. 8-Sept. 17
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

1 bull by drawing permit only;	Nov. 1-Nov. 30
--------------------------------	----------------

up to 100 permits may be issued

(General hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

Sept. 8-Sept. 17

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or
antlers with 4 or more brow
tines on [AT LEAST] one side
by registration permit only

[UNIT 20(E), THAT PORTION
DRAINING INTO THE YUKON
RIVER UPSTREAM FROM AND
INCLUDING THE CHARLEY AND
SEVENTYMILE RIVER DRAINAGES,
TO AND INCLUDING THE
BOUNDARY CREEK DRAINAGES
AND THE TAYLOR HIGHWAY
FROM MILE 145 TO EAGLE]

[RESIDENT HUNTERS:]
[1 BULL BY REGISTRATION
PERMIT ONLY]

[AUG. 24-AUG. 28]
[SEPT. 5-SEPT. 25]

[NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:
1 BULL WITH 50-INCH ANTLERS OR
ANTLERS WITH 4 OR MORE BROW
TINES ON ONE SIDE BY REGISTRATION
permit only]

[SEPT. 5-SEPT. 25]

Unit 20(E), that portion draining
into the Middle Fork of the Forty-
mile River upstream from the drain-
age of the North Fork of the Forty-
mile River

RESIDENT HUNTERS:
1 bull

Aug. 24-Aug. 28
Sept. 8-Sept. 17

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

Sept. 8-Sept. 17

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or
antlers with 4 or more brow
tines on one side

Remainder of Unit 20(E)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

Aug. 24-Aug. 28

1 bull by registration
permit only

Sept. 8-Sept. 17

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS

Sept. 8-Sept. 17

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or
antlers with 4 or more brow
tines on one side by registration
permit only

ISSUE: Currently, moose densities in that portion of Unit 20E drained by the Yukon, Seventymile, and Charley Rivers (YSC) are 0.3-0.4 moose/mi² and are the lowest in Unit 20E. Bull:cow ratios are high ($\geq 60:100$). Since 1999, hunter participation in YSC has increased by 33 percent. Harvest during 2000 and 2001 was 34 and 13 bull moose. Increased hunter participation is due to several factors: 1) it is one of the last moose seasons to close along the road system in Alaska; 2) it has an any bull bag limit; 3) more restrictive moose hunting regulations in other road accessible units have displaced hunters into Unit 20E; and 4) a very liberal federal subsistence season (August 20-September 30, one bull). Between 50 percent and 76 percent of the harvest in YSC has occurred after the moose season in the remainder of Unit 20E has closed.

Modeling data and survey data collected in other areas of Unit 20E indicate that increased harvest in YSC will rapidly reduce the bull:cow ratio because of the population's low density and recruitment levels. By shortening the moose season in YSC will protect against a decline in the bull:cow ratio by limiting future harvest increases and will reduce regulatory confusion within Unit 20E. This regulatory change will mean the hunting season on either side of the Yukon River will be different but considering the large size of this regulatory boundary, hunter confusion is expected to be minimal. This is not an identified intensive management population and reduction in hunter opportunity does not enact the intensive management law AS 16.05.255(e)-(g).

The moose season in the YSC differed from the remainder of Unit 20E by starting earlier and extending later in September. The rationale for the longer season was that most of the hunting in that area occurred along the Yukon River. To reduce confusion, it was best if the season in the YSC mirrored the season along the north bank of the Yukon in Unit 25B which was September 5-September 25. There was little concern of an overharvest because few people participated in the hunt and harvest was low.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Harvest will exceed sustainable resulting in a decline in the bull:cow ratio.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Most moose hunters who use the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who want to hunt later in September or desire to have the same season on either side of the Yukon River.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Maintain the status quo; rejected because the number of moose hunters and harvest is becoming too high.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-068)

PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 85.065(1). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR SMALL GAME. Shorten the season for grouse in Unit 20E as follows:

Grouse seasons for Unit 20E should extend from August 20 through March 31.

ISSUE: Grouse (spruce, blue, ruffed, and sharp-tailed) season length in subunit 20E. Currently the regulation states that grouse season from August 10 - March 31. We request that the board shorten the grouse season length by ten days.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The grouse population will continue to decrease, affecting its long term viability. Ultimately, hunting enjoyment and opportunity will be lost as grouse become less available in Unit 20E.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Grouse hunters in Unit 20E and the grouse populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No negative effects anticipated.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None considered for this proposal.

PROPOSED BY: Eagle Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-081)

PROPOSAL 20 - 5 AAC 92.095(a)(3). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FURBEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation as follows:

Open a hunting season for beaver in Units 12 and 20E. This hunting season should be allowed under a trapping license. Season dates would be Sept. 20—June 10. A bag limit of six beavers.

ISSUE: Create a beaver hunting season in Units 12 and 20E.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A continued low harvest of beavers. Many creeks and sloughs being dammed by beavers.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters or trappers that would like to harvest beavers before the ice sets in or after it goes out.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-040)

PROPOSAL 21 - 5 AAC 92.095(13). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FURBEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Make it illegal to take a coyote during April or October in units 12 or 20E with a steel trap, or a snare smaller than 3/32 inch diameter, as follows:

(a) The following methods and means of taking furbearers under a trapping license are prohibited, in addition to the prohibitions in 5 AAC 92.080:

(7) taking a wolf or coyote with a steel trap or with a snare smaller than 3/32 inch diameter in

(A) Units 12, 13, 19 – 21, 24 or 25 during April or October;

(B) Unit 13 from November 1 through November 9;

ISSUE: Coyote trapping season in units 12 and 20E was lengthened in 1996 to coincide with the wolf trapping season. A corresponding change of methods and means was not part of the 1996 regulation. As a result, traps and all snare sizes were allowed during October and April to catch coyotes when all other furbearer seasons, except for wolf, are closed. Prior to 1996, wolf trappers were restricted to using snares 3/32 inch and larger in order to minimize the take of nontarget furbearer species during October and April. Restricting coyote trappers to the same methods and means would again minimize nontarget catch and still allow efficient trapping for coyotes and wolves.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Possible capture of fox, lynx, and wolverine during the closed season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Most trappers and trapping.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trappers who only use traps to catch coyotes.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-066)

PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 92.095(8). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FURBEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Change this regulation in Units 12 and 20E as follows:

(8) a person who has been airborne may not use a firearm to take or assist in taking an arctic fox, red fox, coyote, wolf, lynx, or wolverine until after 3:00 a.m. on the day following the day in which the flying occurred; this paragraph does not apply to a trapper using a firearm to dispatch an animal caught in a trap or snare, or in taking a coyote if that person is over 300 feet from the

airplane at the time of the taking, or in the taking a red fox or lynx if that person is over 300 feet from the airplane and used legal predator calling methods in Units 12 and 20E.

ISSUE: Under the current regulation, trappers who use airplanes for access to their trapping areas are effectively restricted from using predator calling. Predator calling is a popular method in trying to take foxes, coyotes, and lynx in Units 12 and 20E and because airplanes are not legal access, more hunting pressure is occurring along the highways and trails. Allowing the use of airplanes for access would lessen competition by distributing trappers throughout the units. This regulation change will not lead to abuse. Even though many trappers are skilled in recognizing fox and lynx tracks from the air, it is very inefficient to follow their tracks to find the animal. This regulation change will allow a trapper who uses an airplane for access to find areas where fox and lynx have been moving through, land, and attempt to bring them in using a predator call. Fox, lynx, and coyotes are difficult to take using predator calls; changing this regulation will not cause excessive harvest. This regulatory change would not violate the intent of the Alaskan voters as the taking of wolves would not be legal.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Loss of trapping opportunity.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers who use predator calls.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo – rejected because it needlessly reduces opportunity for predator calling of fox and lynx.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-034)

PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC 92.095(13). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FURBEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Reestablish the requirement in units 12 and 20E to mark snares within one-quarter mile of any publicly maintained road, as follows:

(a) The following methods and means of taking furbearers under a trapping license are prohibited, in addition to the prohibitions in 5 AAC 92.080:

(13) in Units 12 and 20(E) within one-quarter mile of any publicly maintained road, by using a snare with a cable diameter of 3/32 inch or larger that is set out of water, unless the snare has been individually marked with a permanent metal tag upon which is stamped or permanently etched the trapper's name and address, or the trapper's permanent identification number, or is set within 50 yards of a sign that lists the trapper's name and address, or the trapper's permanent identification number; the trapper must use the trapper's Alaska Driver's license number or state identification card number as the required permanent identification number; if a trapper chooses to place a sign at a snaring site rather than tagging individual snares, the sign must be at least 3

inches by 5 inches in size, be clearly visible, and have numbers and letters, that are at least one-half inch high and one-eighth inch wide in a color that contrasts with the color of the sign[; THE PROVISIONS OF THIS PARAGRAPH DO NOT APPLY AFTER JUNE 30, 2002].

ISSUE: During spring 2000, the Board of Game adopted regulation-requiring trappers in units 12 and 20E to mark wolf snares set within ¼ mile of any publicly maintained road. To ensure that the regulation fulfilled its intent and did not place undue hardship on trappers the board placed a sunset clause requiring a thorough review during spring 2002.

Based on testimony brought forward to the Upper Tanana/Fortymile Advisory Committee and comments by trappers responding to the Division of Wildlife Conservation’s Trapping Questionnaire, over 90 percent of the area wolf trappers support continuing the regulation. Respondents believed it has benefited trapping by elevating trapper responsibility and gaining more support for trapping by the non-trapping public. No one found it difficult to mark the snares or sites following regulatory requirements. There were no reports of anyone learning the identity of individual trappers and harassing them. Representatives of the Alaska Division of Wildlife Protection and Department of Fish and Game found no sets that were not marked or sets that were not picked up after the season since the regulation was enacted. Prior to the regulation, that was not the case.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If this proposal is not adopted, marking wolf snares along the road system would no longer be required. Two years of data indicate that without the requirement of marking snares, a higher number of illegal snaring incidents will occur possibly harming other animals and tarnishing trapping in the public eye.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers and trapping’s public image.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The few area trappers who do not support trap marking.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None, as written it has the support of trappers and the enforcement and management agencies.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the Upper Tanana/Fortymile Advisory Committee (HQ-02S-G-067)

PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC 92.095(13). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FURBEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation in units 12 and 20E, as follows:

- (13) in Units 12 and 20(E) within one [ONE-QUARTER] mile of any publicly maintained road, by using a snare with a cable diameter of 3/32 inch or larger that is set out of water, unless the snare has been
 - (i) individually marked with a permanent metal tag upon which is stamped or permanently etched the trapper’s name and address, or the trapper’s permanent identification number; or

- (ii) is set within 50 yards of a sign that lists the trapper's name and address, or the trapper's permanent identification number;
- (iii) **under (i) or (ii) of this section**, the trapper **shall use either his/her** [MUST USE THE TRAPPER'S] Alaska driver's license number or **his/her** state identification card number as the required permanent identification number. If a trapper chooses to place a sign at a snaring site rather than tagging individual snares, the sign must be at least 3 x 5 inches in size, must be **visible to a person enforcing the regulations** [CLEARLY VISIBLE], and have numbers and letters that are at least 1/2 inch in height and 1/8 inch wide in a color contrasting with the sign. [THE PROVISIONS OF THIS PARAGRAPH DO NOT APPLY AFTER JUNE 30, 2002.]

ISSUE: In units 12 and 20E all above-water snares with a cable measuring 3/32 inch diameter or greater and 40 inches length or longer must be identified with an owner-identification number tag. Long line trappers need only identify their lines with a sign within the first mile of either end of their lines.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? N/A. Proposal is intended to facilitate accountability.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? A) Trappers in general by showing responsibility which will in turn protect the industry. B) Law enforcement – being able to locate and identify owners of sets if needed.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Registration of each snare site, similar to bear bait stations. Rejected – not necessary.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Advisory Committee (HQ-02S-G-013)

PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC 92.095(13). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FURBEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Reauthorize this regulation in Units 12 and 20E as follows:

In Units 12 and 20E with in one-quarter mile of any publicly maintained road, by using a snare with a cable diameter of 3/32 of an inch or larger that is set out of water, unless the snare has been individually marked with a permanent metal tag upon which is stamped or permanently etched the trapper's name and address, or the trapper's permanent identification number, or is set within 50 yards of a sign that lists the trappers name and address, or trapper's permanent identification number; the trapper must use the trapper's Alaska Driver's license number or state identification card number as the required permanent identification number; if a trapper chooses to place a sign at the snaring site rather than tagging individual snares, the sign must be at least 3 inches by 5 inches in size, be clearly visible, and have numbers and letters that are at least one-half inch high and one-eighth inch wide in a color that contrasts with the sign; [THE PROVISIONS OF THIS PARAGRAPH DO NOT APPLY AFTER JUNE 30, 2002].

ISSUE: Without reauthorization of this regulation by the board, the regulation will sunset June 30, 2002. The Board of Game passed this regulation in Units 12 and 20E for a period that would cover two full trapping seasons to determine if the requirement to mark those snares, listed in regulation, would reduce violations by encouraging more responsible trapping; and could be easily implemented by trappers without causing a large amount of disruption to the trapping operation. Through field contacts and discussions with the trappers, the Tok Fish and Wildlife Trooper found that the trappers were in compliance with the regulation and that the marking requirements were easily implemented. In discussions with the trapping community, we found that there were no instances of any type of harassment by the non-trapping community based on the requirements of 5 AAC 92.095(13). The trooper found very few violations during the two seasons and found no unintentionally caught big game animals or pets in phantom sets. (Those sets that are not recovered by the trapper when the season ends, and are left in the field set during the remainder of the year.)

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The regulation will sunset on June 30, 2002. The reduced number of trapping violations that have been seen in the past two years in these units may increase again with out this regulation in place.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers, unintentionally caught big game animals, and the general public, will all benefit from responsible trapping. The requirements of this regulation encourage responsible trapping habits by those who participate.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None considered.

PROPOSED BY: Department of Public Safety, Fish and Wildlife Protection (HQ-02S-G-006)

PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC 85.015. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BLACK BEAR. Increase the black bear bag limit in the Unit 19D-East predator control implementation area, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(3)		
Units 9, 11 - 13, 16, and 18 – 26, <u>except 19(D), upstream from the</u>	No closed season. (General hunt only)	No closed season.

**Selatna and
Black River drainages**

3 bears

**Unit 19(D), upstream from
the Selatna and
Black River drainages**

**No closed season.
(General hunt only)**

No closed season.

**10 bears, however in order
to harvest more than 3 bears
the hunter must obtain a
registration permit**

ISSUE: Data from the recent 2001 moose calf mortality study showed that black bear predation on moose calves is substantial in some areas of the Unit 19D-East Predator Control Implementation Area. The harvest of bears by hunters could reduce this predation. The Governor’s 19D-East Adaptive Wildlife Management Team has identified reducing black bears as a key component to the recovery of the moose population. Some hunters that take black bears in the area often harvest their annual limit of bears. This proposal would allow the continued general season harvest of black bears requiring only a hunting license, while increasing the total bag limit through a closely monitored registration hunt for those few hunters interested in the opportunity to take up to 10 bears total.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Black bears will continue to kill an estimated 35 percent of moose calves before they are six weeks of age.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters interested in increased opportunities to take black bears.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Members of the public that are against killing bears.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Department control program.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-061)

PROPOSAL 27 - 5 AAC 85.020. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR and 5 AAC 92.132. BAG LIMIT FOR BROWN BEARS. Amend these regulations in Unit 19 as follows:

Unit 19C: Residents and Nonresidents: 1 bear every regulatory year...Sept. 1—May 31.

Unit 19D: Residents and Nonresidents: 1 bear every regulatory year...Sept. 1—May 31.

One bear every regulatory year and does not count against one bear every four regulatory years bag limit.

ISSUE: The increase in population of brown/grizzly bears in Game Management Units 19C and 19D without an increase in hunting pressure or some sort of population control of this species.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Brown/grizzly bears are in my opinion one of the main predators of moose and caribou especially during the calving season. Many moose and caribou calves are killed in their first few days of life due to bear and wolf predation. If this increase in the bear population continues the number of moose and caribou calves surviving until adulthood will continue to decrease.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal does not address an improvement in the quality of a resource harvested. It is meant to be a tool to help control a potentially dangerous population problem.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose and caribou will be the first to benefit. Moose and caribou hunters will be able to continue hunting in this area with good success. It will also be an improved opportunity for bear hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one or any resource is likely to suffer from this change.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions were considered.

PROPOSED BY: Rob Jones, Jr. (HQ-02S-G-002)

PROPOSAL 28 - 5 AAC 92.015. BROWN BEAR TAG FEE EXEMPTIONS. Reauthorize the current exemption of brown bear tag fee in Unit 19D, as follows:

(b) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear ... in Unit 19(D)...

PROBLEM: The brown bear tag and fee requirement for Unit 19D was eliminated by the Board of Game for the 1998-99 regulatory year. The exemption must be reauthorized on an annual basis. Since then the total harvest in Unit 19D has been 15 bears (avg. 5 bears/year) with a harvest sex ratio of 67 percent males (10/15). Previous to the tag fee exemption harvest was negligible. The current harvest continues to be minimal. However, local hunters have taken interest in harvesting grizzlies since the tag fee exemption was instituted. Based on extrapolation from density estimates conducted in similar habitats in Alaska and field observations, Unit 19D has a relatively abundant bear population. There are also several areas of increased abundance around salmon streams during the fall. The current harvests documented since the exemption was put in place are well within the sustainable limits.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The tag fee would be reinstated for the 2001-2002 regulatory year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local and state resident hunters that wish to harvest bears annually in Unit 19D without paying a tag fee.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-062)

PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 85.045(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.

Restrict hunting season in Unit 19 as follows:

Resident hunts only, closed to nonresidents.

ISSUE: The increased amount of nonresident hunting in Unit 19.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be no more game, especially moose for our younger generation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, Unit 19 moose numbers are down, this proposal addresses the problem.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresidents.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There is a great need to cut hunting down for nonresidents, it is crucial to our younger generation that we do so.

PROPOSED BY: Stony River Traditional Council (HQ-02S-G-094)

PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 85.045(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.

Change this regulation for Unit 19 as follows:

Resident hunts only, closed to nonresident hunting.

ISSUE: The increased amount of nonresident hunting in Unit 19.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? No more moose in Unit 19.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Unit 19 moose numbers are declining, this proposal addresses that problem.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresidents.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Need something done in Unit 19, currently nothing being done about increased hunting in this area.

PROPOSED BY: Kuskokwim Native Association (HQ-02S-G-093)

PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 85.045(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunting season in Unit 19A, only within the Lime Village Management Area, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(17)		
Unit 19(A), that portion within the Lime Village Management Area		
2 moose per regulatory year; up to 28 moose may be taken by Tier II subsistence hunting permit only; up to 14 permits may be issued.	Aug. 10-Sept. 25 (Subsistence hunt only) Nov. 20-Mar. 31 (Subsistence hunt only)	No open season.
[UNIT 19(A), THAT PORTION OF THE KUSKOKWIM RIVER UPSTREAM FROM, BUT NOT INCLUDING, THE DRAINAGES OF THE KOLMAKOF RIVER AND THE HOLOKUK RIVER]		
[RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 MOOSE PER REGULATORY YEAR; HOWEVER, ANTLERLESS MOOSE MAY BE TAKEN ONLY DURING THE FEB.1-FEB.10 SEASON]	[SEPT. 1-SEPT. 20] [NOV. 20-NOV. 30] [FEB. 1-FEB. 10]	
[NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 BULL WITH 50-INCH ANTLERS OR		[SEPT. 5 – SEPT. 20]

ANTLERS WITH 4 OR MORE BROW
TINES ON ONE SIDE BY DRAWING
PERMIT ONLY; UP TO 50 PERMITS
MAY BE ISSUED, IN COMBINATION
WITH THE REMAINDER OF UNIT 19(A)]

Remainder of Unit 19(A)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull per regulatory year

Sept. 1 – Sept. 20

Nov. 20 - Nov. 30

Feb. 1 - Feb 10

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull per regulatory year, with

50-inch antlers or antlers

with 4 or more brow tines on

one side by drawing permit only; up to 50 permits

may be issued[, IN COMBINATION

WITH UNIT 19(A), THAT PORTION OF THE

KUSKOKWIM RIVER UPSTREAM FROM,

BUT NOT INCLUDING, THE DRAINAGES OF

THE KOLMAKOF RIVER AND THE HOLOKUK

RIVER]

Sept. 5 – Sept. 20

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. The estimated harvest from 1993 to 1999 for the February antlerless hunt (Unit 19A, except Lime Village Mgmt. Area) has ranged between 5 and 50 moose with an estimated average February harvest of 22 moose. An estimated average of 15 moose are taken during the winter season within the Lime Village Management Area. November 2001 trend area data from the Holitna/Hoholitna Rivers indicated 8 bulls:100 cows and 7 calves:100 cows, a decrease from the last survey in 1997 when 14 bulls:100 cows and 34 calves:100 cows were observed. Trend area data also showed a decrease in total number observed from an average of 533 moose (1990-1997) to 196 observed in 2001. The February 2001 hunt was closed by emergency order based on survey information and a request from the Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee. The most recent moose surveys and the level of reported harvest in Unit 19A indicate the population is not capable of sustaining this February antlerless season.

The Lime Village Management Area is excluded from this proposed closure because it is managed by Tier II with a fixed number of permits issued, thus controlling the harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be an unwarranted harvest of antlerless moose in this portion of Unit 19A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The hunters who rely on moose in Unit 19A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who like to harvest antlerless moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close the February moose season completely.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-060)

PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 85.045(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.

Eliminate the nonresident hunt in Unit 19A as follows:

Unit 19A should become a resident hunt only; nonresident – no open season.

ISSUE: Moose hunting activity in Unit 19A at present cannot sustain harvest pressures.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Populations will fall to such levels that hunting will be closed.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? 384 resident hunters living in state (data averaged from 1995-1999 department records).

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? 47 nonresident hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Grant Fairbanks (HQ-02S-G-036)

PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 85.045(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.

Restrict the hunting season in Unit 19 as follows:

Preferred option: Moose, Units 19A and 19B, nonresidents, no open season. Anything less than the preferred option should not allow a nonresident season for as long a period as the resident season. Option of Sept. 1—Sept. 15.

ISSUE: Declining moose populations in Units 19A and 19B. Extremely low bull:cow ratios at unacceptable levels, low calf production, winter seasons used by local residents have been closed, subsistence users less successful harvesting moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose population will decline to levels where it may not recover. Continued reduced subsistence opportunity.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local residents who depend on moose for subsistence.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Businesses and individuals who rely on nonresidents for commercial purposes.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Closed season for everybody: subsistence users greatly depend on moose to put food on the table.

PROPOSED BY: Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee (W-02S-G-002)

PROPOSAL 34 - 5 AAC 85.045(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation in Units 19A and 19B as follows:

Nonresident hunters: 1 bull moose with 50-inch antlers or antlers with four or more brow tines on one side by registration permit only (first come/first serve basis); Unit 19A – up to 50 permits may be issued; Unit 19B – up to 225 permits may be issued.

ISSUE: New drawing hunt for nonresident moose hunters will create unstable business environment for reputable guides. In the case of May drawing, guides will not know until July whether they will have hunts (and therefore income for family) that are to take place in just 30 days or so. How will a guide react and survive if not drawn? How will he replace that income or find a job at such short notice? If drawing held in previous December, guide will lose all bookings that would take place that entire winter before the season, but after the drawing application deadline.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Guiding industry in this area will become unstable. Reputable guides may leave while fly-by-night operations and air taxis remain in full force which is what the drawing hunt was intended to address. Quality, safe service to the public will deteriorate rather than increase.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quality of guiding service to the public will be enhanced because it will help promote a stable predictable situation where a guide could call to get an immediate answer from the department whether there are any permits left and therefore an answer on whether he should schedule a hunter in a particular area or not. Guides and hunters could know in some cases two years in advance that they had a permit and that the hunt was going to in fact take place. If and when the permits were gone, a guide would at least know ahead of time and could take appropriate action well in advance.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The more committed guides that plan and book well in advance of hunts. The department will have a lower cost operating this system than a drawing and the permits could be sold for more, thereby not creating as big of a deficit for them.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Last minute operators and huge air taxi operations would be encouraged to scale down their volume or adjust how they book/plan operations.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Changing the time of the drawing, but as stated above, there is not a time that a drawing could be held to really address this very real problem. Also considered somehow putting a limit on how many moose a person/guide could assist in taking in one year. Larger operations would not like this.

PROPOSED BY: George Siavelis (HQ-02S-G-009)

PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 85.045(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation in Unit 19 as follows:

I do not believe that this regulation was based on sound data concerning moose populations. We need detailed surveys before making such restrictions. Return the seasons to the previous year's seasons and then get current information on populations.

ISSUE: Repeal of the nonresident moose drawing in units 19A and 19B. This regulation was adopted in January 2001 and very little if any public notice has been given.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Many guides who have contracts on hunters and air taxis who have bookings for hunters will be forced to take their guests to areas that have no drawings, putting greater pressure elsewhere.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, see above questions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All residents of units 19, 17B, 21, and 18. Guides, air taxis, and transporters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Tony Lee (SC-02S-G-003)

PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC 85.045(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Return to the 2000-2001 seasons and bag limits for nonresident hunters in units 19A and 19B. The board should direct the department to establish a panel of big game resource users in units 17, 18, 19 and 21. This panel will consider the region as a whole and develop coordinated hunting seasons and bag limits. This panel may identify sensitive local hunting areas. Options other than a subunit-wide drawing may include small guide or air taxi exclusion zones, registration hunts in small

critical areas. The board should also direct the department to conduct a comprehensive moose census of the region to provide data to the panel to make informed harvest decisions.

ISSUE: Nonresident moose lottery in units 19A and 19B. Repeal regulation adopted March 2001 regarding a drawing hunt for nonresident moose hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A drawing hunt in units 19A and 19B will not significantly reduce local resident and nonresident hunting conflicts in Unit 19A. Nonlocal residents and nonresident hunters will still be present in sensitive hunting areas in Unit 19A. Guided hunters in Unit 19A are usually in areas inaccessible to local residents using boats for transportation; their presence is normally undetected by local hunters. Guides will suffer most of the consequences of a lottery hunt having done little to cause the conflict in the first place. Guides are restricted to certain areas and may not operate satellite camps in noncontiguous guide use areas. Air taxis and guides that can move will simply shift the unsuccessful drawing hunters to surrounding game management units. This sudden in flux of hunters will cause significant disruption to local hunters and guides already operating in these surrounding areas. There are no villages in Unit 19B and no recent history of subsistence moose hunting. Unit 19B should not have been included in the drawing hunt.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Certain specific areas may be reserved to protect local hunters while continuing to provide hunting opportunities for nonresident and nonlocal resident hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents of units 17B, 18, 19C, 21A, and 21E. Local residents and other hunters will not have the added burden of new guides air taxis in their hunting areas. Guides displaced by a lottery requirement.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one at the present time.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Nonresident tag allocations for guides and air taxis, no regulations presently in place to allow permit allocations. Guide-required for moose: air taxis could hire guide to circumvent this regulation. Guide-required involves the legislature and is a controversial subject at this time.

PROPOSED BY: Kelly Vrem (SC-02S-G-001)

PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC 85.045(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.
Change the size requirements for hunting moose in Unit 19C as follows:

- Change bag limit:
- Resident hunters, 1 bull, 50-inch antlers
- Nonresident hunters, 1 bull, 55-inch or 60-inch antlers

ISSUE: Low to no recruitment to moose herd.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Loss of moose hunting opportunities for hunters. Loss of viewing opportunities for nonconsumptive users. Loss of revenue to state from license sales. Loss of revenue from service providers for hunters. Loss of jobs. Loss of food source for many Alaska residents in area. Eventually loss of moose herd.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by allowing more bull moose to survive hunting season, helping to assure a larger percentage of cows being pregnant, helping calf survival rate through numbers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users of moose in Unit 19.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some hunters who are unwilling to hunt selectively.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1. Permits – Cost prohibitive. 2. Close season – Not necessary if proper action is taken. 3. Aggressive wolf control – Not practical or politically correct with current administration and regulations.

PROPOSED BY: Jeff Pralle (SC-02S-G-005)

PROPOSAL 38 - 5 AAC 85.045(17). HUNTING SEASONS BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Clarify the moose hunt area boundaries for the August season in Unit 19D, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits (17)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 19(D), that portion of the Kuskokwim River drainage <u>downstream from the Big River Drainage and</u> upstream from the Selatna River, but excluding the Selatna River drainage and the Black River drainage[,AND EXCEPT FOR THAT PORTION OF THE UPPER KUSKOKWIM CONTROLLED USE AREA SOUTH AND EAST OF THE KUSKOKWIM AND NORTH FORK KUSKOKWIM RIVER]	Sept. 1 - Sept. 20 Dec. 1 - Dec. 15	No open season.

1 bull by registration permit

Unit 19(D), that portion of the
Kuskokwim River drainage
upstream from and including the
Big River drainage

[UPPER KUSKOKWIM RIVER CONTROLLED
 USE AREA SOUTH AND EAST OF THE
 KUSKOKWIM RIVER AND NORTH FORK
 KUSKOKWIM RIVER]

1 bull by registration permit	Aug. 20- Sept. 20	No open season
	Dec. 1 - Dec. 15	

ISSUE: The boundary for the August portion of the 19D moose season needs to be changed. The boundary that defines this area is confusing to hunters. The current boundary allows hunting only on the south bank of the Kuskokwim and North Fork Kuskokwim upstream from and including the Big River drainage during August in Unit 19D, so you can only shoot moose on or south of the south bank of those rivers. This proposed boundary change would not significantly increase hunting area as hunting is basically limited to the river corridor.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to be confused by the description of the area and be unable to hunt on or north of the north bank of the river.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local residents who would like less confusion in the regulations and in the description of this hunt area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Eliminate the August season entirely.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-063)

PROPOSAL 39 - 5 AAC 85.045(17). HUNTING SEASONS BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Shorten the moose season in Unit 19D by removing the December season except in the remainder where it would be shortened to December 1-15, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits General Hunts)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and Open Season	Nonresident
(17) Unit 19(D), that portion of the Kuskokwim River drainage upstream From the Selatna River, but	Sept. 1 - Sept. 20 [DEC. 1 - DEC. 15]	No open season.

excluding the Selatna River drainage and the Black River drainage, and except for that portion of the Upper Kuskokwim Controlled Use Area south and east of the Kuskokwim and North Fork Kuskokwim River

1 bull by registration permit

Unit 19(D), that portion of the Upper Kuskokwim River Controlled Use Area south and east of the Kuskokwim River and North Fork Kuskokwim River

1 bull by registration permit

Aug. 20- Sept. 20
[DEC. 1 - DEC. 15]

No open season

Unit 19(D), that portion between and including the Cheeneetnuk and Gagaryah River drainages, excluding that portion within 2 miles of the Swift River

1 bull per regulatory year

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20
Dec. 1 - Dec. 15
[DEC. 1 - DEC. 31]

No open season.

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side

Sept. 1-Sept. 20

Remainder of Unit 19(D)

1 bull per regulatory year

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20
Dec. 1 - Dec. 15
[DEC. 1 - DEC. 31]

No open season

ISSUE: Survey estimates indicate that the moose population in Unit 19D continues to remain at low densities and bull:cow ratios are low in the hunted portion of the unit. Measured moose densities have been below 0.37 moose/square mile since 1996. Bull:cow ratios overall are 37 bulls per 100 cows but in hunted areas, the bull:cow ratio is 18 bulls per 100 cows. In the longterm trend area, located in the heaviest hunted areas, the ratios have been 13, 9 and 6 bulls per 100 cows in 1998, 2000, and 2001, respectively.

The department closed the December 2000 season based on survey information collected during Fall 2000. Likewise, fall 2001 survey data indicated continued low densities and low bull:cow ratios and again the department closed the season by emergency order.

Reported harvest has averaged 4.6 bulls/year (range 1-11) in December from 1992-1999. Estimated unreported harvest of both bulls and some cows is between 10-25 per year in this area. Based on population modeling information and current harvest data, the population is low enough that current harvest levels are no longer sustainable and must be reduced.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will remain at low density and the bull:cow ratio will decline.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local residents who rely on moose meat for food.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who do not want to lose hunting opportunity.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Status quo.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-064)

PROPOSAL 40 - 5 AAC 85.045(17). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.
Amend these regulations as follows:

No nonresident moose hunting ½ mile either side of the main channels of the Holitna River from Kaghegalok to the Kuskokwim, the Titnuk from Fuller Mountain to the Holitna, the Hoholitna from Big Diamond to the Holitna, and the Aniak from the Salmon River to the Kuskokwim.

ISSUE: Highly visible moose, nonresident hunting on the Holitna, Hoholitna, Titnuk, and Aniak rivers.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Conflicts will continue to increase between local residents and nonresident unguided and guided hunters.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All local residents and nonlocal residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A few guides, air taxis, and transporters who have a highly visible presence in a traditionally local hunting area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Tony Lee (SC-02S-G-002)

PROPOSAL 41 - 5 AAC 85.045(19). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.
Restrict the hunting season in Unit 21A as follows:

Unit 21A that portion within the Nowitna River drainage: One bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with four or more brow tines on at least one side; harvest; September 5 - September 20.

Remainder of Unit 21A: Nonresidents: One bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with four or more brow tines on at least one side; harvest; September 5 - September 25.

ISSUE: The Nowitna River drainage falls within units 21A and 21B. Current regulations differ within these units for that portion within the Nowitna River drainage as to the ending date of the nonresident season. The nonresident season in Unit 21A currently runs from September 5 to September 25. The nonresident season in Unit 21B, “that portion within the Nowitna River drainage” runs from September 5 to September 20. Within the Nowitna River drainage, we would like to see the ending season date for nonresidents be consistent in both Units 21A and 21B and close on September 20. A change is needed to create consistency in regulation within the Nowitna River drainage.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Inconsistencies in regulations within the drainage will continue to confound prospective hunters and it could increase the likelihood of a hunter to violate a regulation.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Prospective hunters of the Nowitna drainage will not need to reference which unit they are hunting in as the season will be consistent throughout the drainage. Law enforcement personnel will benefit by having a consistent moose hunting season regulation to enforce throughout the Nowitna River drainage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident hunters in the Nowitna River drainage portion of Unit 21A will have their season shortened by five days. Nonresident hunters that normally hunt during that five day period will be inconvenienced by having to hunt earlier in the season.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Koyukuk/Nowitna NWR (I-02S-G-078)

PROPOSAL 42 - 5 AAC 85.045(a). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.
Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt in Unit 21E, as follows:

Resident	
Open Season	
(Subsistence and	Nonresident

Units and Bag Limits

General Hunts)

Open Season

(19)

Unit 21(E)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose per regulatory year; however, antlerless moose may be taken only during the period Feb. 1-Feb. 10 and moose may not be taken within one-half mile of the mainstem of the Yukon River or the Innoko River during the period Feb. 1-Feb. 10

Sept. 5-Sept. 25
Feb. 1-Feb. 10

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side

Sept. 5-Sept. 25

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. Reporting is extremely low. The estimated harvest from 1993 to 2000 for the February antlerless hunt is 75-125 moose, of which 30-65 are cows based on subsistence surveys. The reported harvest from 1992 to 2000 for the February antlerless hunt has ranged between 1 and 19 moose with a reported average February harvest of 9 moose. The most recent moose surveys conducted in a portion (5000 mi²) of Unit 21E during February 2000 indicated a density of 1.0 moose /mi². The population is capable of sustaining this February antlerless season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This antlerless season will not occur.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who rely on this population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-058)

PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 92.050(3)(c). REQUIRED PERMIT HUNT CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES. Amend this regulation as follows:

In the Unit 19, general moose drawing permit hunts, the department shall issue any surplus drawing permits on a first-come, first-served basis to any applicant who holds a valid nonresident hunting

license and a nonresident moose tag. Surplus permits for Unit 19 will be available at the McGrath Division of Wildlife Conservation office beginning five days after each drawing. Surplus permits are not subject to the limitations in 5 AAC 92.050(2) and (4)(F).

ISSUE: We would like to make sure hunters have every available opportunity to obtain permits to hunt. At present, only those who apply during the application period are eligible for a permit. We would like to see any permits not issued during the drawing be available on a first-come, first-served basis to those that decide to hunt after the application deadline.

We feel there is a high probability for this drawing hunt to be undersubscribed and would like to take care of this problem the same way the grizzly drawing is in Units 22 and 23. We would very much like this proposal to take affect for the 2002 moose season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? All permits available for use may not be issued.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who decide to hunt moose later in the year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska's Western Wildlife Alliance (HQ-02S-G-023)

PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 84.270(13). FUR BEARER TRAPPING and 5 AAC 85.056(2). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR WOLF. Extend the seasons in Unit 19 as follows:

Remove wolf from big game hunting list. Extend seasons or reinstate same day airborne hunting by permit to reduce the number of wolves in area to biologically sound numbers by trappers and sportsmen.

ISSUE: Wolf control to allow for increase in moose, sheep, caribou survival. Wolf numbers climbing, game populations falling due to mismanagement. Allows sportsmen/trappers to control numbers other than the department or contracted hunters for state.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued imbalance of predator/prey until prey species collapses, causing loss of all uses be people, followed by predator collapse due to lack of prey for food source. Loss of revenue to state.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Improve game population balance resulting in sustainable

balanced predator/prey relationship. Increased opportunity for hunters and of all species increased. Increased revenue into area by sportsmen/trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters of big game, same day airborne hunting proponents, State of Alaska from hunter revenues.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anti-hunters, opponents of wolf control, State of Alaska and rural communities from lost hunter/trapper revenues.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? State controlled hunting of wolves/predators – loss of revenue from sportsmen/trappers, inefficient use of resource.

PROPOSED BY: Jeff Pralle (SC-02S-G-006)

PROPOSAL 45 - 5 AAC 92.080(4). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Restrict the use of snowmachines in Units 19D-East, 20A, and 20D as follows:

Taking wolves by actively pursuing them with a snowmachine is an offense punishable under the law. Shooting wolves from a moving vehicle is an offense punishable under the law.

ISSUE: Permanently ban “unfair chase” involving wolves and snowmachines anywhere in Alaska. (Currently allowed in the areas of active management of wolf populations in Stet, Unit 19D-East, Unit 20A and Unit 20D.)

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Taking wolves by means of actively pursuing them with a snowmachine and shooting them from a moving vehicle constitutes “unfair chase.” The public-at-large and most American hunters would be appalled to know that Alaska currently allows such a practice. The Boone and Crocket Club states that “Fair chase is the ethical, sportsmanlike, and lawful pursuit and taking of free-ranging wild game animals in a manner that does not give the hunter an improper or unfair advantage over the animal. Fair chase has been the Boone and Crockett philosophy since the Club's beginning.”

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Fair chase “is the very core of outdoor ethics, extending to all who enjoy wildlife and wildlands, or who make use of their resources” (Boone and Crocket Club).

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All ethical hunters and Alaskans who care about the principles of fair chase. All who are concerned about Alaska’s image as a state that allows unfair chase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unethical hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Alliance

(SC-02S-G-011)/(HQ-02S-G-096)

PROPOSAL 46 - 5 AAC 92.125. WOLF PREDATION CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN. Amend this regulation for Unit 19 as follows:

Add Unit 19 to the areas identified as “Active Management of Wolf Populations” so wolves can be taken with the use of snowmachines. Also extend season through the month of May. There are a lot of bear hunters in the field in May and we are (the state is) missing a free opportunity to harvest many wolves without using state-funded wolf control.

ISSUE: Wolf populations in Unit 19 are getting too high and out of control. Moose population and calf survival are not high enough. Hunts are being cancelled, guides are being squeezed out of business, subsistence needs are not being met, and so human families are going to be suffering a great deal without some additional wolf reduction strategies. We should not wait until we are in an absolute crisis like in Unit 19D to act; it takes too long to get an area to recover.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Calf survival will continue to be lower and lower. Human hunting (sport and subsistence) opportunity will have to be cut back more and more every year until there is very little left. No matter how much human hunting is cut back, moose will still be in trouble without additional wolf reduction strategies.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Not the quality of animals harvested, but the quality of the health of the ecosystem would be enhanced. Would create a potential for more guiding of wolf hunters that could possibly off-set some of the loss of guiding opportunity on moose, etc. This appears to be such a common sense strategy to help with wolves, help guides who are being pressured out, and help increase subsistence opportunity. No matter what we do with human hunting of moose, we are not going to help in a big way until we reduce wolves (Human take, or lack of, is probably too small of a percentage to significantly affect the moose population).

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence hunters, sport hunters, guides, moose, sheep, caribou, etc.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one other than the overpopulated wolf.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? State funded and operated air wolf control, but much more expensive. State funded wolf sterilization, but that is even more expensive and ridiculous. Does not benefit us in any of the ways illustrated above.

PROPOSED BY: George Siavelis

(HQ-02S-G-010)

PROPOSAL 47 - 5 AAC 92.125. WOLF PREDATION CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

All wolf predation control implementation plans in units 19D-East, 20A, and 20D are to be put on hold until there is a base of solid science to substantiate their need.

ISSUE: Reevaluate the need for both existing and future programs of active management of wolf populations in interior Alaska.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wolf numbers will continue to be grossly manipulated because of a bad attitude about wolves and the belief that they prey much more on moose populations than in fact they do. The advice of several scientists that wolves are not the primary problem in these areas has been largely ignored. Now that several biologists involved with the department have examined one of these areas in detail (Unit 19D-East), and determined that what the scientists have been saying all along is true, all of the wolf predation control implementation plans currently in effect should be scaled back until there is a base of solid science to substantiate their need.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Ecologically unsound management practices would be stopped which would lead to the creation of healthier wildlife populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaskans who care about the need for sound wildlife management practices.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who do not believe in wildlife management based on sound science, or who dislike wolves.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Alliance (SC-02S-G-010)/(HQ-02S-G-099)

PROPOSAL 48 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. PERMIT FOR USING AIRCRAFT TO TRANSPORT HUNTERS. Add a new requirement in Unit 19 as follows:

Require moose hunters using aircraft for transportation in Units 19A and 19B to first obtain a permit. The permit would be required for the hunter and would regulate the transportation of moose hunters, their hunting gear, and moose parts; however, this provision would not apply to the transportation of moose hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of moose by aircraft on scheduled flights, or between publicly-owned airports. The number of permits would be limited (perhaps a range of 75-120).

ISSUE: Excessive pressure on moose populations by hunters assisted or transported by aircraft.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose population will decline to levels where it may not recover. Continued reduced subsistence opportunity.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose populations would benefit and quality of hunt for all users would be improved.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? High volume commercial air operators and guides.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Apply this restriction to Unit 19A and specific areas of Unit 19B.

PROPOSED BY: Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee (W-02S-G-001)

PROPOSAL 49 - 5 AAC 92.540. CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Modify the boundaries of the Holitna-Hoholitna Controlled Use Area as follows:

Include the complete watersheds of the Holitna-Hoholitna rivers in the controlled use area. The new regulations would state: (i) the area consists of all the waters, including tributaries, of the Holitna and Hoholitna rivers.

ISSUE: Because of a loophole in the description of the controlled use area, large powered outboards are allowed in the shallow headwater areas of these rivers. The original intent of this regulation was to close the whole rivers to the use of engines over 40 hp. The proposed regulation would do what the original regulation should have done.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If this loophole in the regulation is not corrected the drastic increased use of large engines in this headwater area will continue to contribute to the moose overharvest problem.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters from the 18 down river villages who have used this river this past 60 years. 300-450 hunters per year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A very small group of guided hunters from outside the area "who use motors over 40 hp."

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Grant Fairbanks (HQ-02S-G-037)

PROPOSAL 50 - 5 AAC 92.540(7)(B). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend the Holitna-Hoholitna Controlled Use Area as follows:

In the Holitna-Hoholitna Controlled Use Area, that portion in Unit 19A should have the definition changed to read, (ii) the area **of this controlled use area, that portion in Unit 19A**, is closed to the use of any **motorized vehicle** [BOAT EQUIPPED WITH AN INBOARD OR OUTBOARD MOTOR] with an aggregate horsepower in excess of the manufacturer’s rating of 40 horsepower for hunting big game...

ISSUE: The increasing use of airplanes in Unit 19A in the support of moose hunters has put an added burden on the declining moose populations. Use of GPS devices and aerial spotting by airplane hunters and guides and the misuse of the “fair chase regulations” has become a problem in the last few years.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If this problem is not corrected the moose populations will continue to decline. This improper use of airplanes, as a spotting tool, is hard to enforce and will continue until this is addressed with a clear solution.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? 300 moose hunters who hunt by boat, snowmachine, or other (under 40 horsepower motorized vehicles).

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? 30 hunters who use planes as access or support for moose hunting in Unit 19A.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered including Unit 19B in this proposal but the big game guide’s lobby would oppose it. This problem exists in Unit 19B in even greater degrees but the political pressure would be too great to include this area at this time.

PROPOSED BY: Grant Fairbanks (HQ-02S-G-103)

PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 85.045(19). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation as follows:

Elimination of fall cow season in Unit 21.

ISSUE: Increasing hunting pressure on moose combined with steadily dropping recruitment rates.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Steadily dropping opportunities for local subsistence hunting and sport hunting.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Preserving cows would naturally preserve total populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All moose hunters would benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those individuals who did not get a bull.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1. Encourage local hunting and trapping wolves and bears. 2. Eliminate taking a cow with calf or a calf. Note: We considered above solutions and we plan to further pursue.

PROPOSED BY: Ruby Advisory Committee (HQ-02S-G-028)

PROPOSAL 52 - 5 AAC 85.045(19). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.
Restrict the resident and nonresident seasons in Unit 21B as follows:

Unit 21B shall be strictly a moose subsistence area no big game guiding or hunting shall be permitted.

ISSUE: Moose classified strictly as a subsistence game animal, take moose off of trophy and guided hunts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A lower than sustained bull population will occur, as in Unit 19. Our "herd" at present is ok but stats show the population is getting smaller and larger bulls are getting all but depleted.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All people that use this resource for food. Holy Cross, Aniak, Grayling, Shageluk, and others living along the Yukon, Innoko, and Anvik River areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Really no one until just a few years ago no guides operated in the area, we now have several guides and transportation in an area that historically did not have any.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Kenneth W. Chase (I-02S-G-066)

PROPOSAL 53 - 5AAC 85.045(a). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.
Reauthorize antlerless moose hunting seasons in Unit 21D, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits (19)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------

Unit 21(D), that portion

within the Koyukuk
Controlled Use Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose per regulatory
year, only as follows:

[1 MOOSE BY REGISTRATION
PERMIT ONLY; OR]

[AUG. 27-AUG. 31
(SUBSISTENCE HUNT ONLY)]

1 bull by registration
permit only; or

Aug. 27 [SEPT. 1]-Sept. 20
(Subsistence hunt only)

1 bull by drawing permit
only; up to 320 permits
may be issued in
combination with Unit 24,
that portion within the
Koyukuk Controlled Use Area; or

Sept. 5-Sept. 25
(General hunt only)

1 moose during a five-day
season to be announced by
emergency order during the
period Feb. 1-Feb. 28

(To be announced)
(Subsistence hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or
antlers with 4 or more brow
tines on one side by drawing
permit; up to 80 permits may be
issued in combination
with Unit 24, that portion
within the Koyukuk Controlled
Use Area

Sept. 5-Sept. 25

Remainder of Unit 21(D)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose per regulatory year;
however, antlerless moose
may be taken only [DURING
THE PERIODS SEPT. 21-
SEPT. 25 AND] during a five-day
season **to be announced by emergency
order** during the period Feb. 1-Feb. 28

Sept. 5-Sept. 25
(To be announced)

[; TO BE ANNOUNCED BY
EMERGENCY ORDER]; moose may not
be taken within one-half
mile of the mainstem of
the Yukon River during the
February season

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers
or antlers with 4 or more
brow tines on one side

Sept. 5-Sept. 25

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. Antlerless moose harvest in the two geographic areas described in regulation (above), can be supported by present moose populations on a limited basis only. Fall 1999 surveys suggest static or declining numbers in Three Day Slough, Kaiyuh Slough, Pilot Mountain Slough, and Squirrel Creek, trend count areas. Calf:cow and yearling:cow ratios indicate recruitment rates are declining, and more conservative harvest on the reproductive portion of the population is needed in some areas of the unit. Surveys conducted in March 1999 indicate increasing wolf population that is also having a downward influence on recruitment rates of moose in the Unit 21D. Reduction of antlerless seasons is in accordance with the Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The bag limit will revert to antlered moose only, which could reduce overall harvest of moose and result in more restrictive seasons. Failure to utilize the antlerless moose resource may result in lost opportunities to local users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who like to hunt cow moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

- Continue the cow harvest for all seasons currently open
- Discontinue all cow seasons
- Continue the cow harvest during the winter seasons only
- Shift the Fall season in the “remainder” portion of Unit 21D to the first five days of the open season

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-057)

PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 85.045(19). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.
Amend this regulation in Unit 21D to provide the following:

Eliminate the harvest of calves or cows accompanied by calves in Unit 21D.

ISSUE: Increasing moose hunting pressure combined with dropping recruitment rates.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Lack of moose hunting opportunity for all hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Taking a cow or a calf is an inefficient way of managing moose for long-term subsistence needs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All moose hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Someone who was unable to take a bull or grown moose. Someone who is starving.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Ruby Advisory Committee (HQ-02S-G-032)

PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 85.045(19). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.
Amend this regulation as follows:

Remove the one-half mile restriction for the winter hunt in the remainder of Unit 21D.

ISSUE: The unnecessary and difficult one-half mile restriction along the Yukon River in Unit 21D during the winter moose season. It is difficult to determine the one-half mile line from the Yukon River and with the limited winter hunt season, the regulation no longer is necessary.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to have the difficult task of determining one-half mile from the main stem of the Yukon River and will have less opportunity to harvest moose during the important winter season for villages.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who depend on the winter moose season to provide for their family's need and who find it difficult to travel one-half mile off the main stem of the Yukon River.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one is likely to suffer because the regulation is unnecessary and difficult to determine open and closed areas one-half mile from the Yukon River.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The Western Interior Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council considered removing the parallel federal regulation but rejected it because of the difficulty of determining land status where the one-half mile restriction would be in effect. During discussions on a similar federal proposal, the Wildlife Division biologist indicated the one-half mile

restriction may not be needed and also understood the difficulties of determining the one-half mile line from the main stem of the Yukon River.

PROPOSED BY: Western Interior Regional Advisory Council (I-02S-G-007)

PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 85.045(19). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Change the requirements for drawing permits in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area as follows:

Up to 25 percent of the permits would be issued to people who kill three wolves or more in the controlled use area. The guiding operation with the permits to guide in the refuge and controlled use area will be issued one moose permit per every three wolves killed by their guides.

ISSUE: Drawing permits for Koyukuk Controlled Use Area moose. A high number of people who draw permits do not go hunting. One of the reasons for drawing is increase in wolf population. Incentive for people to kill wolves to help moose population. When the management plan was adopted the drawing application period was supposed to be March to November.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will continue to suffer from increased wolf predation. The hunting guides who live in Huslia, Hughes, Koyukuk, Nulato, and Kaltag will not be able to take clients hunting.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The mature bulls weak from the rut will have a better chance of recovery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The moose guides who live in area. The single mothers and elderly and handicapped.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who get the meat from the guided hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Virgil L. Umphenour (I-02S-G-063)

PROPOSAL 57 - 5 AAC 85.045(22). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunting seasons in Unit 24, as follows:

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

(22)

Unit 24, that portion within

the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:

[1 MOOSE BY REGISTRATION PERMIT ONLY; OR]

[AUG. 27-AUG. 31]
[(SUBSISTENCE HUNT ONLY)]

1 bull by registration permit only; or

Aug. 27- Sept. 20
[SEPT. 1-SEPT. 20]
(Subsistence hunt only)

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 320 permits may be issued in combination with Unit 21(D), that portion within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area; or

Sept. 5-Sept. 25
(General hunt only)

1 moose

Dec. 1-Dec. 10
Mar. 1-Mar. 10
(Subsistence hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit; up to 80 permits may be issued in combination with Unit 21(D), that portion within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area

Sept. 5-Sept. 25

Unit 24, that portion of the John and Alatna River drainages within the Gates of the Arctic National Park

1 moose

Aug. 1-Dec. 31

No open season.

Unit 24, all drainages to the north of the Koyukuk River upstream from the Henshaw

Creek drainage, to and including the North Fork of the Koyukuk River, except that portion of the John River drainage within Gates of the Arctic National Park

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 **bull** [MOOSE; HOWEVER, ANTLERLESS MOOSE MAY BE TAKEN ONLY DURING THE PERIODS SEPT. 21-SEPT. 25]

Sept. 1-Sept. 25

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side

Sept. 5-Sept. 25

Unit 24, all drainages to the north of the Koyukuk River between and including the Alatna River, and Henshaw Creek Drainages, except that portion of the Alatna River drainage within Gates of the Arctic National Park

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose; however, antlerless moose may be taken only during the period [SEPT. 21-SEPT. 25 AND] Mar. 1-Mar. 10

Sept. 1-Sept. 25
Mar. 1-Mar. 10

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side

Sept. 5-Sept. 25

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. Antlerless moose harvest in the four geographic areas described in regulation (above), can be supported by present moose populations on a limited basis only. Fall 1998 trend count surveys suggest static or declining moose populations in the Dulbi Slough, Dubi River Mouth, the Treat Island, and Mathews Slough. Population estimation surveys in northern Unit 24 also suggest a decline has occurred in the population. Calf:cow and yearling:cow ratios indicate recruitment rates are

declining, and a more conservative harvest on the reproductive portion of the population is needed in some areas of the unit. Reduction of antlerless seasons is in accordance with the Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The bag limit will revert to antlered moose only, which could reduce overall harvest of moose and result in more restrictive seasons. Failure to utilize the antlerless moose resource may result in lost opportunities to local users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who like to hunt cow moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

- Continue the cow harvest for all seasons currently open.
- Continue the cow harvest except for fall hunting in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area of Unit 24.
- Continue the cow harvest during the winter seasons only.
- Shift the cow season in the “remainder” portion of Unit 24 to the first five days of the fall season.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-059)

PROPOSAL 58 - 5 AAC 85.045(22). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation as follows:

Unit 24, all drainages to the north of the Koyukuk upstream from the Henshaw Creek drainage **outside of the Gates of the Arctic Park:**

Residents: one antlered moose, Sept. 1—Sept. 25.

Nonresidents: one bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with four or more brow tines on at least one side, Sept. 5—Sept. 25.

Within Gates of the Arctic Park:

Residents: one antlered moose, Sept. 1—Sept. 25 or one moose Mar. 1—Mar. 10.

ISSUE: To align the regulation book with the intent of the February 21, 2001 Koyukuk River Advisory Committee motion for moose season adjustments in northern Unit 24. There is still a need to close the fall cow season in the described area. The dates of the Gates of the Arctic Park seasons should remain as previous.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The fall cow season Sept. 21—Sept. 25, and the Mar. 1—Mar. 10 moose hunt was to be closed in the area from and including all the drainages north of the Koyukuk from the John River East to, but excluding the Gates of the Arctic Park.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those hunters who are concerned about heavy harvest of cows north of Bettles, outside of the park, subsistence hunters who want to hunt on non-park lands within the park boundary.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who may want to hunt cow moose in the described area north of Bettles, who are unconcerned about sustained yield.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Jack Reakoff (I-02S-G-002)

PROPOSAL 59 - 5 AAC 92.220. SALVAGE OF GAME MEAT, FURS, AND HIDES. Amend this regulation to include the following:

In Unit 21, all moose meat must remain on the bone until final processing point. Also the head must accompany the meat.

ISSUE: Increasing moose hunting pressure combined with steadily dropping recruitment rates. Difficulty by enforcement to control wanton waste. Erosion of hunting values.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Increasing hunting pressure by air taxis, etc., combined with lower recruitment will seriously drop population. Continued waste as a result of erosion of the value that moose hunting is first and foremost to provide food for the table. Further difficulty by enforcement to prove that wanton waste did occur.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Meat on the bone is traditional for this unit and will result in better quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who place primary value of moose as food.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides, air taxis, transporters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1. Encourage local hunting and trapping of wolves and bears. 2. Eliminating fall cow season. 3. Eliminate taking cow with calf or a calf. Note: We considered above solutions and we did not reject them.

PROPOSED BY: Ruby Advisory Committee (HQ-02S-G-029)

PROPOSAL 60 - 5 AAC 92.220(d). SALVAGE OF GAME MEAT, FURS, AND HIDES. Add salvage requirements in Unit 21B as follows:

(d) A person taking game not listed in (a) of this section shall salvage for human consumption all edible meat, as defined in 5 AAC 92.990(17). In addition, for moose or caribou taken before October 1 in Unit 9B, Unit 17, those portions of Unit 19A within the Holitna/Hoholitna Controlled Use Area, Unit 19B, Unit 21A, and Unit 21B, the edible meat of the front quarters and hindquarters must remain naturally attached to the bone until the meat has been transported from the field or is processed for human consumption.

ISSUE: The Nowitna River drainage falls within Units 21A and 21B. Current regulations differ within these units as to how big game meat is to be processed. Prior to October 1, moose hunters in Unit 21A must leave the meat on the bones of the front quarters and hindquarters until removed from the field or it is processed for human consumption. Meat taken in Unit 21B can be removed from the bone before it is transported from the field. The Koyukuk/Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) maintains a moose hunter check station on the Nowitna River in order to monitor hunting effort and harvest activity, collect biological data, and determine if salvage requirements are being met. Over the years when collecting harvest information, refuge staff has talked with several hunters that have had difficulty in knowing which unit their animal was shot in. Over the last 10 years, an average of 134 hunters (averaging 19 from local villages, 99 from other Alaska cities and 16 from out of state) have checked through the station. When meat is not on the bone it can be difficult to determine if wanton waste has occurred. Requiring meat on the bone generally reduces spoilage. A change is needed to create consistency in regulation within the Nowitna River drainage.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Inconsistencies in regulations within the drainage will continue to confound prospective hunters and it will be more difficult for law enforcement personnel to determine and prosecute wanton waste.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, there is less chance of spoilage if meat is left on the bones of the front and hindquarters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Law enforcement personnel will benefit by having a better means to establish and prosecute wanton waste when it occurs. Prospective hunters of the Nowitna drainage will not need to reference which unit the animal is taken in as the proposed regulation is drainage-wide.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Prospective hunters who do not normally leave meat on the bones of the front and hindquarters will be inconvenienced by having to get the additional weight out of the field.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Koyukuk/Nowitna NWR (I-02S-G-060)

PROPOSAL 61 - 5 AAC 92.220(d). SALVAGE OF GAME MEAT, FURS, AND HIDES. Amend this regulation to include Unit 24.

A person taking game not listed in (a) of this section shall salvage for human consumption all edible meat as defined in 5 AAC 92.990(17). In addition for moose or caribou take before Oct. 1 in Units 9B, Unit 17, those portions of Unit 19A within the Holitna/Hoholitna Controlled Use Area, Unit 19B, Unit 21A and **Unit 24**, the edible meat of the front quarters and hindquarters **and in Unit 24 the ribs** must remain naturally attached to the bone until the meat has been transported from the field or is processed for human consumption.

ISSUE: Boned-out moose and caribou meat spoiling before being transported from the field, or processed for human consumption.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Meat which is boned will normally sour when piled in game bags for a couple of days. Meat attached to the bones of the quarters will not have cut surfaces to stick to one another. Many hunters who are dropped off or floating cannot vacate the field with boned meat in time to prevent massive spoilage.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who value the edible meat of moose and caribou in Unit 24, who wanting to assure that regulations requiring salvage of edible meat for human consumption will indeed be unspoiled and edible. Spoiled meat coming out of the fields is offensive here in the Koyukuk.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who care little for the meat quality and intend to give it to an unsuspecting recipient, or throw it away once out of the field.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Meat that has been removed from the bone must be removed from the field or processed within 24 hours from the date harvest ticket is punched – may be an option.

PROPOSED BY: Jack Reakoff (HQ-02S-G-018)

PROPOSAL 62 - 5 AAC 92.125. WOLF PREDATION CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN. Amend this regulation to include the following:

Implement an intensive predator management for Unit 24, as soon as possible.

ISSUE: The moose population has been on a decline for several years now and its productivity reduced. The moose is one of the main food staples for Unit 24 residents. Let's not wait until we are in a similar problem like McGrath's moose problem.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It is like the salmon disaster, we are experiencing on the Yukon Drainages. If we had done something 10 years ago about preserving the

salmon then we would not be having a salmon disaster today. Let's do something now for the moose population before we are in a moose crisis.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It would help the moose population to come to a sustainable harvest level.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Allakaket Tribal Council (I-02S-G-003)

PROPOSAL 63 - 5 AAC 92.540. CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this regulation as follows:

Establish Huslia/Dakli River Drainage Controlled Use Area.

ISSUE: Different hunting regulations up Huslia and Dakli River drainages.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will kill off country where people from Huslia hunt for moose and bear.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, all hunts are same and applies to everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonlocal hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Cannot change regulations without a controlled use area.

PROPOSED BY: Jack R. Wholecheese (I-02S-G-005)

PROPOSAL 64 - 5 AAC 92.540(8)(A). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this regulation as follows:

Add an area within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area (KCUA), well off the river corridor(s) that hunters with permits can access by airplane. Describe the area as: The Cottonwood Creek drainage (within the KCUA) upstream to and then along a northerly line that is the drainage divide between the Dulbi Slough and the Nayuka River to the forks of the Nayuka River just west of Hadakhten Lake, then on an easterly line from those forks to the mountain peak approximately 2 miles

southwest or Bear Mountain then on a line southeast between that peak and Hochandachtla Mountain (which is on the boundary of the KCUA).

Allowing aircraft access in this sub-area of approximately 500 square miles would spread out the moose hunting pressure(s) and conflicts. The sub-area is virtually inaccessible under the present KCUA prohibition on aircraft access. Making this regulation change would improve hunting conditions for hunters using the Koyukuk River by moving some of the permittees to use other access. All other elements of the hunt could be maintained, i.e., meat on the bone, permits, etc.

ISSUE: Unnecessary access restrictions for moose hunting in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area. Local hunters are still complaining about the number of boats, concentrations of camps, trespass on private property and the number of hunters along the Koyukuk River and connected waterways within the KCUA. Moose hunters are now regulated by registration permits and drawing permits to control the allowable harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Concentrating all of the moose hunting in the river corridor(s) exacerbates all of the negative experiences for moose hunters. Even under the permit hunt requirements there will continue to be complaints about crowded conditions and trespass.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who can afford aircraft access, air taxi operators, other KCUA hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one would suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Considered recommending a boundary change to the KCUA to exclude this area. Using the sub-area could be better because no additional harvest is anticipated.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-041)

PROPOSAL 65 - 5 AAC 92.540(8)(A). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend the description of the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area as follows:

Confluence of Billy Hawk Creek and the Huslia River, then easterly to the lower forks of the Dakli River, then easterly to the confluence of McLanes Creek and the Hogatza River, then easterly to the middle of the Hughes airstrip.

ISSUE: The boundary of the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area between the confluence of Billy Hawk Creek and the Huslia River to the south end of the Solsmunket Lake, then east to Hughes. This boundary crosses two forks of the Dakli River and the Hogatza River. The south end of Solsmunket Lake moves with the water level. The village of Hughes is over two miles long north

to south. The boundary is moving constantly depending on the water level and it is impossible to determine where it is.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? No one will be able to tell where the boundary is.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone that hunts in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Virgil L. Umphenour (I-02S-G-044)

PROPOSAL 66 - 5 AAC 92.540(8). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this regulation in Unit 24 as follows:

Prohibit the use of airboats for moose hunting, or moose hunting equipment in the upper Koyukuk River drainages.

ISSUE: Airboat hunters are increasing in the Upper Koyukuk River drainages and are depriving Allakaket and Alatna hunters from moose hunting opportunities. Also of concern are noise pollution and habitat degradation, especially for chum salmon, grayling, and whitefish, which are some of our primary diet.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be more habitat degradation and a confirmation of depriving Allakaket and Alatna moose hunters from hunting moose.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Allakaket and Alatna moose hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Airboat hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Expand the Kanuti Controlled Use Area.

PROPOSED BY: Allakaket Tribal Council (I-02S-G-004)

PROPOSAL 67 - 5 AAC 92.540(8)(A). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this regulation in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area as follows:

Delete the language: [THE AREA IS CLOSED TO THE USE OF AIRCRAFT FOR HUNTING MOOSE, INCLUDING THE TRANSPORTATION OF MOOSE HUNTERS, THEIR HUNTING GEAR, AND/OR MOOSE PARTS; HOWEVER THIS DOES NOT APPLY TO THE TRANSPORTATION OF MOOSE HUNTERS, THEIR HUNTING GEAR, AND/OR PARTS OF MOOSE FROM A PUBLICLY OWNED AIRPORT IN THE CONTROLLED USE AREA.]

ISSUE: Prohibition of aircraft access to the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? 1) Nearly three million acres of public lands that are inaccessible by any means other than aircraft will remain essentially closed to hunting without any biological reason. The thin ribbon of water (Koyukuk River) that courses through the nearly four million acre Koyukuk National Wildlife Refuge affords moose hunting only to boat borne hunters and only to an average of less than one mile back from the river. Meanwhile the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area covers an area so vast that small ponds and lakes 30 miles back from the river, that are inaccessible except to aircraft, are left unutilized on otherwise huntable public lands. 2) With the ever closing of more federal park lands, native held lands, etc., crowding has become a problem. This is an opportunity to easily open more public land and spread out the pressure. 3) The clause of equal access to natural resources for all residents in the Alaska Constitution will continue to be violated. Since the controlled use area is an area of drawing permit and registration permit only a set number of hunters will have access to the area. It should therefore not matter that a hunter transports himself by boat or aircraft. 4) The controlled use area restriction to aircraft was conceived 23 years ago to limit the number of hunters in the area. In the intervening years the very fact so many hunters have engulfed the area that a drawing permit system became necessary shows what an abject failure the aircraft restriction is. Without allowing some of those permitted hunters to get off of the river and into the back country the problems associated with crowding on the river will continue. 5) If no aircraft access continues, all hunters will remain bunched together on the river corridor, competition and hostilities between local and nonlocal users will continue and hunting pressure on the moose herd in a small area will continue rather than be spread out over a larger area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Many of the drawing permit hunters are nonlocal. Many would prefer to fly into the area well back from the main river, thus reducing conflict and crowding with other hunters and also providing a more quality hunting experience. Also, since this is a drawing permit area, only a set number of hunters are allowed in so the harvest would not increase and it would be spread over a larger area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All people who want to see the hunting pressure and people conflicts reduced on the Koyukuk River while at the same time providing a more quality outdoor experience. Also benefiting are all the people who would like to see an approximate three million more acres of public land opened to moose hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? All those who believe an Alaska resident who owns an aluminum boat with a 150 horsepower engine and a propeller should have open access to this huge area while an Alaska resident who owns an aluminum airplane with a 150 horsepower engine and a

propeller should not. We need to get past the idea that an airplane owner is rich and therefore does not deserve to hunt this controlled use area. Fly-in hunting and certainly scouting the area from the air is an option that is affordable to anyone, especially those who can afford to hunt via gas sucking motorboat.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Changing the controlled use area to a five mile-wide corridor along the Koyukuk River (2 ½ miles either side) that would be inaccessible to aircraft. This solution still violated the equal access clause to the Alaska constitution. 2) Changing the regulation for the controlled use area to allow only the use of aircraft for moose hunting and banning boats for moose hunting completely. This solution also violates the equal access clause of the Alaska Constitution and is as silly as the present ban on aircraft.

PROPOSED BY: Colin Brown (HQ-02S-G-034)

PROPOSAL 68 - 5 AAC 92.540(8)(A). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this regulation in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area to include the following:

Establish a check station at Huslia and require all hunters of RM 830 and 832 to check in and out at either Ella's Cabin or Huslia.

ISSUE: There is a loophole in the harvest data and possible illegal hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Perhaps nonlocal hunters will take more advantage of this as hunting pressure continues to increase. A check station per se has a deterrent value.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All responsible hunters and wildlife managers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Irresponsible hunters and the department financially.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Check station at Dulbai Slough, another proposal.

PROPOSED BY: Middle Yukon AC and Koyukuk River AC (HQ-02S-G-008)

PROPOSAL 69 - 5 AAC 92.540(8)(B). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend the Kanuti Controlled Use Area as follows:

...to the north [SOUTH] end of Todatonten Lake...

ISSUE: Inappropriate and unnecessary access restrictions. Specifically, the Kanuti Controlled Use Area in Unit 24 includes Todatonten Lake and thus prohibits aircraft access for moose hunting there. This lake is not reachable by boat and is a very long ways from anywhere that is. It is not anywhere near any villages or significant rivers. It is potentially possible to reach it by some type of ATV, but it likely would be an extremely long trip. The aircraft access restriction

essentially makes this lake closed to moose hunting as aircraft is the only practical way to get there.

The Kanuti Controlled Use Area was established to exclude the only significant moose hunting user group that were not local residents. However, since most local residents hunt moose by road hunting the rivers, this prohibition was overly broad. There was never any competition between airplane hunters and locals at places like Todatonten Lake nor would there likely be if it were no longer in the controlled use area. The Kanuti Controlled Use Area encompasses a great deal of real estate that is not used by anyone for moose hunting and is not likely to be as the only practical way to access it is aircraft.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A potentially nice place to go moose hunting will continue to be unavailable.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? An extremely unusual event, the opening of an area formerly closed, albeit small, would provide a potential place for a few people to go moose hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? It is difficult to imagine anyone actually suffering very much.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We would have suggested more sweeping reductions in the size of this access restriction area, but have had no success with this type of proposal in the past. We felt that perhaps if we proposed getting back some opportunity in small areas that were likely unusable by the group most favored by the board, there might be a greater potential of success.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-024)

PROPOSAL 70 - 5 AAC 92.540(8)(B). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this regulation as follows:

(B) the Kanuti Controlled Use Area:

(i) the area consists of that portion of Unit 24 bounded by a line from the Bettles Field VOR to the eastside of Fish Creek Lake, to Sithylemenkat Lake, to Old Dummy Lake, to the south end of Lake Todatonten, to Nogrilenten Lake, to the unnamed lake two miles southwest of the mouth of Chebanika Creek, including all waters of these lakes, to the mouth of Chebanika Creek, [TO THE NORTHERNMOST HEADWATERS OF SIRUK CREEK,] to the highest peak of Double Point Mountain, then back to the Bettles Field VOR;...

ISSUE: Moose population going down farther and farther, hunters having to travel farther from the village to get moose. There are too many transporters coming out of Bettles and other areas moose hunting using aircraft. Hunters want to protect area until moose numbers come back up.

3 bears per community harvest report by community harvest permit in an established community harvest area

No closed season.

No closed season

...

5 AAC 92.072(c)(1). COMMUNITY SUBSISTENCE HARVEST HUNT AREAS AND PERMIT CONDITIONS.

(1) a hunt administrator representing a group of residents may apply to the department for a community harvest permit by identifying the community harvest hunt area and the species to be hunted, and by requesting community harvest reports **sufficient to supply** [FOR] the **estimated** [TOTAL] number of individuals who **will subscribe** [HAVE SUBSCRIBED] to the community harvest permit; the hunt administrator:

(A) must record and maintain a record of the names of residents subscribing to the community harvest permit and the residents hunting license number, permanent hunting identification card number, or birth date for residents under 16 years of age;

(B) must issue harvest reports to hunters who have subscribed to the community harvest permit, but may not issue more individual harvest reports than the sum of the individual bag limits **of the** number of the residents who have subscribed to the permit;

(C) must request additional harvest reports for a community harvest permit from the department during a hunting season if **the number of** [ADDITIONAL] people **subscribing** [SUBSCRIBE] to the hunt **exceeds the original estimate** [FOLLOWING THE ORIGINAL APPLICATION];

...

5 AAC 92.074. COMMUNITY HARVEST AREAS.

(c) Yukon Flats Community Harvest Area for black bears: Includes all of Unit 25(D).

ISSUE: The proposed regulation would establish a season and bag limit for a community subsistence harvest of black bear in Unit 25D-East. The rationale for providing a community harvest permit for bears is the same as for other big game. It would allow communities or other groups to accommodate local harvesting practices, in which a relatively small number of hunters harvest a relatively large portion of the resources used by some groups of people. The proposed regulation would provide the opportunity for groups of Alaska residents to designate a hunt administrator and apply for a community harvest permit to harvest black bears in Unit 25D. Under this system, individuals could combine their individual bag limits so that some hunters can take a larger number of bears. This would also establish a method to report black bears harvested under the community harvest permit. It may result in a modest increase in the harvest of black

bears, which are abundant and lightly harvested, but the primary effect will be to accommodate local hunting patterns, increase harvest reporting, and provide an opportunity for increased local involvement in harvest management.

This proposal is consistent with recommendations in the Yukon Flats Moose Management Plan, which identified the need to reduce bear predation on moose in key hunting areas near local communities, and emphasized the participation of local communities in management and the need to improve harvest reporting for moose and other species.

The planning committee also recognized that increasing the bag limit would be an alternative approach.

The current general black bear hunting season and bag limit would continue to apply to resident hunters that were not participants in a community harvest program.

In addition, the original regulation concerning community subsistence harvest permit conditions resulted in a delay of several days before a hunter who subscribes to a community harvest permit could obtain a harvest permit. The first CHP was initiated in fall 2000 for moose in the Chalkyitsik Community Harvest Area. It became apparent that this condition was unnecessarily cumbersome, and tended to discourage hunters from participating in a CHP, because it meant that people who signed up shortly before or after the season opened would have to wait several days before they could legally hunt. The same hunter could obtain a regular moose harvest ticket, which are issued to vendors on an unlimited basis, without a delay. The regulation already states that the hunt administrator "...may not issue more individual harvest reports than the sum of the individual bag limits of the number of residents who have subscribed to the permit." By making these housekeeping changes to this regulation, the permit system will operate more smoothly for hunters in either the black bear or the moose hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Existing bear harvest regulations will not fit well with traditional hunting practices in some areas.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Black bear and subsistence hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Increasing the bag limit for black bears.

PROPOSED BY: Yukon Flats Moose Management Planning Committee/Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-049)

PROPOSAL 72 - 5 AAC 92.085(4)(A). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME, EXCEPTIONS. Allow bear baiting from Aug. 1-Sept. 25 in Unit 25D, as follows:

The following methods and means of taking big game are prohibited in addition to the prohibitions in 5 AAC 92.080:

(4) with the use of bait for ungulates and with the use of bait or scent lures for any bear; except that black bears may be taken with the use of bait or scent lures only as follows:

(A) in Unit 14(A) from April 15 through May 25; in Unit 14(B) from April 15 through May 31; in Units 1(A), 1(B), 1(D), 2, 3, 5 - 7 (except Resurrection Creek and its tributaries), 11, 13, 15, 16(A) (except Denali State Park), and 17 from April 15 through June 15; in Units 12, 16(B), 19 - 21, 24, and 25(A), 25(B) and 25(C) from April 15 through June 30, in Unit 25(D) from April 15 to June 30 and from August 1 to September 25; and in the portion of Units 21(D) and 24 within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area from September 1 through September 25;

ISSUE: The proposed regulation would establish a fall season for bear baiting in Unit 25D. Black bears are abundant in this area. There are an estimated 1750-3500 black bears in Unit 25D (17,500 mi²). The current harvest in Unit 25D is on the order of 100 bears per year. Increased awareness and concern about the effects of bear predation on moose has resulted in greater local interest in harvesting bears. The Yukon Flats Moose Management Planning Committee and the Yukon Flats Advisory Committee have developed a number of regulation proposals in connection with the development of a moose management plan. A basic goal of the plan is to increase moose numbers in key hunting areas near local communities. The proposed regulation is intended to provide increased hunting opportunity and increase the harvest of black bears.

At present there is relatively little baiting in this area, which is used primarily in a limited area in western Unit 25D by one guide who takes a small number of black bear hunters each year. By itself, the proposed regulation could result in a small increase in bear harvest. It is intended to work in conjunction with related proposals to allow an increased harvest of bears in local areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The harvest of black bears will be unnecessarily restricted.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Black bear hunters who would benefit from an increased opportunity to harvest an abundant resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game on behalf of the Yukon Flats Moose Management Planning Committee (HQ-02S-G-051)

PROPOSAL 73 - 5 AAC 85.020(23). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR. Extend the season dates in Unit 25A as follows:

Resident: Sept. 1 – [MAY 20] **June 15**, general hunt only
 Nonresident: Sept. 1 – [MAY 20] **June 15**

ISSUE: Amend the regulation to change the season closure for grizzly bear in Unit 25A from May 20 to June 15, aligning it with season in adjacent Unit 24.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This remote region is largely unhunted due in part to limited access options, especially during the spring breakup period. The longer spring season would give bear hunters a reasonable opportunity to hunt bears in the lightly harvested population during a time when hides are still in good condition, and after climatic conditions have stabilized. There is little or no hunting for other big game during May and June, and there would be virtually no bears taken incidental to other hunting. Grizzly bear harvest will still remain well below sustainable levels. Extending the season will also create consistency with the season in adjacent Unit 24.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Grizzly bear hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Extending season to May 31. Rejected because break up conditions are still unstable and season would still be inconsistent with adjacent Unit 24.

PROPOSED BY: Dave Morris (HQ-02S-G-003)

PROPOSAL 74 - 5 AAC 85.020(23). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR. Provide increased hunting opportunity and increase the harvest of grizzly bears, while increasing harvest reporting by changing the season and bag limit for grizzly bear in Unit 25D, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(23)		
Unit 25(A)	Sept. 1 - May 20 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1 - May 20

1 bear every 4 regulatory years

Units 25(B) and 25(C)

Sept. 1 - May 31
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1 - May 31

1 bear every 4 regulatory years

Unit 25(D)

July 1-June 30
[SEPT. 1-MAY 31]
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1 - May 31

1 bear every regulatory year

ISSUE: The Yukon Flats Moose Management Planning Committee and the Yukon Flats Advisory Committee have developed a number of regulation proposals in connection with the development of a moose management plan. A basic goal of the plan is to increase moose numbers in key hunting areas near local communities. The proposed regulation is unlikely to cause a substantial increase in the unit-wide harvest of grizzly bears, but could increase bear harvest in important moose hunting areas and substantially improve the accuracy of harvest data.

There are an estimated 380 grizzly bears in Unit 25D. The average reported harvest is low, with less than five bears sealed each year. An additional number of bears are taken and not reported. The estimated sustainable harvest is 19 bears per year. The bag limit was changed to one bear per year and the requirement for a resident brown bear tag was eliminated beginning in regulatory year 2000-2001. Rural residents of Unit 25D can take grizzly bears year-round on federal land in the unit.

There are currently only two guides operating in the area, and nonresident hunters take 0 to three bears annually. Local residents rarely hunt specifically for grizzlies, but take bears opportunistically, often in cases where there is real or potential threat to life or property. Grizzly bears are taken near fishing or hunting camps, moose kill sites and near and in communities. Encounters between brown bears and people are not limited to the open hunting season, and are common during summer.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A significant number of bears harvested will not be reported.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bear hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? August 15-June 30 season or establishing a

community harvest permit system for grizzly bears.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game on behalf of the Yukon Flats Moose Management Planning Committee (HQ-02S-G-052)

PROPOSAL 75 – 5 AAC 92.015(b). BROWN BEAR TAG FEE EXEMPTIONS. Reauthorize the current exemption of brown bear resident tag fee for Unit 25D, as follows:

(b) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear...in Unit 25(D).

ISSUE: The brown bear tag and fee requirement for Unit 25D was eliminated by the Board of Game for the 1998-99 regulatory year. The exemption must be reauthorized by the board annually or the fee automatically becomes reinstated. The total harvest of bears continues to be well below the estimated sustainable level of 19 bears. One bear was reported taken under the new regulation during regulatory year 1998-1999, six were taken in regulatory year 1999-2000, and one in regulatory year 2000-2001. We recommend continuing with the present regulation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The tag fee would be re-instituted for the 2002-03 regulatory year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents who are reluctant or unable to purchase the \$25 tag before hunting will be able to opportunistically and legally harvest a brown bear.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-050)

PROPOSAL 76 - 5 AAC 85.020(24). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR. Amend this regulation in Unit 26 as follows:

Open season, residents and nonresidents, Sept. 1—May 31.

ISSUE: Eliminate the unnecessary permit drawing (DB 987 and 997) for nonresident grizzly bear in Unit 26B. In no other subunit is it required that nonresidents apply for permits to hunt grizzly bear. If bear populations in Units 26A and 26C are substantial enough to warrant non-permit hunting for nonresidents, then Unit 26B should also.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaska game regulations are confusing enough. Making all subunit requirements the same will ease the confusion.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nonresident hunters and guides who contract with nonresident hunters for professional services.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Dave Neel (I-02S-G-020)

PROPOSAL 77 - 5 AAC 85.020(24). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR. Amend this regulation in Unit 26B as follows:

Open season, Aug. 20—May 31.

ISSUE: Standardize grizzly bear seasons across all subunits in Unit 26. Currently Unit 26B is the only subunit with an opening date of Sept. 1. Another subunit opens Aug. 20. The bear population in Unit 26B is healthy with adjoining Unit 26A allowing harvest of one bear every year. Enforcement officers cannot determine whether harvested bears were taken on the legal side of subunit boundaries.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The hunting public will continue to be confused by unnecessary regulations. Communities within Unit 26B (Prudhoe Bay) will continue to have grizzly bear overpopulation problems (five bears were killed in defense of life or property in summer/fall 2001).

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters. They will no longer have confusing season opening dates and subunit boundaries. Enforcement officers will have their jobs simplified.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Dave Neel (I-02S-G-021)

PROPOSAL 78 - 5 AAC 85.045(23). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Establish a minimum antler size limit for moose taken by nonresident hunters in Unit 25A and align the bag limit for nonresident hunters with that in surrounding areas, as follows:

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

(23)

Unit 25(A)

[SEPT. 5 - SEPT. 25]

[SEPT. 5 - SEPT. 25]

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull

Sept. 5 - Sept. 25

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

**1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers
with 4 or more brow tines on one side**

Sept. 5 - Sept. 25

ISSUE: Unit 25A is one of the few areas in Alaska that does not have a minimum antler size requirement for nonresident hunters. The current liberal regulation gives hunters false expectations about the availability of moose in the area. The area supports a low density moose population which has declined by about 50 percent during the past decade. The total number of moose in the area is relatively small, but moose are highly visible because of the relatively open terrain in some areas. Although the bull:cow ratio in the eastern portion of Unit 25A continues to be relatively high, hunting pressure has increased around the limited number of access points. The proposed regulation would align the bag limit for nonresident hunters with that in surrounding areas. Reported harvest in recent years has ranged from 30-50 moose annually.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to be misled about the availability of moose where numbers are limited and additional hunting pressure is not sustainable.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters and the moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident moose hunters who do not want to be selective.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-047)

PROPOSAL 79 - 5 AAC 85.045(23). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend Unit 25B moose season on the upper Porcupine River to open on September 10, rather than September 20, aligning the opening with the lower part of the Porcupine River in Unit 25D, as follows:

Resident	
Open Season	
(Subsistence and	Nonresident

Units and Bag Limits	General Hunts)	Open Season
(23)		
Unit 25(B), that portion within the Porcupine River drainage upstream from but excluding the Coleen River drainage	[SEPT. 20–SEPT. 30] [[GENERAL HUNT ONLY]]	[SEPT. 20–SEPT. 30]
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull	<u>Sept. 10 – Sept. 25</u> [SEPT. 20–SEPT. 30] (General hunt only)	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side		<u>Sept. 10 - Sept. 25</u> [SEPT. 20–SEPT. 30]

ISSUE: The existing season in the upper Porcupine River drainage in Unit 25B was established in the 1980s for reasons related to the limited number of moose in the area. This proposal would amend regulation to open the season to on September 10, rather than September 20, aligning the opening with the lower part of the Porcupine River in Unit 25D and close it on Sept. 25, as is the case in adjacent units. Moose numbers, and hunting pressure and harvests, are relatively low in northern Unit 25B. Access to the area is limited and a longer fall season is unlikely to increase moose harvests.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose seasons will be unnecessarily complicated.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Opening the season on September 5, as in other parts of Unit 25B. This was rejected because it might create excessive hunting pressure on moose because caribou hunters are most numerous around the first of September, and because there would continue to be different opening dates for two sections of the river.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-048)

PROPOSAL 80 - 5 AAC 85.045(23). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Create a registration permit for moose in eastern Unit 25D, and close the nonresident

moose season, as follows:

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

(23)

Remainder of Unit 25(D)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull per regulatory year, only as follows:

1 bull by registration permit; up to 200 moose may be taken; or

Sept. 10 - Sept. 20
Feb. 18 - Feb. 28

1 bull per community harvest report by community harvest permit in an established community harvest area

Sept. 10 - Sept. 20
(Subsistence hunt only)

Feb. 18 - Feb. 28
(Subsistence hunt only)

A combined total of up to 200 moose can be taken in the remainder of Unit 25(D) under registration or community harvest permits

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

[1 BULL WITH 50-INCH ANTLERS OR ANTLERS WITH 4 OR MORE BROW TINES ON ONE SIDE]

No open season
[SEPT. 10 - SEPT. 20]

ISSUE: Moose numbers are low and appear to be declining in Unit 25D. Community harvest surveys indicate that about 150-200 moose are taken annually, primarily by unit residents, but harvest reporting by local residents has been generally low. The board has previously established the amount reasonably necessary for subsistence use in Unit 25D-East as 150-250 moose. The Yukon Flats Moose Management Planning Committee has identified the need to improve harvest reporting and more closely regulate harvest. A registration hunt is being considered as a possible alternative regulatory approach. This issue will continue to be discussed by interested parties and a final recommendation to the Board of Game will be made in March 2002. The proposed regulation would allow registration permits to be issued in the communities of Birch Creek,

Chalkyitsik, Circle, Fort Yukon and Venetie, as well as in Fairbanks. The system is intended to 1) establish a harvest quota so that the total harvest is limited to the estimated harvestable surplus; 2) increase involvement of local governments in monitoring and reporting moose harvest; 3) provide better information to hunters regarding land status, moose population status and management issues; 4) increase the level and timeliness of harvest reporting. The Community Harvest Permit system would continue to be an option for Alaska residents if a registration permit were established.

Population surveys suggest there are currently 2000 to 2500 moose in Unit 25D-East, with density ranging from approximately .18-.25 moose/mi². Bull:cow ratios are generally high, ranging from 50-100 bulls per 100 cows. Calf survival has been fairly good in recent years, ranging from 40-50 calves per 100 cows. Moose numbers have been chronically low, and surveys during 1992-2000 suggest the population has declined. Limiting factors include predation by black bears, grizzly bears and wolves, as well as hunting. Predation by black and grizzly bears is the major cause of calf moose mortality during their summer.

The department and advisory committee presently recommend an initial harvest quota of 200 moose, which would represent a harvest rate of 8–10 percent. Population modeling suggests this level is sustainable as long as calf survival does not decline from current levels. If the population status or trend changes significantly the quota will be reevaluated.

Nonresident harvest is small, ranging from 0 to 6 moose per year, and averaging 1.6 per year from 1986-2000. However, closing the area to moose harvest by nonresidents seems appropriate in view of the limited availability of moose. Nonlocal residents reported harvesting 5-17 moose annually during 1986-2000. Harvest surveys in local communities indicate that local residents take approximately 150-200 moose annually.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Compliance with regulations and harvest reporting will continue to be low. The likelihood of excessive harvest will be higher than under the proposed system. The harvest of moose by nonresident hunters may reduce the opportunity for Alaska resident hunters to meet subsistence needs.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose populations, hunters and management agencies. Resident moose hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident moose hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Continue with present system and emphasize sharing information about moose management issues. Leave regulation as it is, in view of the small harvest by nonresident hunters.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game on behalf of the Yukon Flats Moose

PROPOSAL 81 - 5 AAC 85.045(24). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.

Amend this regulation to include the following:

Unit 26B, that portion west of the east bank of the Kuparuk River,
Resident open season: Sept. 5—Sept. 10, 1 bull.
Remainder of Unit 26B closed.

ISSUE: As moose populations continue to improve along the Unit 26A/B boundary, hunting opportunities for bull moose should be restored along the area west of the Kuparuk River in Unit 26B. Area residents have waited patiently since the moose population crash in 1985. Residents of nearby Unit 26A have a very lucrative moose season along the Colville River, but since access by aircraft to this area is illegal, residents not living along the Colville River have no chance to partake in this hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Traditional hunting of moose by residents will continue to be delayed and families who relied on this game prior to 1995 will continue to have no moose season.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence resident hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Dave Neel

(I-02S-G-019)

PROPOSAL 82 - 5 AAC 85.055(10). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR DALL SHEEP. Amend this regulation in Unit 25A as follows:

Nonresidents, within the area west of and including the Your Creek drainage of the middle fork of the Chandalar River, including the middle fork drainage below the mouth of Your Creek, 1 ram with full-curl horn or larger by drawing permit, Aug. 10—Sept. 20, 50 permits maximum to be issued.

ISSUE: Too many guides are hunting the state land west of the Your Creek drainage of the middle fork Chandalar River in Unit 25A. As the board knows, under state law unlimited numbers of guides may hunt on state lands. The sheep are taking a beating.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Guides compete with one another for the sheep resource, with the high prices they receive for hunts. Harvest has become excessive on the

state lands. Resident hunters are having a hard time finding legal sheep. If nothing is done, residents and nonresidents alike will have poor hunting. The sheep population is low and trying to recover from various environmental conditions, unlimited harvest is unwarranted at this time.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident and nonresident hunters who would like to be successful, after expending a lot of money to access this area. The sheep population, at a low point in fluctuation, needs additional protection in this area of Unit 25A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unlimited amounts of influxing guides who continue to book an excessive amount of clients, without constraint or regard for the sheep population.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A season reduction for nonresidents Aug. 10—Sept. 1. The numbers of guides, assistants, camps, and clients is not addressed.

PROPOSED BY: Jack Reakoff (I-02S-G-023)

PROPOSAL 83 - 5 AAC 85.056(2). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR WOLF. Amend this regulation to increase the bag limit for wolves in units 25A, 25B, and 25D, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(2)		
Remainder of Unit 16 and Units 17, 18, [AND] 20 – <u>24, and 25(C)</u>	Aug. 10 - Apr. 30	Aug. 10 - Apr. 30
5 wolves		
(3)		
Units <u>25(A), 25(B), 25(D) and 26</u>	Aug. 10 - Apr. 30	Aug. 10 - Apr. 30
10 wolves		

ISSUE: Wolves are relatively abundant and widely distributed in units 25A, 25B, and 25D and hunting and trapping harvests are limited. There are an estimated 500 to 630 wolves in this area. The average annual harvest from 1989 to 1998 was 48 wolves. The Yukon Flats Moose Management Planning Committee and the Yukon Flats Advisory Committee have developed a

number of regulation proposals in connection with the development of a moose management plan. A basic goal of the plan is to increase moose numbers in key hunting areas near local communities. The proposed regulation is intended to provide increased hunting opportunity and an increased harvest of wolves, which are a major cause of moose mortality in the area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wolf harvests will be unnecessarily restricted.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose populations and hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game on behalf of the Yukon Flats Moose Management Planning Committee (HQ-02S-G-055)

PROPOSAL 84 - 5 AAC 92.510(15). AREAS CLOSED TO HUNTING. Amend the regulation to extend the area closed to the taking of big game in Unit 26B.

(15) Unit 26

(A) the Prudhoe Bay Closed Area is closed to the taking of big game; this closed area consists of the area bounded by a line beginning at 70° 22' N. lat., 148° W. long., then running south approximately 14 miles to a point at 70° 10' N. lat., 148° W. long., then west approximately 15 miles to a point at 70° 10' N. lat., 148° 40' W. long., then north approximately two miles to a point at 70° 12' N. lat., 148° 40' W. long., then west approximately eight miles to a point at 70° 10' N. lat., 148° 56' W. long., then north approximately two miles to a point at 70° 15' N. lat., 148° 56' W. long., then west approximately 12 miles to a point at 70° 15' N. lat., 149° 28' W. long., then north approximately 12 miles to a point at 70° 26' N. lat., 149° 28' W. long., then east approximately 14 miles to a point at 70° 26' N. lat., 148° 52' W. long., then south approximately 2 miles to a point at 70° 24' N. lat., 148° 52' W. long., then east approximately 16 miles to a point at 70° 24' N. lat., 148° 11' W. long., then south approximately 2 miles to a point at 70° 24' N. lat., 148° 11' W. long., then east approximately 6 miles to a point of beginning; the Prudhoe Bay Closed Area also extends south from the area described above to the Continental Divide at Atigum Pass, to include the area within ¼ mile (440 yards) from each side of the Dalton Highway, including the driveable surface of the Dalton Highway, except areas east of the west bank of the Sagavanirktok River that lie south of 70° 10' N. lat.

ISSUE: Overcrowding, poor ethical image of bowhunting, and safety along the Dalton Highway north of Atigum Pass.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be an increase in negative publicity of bowhunting, increase in overcrowding, and an increase in danger along the Dalton Highway.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposal attempts to improve the quality of bowhunting by spreading out the hunting pressure and it will improve the image and ethics of the bowhunter.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The majority of bowhunters will benefit by reducing user conflicts and all users of the Dalton Highway will benefit by reducing the safety hazard.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The only group likely to suffer from this solution are the road hunters who prefer not to leave their vehicle or the roadside to harvest game.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Registration hunts – no advantage. Permit hunts – no significant advantage and the resource is plentiful with low harvest. Wider corridor closures – beyond ¼ mile nothing should be gained that a ¼ mile closure would not address adequately. Narrower closures – narrower closures would not separate the user groups significantly or encourage safe stopping along the road. Create a new closed area called the Dalton Highway Closed Area with exactly the same parameters as stated above. It may be a viable administrative choice.

PROPOSED BY: Rob Sylvester

(I-02S-G-059)

PROPOSAL 85 - 5 AAC 92.540. CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Create a new controlled use area as follows:

Create the Atigun Drainage Controlled Use Area. The Atigun Drainage Controlled Use Area is closed to the taking of Dall sheep except with a bow and arrow and the use of motorized vehicles except highway vehicles on state maintained roads is prohibited. The area consists of all areas within the Atigun River drainage and the west side of the Sagavaniroktok River bounded on the west by the Gates of the Arctic National Preserve Boundary at approximately N68.439° W149.624° then southerly along this boundary to the continental divide at approximately N68.130° W149.854° then easterly along the continental divide to the middle fork of the Sagavaniroktok River at approximately N68.156° W148.932°. Then northerly along the west bank of the Sagavaniroktok River to the confluence with the Accomplishment River at approximately N68.703° W148.905° then due west to the Dalton Highway, then southerly along the Dalton Highway to the confluence of the Galbraith Lake Airport Road, then westerly along this road to the state maintained gravel pit at approximately N68.469° W149.257° then southwesterly to the peak at N68.439° W149.624°. This area is closed to the taking of Dall sheep except with a bow and arrow and the use of motorized equipment is prohibited except highway vehicles.

ISSUE: Overcrowding, extremely low hunter success, conflicts between use groups, decreasing rams horn size when compared to ten years earlier. Repeated conflicts with nonarchery usage within the present corridor whether illegally hunting or passing through the archery only corridor.

The harvest, horn size, and number of rams has been decreasing since 1989. In 1989 this area was identified as one of the most productive sheep habitats in the Brooks Range.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The sheep population genetics will drift over time to a less robust gene pool jeopardizing the overall health and genetic potential of the population. Hunter success will remain low, the number of legal rams will decrease and use conflicts will increase.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal directly improves the quality of resource and its pursuit. It provides a means for the Dall sheep population found between the Sagavaniroktok River and the Atigun River to produce large rams in sufficient quantity to hunt and view. It provides an opportunity for this population to return to historic levels. It reduces enforcement problems associated with equipment use in the corridor.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The resource will benefit by reversing the trend for breeding for a less robust gene pool. Most bowhunters will benefit by having an improved hunting experience, greater trophy size and increased likelihood of seeing legal game. Enforcement will benefit by simplifying the identification of legal equipment within the corridor area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The only group likely to suffer from this solution is a handful of hunters who have flown in the last few years on the west side of the Sagavaniroktok River and the ones that walk through or into the bowhunting corridor to hunt the west side of the Sagavaniroktok River.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Doing nothing. The Dall sheep gene pool will drift to a less robust population and will be expressed by more substandard rams in the population. User conflicts within the corridor will continue and increase and the success ratio will be maintained at significantly low rates, with a small number of substandard rams being taken.

- 1) Permit system – Reduced opportunity for many individuals. Unknown number of permits that could be assigned to this area.
- 2) Split seasons within this management area. Archery-only from Aug. 10—Aug. 31. Regular season from Sept. 1—Sept. 20. Harvest may be too high to sustain the goals stated above.
- 3) The solution stated in the creation of a controlled use area, with the exception that it is not closed to the use of airplanes or boats. If it was an archery-only area this may achieve the desired goal. If it was open to all equipment it would not achieve the desired goal.

PROPOSED BY: Rob Sylvester (I-02S-G-058)

PROPOSAL 86 - 5 AAC 92.450(26)(B). DESCRIPTION OF GAME MANAGEMENT UNITS.
Amend this regulation as follows:

Unit 26B: That portion of Unit 26 [EAST OF UNIT 26A] lying east of the east bank of the Anaktuvuk River, east of the east bank of the Colville River, west of the west bank of the Canning River, and west of the west bank of the Marsh Fork of the Canning River.

ISSUE: Move and simplify the west boundary of Unit 26B. Unlike the east boundary, which is defined by major rivers, the west boundary runs along an undefined imaginary line between two rivers. Most of the unit consists of rolling tundra which offers no terrain features that can be identified as a boundary line.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters in the field will continue to be confused by imaginary unit boundaries. Enforcement officers will have their job simplified.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters and trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Dave Neel (I-02S-G-022)

PROPOSAL 87 - 5 AAC 85.020(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR. Extend the hunting season in Unit 20A as follows:

Unit 20A, residents and nonresidents, one bear every four regulatory years, Sept. 5—May 31.

ISSUE: Opening date for hunting of brown/grizzly bear. Change it to open on Sept. 5 rather than Sept. 10.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Steady increase in bear population.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Middle Nenana River Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-057)

PROPOSAL 88 - 5 AAC 85.020. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR. Lengthen the season in Unit 20A, as follows:

Resident

Units and Bag Limits	Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(18)		
Unit 20(A) 31]	<u>Sept. 5 - May 31</u> [SEPT. 10 – MAY 31]	<u>Sept. 5 - May 31</u> [SEPT. 10 – MAY 31]
	(General hunt only)	

1 bear every 4 regulatory years

ISSUE: The grizzly bear population in Unit 20A has been intensively studied since 1981. Grizzly bear seasons were liberalized from 1981-1992 and the population declined 35 percent during that phase of the study (reduction phase). Seasons were then shortened in 1993 to allow for and monitor the recovery of the population. The department agreed that it would move the opener back to September 1 when the bear population recovered to pre-reduction levels. We estimate that the grizzly bear population is close to recovery and recommend liberalizing the grizzly bear season. However, rather than extending the season 10 days (September 1 opener), we are recommending a 5 day increase (September 5 opener). We prefer to take a cautious approach because harvest rates exceeded maximum sustained yield and the population declined when the season was opened on September 1 (1981-1992). Current models being developed from research in Unit 20A indicate that the present harvest is sustainable. However, harvests of adult females have been relatively high in some years (8 and 5 in 1996-97 and 1997-98). Therefore, we would prefer to liberalize the season incrementally, so we can monitor the harvest and evaluate the season extension to reduce the chance of overharvesting the population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Likely, no negative biological consequence, i.e., the harvest will likely be less than what the population could sustain. However, hunters will have less opportunity to harvest grizzly bears.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bear hunters and other hunters hoping to bag a grizzly bear incidentally.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-042)

PROPOSAL 89 - 5 AAC 85.020(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR. Lengthen the season in Unit 20A as follows:

Brown/grizzly bear season Sept. 1—May 31.

ISSUE: Extend grizzly bear season by opening the season earlier. Start the season Sept. 1 or Sept. 5. Hunters would have a better opportunity with more hunting days during the moose season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This is not a problem, but could become one if bear populations continue to increase.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone who hunts brown bear in Unit 20A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Bob Kempson (I-02S-G-072)

PROPOSAL 90 - 5 AAC 85.020(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR. Lengthen the season for brown bear in Unit 20A as follows:

Lengthen season on brown bears in Unit 20A by ten days or to coincide with opening of moose season.

ISSUE: Length of brown bear hunting season in Unit 20A. Since the largest number of hunters are in the field during moose season, increasing encounters with brown bears are occurring with many lives threatened.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More bears killed because of life and property.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Allows increased hunting for residents and nonresidents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters in Unit 20A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Since the take should increase little, brown bears should not suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Tony Lamanna

(I-02S-G-074)

PROPOSAL 91 - 5 AAC 85.020(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Unit 20A controlled use areas (Yanert, Wood River, Nenana): residents: one bear every regulatory year.

ISSUE: Changing the harvest of brown/grizzly bears to every year for resident hunters in Unit 20A controlled use areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Grizzly bears contribute through May/June predation to the continued low moose calf production.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, lowering predation pressure on moose calves.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Catherine Lieser

(HQ-02S-G-104)

PROPOSAL 92 - 5 AAC 92.015. BROWN BEAR TAG FEE EXEMPTIONS and 5 AAC 85.020(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR. Amend these regulation as follows:

Provide for a tag fee exemption in Unit 20A from the Little Delta River and extend the season to run from Aug. 10 – June 30 consistent with the adjacent Unit 20D area.

ISSUE: It is the opinion of the Delta Advisory Committee that the brown bear tag fee exemption is the only portion of the intensive management plan submitted by them that has had any real significance in Unit 20D. Although the effect has been low impact in its seven years of existence, the brown bear tag fee exemption has nonetheless produced results.

One side benefit in Unit 20D has been the opportunity it has afforded to those who might not otherwise have the opportunity to hunt. The tag fee exemption area in Unit 20D contains two Native villages, and many people outside of those villages, for whom the \$25 tag fee is prohibitive. For many people in this area, a hunting license costs \$5 and the opportunity to hunt, not take, a brown bear is five times as much. Is there a reason for denying the people who cannot afford the bear tag an opportunity to take a bear? This appears to be discriminatory. Even with the tag fee exemptions in place, the brown bear harvest remains well within the harvest goals set by the Board of Game. In fact, not enough bears are being taken. The community of Whitestone is located in

Unit 20A as are many private homes. Within the last few years grizzlies have ransacked a number of cabins, and even been shot within the community of Whitestone, which has a high percentage of small children. Hunters have reported seeing large numbers of bears, as well as many cow moose without calves in this portion of Unit 20A.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Unit 20A bear season will not open until Sept. 10, halfway through moose season. The incidental take of grizzlies will continue to be impeded by having the season closed while hunters are present. The only reason for this extreme season restriction was to assist a grizzly study being done by the department. Individuals who cannot afford a brown bear tag, including those who live within the tag fee exemption area, would once again be denied the opportunity to hunt brown bears. (Note: the opportunity to hunt is not directly related to success in this case, but the opportunity itself is valuable.) Hunters report finding extremely high brown bear populations during this past season throughout this portion of Unit 20A. The Delta Advisory Committee has been watching this pattern over the past five seasons and has reached the conclusion that this is an established population trend.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? In particular, hunters within and near the tag fee exemption areas who cannot afford brown bear tags. Residents and moose hunters would have greater opportunity due to the increased season length as well as tag fee exemption. Serious brown bear hunters who can afford the tags will purchase them as this will remove the restriction forcing them to hunt only in this limited area. This will also benefit hunters in the area who may be hunting moose or caribou and are aware that they have the opportunity to take a bear without a tag. Moose and caribou hunters will benefit from this program in future years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The Delta Advisory Committee feels that many of the people they represent lose the opportunity to hunt brown bear without this tag fee exemption, and with a season unreasonably restrictive in length. Bear harvest of ungulate populations, moose and caribou, would continue to increase. This is an extremely healthy brown bear population in a relatively inaccessible area, thus no one will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Put this in effect for the entirety of Unit 20A. However, the people living within the Little Delta River boundary are considered residents of Delta Junction, thus our greatest effort must be made to represent their needs.

PROPOSED BY: Delta Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-031)

PROPOSAL 93 - 5 AAC 85.025(15). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR CARIBOU. Change the requirements for drawing permits in Unit 20A as follows.

Up to 25 percent of the caribou permits would be issued to individuals who trap or shoot three wolves in the permit area per year. Guides who operate in the area would be issued one caribou

permit for each three wolves they trapped or shot in the permit area per year up to 25 percent of the permits.

ISSUE: The objectives of the wolf predation control plan in Unit 20A are for a sustainable harvest of 300-500 caribou per year. From 1997—2001, an average of only 37 caribou have been harvested. The department wolf control program was stopped in December 1994. Of the 100 permits issued for caribou per year, an average of 64 hunters per year have hunted.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The objectives of 5 AAC 92.125(2), the Unit 20A wolf predation control plan, will not be obtained.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposal address: people who draw permits and do not go hunting, reward real trappers and hunters and recovery of the Unit 20A caribou herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All people who would like to have the Unit 20A caribou herd recover from wolf predation. The sheep and moose would also benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Virgil L. Umphenour (I-02S-G-062)

PROPOSAL 94 - 5 AAC 85.025. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR CARIBOU.
Add a winter season for Fortymile caribou in portions of units 20B and 20D, as follows:

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

(15)

Unit 20(B), that portion south and east of the Steese Highway

RESIDENT HUNTERS:
1 caribou by registration permit only; up to 300 caribou may be taken under combined resident and nonresident bag in combination with Unit 20(D),

Aug. 10-Sept. 30
Dec. 1-Feb. 28
(General hunt only)

that portion north of the south bank of the Tanana River and Unit 20(E), that portion within the Middle Fork of the Fortymile River and Charley River drainages

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:
1 bull by registration permit only

Aug. 10-Sept. 20

Unit 20(D), that portion north of the south bank of the Tanana River

RESIDENT HUNTERS:
1 caribou by registration permit only; up to 300 caribou may be taken under combined resident and nonresident bag in combination with Unit 20(B), that portion south and east of the Steese Highway, and Unit 20(E), that portion within the Middle Fork of the Fortymile River and Charley River drainages

Aug. 10-Sept. 30
Dec. 1-Feb. 28

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:
1 bull by registration permit only

Aug. 10-Sept. 20

ISSUE: Fortymile caribou harvest is managed following the recommendations of the Fortymile Caribou Herd Harvest Plan (Harvest Plan) that was endorsed by the Alaska Board of Game in March 2000. The Harvest Plan furthers the goal of continued herd growth to restore the herd to traditional range by providing the framework how to manage harvest and hunting opportunity that will allow an average annual growth rate of 10 percent. As the herd increases, there are provisions in the Harvest Plan to increase hunting opportunity and harvest.

Since 1995, the Fortymile herd has increased in size and is beginning to use a greater proportion of its traditional range and since 1998, a portion of the herd has wintered in portions of units 20B and 20D. Currently, these subunits do not offer a winter hunt for Fortymile caribou. Since the winter hunt is managed under a quota that is based on herd growth, greater hunter opportunity could be offered in units 20B and 20D during the winter without jeopardizing herd growth.

It is the intent of the Harvest Plan that fall and winter harvests are allocated across the herd's

range. To meet that intent, the fall harvest quota is subdivided into three different regions based on historical take. This format should be copied during the winter season except that each area's quota will be based on the herd's winter distribution but will never be below 30 percent in either units 20E or 25C, the areas where most of the historical harvest has occurred. For example, if the majority of the caribou are along the Steese Highway then the majority of the quota will be allocated to Unit 25C but at least of 30 percent of the quota will still be allocated to Unit 20E to ensure harvest is spread across the herd's range.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity will be lost by not allowing hunting in units where the herd is wintering.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fortymile caribou hunters and people who support intensive harvest management that will ensure continued herd growth and better harvest allocation. Local economies in many rural communities within the herd's range will benefit from always having a known hunt bringing more hunters into the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-069)

PROPOSAL 95 - 5 AAC 85.025(15) and (20). **HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR CARIBOU.** Change the one bag limit for caribou to one bull during the fall general season, and change the start of the winter registration from November 1 to December 1, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(15)		
Units 20(B) and 20(F), those portions north and west of the Steese Highway, north and east of the Elliot Highway to its intersection with the Dalton Highway, then east of the Dalton Highway and south of the Yukon River.		
1 caribou per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 bull [CARIBOU]	Aug. 10-Sept. 20	Aug. 10-Sept. 20

(General hunt only)

1 caribou by registration permit only; up to 100 caribou may be taken

Dec. 1-Mar. 31
[NOV.1-MAR. 31]
(General hunt only)

Dec. 1-Mar. 31
[NOV.1-MAR. 31]

...

(20)

Unit 25(C), those portions west of the east bank of the mainstem of Preacher Creek to its confluence with American Creek, then west of the east bank of American Creek

1 caribou per regulatory year, only as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
1 <u>bull</u> [CARIBOU]	Aug. 10-Sept. 20 (General hunt only)	Aug. 10-Sept. 20
1 caribou by registration permit only; up to 100 caribou may be taken	<u>Dec. 1-Mar. 31</u> [NOV.1-MAR. 31] (General hunt only)	<u>Dec. 1-Mar. 31</u> [NOV.1-MAR. 31]

ISSUE: Maintaining the current seasons and bag limits will increase the potential for cow harvests in excess of sustained yield, resulting in lost hunting opportunity. The fall general hunt season and bag limits identified in this proposal are the same as those in place prior to the March 2000 Board of Game meeting.

At the March 2000 meeting, the board adopted a department proposal to liberalize the White Mountain caribou seasons and bag limits. The data available suggested a herd size of 1,200-1,500 animals. After the 2000 board meeting we conducted a census and counted 687 animals. This indicated that the population was well below the 1,200-1,500 caribou believed to be in the herd. Until we obtain more data concerning herd population dynamics, a conservative cow harvest is recommended.

Since 1998 the percent bulls in the population has been 30-32 and bulls:100 cows has varied from 50 to 62, suggesting the herd can sustain recent bull harvests (up to 29 annually). The total reported cow harvest was 16 for the 10 years (1990-1999) cow harvest was legal only in winter hunts. The first year cow harvest was allowed during the fall general season (2000), 21 cows were taken (15 during fall and 6 during winter). Cow harvests this high may not be sustainable.

To maintain reasonable opportunity to hunt White Mountain caribou we need the ability to closely monitor cow harvest. To do this we need harvest statistics in a timely manner. The data from the fall general season hunt is not available until late spring. However, under the winter registration season successful hunters must report within five days. Therefore, we recommend a one caribou bag limit, with bulls only allowed during the fall general season and either sex allowed during the winter registration season. This would maintain reasonable hunting opportunity and keep harvest within sustained yield guidelines.

The White Mountain caribou and the Fortymile caribou hunt areas share a common border. Starting the winter registration hunt on December 1 would align the start date for winter these hunts, simplifying regulations. It would also have minimal impact on hunting opportunity.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There is a possibility of harvesting too many cows, which may cause a population decline.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Individuals who want the opportunity to harvest White Mountain caribou during a fall general, and a winter registration season. Individuals concerned with overharvesting the herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals who would like the opportunity to harvest any caribou during the fall season.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Leave the fall season as it is. Change the fall general hunt to a registration hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-046)

PROPOSAL 96 - 5 AAC 85.045. CHILD HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Establish a new regulation to implement AS 16.05.255(i). – “Take a Child Hunting.”

Moose in Units 20 and 25 add a season: the second weekend in August plus the following Monday and Tuesday. Bag limit, as stated for the general hunt (or permit hunt). Do not establish a children’s hunting season in Unit 20A or the Fairbanks Management Area.

ISSUE: Implement the “Take a Child Hunting” legislation, beginning in Unit 20 with a few areas restricted. After some discussion between constituents and department staff, this proposal qualifies

under the guidelines set forth in the new law. It would create a new moose hunting season before the normal school year, for Alaskan resident children (as defined in the law).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Families who want to get a big game hunt in together, who want to teach their children how they have traditionally hunted, who want to let their children participate in harvesting resources for their table, will continue to be restricted from doing so.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskan families who want to hunt together and/or to teach their children the traditional locations and methods for moose hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Discussed opening in only a small area to assess the interest and effects of the hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Mike Tinker (I-02S-G-043)

PROPOSAL 97 – 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.
Shorten the bull moose season and reauthorize antlerless moose season in Unit 20A, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(18)		
Unit 20(A), the Ferry Trail Management Area and the Yanert Controlled Use Area		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side	<u>Sept. 1 - Sept. 15</u> [SEPT. 1– SEPT. 20] (General hunt only)	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side		<u>Sept. 1 - Sept. 15</u> [SEPT. 1– SEPT. 20]
Unit 20(A) within the Nenana		

Controlled Use Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull

Sept. 1 - Sept. 15
[SEPT. 1– SEPT. 20]

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers
with 4 or more brow tines on one side

Sept. 1 - Sept. 15
[SEPT. 1– SEPT. 20]

Remainder of Unit 20(A)

1 moose per regulatory year,
only as follows:

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull; or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 15
[SEPT. 1– SEPT. 20]
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit
only; up to 300 permits may be
issued; or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 25
(General hunt only)

1 bull by drawing permit only, by
muzzle-loading firearms only; up
to 75 permits may be issued

Nov. 1 - Nov. 30
(General hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers
with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 15
[SEPT. 1– SEPT. 20]

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit
only; up to 300 permits may be issued; or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 25

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers
with 4 or more brow tines on one side
by drawing permit only, by muzzleloading
firearms only; up to 75 permits may
be issued

Nov. 1 - Nov. 30

ISSUE: Reported harvest of bull moose (2000 = 540 bulls) in Unit 20A continues to exceed sustained yield estimates (430 bulls) despite a shorter season and increased antler restrictions instituted in 2000. As a result, estimated bull:cow ratios (23:100) remain below our management objective of 30:100. Estimated bull:cow ratios in Unit 20A have fallen from 39 bulls:100 cows

in 1996 to 23 bulls:100 cows in 1999 and 2000. In addition, current estimates indicate that the moose population is stable at about 10,000 - 12,000 moose, although harvest has been increasing since the early 1990s (Reported bull harvest: regulatory years 1990-91 – 1994-95: mean = 353; 1996-97 – 1998-99: mean = 616). Furthermore, we anticipate greater demands will be placed on the Unit 20A bull moose population as hunting effort continues to increase, especially with reduced opportunities to hunt moose in units 13, 14 and 16.

Unit 20A antlerless moose season reauthorization

Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. The purpose of this antlerless hunt is to provide the opportunity to hunt a harvestable surplus of cow moose in the central portion of Unit 20A. Moose density in central Unit 20A, which contains about 50 percent of the moose habitat in Unit 20A and about 67 percent of the moose, is relatively stable, but high. As a result, the moose population has been exhibiting pronounced density-dependent effects. Therefore, our management goal is to prevent moose numbers in central Unit 20A from increasing. We estimate that there are approximately 7000 cow moose in Unit 20A. Average reported harvest has been 68 cows and the maximum reported harvest was 75 (2001). We estimate that this harvest is slightly below the sustainable harvest of cow moose for central Unit 20A.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunter success rates will decline and, in general, the quality of hunting experiences will deteriorate. The productivity of the Unit 20A moose population may be compromised as bull:cow ratios reach low levels. The opportunity to hunt a harvestable surplus of cow moose will be lost. The central Unit 20A moose population may increase, which could result in more pronounced density-dependent effects and further deterioration of the habitat.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? In the long run, all hunters (over 1500 hunters reported hunting moose in Unit 20A in 2000). Members of the general public that enjoy seeing and watching moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? For the short term, hunters that prefer to hunt moose during the later part of the season. People opposed to antlerless moose hunts.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Spike-fork/50-inch antler restrictions for residents and nonresidents. Liberalize surrounding units (20B, 20C) to reduce hunting pressure in Unit 20A. Shorten season by opening the moose season later in September.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-041)

PROPOSAL 98 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.
Amend this regulation as follows:

Unit 20A, nonresidents, Sept. 1—Sept. 10

ISSUE: Unit 20A – Shorten the moose season for nonresidents to ten days, Sept. 1—Sept. 10.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting pressure from nonresident hunters will only increase. Moose population is hurting. This would decrease pressure.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Resident hunters will have more quality time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Closing selected use areas to nonresidents. Reason for rejected – too restricted and complicated.

PROPOSED BY: Middle Nenana River Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-054)

PROPOSAL 99 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Lengthen the season in Unit 20A as follows:

Change bull moose season to September 1 through September 25.

ISSUE: The length of hunting season in Unit 20A for bull moose. Change season closing from September 20 back to September 25.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Less meat in the freezer for Alaskans who depend on moose for food. Warm fall temperatures in the Interior result in late leaf fall and later rut, so less access to bull moose for hunters. Reduced hunter success.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans who hunt moose to feed their families.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Emma Lee Grennan (I-02S-G-065)

PROPOSAL 100 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend the antler restrictions in Unit 20A as follows:

Nonresidents: 1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with three or more brow tines on at least one side.

ISSUE: 50-inch, four brow tine horn restriction for nonresident hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nonresident hunters account for a small percentage of moose harvested in Unit 20A; 15 percent or less. This will result in fewer nonresident hunters and less revenue for the State of Alaska.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, more revenue for the State of Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nonresident hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Bob Kempson (I-02S-G-071)

PROPOSAL 101 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend the antler restrictions in Unit 20A as follows:

If the board believes that the nonresident restriction should remain, the requirement should be changed to 50-inches, three brow tines. This should provide more nonresident hunting without changing total moose harvest little.

ISSUE: 50-inch, four brow tine requirement for nonresident hunters in Unit 20A.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Since the nonresident moose harvest in Unit 20A is 25 percent or less of total, nonresident hunters are unduly restricted in available animals with many feeling that their hunting experience was diminished. Future revenue for the State of Alaska will decrease.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Increased nonresident hunting and revenue for the State of Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nonresident hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Probably no one or moose population.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Tony Lamanna (I-02S-G-073)

PROPOSAL 102 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Unit 20A, excluding the Healy/Lignite Bow Management Area. Residents: one bull with a spike-fork, 50-inch antlers or four or more brow tines on at least one side. Nonresidents: one bull with 50-inch antlers or four or more brow tines on at least one side. Healy/Lignite Management Area: one bull.

ISSUE: Overharvesting of bull moose within Unit 20A.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continue to overharvest bulls which will result in further restrictions on hunting this moose population.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, would reduce the number of bulls harvested therefore increase the bull:cow ratio, enhancing the moose population as a whole.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose population within Unit 20A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who hunt in the current any bull areas.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Middle Nenana River Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-055)

PROPOSAL 103 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation for Unit 20A to provide the following:

Before shortening the existing season or imposing more antler restricted areas, I would propose that any two resident hunters be allowed to harvest any bull moose. Single hunters would be allowed to take 50-inch plus bulls. In other words, two harvest tickets would take any bull while single harvest tickets could take 50-inch plus bulls.

ISSUE: In previous years, harvest for Unit 20A has been too high to continue maintaining a healthy moose population. Current data is not available at this time.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The bull:cow ratio will drop to a level that cannot support a healthy calf crop and further hunting restrictions will be necessary.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? I believe that the harvest would drop some, raising the bull:cow ratio.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People that hunt in pairs or groups would benefit with a longer season and no antler restrictions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The people that would suffer are likely to be single hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered a two or three party registration permit for Unit 20A moose. Not as easily implemented as this.

PROPOSED BY: Mark Albert (I-02S-G-075)

PROPOSAL 104 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation in Unit 20A as follows:

Unit 20A, Eastern portion of the Wood River Controlled Use Area

Residents: 1 bull with 50-inch antlers or with 3 or more brow tines on at least one side

Remainder of Unit 20A

Residents: 1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on at least one side

ISSUE: Change the bag limit on bull moose in Unit 20A for resident moose hunters, except the Ferry Trail Management Area, and Yanert Controlled Use Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bull:cow ratio will drop below what ADF&G would like to have.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Bull:cow ratio will increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All moose hunters in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The person that wants to kill any bull moose now.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Give more cow permits out in Unit 20A that are given now, so the hunter that cannot find a 50-inch bull can take a cow for meat for their freezer. ADF&G wants more cows harvested, raise the cow permits to 450.

PROPOSED BY: Mike DeNent (I-02S-G-032)

PROPOSAL 105 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Amend this regulation in Unit 20A as follows:

Reestablish drawing number DM 766, 75 permits, Nov. 1-30, bull, hunt area Wood River Controlled Use Area, muzzle-loading rifles only.

ISSUE: Only one quality muzzle-loading moose hunt offered statewide. The one hunt offered on Fort Richardson is over 350 miles south of Fairbanks, Alaska. No opportunity for Interior residents to have a quality primitive weapon hunt. The Wood River Controlled Use Area November drawing hunt provided minimum opportunity and it was taken away. Rifle hunters have options throughout the state and bow hunters have several options (Fairbanks Management Area, 500 miles of the Dalton Highway). Muzzle-loaders have nothing.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? No opportunity for residents that prefer these primitive type hunts without competing with high power rifles. Also, increased hunter density during the September season.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Bulls not accessible during the September season may be in November.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters successful in drawing permits and hunters having less competition in the September season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters unsuccessful in drawing permits and hunters who cannot endure the harsh November weather in remote country to make the hunt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Currently no opportunity for Interior hunters, opening any interior muzzle-loading only hunts is an improvement.

PROPOSED BY: Dave Machacek, Kenneth Forbes, Jr., and Joe Sigmon, Jr. (HQ-02S-G-001)

PROPOSAL 106 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.
Amend this regulation to provide the following:

In Unit 20A that portion of the Wood River Controlled Use Area and the Yanert River Controlled Use Area would have the same seasons for moose, with the legal bull being for resident and nonresident hunters as currently reads for the Yanert River, thus changing the Wood River to an antler restriction for resident hunters.

ISSUE: Unit 20A moose season. Change what a legal bull moose is for resident hunters in the Wood River Controlled Use Area. That portion of the Wood River Controlled Use Area for moose hunting make the same moose antler restrictions for residents and nonresidents in the Wood River as they currently are in the Yanert River Controlled Use Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The overharvest of bull moose in this portion of Unit 20A which will result in a low bull:cow ratio.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters will benefit if the bull moose population ratio stays healthy.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? All hunters will suffer if the season has to be reduced because of too high of harvest in the past seasons. It would perhaps be far better to have some antler restriction for a bull moose than to have the season dates reduced to a shorter time and have the same hunting pressure that currently exist in the Wood River Area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Cutting the season dates shorter. This will just put all the hunters in the field at the same time thus creating a much less pleasing hunting experience.

Change the nonresident antler restriction to a bull moose with four or more brow tines on one side in both the Wood River and Yanert River areas. No inches being legal. Depending on the overall harvest data of bull moose that are taken by nonresidents in the 50-inch class and have only 3 brow tines this option could be considered.

PROPOSED BY: Tom Kirstein (HQ-02S-G-106)/(I-02S-G-083)

PROPOSAL 107 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunting season in Unit 20B within the Fairbanks Management Area and the Minto Flats Management Area, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(18)		
Unit 20(B), that portion within the Fairbanks Management Area		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 bull with spike-fork or greater antlers by bow and arrow only	Sept. 1—Sept. 30 (General hunt only) Nov. 21-Nov. 27 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1—Sept. 30 Nov. 21—Nov. 27
1 moose by bow and arrow only, by drawing permit only; up to 100 permits may be issued	Sept. 1-Sept. 30 (General hunt only) Nov. 21-Nov. 27 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1-Sept. 30 Nov. 21—Nov. 27

Unit 20(B), that portion within the Minto Flats Management Area

1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:

1 moose by Tier II subsistence hunting permit only; up to 100 permits may be issued	Sept. 1-Sept. 20 (Subsistence hunt only) Jan. 10-Feb. 28 (Subsistence hunt only)	No open season.
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side	Sept. 11-Sept. 20	No open season.

ISSUE: Fairbanks Management Area (FMA): Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. The purpose of this antlerless hunt is to provide opportunity to harvest relatively abundant numbers of female moose in the FMA and reduce moose-vehicle collisions and nuisance moose problems.

Trend surveys, population estimates in Unit 20B and adjacent Unit 20A and anecdotal information suggest high and stable moose numbers in the FMA. The number of moose-vehicle collisions in the FMA is also high and continues to be a chronic problem that poses significant safety concerns to motorists. In addition, moose nuisance complaints continue to place significant demands on department staff. Our goal is to decrease the number of moose-vehicle collisions and nuisance problems by increasing the harvest of cow moose, but within sustained yield limits. To accomplish this goal, we increased the number of drawing permits for cow moose by archery hunting only (DM788) from 25 in 1999 to 50 in 2000 and 75 in 2001. Trend survey and harvest data indicate that the current seasons are biologically sustainable. At this juncture, we do not have sufficient data to determine if the increased harvest of cow moose has resulted in a decline in moose-vehicle collisions or moose nuisance problems in the FMA.

Minto Flats Management Area (MFMA): The purpose of this antlerless hunt is to provide for subsistence harvests in a manner that allows opportunity for general hunts as well.

Population estimation surveys indicate that the moose density within the MFMA is high and stable. We are currently meeting our management objective of 30 bulls: 100 cows, while providing for a 10 day bull only general season and fall and winter subsistence (TM785) seasons. The reported harvest of cows taken during the TM785 hunt has not exceeded 27. This harvest of approximately 1 percent of the MFMA moose population has proven to be sustainable.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The opportunity to hunt a surplus of cow moose will be lost. In the FMA, moose - vehicle collisions and nuisance moose problems will likely

remain high and, possibly even increase. In the MFMA, if the subsistence harvest is restricted to bulls only, the general season may have to be further restricted or closed to maintain the desired bull:cow ratio.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and other residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-043)

PROPOSAL 108 - 5 AAC 85.045. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.
Amend this regulation in Unit 20B as follows:

Unit 20B Tier II: no change.

General hunt: one bull by drawing permit, up to X number of permits.

ISSUE: Unnecessary access restrictions for moose hunting. Aligning the hunting regulation with the intent of the Legislature when the Minto Flats State Wildlife Refuge (MFSWR) was created. Get rid of the burdensome to hunters spike, fork, 50-inch, four brow tine type regulation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the board will not consider the language of the Legislature, our constituents who supported the creation of the MFSWR will be shortchanged because of limited types of access during moose season. The present access prohibition for aircraft and airboats makes a caste system among moose hunters that the board should try to avoid. And, it would be desirable to align the hunting access regulations with the legislature's stated intent for access to the MFSWR. Given the present game management policy to do nothing about natural predators and very little to improve habitat, there is little chance that the moose population can be increased to allow for more hunting. Rather than create a niche for airboats here, airplanes there, ATVs in another place, let's get to how many moose can be harvested, give out a number of permits that will achieve that harvest and get out of the knock down drag out sociology of limiting access means. Minto Flats is a location where both rural and non-rural hunters have coexisted for decades. The number set for the subsistence harvest seems to be working, let us ease restrictions on the remainder of the harvest.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Spread the harvest among all age classes or bull moose instead of targeting just the very young and old bulls.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who lack the expertise to judge the numbers of inches of spread on a moose antler. Hunters who have the vehicles that are now restricted for access.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-042)

PROPOSAL 109 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE and 5 AAC 92.003. HUNTER EDUCATION AND ORIENTATION REQUIREMENTS. Add a bow hunting season in a portion of Unit 20B as follows:

The remainder of Unit 20B would be as defined in the regulations and added below the second line defining the gun season.

By bow and arrow only:

Remainder of Unit 20B: Residents, one bull, Sept. 21—Sept. 30
Nonresidents, one bull, Sept. 21—Sept. 30

All bow hunters must have passed the department proficiency test (or equivalent) in order to hunt. This will have the effect of reducing the loss of wounded animals.

ISSUE: Bow and arrow hunters have difficulty in finding hunting areas where they are not interrupted. Also, the early closure makes it difficult for them to effectively call moose to the ranges that are necessary for a clean kill. This proposal will improve the quality of the hunt for all hunters by spreading the hunting pressure over a long period of time, without having any negative impact on the moose population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? As hunting pressure increase, there will continue to be a decline in the opportunities for having a “quality hunt.” Black powder weapons have been excluded from this proposal because of the effectiveness of the modern replicas. This proposal eliminates use conflict.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters would benefit by distributing the hunting pressure over a longer time period, thereby eliminating user conflict during the regular season. This time period coincides with the existing season in the Fairbanks Management Area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? This is a biologically sound proposal and no one would suffer. The remainder of Unit 20B is already well defined in the regulations and would not overlap with any existing controlled use areas.

Expanding the bow and arrow seasons has been tried and proven in most of the Lower 48 states as a way of expanding hunting opportunities without any negative impact on populations.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: James Dunlap

(I-02S-G-068)

PROPOSAL 110 - 5 AAC 85.045. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Change this regulation in Unit 20B as follows:

The brow tine requirement for a 50-inch antler presumption in the Minto Flats Management Area should be relaxed from 4 brow tines on one side down to 3 brow tines on one side.

ISSUE: For the open-harvest period, the current antler restrictions require 4 brow tines for a 50-inch presumption. After hunting this area for six years and seeing many moose, it is my firm belief that the genetic subpopulation in this area rarely ever produces moose with 4 brow tine antlers. Most of the bulls I have taken have exceeded 50-inch antlers, but have only had 2 or 3 brow tines on a side.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters who make the considerable effort to get into this controlled use area will continue to have to pass up the many legal 50-inch to 55-inch antlered bulls with 2 or 3 brow tines, as the width estimate is “too close to call.”

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes – will allow more large, 50-inch-class moose to be taken, still leaving an abundant percentage of younger bulls to mate with remaining cows.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who make the effort to access and hunt the Minto Flats Management Area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one – residents of the area who depend on moose for subsistence already get a Tier II hunt allowing them to take any moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Go to “any bull” – rejected as I support protecting the “middle-age class” bulls as prime breeders.

PROPOSED BY: Daniel P. Hoffman

(HQ-02S-G-025)

PROPOSAL 11I - 5 AAC 92.530(8). MANAGEMENT AREAS and 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Create a three party hunt in this area as follows:

I would like to propose a pilot program to introduce a registration party hunt, any bull in the Minto Flats Management Area. Remove the resident harvest ticket hunt for and keep the no open season for nonresidents as is. The registration would require three hunters to sign up for the permit and all three hunters are required to be present for the hunt. Under current bag limits if the party is successful they would not be able to use a harvest ticket to take any other moose in the state. This would start a program to reduce pressure on the moose population statewide.

ISSUE: I would like to address the restrictions currently in place for the Minto Flats Management Area. This unit appears to have a healthy bull:cow ratio. I believe the current restrictions can change in a way that will preserve the health of the population, and provide hunters with a more realistic chance for success. The current spike-fork 50-inch four brow tine restriction reduces the quality of the hunt and places pressure on the hunter to determine a legal bull.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? I believe that the current framework for regulating harvest of bull moose will eventually lead to the whole state being a spike-fork 50-inch four brow tine area, or a hunt by drawing permit only. We need to find a way for people to hunt every year and be successful without overharvesting the moose population.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal returns the quality of the hunt back to any bull and gives the department more control of the harvest quota. It seeks to maintain a stable population of moose while at the same time gives hunting parties a better chance of success. This could provide a mechanism for limited cow harvests as well if available or desired by the department.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The benefit would be for people with a limited amount of time to hunt and families that share a harvested moose. The party hunt would also encourage a large family to hunt as a unit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The only people who would be negatively impacted would be a party of two hunters who have hunted together in the past. They could add a third hunter or they could add a proxy hunting authorization as their third hunter. Since there is a Tier II hunt, some of the hunting parties of two might already be under that program.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The other solutions we have considered all loosen up restrictions more than we think necessary. We believe the current policy of added antler restrictions is counter-productive to a successful hunt. It encourages waste, and discourages hunters. Trying to count brow tines and judge antler spread can lead to inadvertently taking a moose that is not within the size restrictions. With this proposal party hunt, a party could decide to take the bull they choose without compromising the legality of the hunt. The tradeoff would be that they would then use three tickets, thus sparing the population the potential of an additional two animals taken. I would like to see this proposal given a two-year trial.

PROPOSED BY: Phil Schad (I-02S-G-047)

PROPOSAL 112 - 5 AAC 92.530(8). MANAGEMENT AREAS and 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Create a three-party hunt in this area as follows:

We would like to see a three-person party hunt added to the options of moose hunting in the Minto Flats Management Area. All current restrictions would remain in effect. In addition to these restrictions, we propose the option of allowing a three-hunter party to take any bull provided that all

three hunters punch their tickets upon taking one bull moose. This option would not entail any additional paperwork and would be as enforceable as all current restrictions. One bull; three harvest tickets punched as per current regulations.

ISSUE: We would like to address the restrictions currently in place for the Minto Flats Management Area. This area appears to have a healthy moose population. We believe the current restrictions can change in a way that will preserve the health of the population, and provide hunters with a more realistic chance for success.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If left unchanged, the moose population may grow to the point where it would become necessary to lift restrictions to a greater degree than is currently warranted. This would result in broad swings in the moose population. We seek a solution that would add an incremental change in the restrictions, and not drastically increase the hunting pressure on the population.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal simply adds an incremental change in the restrictions. It seeks to maintain a stable population of moose while at the same time giving hunting parties a better chance of success.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The benefit would be for people with a limited amount of time to hunt. Families that share a harvested moose would do so, thus discouraging waste. The party hunt would also encourage a large family to hunt as a unit. People do make mistakes and shoot a bull that does not meet the size restrictions. This change would allow them to utilize the animal provided three harvest tickets are punched.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The only people who would be negatively impacted would be a party of two hunters who have hunted together in the past. They could add a third harvest ticket or they could continue to hunt the area as per current regulations. It would be their choice.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The other solutions we have considered all loosen up restrictions more than we think necessary. We believe the current policy of added antler restrictions is counter-productive to a successful hunt. It encourages waste, and discourages hunters. Trying to count brow tines and judge antler spread can lead to inadvertently taking a moose that is not within the size restrictions. With this proposed group hunt, a party could decide to take the bull they choose without compromising the legality of the hunt. The tradeoff would be that they would then punch three tickets, thus sparing the population the potential of an additional two animals taken. We would like to see this proposal given a two-year trial.

PROPOSED BY: Steve Zabel and Rick Kreofsky (I-02S-G-048)

PROPOSAL 113 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Extend the nonresident hunting season in Unit 20C as follows:

Unit 20C, residents and nonresidents, one bull; however, white-phased or partial albino (more than 50 percent white) moose may not be taken; Sept. 1—Sept. 20.

ISSUE: Separate opening and closing dates for residents and nonresidents.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nonresidents, State of Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Middle Nenana River Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-056)

PROPOSAL 114 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Clarify the codified language for moose hunting in Unit 20F, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(18) Unit 20(F), that portion drained by the Yukon River <u>downstream from but not including the Hess Creek drainage, and</u> excluding the Tanana River drainage [DOWNSTREAM FROM THE DRAINAGE OF HESS CREEK]	Sept. 1-Sept. 20 Dec. 1-Dec.10	No open season
1 bull per regulatory year		
Unit 20(F), that portion <u>drained by</u> [OF] the Tanana River [DRAINAGE DOWNSTREAM FROM THE HESS CREEK DRAINAGE]	Sept. 1-Sept. 20	No open season

1 bull

ISSUE: Current codified language is confusing.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People who want to hunt this area will continue to be confused when comparing codified language to the description in the Alaska hunting regulation booklet.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The hunting public.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Leave the language as it is.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-044)

PROPOSAL 115 - 5 AAC 85.045. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.

Amend this regulation in Unit 20F as follows:

I would recommend the gun season for this area remain the same. An archery-only season Sept. 16-Sept. 25. Most states have realized this problem and support an archery-only season.

ISSUE: Remainder of Unit 20F, Residents: 1 bull, Harvest: Sept. 1-Sept. 15. At the present time both archery and gun hunters compete for moose during a very short season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Gun hunters harvest animals from long range. Archery hunters must be within forty yards or less. Gun hunters are unable to see the archery hunter on many occasions. If both parties are stalking the same animal (which has happened on many occasions), the archery hunter is in danger of being shot.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both gun and archery hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: James R. Herrington (HQ-02S-G-026)

PROPOSAL 116 - 5 AAC 85.045(23). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Align seasons along a small portion of the Steese Highway to reduce confusion about seasons adjacent to the highway as follows:

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

(23)

Unit 25(C), that portion within 10 miles of the east side of the Steese Highway from the Birch Creek bridge at mile 147.2 of the Steese Highway to Circle

1 bull	<u>Sept. 10—Sept. 20</u>	<u>Sept. 10—Sept. 20</u>
--------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Remainder of Unit 25(C)

1 bull	Sept. 1—Sept. 15 (General hunt only)	Sept. 5—Sept. 15
--------	---	------------------

ISSUE: The boundary between Units 25D and 25C lies close to the west side of the Steese Highway in the area north of the bridge on Birch Creek about 12 miles south of Circle. Some maps show it following the Steese Highway, creating confusion for some hunters, who would prefer to have the same fall season on both sides of the highway north of the Birch Creek Bridge. The proposed regulation would make the fall season in this portion of Unit 25C the same as in Unit 25D.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to be confused about hunting seasons in this area.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and enforcement efforts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Use public information to clarify that the section of the road in question is technically all in Unit 25C and hunters do not need to be concerned about the possibility of different seasons on each side of the road.

PROPOSED BY: Circle Village Council and Yukon Flats Moose Management Planning Committee (I-02S-G-046)

PROPOSAL 117 - 5 AAC 85.065. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR SMALL GAME. Amend this regulation in units 12, 20B, portions of 20D, 20E, and 25C, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(1)		
Grouse (spruce, blue, ruffed, and sharp-tailed)		
<u>Units [UNIT] 12, 20(B), remainder of 20(D), 20(E), and 25(C)</u>		
15 per day, 30 in possession; <u>however, a season may be announced during which the bag limit is less than 15 grouse per day, 30 in possession</u>	Aug 10-Mar. 31 (General hunt only)	Aug. 10-Mar. 31
Unit 20(A), (C), and (F) [(EXCEPT 20(D) AND THAT PORTION OF UNIT 20(B) OUTSIDE OF THE FAIRBANKS NONSUBSISTENCE AREA)]	Aug 10-Mar. 31 (General hunt only)	Aug. 10-Mar. 31
15 per day, 30 in possession		
[UNIT 20(B), THAT PORTION WITHIN THE FAIRBANKS NONSUBSISTENCE AREA]	[AUG 10-MAR. 31] [(GENERAL HUNT ONLY)]	[AUG. 10-MAR. 31]
[8 PER DAY, 24 IN POSSESSION]		
Unit 20(D), that portion lying west of the east bank of the Johnson River and south of the north bank of the Tanana River		

10 per day, of which not more than 2 may be sharp-tailed grouse, by falconry only; 10 in possession of which not more than 2 may be sharp-tailed grouse, by falconry only	Aug. 10-Aug. 24	Aug. 10-Aug. 24
15 per day, of which not more than 5 may be sharp-tailed grouse, 30 in possession, of which not more than 10 may be sharp-tailed grouse <u>however, a season may be announced during which the bag limit is less than 15 grouse per day, 30 in possession, and less than 5 sharp-tailed grouse per day, 10 in possession</u>	Aug 25-Mar. 31	Aug. 25-Mar. 31
[REMAINDER OF UNIT 20(D)] [15 PER DAY, 30 IN POSSESSION]	[AUG. 10-MAR. 31]	[AUG. 10-MAR. 31]
Unit 25(A), (B), and (D) 15 per day, 30 in possession (3)	Aug. 10 – Mar. 31 (General hunt only)	Aug. 10 – Mar. 31
Ptarmigan (rock, willow, and white-tailed) Units 8-10, [12,] 17-19, 21, 24, 25 (except 25(C)), and the Dalton Highway Corridor and Prudhoe Bay Closed Area in Unit 26(B) 20 per day, 40 in possession	Aug 10-Apr. 30 (General hunt only)	30 Aug. 10-Apr. 30
[UNITS 20 AND 25(C), THOSE PORTIONS WITHIN 5 MILES OF AK ROUTE 6 (STEESE HWY.) AND AK ROUTE 4 (RICHARDSON HWY.) SOUTH OF DELTA JUNCTION]	[AUG 10-MAR. 31 [(GENERAL HUNT ONLY)]	[AUG. 10-MAR. 31]

[20 PER DAY, 40 IN POSSESSION]

[REMAINDER OF] Units 12, 20, and 25(C)

Aug 10 - Apr. 30
(General hunt only)

Aug 10 – Apr. 30

20 per day, 40 in possession;
however, a season may be announced during which the bag limit is less than 20 ptarmigan per day, 40 in possession,

ISSUE: In Interior Alaska, ptarmigan and grouse populations exhibit large fluctuations in abundance but do not follow a classic 7-10 year cycle. It is thought that adverse weather occurring over a few years or high predator numbers can reduce chick production and overwinter survival resulting in rapid and substantial declines. However, if environmental conditions are favorable, these bird species can respond quickly and become very plentiful.

Harvest impacts ptarmigan and grouse species in various ways. To ensure adequate protection to the bird populations and to optimize hunter opportunity, managers need to take in account population status and trend, harvest amount and timing and trend of mortality factors other than hunting. Studies conducted in Alaska and western Canada indicate that harvest has little impact when bird populations are high. However, when population numbers are low harvest can have significant effects especially on local resident populations. Harvest timing has more of an impact if concentrated after the period most other forms of mortality have declined (late winter) or in local areas removing resident breeders.

The best management scenario would include a flexible bag and hunting season. During population lows, it would be beneficial to lower the bag limit and shorten the winter season to protect the resident birds and reduce the additive component of harvest. During population highs, bag limits and seasons can be maximized.

Ptarmigan and grouse hunting popularity has increased during the past 10 years and there is evidence that hunting in the more accessible areas needs to be managed closely. Managing ptarmigan and grouse seasons and bag limits by emergency order based on population trend would allow the greatest hunting opportunity during population highs and adequate protection for accessible populations when there are few birds. For example, if the ptarmigan population is high along the Steese Highway the hunting season can begin August 10 with a bag limit of 20 and continue into mid-April. If the population is low, the season can begin August 10 but the bag limit should be reduced substantially to protect the resident breeders. The bag limit could possibly be increased after September 1 but the season should be closed early to prevent high harvests by spring hunters. Advisory committees will be consulted before decisions are made.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Possible overharvest during population lows and missed opportunities during population highs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Ptarmigan and grouse hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who take high numbers of birds annually regardless of population status.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-071)

PROPOSAL 118 - 5 AAC 85.065(4). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR SMALL GAME. Amend this regulation in Unit 20 as follows:

1. Modify geographical zoning and seasons to correspond with migratory patterns. Divide the Northern Zone of the Alaska Migratory Bird Hunting Zones into North Slope, West Coast/Y-K Delta, Interior, and South-Central (south of the Alaska Range).
2. Reduce the length of the fall season and institute a 20-day spring waterfowl season to allow all Alaskans equal opportunity for waterfowl hunting. If biologically sound, start the Migratory Bird season one week earlier. Suggested fall season (Interior): August 25—November 1.

ISSUE: The Northern Zone of the Alaska Migratory Bird Hunting Zones extends from the Arctic Ocean to South-Central, and the West Coast to the Canadian border. This zone encompasses the majority of Alaska, and contains vastly different climatic regions and migratory periods. Yet, the hunting season in the entire Northern Zone (and Southeast) is the same: September 1—December 16. Most resident waterfowl in the Interior Region have moved out by the end of the first week of the season; any migratory birds have passed through region by the end of the second week of September (these vary within the region). Although the season is 15 weeks long, in most areas the only viable hunting period only lasts two to three weeks. The Northern Zone of Alaska covers roughly the same land area in the lower 48 from North Dakota to Iowa, and from Wyoming to Illinois; and contains over 24 different hunting zones/seasons. Seasons in these states are set according to USFWS and American Waterfowl Management Plan policy to mimic population dynamics and provide a high value hunting opportunity. However, Alaska's Northern Zone season does not correspond to waterfowl populations in primary areas and provides a low value hunting opportunity.

In October 1997, the International Migratory Bird Treaty was amended and ratified to allow migratory bird hunting between March 10 and September 1. Under the amended treaty, the USFWS authorized a spring/summer subsistence hunt, but limited it to only "permanent village residents who live within designated subsistence harvest areas." The amendment also formed the Alaska Migratory Bird Co-Management Council, which consists of 11 members of native corporations, one from USFWS and one from ADF&G; no non-rural representation. The duties of this Council include recommending the designation of subsistence areas and population/harvest monitoring. Once this program is finalized, waterfowl harvests that have been taking place illegally with the blessing of USFWS, will now be counted and used to further regulate and limit hunting

opportunity for non-rural residents; who provide the vast majority of funds and volunteer time to conservation/habitat efforts.

These circumstances create a disparity between residents of Alaska, and inconsistency with seasons in other states and Canada, and contrary to Alaska's constitution.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? In 2000/2001, Alaskans were seventh in the nation in dollars per capita contributed to waterfowl enhancement and raised over \$1,035,393 for Ducks Unlimited projects, not to mention donated time. But hunting opportunity for Alaskans (Interior) is realistically 65 percent less than citizens of other states. If not addressed, Alaskans will continue to have minimal waterfowling opportunity. Furthermore, since other seasons within the state are also in the first part of September, Alaskans must choose between big game and waterfowl hunting, further lessening the opportunity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Migratory birds returning in the spring are in better condition due to full plumage (no pin feathers), maturation, and feeding on agricultural crops en route. Instituting a spring waterfowl season for all residents will provide better quality and quantity of the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaskan hunters/conservationists equally.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, unless they prefer continued division of Alaska citizens.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: John Keys (HQ-02S-G-004)

PROPOSAL 119 - 5 AAC 92.095(6). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING FURBEARERS; EXCEPTIONS. Allow the use of aircraft in the Minto Flats Management Area as follows:

Eliminate this access restriction when taking bearer.

ISSUE: In the absence of any color of conservation concern the board has restricted airplane access for beaver trapping in the Minto Flats Management Area (MFMA). This restriction was created many years ago for reasons that are obscure, however our suspicion is it was the result of complaints from ground trappers with competition problems that were probably more perceived than real.

There is not now, nor has there been for many years, a very significant level of beaver trapping activity in this area. The department's harvest data is based on sealing records and is broken down by Uniform Coding Unit (UCU). For UCU 0201, generally the western portion of the MFMA and including Minto village, the average reported harvest for the last two years was two, and for the last five years was 16. For UCU 0205, including the eastern portion of the MFMA,

the two-year average was 0, and the five-year average was two. Finally, for UCU 0210, the southern remainder (only about half of which is actually within the MFMA – the rest is close to Nenana and easily accessible from the Parks Highway), the two-year average was 100, and the five-year average was 113.

We considered the possibility that there really was a significant level of beaver trapping activity by the residents of Minto village, but that they just were not reporting it or getting the hides sealed in accordance with existing regulations. We suspect this is not the case. Anecdotal reports by several local fur buyers suggest there is no significant level of beaver, or any other kind, of trapping by Minto residents.

MFMA is mostly state land and mostly coincides with the Minto Flats State Game Refuge. This refuge was created specifically (see AS 16.20.037) to guarantee the continuation of hunting, fishing, trapping and other uses by the public compatible with the protection and enhancement of habitat and the conservation of fish and wildlife. In addition, the statute states that public access to the Minto Flats State Game Refuge by means of horse, boat, aircraft, dog team, snowmachine, ATV, or other means ... may not be prohibited. Prohibition of one means of access, especially in the absence of conservation concerns or any demonstrable habitat impacts, is especially inappropriate in this area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Inappropriate and unnecessary access restrictions will be continued. This prohibition, the only beaver trapping access restriction in the state, will remain as a classic case of special interest regulation that is impossible to dislodge.

The Fairbanks Advisory Committee has submitted this proposal three times in the past; it has failed to pass. The only reason we have ever been able to discern from the minutes of the board meetings or discussions with observers is that comments in the minutes of the Minto-Nenana Advisory Committee suggest they like things the way they are. They do not want the potential of having to share this resource with someone who arrives by air – even though, as demonstrated by harvest records, they do not use it themselves.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who wish to trap beaver in Minto Flats utilizing aircraft for transportation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? It is possible conflicts might occur between the few people likely to go beaver trapping utilizing aircraft for transportation and the few people actually trapping beaver now. It would seem, in an area the size of the MFMA, these conflicts would be minimal and easily resolvable by simply moving to another spot.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A less satisfactory solution, but an improvement over the current situation, would be to eliminate the restriction on the eastern half, defined by a longitude or a township line, of the MFMA. This would reduce the likelihood of anyone from

Minto ever having to share with anyone from Fairbanks – in the unlikely event anyone from Minto actually went beaver trapping.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-025)

PROPOSAL 120 - 5 AAC 92.170(a). SEALING OF MARTEN LYNX, BEAVER, OTTER, WOLF AND WOLVERINE. Amend this regulation as follows:

Delete Unit 20 from the list of units where sealing of beaver skin is required.

ISSUE: Required beaver sealing in Unit 20. Sealing is no longer needed for management purposes because of low harvest effort.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Beaver sealing will continue to be required for Unit 20, but not for Units 18, 22, 23, or 26A.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Beaver trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Middle Nenana River Advisory Committee (HQ-02S-G-027)

PROPOSAL 121 - 5 AAC 92.510(16). AREAS CLOSED TO HUNTING and 5 AAC 92.550(7). AREAS CLOSED TO TRAPPING. Amend these regulation in Unit 20C as follows:

Increase the wolf buffer zone on state lands bordering Denali National Park from 90 square miles to 500 square miles.

ISSUE: The Board of Game appointed Denali wolf group should be asked to immediately review the status of both packs, and steps should be taken to ensure that both packs are fully protected from hunting and trapping. With trapping season just getting underway, this proposal should be treated with urgency.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Threats to Alaska’s most viewed wolves continue to exist. The 90 square mile area on state land adjoining Denali that has been zoned as free of wolf hunting and trapping for the Toklat wolves, while good, is not complete. No protection was given to the Sanctuary pack. Over the past two winters the Sanctuary pack, which formerly was of great importance as a viewable pack, was severely reduced by trapping, and made highly vulnerable to being wiped out if the remaining alpha female was destroyed. This happened during a darting accident. The Headquarters pack that previously occupied the area was wiped out by a

trapper in 1995. The Savage pack that occupied the area before that was wiped out by a hunter in 1983. Now we have a fourth group of wolves, known as the Margaret Pack, that has filled in the vacancy left by the Sanctuary pack. Given that there is now a history of repeated loss, and given that it can take years for wolves to adjust to being seen by visitors at moderately close distances and without taking flight when spotted, the Margaret pack should be given the same level of protection on state land as is currently given to the Toklat wolves.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Interpreting the "harvest" not as the value in pelts, but in terms of dollars added to the economy and total number of jobs created, the potential benefits of implementing excellent protection for these two wolf packs is very great. Alaskan wildlife viewers already contribute a great deal to the economy. Tourists are drawn to Alaska primarily by the wish to see wildlife, creating in the process a billion dollar industry and over 30,000 in-state jobs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaskans interested in seeing wolves with some reasonable level of probability (currently about 10 percent per day visit to Denali National Park). Job opportunities and economic benefits would be improved at the local level. The state would benefit as a whole.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Local hunters and trappers who hunt or trap wolves in the area where these two packs range. To put matters in perspective, if the area of restriction on wolf hunting and trapping on state land were to be increased to about 500 square miles, it would amount to about 0.05 percent of Alaska's land base.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Alliance (HQ-02S-G-022)

PROPOSAL 122 - 5 AAC 92.510(16). AREAS CLOSED TO HUNTING and 5 AAC 92.550(7). AREAS CLOSED TO TRAPPING. Amend these regulations to eliminate the sunset clauses as follows:

The Board of Game-appointed Denali wolf group should be asked to immediately review the status of both packs, and steps should be taken to ensure that both packs are fully protected from hunting and trapping. This proposal should be treated with urgency.

ISSUE: Evaluate the need for additional areas of protection for potentially high visibility wolves near Denali National Park.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Threats to Alaska's most viewed wolves will continue to exist. The 90 square mile area on state land adjoining Denali that has been zoned as free of wolf hunting and trapping for the Toklat wolves, while good, is not complete. (The area selected for wolf protection is actually much smaller than that surrounding Anchorage where world-class wolf viewing is not a priority). No protection was given to the Sanctuary pack. Over the past two winters the Sanctuary pack, which formerly was of great importance as a

viewable pack, was severely reduced by trapping, and made highly vulnerable to being wiped out if the remaining alpha female was destroyed. This happened during a darting accident. The Headquarters pack that previously occupied the area was wiped by a trapper in 1995. The Savage pack that occupied the area before that was wiped out by a hunter in 1983. Now we have a fourth group of wolves, known as the Margaret pack, that has filled in the vacancy left by the Sanctuary pack. Given that there is now a history of repeated loss, and given that it can take years for wolves to adjust to being seen by visitors at moderately close distances and without taking flight when spotted, the Margaret pack should be given the same level of protection on state land as is currently given to the Toklat wolves.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Interpreting the “harvest” not as the value in pelts, but in terms of dollars added to the economy and total number of jobs created, the potential benefits of implementing excellent protection for these two wolf packs is very great. Alaskan wildlife viewers already contribute a great deal to the economy. Tourists are drawn to Alaska primarily by the wish to see wildlife, creating in the process a billion dollar industry and over 30,000 instate jobs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaskans interested in seeing wolves with some reasonable level of probability (currently about 10 percent per day visit). Job opportunities and economic benefits would be improved at the local level. The state would benefit as a whole.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The few local hunters and trappers who hunt or trap wolves in the area where these two packs range. None of the hunters or trappers living in the area depend on these two packs for their livelihood. It is primarily a recreational interest. To put matters in perspective, if the area of restriction on wolf hunting and trapping on state land were to be increased to about 500 square miles, it would amount to about 0.05 percent of Alaska’s land base.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Alliance (SC-02S-G-013)/(HQ-02S-G-097)

PROPOSAL 123 - 5 AAC 92.530(10). MANAGEMENT AREAS. Clarify the language describing the Fairbanks Management Area, as follows:

(10) the Fairbanks Management Area:

(A) this area consists of that portion of Unit 20(B) bounded by a line from the confluence of Rosie Creek and the Tanana River, northerly along Rosie Creek to **a point directly west of the end of West Isberg Road, then east to West Isberg Road, then northeasterly on West Isberg Road to Sonata Drive, then northeasterly on Sonata Drive** [ISBERG ROAD, THEN NORTHEASTERLY ON ISBERG ROAD] to Cripple Creek Road, then northeasterly on Cripple Creek Road to the Parks Highway, then north on the Parks Highway to Alder Creek, then westerly along Alder Creek to its confluence with Emma Creek, then upstream along Emma Creek to its headwaters, then northerly along the hydrographic divide between Goldstream Creek

drainages and Cripple Creek drainages to the summit of Ester Dome, then down Sheep Creek to its confluence with Goldstream Creek, then easterly along Goldstream Creek to Sheep Creek Road, then north on Sheep Creek Road to Murphy Dome Road, then west on Murphy Dome Road to Old Murphy Dome Road, then east on Old Murphy Dome Road to the Elliot Highway, then south on the Elliot Highway to Goldstream Creek, then easterly along Goldstream Creek to its confluence with First Chance Creek, then up First Chance Creek to Tungsten Hill, then southerly along Steele Creek to its confluence with Ruby Creek, then upstream along Ruby Creek to Esro Road, then south on Esro Road to Chena Hot Springs Road, then east on Chena Hot Springs Road to Nordale Road, then south on Nordale Road to the Chena River, then along the north bank of the Chena River to the Moose Creek dike, then southerly along Moose Creek dike to its intersection with the Tanana River, and then westerly along the north bank of the Tanana River to the point of beginning;

ISSUE: The current codified language does not correctly describe the boundary of the Fairbanks Management Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The codified language will not be correct.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The hunting public.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-045)

PROPOSAL 124 - 5 AAC 92.530(10)(A). MANAGEMENT AREAS. Amend this regulation as follows:

(10) The Fairbanks Management Area:

(A) this area consists of that portion of Unit 20(B) bounded by a line from the confluence of Rosie Creek and the Tanana River, northerly along Rosie Creek to the middle fork of Rosie Creek through section 26 to the Parks Highway, then west along the Parks Highway to the intertie line, then east along the intertie line to Emma Creek, [ISBERG ROAD, THEN NORTHEASTERLY ON ISBERG ROAD TO CRIPPLE CREEK ROAD, THEN NORTHEASTERLY ON CRIPPLE CREEK ROAD TO THE PARKS HIGHWAY, THEN NORTH ON THE PARKS HIGHWAY TO ALDER CREEK, THEN WESTERLY ALONG ALDER CREEK TO ITS CONFLUENCE WITH EMMA CREEK,] then upstream along Emma Creek to its headwaters, then northerly along the hydrographic divide between Goldstream Creek drainages and Cripple Creek drainages to the summit of Ester Dome, ...

ISSUE: Cripple Creek Subdivision most appropriately belongs within the Fairbanks Management Area (FMA). In March 2000, the Board of Game adjusted the FMA boundary to address concern over rifle hunting close to residential areas. Only the eastern portion the Cripple Creek Subdivision was added to the FMA at that time. Residents in the western portion of the subdivision continue to experience problems with rifle hunting during moose season. This proposal would add the western portion of the Cripple Creek Subdivision to the FMA.

This subdivision is a residential area considerably more developed than most of the areas added to the FMA in 2000, such as those between Goldstream Creek and the Old Murphy Dome Road. This action would be consistent with the Board of Game's responsibility for conservation and development of game resources and consistent with the intent of previous board actions on FMA boundary adjustments that have been made as residential development has expanded in the Fairbanks area.

This action would also clarify the boundary description. The current language does not clearly identify West Isberg Road and Sonata Drive, rather than Isberg Road, as the intended boundary of the FMA.

This proposal is intended to address problems experienced during moose hunting activities only. It is recognized that firearms would still be allowed for other hunting activities. However problems have only been experienced during moose hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued inconsistency and problems with rifle hunting close to residential neighborhoods resulting in loss of hunting (same as issue addressed in March 2000).

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters because the resulting boundary would be a more logically defined management area. Bow hunters could see a slight benefit from an increase to the FMA.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? This small addition to the FMA would have minimal impact on the hunting public. Bow hunting would still be allowed, so any impact would be limited to those wanting to use rifles for moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? (10) The Fairbanks Management Area:
(A) this area consists of that portion of Unit 20(B) bounded by a line from the confluence of Rosie Creek and the Tanana River, northerly along Rosie Creek across West Isberg Road and continuing northwesterly along the drainage to mile 346.75 of the Parks Highway, then easterly [ISBERG ROAD, THEN NORTHEASTERLY ON ISBERG ROAD TO CRIPPLE CREEK ROAD, THEN NORTHEASTERLY ON CRIPPLE CREEK ROAD TO THE PARKS HIGHWAY, THEN NORTH] on the Parks Highway to Alder Creek, then westerly along Alder Creek to its confluence with Emma Creek, then upstream along Emma Creek to its headwaters,

then northerly along the hydrographic divide between Goldstream Creek drainages and Cripple Creek drainages to the summit of Ester Dome, ...

This second option would result in a smaller addition to the FMA and is considered the minimum action needed to address the current problem. It would include most of the Cripple Creek No. 2 subdivision and a portion of Aspenwood subdivision which is platted but undeveloped. Both subdivisions are south of the Parks Highway. It would not include residential developments along Parks Ridge Road north of the Parks Highway.

PROPOSED BY: Dennis Bogren (I-02S-G-070)

PROPOSAL 125 - 5 AAC 92.530(10)(A). MANAGEMENT AREAS. Amend the Fairbanks Management Area as follows:

(A) this area consists of that portion of Unit 20(B) bounded by a line from the confluence of Rosie Creek and the Tanana River, northerly along Rosie Creek to Isberg Road, then northeasterly on Isberg Road to Cripple Creek Road, then northeasterly on Cripple Creek Road to the Parks Highway, then north on the Parks Highway to Alder Creek, then westerly along Alder Creek to its confluence with Emma Creek, then upstream along Emma Creek to its headwaters, then northerly along the hydrographic divide between Goldstream Creek drainages and Cripple Creek drainages to the summit of Ester Dome, then down Sheep Creek to its confluence with Goldstream Creek, then easterly along Goldstream Creek to Sheep Creek Road, then north on Sheep Creek road to Murphy Dome Road, then west on Murphy Dome Road to Old Murphy Dome Road, then east on Old Murphy Dome Road to the Monte Cristo Creek trail, along the Monte Cristo Creek trail to the four corners, then southeast to the unnamed creek through Section 31, to its confluence with Big Eldorado Creek, then northeast along Big Eldorado Creek to the cabin in Section 27, then southeast to the west fork of Silver Creek, then down Silver Creek to the outlet stream of the Davidson Ditch, then along the Davidson Ditch to the creek in Section 29, then south along the creek in Section 29 to [THE ELLIOT HIGHWAY, THEN SOUTH ON THE ELLIOT HIGHWAY TO GOLDSTREAM CREEK, THEN EASTERLY ALONG GOLDSTREAM CREEK TO ITS CONFLUENCE WITH] First Chance Creek, then up First Chance Creek to Tungsten Hill, then southerly along Steele Creek to its confluence with Ruby Creek...

ISSUE: A boundary change in the Fairbanks Management Area (FMA) in the Fox area and northwest of Fox. This proposal would add about one square mile to the FMA surrounding the community of Fox. There is strong local support for this action, given the residential development in Fox, an RV park, and other developments. The proposal would also remove about 11 square miles from the FMA which is undeveloped land in the upper O'Conner Creek drainage, upper Big Eldorado Creek drainage, and hills northwest of Fox. These areas are easily accessible for hunters and provide an important local hunting opportunity. People can get to these areas for a couple hours of hunting before or after work. This area can be accessed from the Old Murphy Dome Road, the Goldstream Road, and at least three ORV trails.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This would stop gun hunting in the Fox residential area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it would improve moose hunting opportunity and safety.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fox residents would be safer. Fairbanks area hunters wanting hunting opportunity reasonably close to town.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one because no one lives in the area northwest of Fox.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? So far everyone we have talked to likes this new boundary change. One possible alternative is to have the boundary follow the section line on the east side of Gold Stream Subdivision to Goldstream Road then east to the trail to the end of the Davidson Ditch.

PROPOSED BY: Carl Nichols (I-02S-G-013)

PROPOSAL 126 - 5 AAC 92.530(10)(A). MANAGEMENT AREAS. Change the size of the Fairbanks Management Area as follows:

(10) The Fairbanks Management Area:

(A) this area consists of that portion of Unit 20(B) bounded by a line from the confluence of Rosie Creek and the Tanana River, northerly along Rosie Creek to Isberg Road, then northeasterly on Isberg Road to Cripple Creek Road, then northeasterly on Cripple Creek Road to the Parks Highway, then north on the Parks Highway to Alder Creek, then westerly along Alder Creek to its confluence with Emma Creek, then upstream along Emma Creek to its headwaters, then northerly along the hydrographic divide between Goldstream Creek drainages and Cripple Creek drainages to the summit of Ester Dome, then down Sheep Creek to its confluence with Goldstream Creek, [THEN EASTERLY ALONG GOLDSTREAM CREEK TO SHEEP CREEK ROAD, THEN NORTH ON SHEEP CREEK ROAD TO MURPHY DOME ROAD, THEN WEST ON MURPHY DOME ROAD TO OLD MURPHY DOME ROAD, THEN EAST ON OLD MURPHY DOME ROAD TO THE ELLIOT HIGHWAY, THEN SOUTH ON THE ELLIOT HIGHWAY TO GOLDSTREAM CREEK,] then easterly along Goldstream Creek to its confluence with First Chance Creek, then up First Chance Creek to Tungsten Hill, then southerly along Steele Creek to [ITS CONFLUENCE WITH RUBY CREEK, THEN UPSTREAM ALONG RUBY CREEK TO ESRO ROAD, THEN SOUTH ON ESRO ROAD TO CHENA HOT SPRINGS ROAD, THEN EAST ON CHENA HOT SPRINGS ROAD TO NORDALE ROAD, THEN SOUTH ON NORDALE ROAD TO THE CHENA RIVER,] its intersection with the T-A-P-S right of way, then southeasterly along the T-A-P-S right of way to the north bank of the Chena River, then along the north bank of the Chena River to the Moose Creek dike, then southerly along Moose Creek dike to its intersection with the Tanana River, and then westerly along the north bank of the Tanana River to the point of beginning;

ISSUE: a) The increase in moose/people conflicts in the Fairbanks Management Area. b) The reduction in opportunity to hunt moose with firearms in the Fairbanks area due to expansion of the Fairbanks Management Area and the related problem of managing an expanding/increasing moose population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Opportunity to hunt moose with firearms will continue to be needlessly limited. The moose population will increase resulting in possible habitat damage and in increased car/moose accidents, moose/snowmachine, skier and musher incidents, increased incidents of moose interaction with children near school bus stops, and property damage (crops, shrubs).

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Firearm-equipped hunters, vehicle drivers, gardeners, trail users (skiers, mushers, snowmachiners), school bus riders and their parents, private property owners.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some residents who are apprehensive over firearms use for moose. Some bowhunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I suggest, and support consideration of these options: 1) A different northern and eastern boundary than I propose. 2) Allowing muzzle loaders and shotgun use in all or parts of Fairbanks Management Area.

PROPOSED BY: Richard H. Bishop (I-02S-G-050)

PROPOSAL 127 - 5 AAC 92.530(10). MANAGEMENT AREAS. Amend the Fairbanks Management Area as follows:

We would prefer that the boundary be changed back to Steele Creek or the Alaska pipeline. The additional closed area to gun hunting, including our private property, is mainly vacant state land.

ISSUE: Last year Fairbanks Management Area in Unit 20B included our 280 acres of private property and state land in a moose bow hunting only closure. We have hunted our moose with a gun for 54 years on this property.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The addition of this land between Steele Creek and Nordale Road was made without our input and prevents our subsistence on our property. The change was made at the last regulation change.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? We thin trees and clear land on our property to improve moose habitat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The local private property owners who until one year ago have hunted their property.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody seemed to suffer when this area was open for 54 years.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The Fairbanks paper said this closure expanded bow hunting opportunities; they could hunt public land here already.

PROPOSED BY: Dave and Debbie Walter, and Maryanne and Kory Eberhardt
(HQ-02S-G-014/I-02S-G-010)

PROPOSAL 128 - 5 AAC 92.530(10)(A). MANAGEMENT AREAS. Amend this regulation as follows:

Delete that area between Steele Creek and Esro Road from the Fairbanks Management Area.

(A) this area consists of that portion of Unit 20B bounded by a line from the confluence of Rosie Creek and the Tanana River, northerly along Rosie Creek to Isberg Road, then northeasterly on Isberg Road to Cripple Creek Road, then northeasterly on Cripple Creek Road to the Parks Highway, then north on the Parks Highway to Alder Creek, then westerly along Alder Creek to its confluence with Emma Creek, then upstream along Emma Creek to its headwaters, then northerly along the hydrographic divide between Goldstream Creek drainages and Cripple Creek drainages to the summit of Ester Dome, then down Sheep Creek to its confluence with Goldstream Creek, then easterly along Goldstream Creek to Sheep Creek Road, then north on Sheep Creek Road to Murphy Dome Road, then west on Murphy Dome Road to Old Murphy Dome Road; then east on Old Murphy Dome Road to the Elliot Highway, then south on the Elliot Highway to Goldstream Creek, then easterly along Goldstream Creek to its confluence with First Chance Creek, then up First Chance Creek to Tungsten Hill, then southerly along Steele Creek to [ITS CONFLUENCE WITH RUBY CREEK, THEN UPSTREAM ALONG RUBY CREEK TO ESRO ROAD, THEN SOUTH ON ESRO ROAD TO] Chena Hot Springs Road, then east on Chena Hot Springs Road to Nordale Road, then south on Nordale Road to the Chena River, then along the North bank of the Chena River to the Moose Creek dike, then southerly along Moose Creek dike to its intersection with the Tanana River and then westerly along the north bank of the Tanana River to the point of beginning;

(B) the area is open to moose hunting by bow and arrow only;

ISSUE: The March 2000 change in the Fairbanks Management Area boundary unnecessarily limited hunting opportunity in the areas east of Steele Creek and west of Esro Road. This area has been safely hunted for years and there was no need for adding this area into the Fairbanks Management Area. The land is privately owned and is used by only a small number of hunters.

Esro Road is a privately owned road and should not be used to define hunting regulation boundaries. Listing the road in regulation implies that it is open for public use, which it is not. The Department of Public Safety's concern over having definable boundaries which are easy to enforce made some sense for the area along Steele Creek, south of the Chena Hot Springs Road in a

lowland muskeg area, but not north of Chena Hot Springs Road, where Steele Creek is easily identified in a narrow valley.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters who have used this area for years will be shut out of their historic hunting area.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who have used this area for years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: John H. Janssen (I-02S-G-009)

PROPOSAL 129 - 5 AAC 92.550. AREAS CLOSED TO TRAPPING. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Close the Fairbanks Management Area to trapping except for under-ice traps and except to allow all traps within a 1/2 mile corridor (1/4 mile each side) of Goldstream River and its tributaries, west of the Old Steese Highway. Allow under-ice traps only east of the Old Steese Highway.

ISSUE: The problem is conflict between trappers and residents living in residential areas in the Fairbanks Management Area, particularly pets being caught in traps in high density residential areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The incidence of pet captures and conflicts between trappers and other residents will continue to increase as human population density increases.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the quality of resource harvested will be improved since trappers will not be trapping as many unwanted pets (i.e., dogs and cats). It also will improve the quality of the experience of trapping since the trapper will not have negative experiences with pet owners.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Pet owners who abide by the voice control law of the Fairbanks North Star Borough and yet still run the danger of having pets caught in traps in their own neighborhoods in the Fairbanks Management Area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trappers who do not have easy access to more remote and appropriate areas for trapping (i.e., areas away from neighborhoods) and trappers who cannot locate areas not already claimed by other trappers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered setting a maximum allowable size for snares so that it is specific for foxes and also mandating use of breakaway snares. This would improve the likelihood of moose escaping snares but does not allow cats and dogs to escape since neither would exert enough force to cause the lock to break away. I also considered trying to word the closure to allow for trapping in the far reaches of the Fairbanks Management Area along Murphy Dome Road, for example, but could not locate roads or easily discernable geographic features to allow for an obvious border.

PROPOSED BY: Fran Mann (HQ-02S-G-105)

PROPOSAL 130 - 5 AAC 92.530(10)(B). MANAGEMENT AREAS. Allow use of firearms inside of the Fairbanks Management Area as follows:

- (10) The Fairbanks Management Area:
 - (A) this area consists of ...
 - (B) the area is open to moose hunting by bow and arrow, shotgun, or muzzle loader.

ISSUE: a) The increase in moose/people conflicts in the Fairbanks Management Area. b) The reduction in opportunity to hunt moose with firearms in the Fairbanks area due to expansion of the Fairbanks Management Area and the related problem of managing an expanding/increasing moose population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Opportunity to hunt moose with firearms will continue to be needlessly limited. The moose population will increase resulting in possible habitat damage and in increased car/moose accidents, moose/snowmachine, skier and musher incidents, increased incidents of moose interaction with children near school bus stops, and property damage (crops, shrubs).

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Firearm-equipped hunters, vehicle drivers, gardeners, trail users (skiers, mushers, snowmachiners), school bus riders and their parents, private property owners.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some residents who are apprehensive over firearms use for moose. Some bowhunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I suggest, and support consideration of these options: 1) A different northern and eastern boundary than I propose. 2) Allowing muzzle loaders and shotgun use in all or parts of Fairbanks Management Area.

PROPOSED BY: Richard H. Bishop (I-02S-G-051)

PROPOSAL 131 - 5 AAC 92.540(3)(F). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Open the Wood River Controlled Use Area from the east bank of the Totatlanika River to the east side of the Tatlanika River to motorized vehicles. By opening an area that sees little use, it will increase the quality of hunting.

ISSUE: Open the Wood River Controlled Use Area from the east bank of the Totatlanika River to the east side of the Tatlanika River to motorized vehicles.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting pressure is increasing on the Rex and Ferry Trail and local hunters get hit the hardest with restrictions. There is no biological reasons for this area to be closed.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by taking pressure off overhunted areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fly-in hunters. Only the big buck hunters can use a fly-in only area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Middle Nenana River Advisory Committee (I-02S-G-053)

PROPOSAL 132 - 5 AAC 92.540(F)(i). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend the Wood River Controlled Use Area as follows:

...then from Gold King airstrip along the trail's extension along the north side of Japan Hills to the Wood River: bounded on the east by the high water mark of the east side of the Wood River, including...

ISSUE: Wood River Controlled Use Area – change the boundary where it meets the Wood River to the north, to include the Wood River itself going south.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More motorized traffic on and along the river below the high water mark.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It will give the moose less interference on their way from the flats to the hills.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose on their way up from the flats, and hunters in the Wood River Controlled Use Area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Big rigs coming in from the highway and others using the river for motorized traffic.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Audun Endestad (I-02S-G-008)

PROPOSAL 133 - 5 AAC 92.540(3)(J). CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this regulation in the Nenana Controlled Use Area, as follows:

That area southeast of the Parks Highway to the Rex Trail to the Wood River and to the Tanana River: there is no restriction of any ORVs or ATVs.

ISSUE: The Nenana Controlled Use Area closed to airboat use.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The prejudice and restriction of airboats over all other user groups.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It opens up the interior area of that unit to hunting for airboaters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The airboaters who are being discriminated against.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close it to everyone and make it the same for everyone.

PROPOSED BY: Lee Olsen (I-02S-G-011)

PROPOSAL 134 - 5 AAC 92.540. CONTROLLED USE AREAS. Amend this regulation in Unit 20 to provide the following:

Increase the number of and size of nonmotorized hunting area.

ISSUE: Lack of nonmotorized hunting area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Quality hunting experience.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nonmotorized hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Motorized hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Dennis Moen

(I-02S-G-077)

PROPOSAL 135 - 5 AAC 92.550. AREAS CLOSED TO TRAPPING. Amend this regulation in Unit 20 by adding the following:

By placing traps or snares on the Fairbanks-Nenana-Manley Hot Springs Trail or the Dunbar-Brooks Terminal Trail; and

By placing traps or snares on a RS2477 right-of-way rendering it impassable or passable only with unreasonable inconvenience or hazard in Unit 20.

ISSUE: This proposal seeks to amend the trapping regulations by adding a restriction that is already in state law. Alaska Statute 11.61.150 specifies that it is illegal to obstruct state designated highways - this includes RS2477 trails.

Unfortunately, there are a few trappers who insist on placing traps or snares on these public use trails, and thereby causing injury and property damage for others using these public use trails. When reported to the Department of Public Safety, officers are unable to get backing from their district attorney for enforcement efforts. What is needed is clarity in the trapping regulations to indicate that this illegal practice is in fact illegal. The legislature has already made their intent clear, and the regulations should be made consistent with state statute.

This proposal is not anti-trapping. Standard trapping practices would not be restricted by this proposal. Moreover, the proposal only addresses RS2477 right-of-ways and not the trails that trappers typically cut, maintain, and use for their own trapping purposes.

The Department of Natural Resources is very clear in asserting that RS2477 right-of-ways are highway right-of-ways available for general public use. Provisions of the Alaska criminal code make it a crime to knowingly obstruct a state highway. Alaska Statute 11.61.150, obstruction of Highways includes rendering a highway "impassable or only passable with unreasonable inconvenience or hazard."

Fairbanks-Nenana-Manley Hot Springs (RST 152) was a transportation and telegraph route built by the N.C. Company in 1903 and maintained by the Alaska Road Commission until 1959. It has been in continuous use from 1903 to the present. Dunbar-Brooks Terminal (RST 66) was a mining transportation route maintained by the Alaska Road Commission that connects Dunbar Siding on the Alaska Railroad with Livengood (Brooks Terminal).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Public access will continue to be impeded and incidents of sled dogs being injured in traps or by trapped animals will continue. The unfortunate result is turning non-trappers who are okay with trapping into anti-trapping diehards.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All ethical trappers. Also, those who do not want to have their sled dogs caught in traps and snares while mushing along these public use trails.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Only unethical trappers. Again, this is not an anti-trapping proposal. This proposal addresses the Fairbanks-Nenana-Manley Hot Springs trail, the Dunbar-Brooks Terminal trail and similar RS2477 trails in Unit 20. Trapping along non-RS2477 trails such as those trappers typically cut, maintain, and use for their own trapping purposes would not be affected by this proposal.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Asking that the department include the reference to the state law against trapping on RS2477 trails in the next printing of the Alaska Trapping Regulations Summary booklet. This would be logical to do, but it is preferable to make the change in the codified regulations for increased clarity for both the public and for resource managers.

Delaying until the next statewide Board of Game meeting scheduled for January 2004. This solution was rejected because of the specific nature of the problem along the Fairbanks-Nenana-Manley Hot Springs trail and the Dunbar-Brooks Terminal trail in Unit 20, the need for immediate action, and the benefit of the board acting on the solution when meeting in the local region.

PROPOSED BY: Doug and Becky Bowers and Tom Delong (I-02S-G-033)

PROPOSAL 136 - 5 AAC 85.020. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR. Amend this regulation in Unit 26B, as follows:

Within the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area: one bear every four regulatory years by drawing permit only. Four permits to be issued. Permittee may only shoot with bow and arrow at 25 yards or less. Wounded bears to be reported to the department.

ISSUE: The brown/grizzly bear population within the Dalton Highway Corridor, in Unit 26B has declined dramatically over the past few years. A harvest strategy is needed to allow the brown/grizzly population to recover from depletion. Very few bears are left available for the viewing public.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The open terrain of the north slope of the Brooks Range in combination of road access has led to harvest beyond sustained yield. Opening of the Dalton Highway has attracted more spring and fall grizzly hunters. Unrestricted harvest and wounding loss will hold the grizzly population below the carrying capacity.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The primary people to benefit would be the thousands of tourists who would normally have an opportunity to see bears in the open vista of the North Slope. Responsible permittees who would be allowed to hunt grizzly bears from the Dalton Highway would be beneficiaries.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The unlimited number of hunters who would like to hunt grizzly bear in Unit 26B from the Dalton Highway.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered a closure of the corridor in Unit 26B for grizzly for two years, then a drawing hunt opening as above.

PROPOSED BY: Jack Reakoff (HQ-02S-G-011)/(I-02S-G-017)

PROPOSAL 137 - 5 AAC 85.025(21). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR CARIBOU. Amend this regulation in Unit 26B within the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area as follows:

Residents: 2 caribou total – 1 bull Aug. 10 [JULY 1] - Sept. 30
 Any caribou Oct. 1 - Apr. 30

Nonresidents: 2 bulls total 1 bull Aug. 10 [JULY 1] - Sept. 30

ISSUE: Taking of bull caribou along the Dalton Highway in July before the animals are in good shape, during warm weather. This hunt also conflicts with the peak tourism viewing period.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Many new caribou hunters are using the early portion hunt inadvertently, only to find after taking a caribou that the skin is still healing from warble fly holes, the antler is not ossified or finished hardening, and very warm and hard to keep the meat from insects and spoilage.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All the hunters who would like to take the “summering” caribou near the Dalton Highway after the animals are in much better condition. The same animals would also be available for the thousands of tourists to see during the peak viewing time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those hunters who do not care about the hide, antlers, or meat harvested at the more appropriate time.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? To do nothing. I feel that as more hunters and tourists come to this country a fair remedy is in order.

PROPOSED BY: Jack Reakoff (HQ-02S-G-012)/(I-02S-G-018)

PROPOSAL 138 - 5 AAC 85.045(22). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.
Amend these regulations in Unit 24 as follows:

Moose Unit 24: Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area: From Gobblers Knob milepost 132 north to the Unit 24 boundary at milepost 237.1. Residents: one antlered moose by drawing permit. Nonresidents: one bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with four or more brow tines by drawing permit. A maximum of 50 permits to be issued, of which only 10 permits would be valid north of Slate Creek.

ISSUE: There are too many moose hunters competing for the very limited, low density moose population available in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area in Unit 24. The moose in this area are declining due to poor recruitment of calves. The six years of data at the Yukon check station on the Dalton Highway showed ever increasing hunter numbers. Harvest reports do not reflect the large volumes of hunters who hunt moose while traveling north and south from Unit 26B caribou hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population in the Dalton Highway Corridor, Unit 24 cannot sustain unlimited harvest without a limitation. Moose hunting will continue to be low quality as hunters aggregate and compete for any moose that shows itself.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Harvest would be within sustained yield, hunters who draw permits would have a higher quality hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who want to hunt moose in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area Unit 24 with a reasonable hunter to moose ratio, within sustained yield parameters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unlimited opportunistic hunters who try for moose while driving to the North Slope for caribou. These hunters number in the hundreds, maybe thousands.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Registration hunt, reporting within two days of harvest, closure at 30 bull moose. There is very limited data for this area, setting a quota and tracking harvest would be expensive and impractical.

PROPOSED BY: Jack Reakoff (I-02S-G-016)

PROPOSAL 139 - 5 AAC 92.003. HUNTER EDUCATION AND ORIENTATION REQUIREMENTS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

Bow Hunter Education Requirements (new section). Within the Dalton Highway Management Area, you may not continue to hunt for another big game animal, upon wounding another of that species. Every effort shall be made to retrieve wounded game. The wounding of an animal shall be noted on harvest report.

ISSUE: In the Dalton Highway Management Area, some unethical hunters after wounding an animal, will continue to hunt another animal of the same species. ADF&G has no wound rate data for the Dalton Highway Management Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Some hunters will continue to shoot multiple animals. Wound rate is very high with this mindset. Unknown resource loss is accounted for by ADF&G.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All resource users who want to ethically use game in the Dalton Highway Management Area and provide for sustained yield management.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unethical hunters who want to have opportunity to shoot into as many animals, without regard to resource loss.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close the Dalton Highway Management Area. Rejected as it would penalize ethical bow hunters.

PROPOSED BY: Jack Reakoff (HQ-02S-G-019)

PROPOSAL 140 - 5 AAC 92.003. HUNTER EDUCATION AND ORIENTATION REQUIREMENTS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

Bow hunter education requirements (new section). You may not hunt the Dalton Highway Management Area unless successfully demonstrating 90 percent proficient at a 9-inch target at 10, 20, and 30 yards. Hunters will have their personal proficiency endorsement on their bow card, and may only shoot at big game at that bench mark range, with bow type used while testing.

ISSUE: The Dalton Highway Management Area has been experiencing a steady decline in hunter ethics in recent years. Unfortunately, many bow hunters are attempting shots at big game far out of ethical bow range. The IBEP education course is not addressing the high wound rate associated with out of range shooting in the open terrain of the Brooks Range, and unaccounted loss of big game resources.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? ADF&G does not have good or any wound rate figures for Alaskan game, only best guess. The only comprehensive data I have found is on deer and elk, by The Wildlife Society, Technical Review 99-1. This data shows unacceptable wound rates for deer at 30 yards or greater. Alaskan game is generally much larger. If Dalton Highway Management Area hunters do not have a legal personal bench mark many will legally, yet unethically continue to shoot beyond their capabilities.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All diligent hunters who stalk within their proficient range make clean kills. I have had ethical bow hunters tell me this proposed regulation will not effect them, as their objective is to have the opportunity to take game with a primitive weapon, which entails close stalking.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those hunters who are only using bow because it is required to hunt the Dalton Highway Management Area. Because of the relative remoteness of this area, some hunters feel they are out of sight and mind. Tourists, Fish and Wildlife Protection, and subsistence hunters have agonized at watching bad, but legal hunting. This regulation will give each bow hunter a legal parameter to try for a clean shot.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close the corridor to hunting. There is enough resource generally for prudent use.

PROPOSED BY: Jack Reakoff (HQ-02S-G-020)

PROPOSAL 141 - 5 AAC 92.530(7). MANAGEMENT AREAS. Enlarge the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area to include the Prudhoe Bay Closed Area, and limit the use of highway vehicles to transport hunters and game, as follows:

(A) the area consists of those portions in Units 20 and 24-26 extending five miles from each side of the Dalton Highway, including the drivable surface of the Dalton Highway, from the Yukon River to the Arctic Ocean, and including the Prudhoe Bay Closed Area;

(B) the area within the Prudhoe Bay Closed Area is closed to the taking of big game; the remainder of the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area is closed to hunting, however big game, small game, and fur animals may be taken in the area by bow and arrow only; no motorized vehicle, except licensed highway vehicles on publicly maintained roads, aircraft, and boats [, AND LICENSED HIGHWAY VEHICLES] may be used to transport game or hunters within the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area; however, a snowmachine may be used to transport game or a hunter across the management area from land outside the management area to access land on the other side of the management area; any hunter traveling on the Dalton Highway must stop at any check station operated by the department within the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area;

ISSUE: The Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area (DHCMA) was established, in part, to protect wildlife resources adjacent to the highway from over-exploitation. In recent years a small but growing number of hunters have used snowmachines to access areas adjacent to the DHCMA by driving to the Prudhoe Bay Closed Area (PBCA), which is located outside the DHCMA, to begin hunting. These hunters have participated in subsistence hunts for muskoxen and Dall sheep. Restrictions and exceptions for motorized vehicle use are listed in paragraph (B) of the DHCMA regulation, but are not part of the PBCA regulation. By expanding the DHCMA to include the PBCA, snowmachine access would be restricted, with exceptions, in the same manner as in the Dalton Highway south of the PBCA. There has been a general increase in the

number of hunters accessing areas on the North Slope from the PBCA. The proposed regulation would close a loophole that allows hunters to drive to the PBCA and travel by snowmachine to areas outside the corridor.

In a related issue, during the last few years there has been a growing number of cases where hunters have used licensed highway vehicles to transport ATVs across the five-mile corridor to begin hunting, resulting in a growing potential for high harvests in local areas, environmental degradation and enforcement problems. This pattern is likely to expand unless the regulation is changed. The proposed language would allow the use of licensed highway vehicles to transport game and hunters on publicly maintained roads, which include the Dalton Highway and unrestricted access roads associated with material sites. The proposed regulation would be consistent with the intent of the state law and the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area regulations, and also with the proposed change to the Prudhoe Bay Closed Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The number of hunters using snowmachines to access areas outside the DHCMA will continue to increase. This could make it more difficult to close the registration muskox hunt when the quota has been reached. The harvest quota for muskoxen was exceeded by two animals in 2001, partly because hunters were in the field when the quota was reached. An increase in the use of snowmachines in the subsistence sheep hunts could also lead to the local overharvest of sheep. It would also continue to be difficult for law enforcement officers to determine whether people are hunting legally.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence and other hunters who access areas adjacent to the Dalton Highway Corridor as the law intended. These hunters will have a better chance of harvesting muskox before the quota is reached. Enforcement officers will be able to determine if people are hunting legally. Muskox and sheep hunters will benefit because the likelihood of overharvest will be minimized.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People that might use the loophole in the regulations in the future to hunt in areas that are intended to have restrictions on motorized vehicle access.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered asking the state legislature to change the wording in the statute that addresses off-road vehicle use in the DHCMA. We rejected it because the proposed approach is simpler. We also considered a proposal to change the limit for the subsistence registration sheep hunt to one sheep per year or to eliminate this hunt. We concluded the proposed approach is better because it addresses the problem of potential overharvest for both sheep and muskox, as well as the general increase in hunters accessing North Slope lands from the PBCA.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-02S-G-054)

PROPOSAL 142 - 5 AAC 92.530(7)(B). MANAGEMENT AREAS. Amend this regulation to include the following:

The Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area – Units 20, 24, 25, and 26. No motorized vehicles, except aircraft, boats, and licensed highway vehicles on state maintained roads, may be used to transport game or hunters within the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area.

ISSUE: Hunters are driving licensed highway vehicles off maintained roads in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area. Circumventing state statute, restricting off-road vehicle use. Unchecked ORV use cannot be sustained in low density game populations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters are starting to drive through the tundra and anadromous fish streams to access areas outside the corridor, with highway vehicles. Low density populations of moose do not tolerate highly accessible hunting in relatively open terrain. Expansion of wilderness destruction, into areas which have not had ORV use.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and nonhunters who want limited game resources sustained, and destruction of untrampled wilderness limited.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those few, but growing numbers of hunters who have “boonie stomped” trails out of the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area, with licensed highway vehicles.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There are few solutions to this growing problem. Season reductions would be too restrictive.

PROPOSED BY: Jack Reakoff (HQ-02S-G-016)

PROPOSAL 143 - 5 AAC 92.530(7). MANAGEMENT AREAS. Amend this regulation in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area as follows:

Equipment: You may not hunt big game with bow unless the arrow is tipped with a broadhead, at least 20 inches in overall length and 650 grains total weight. For moose and brown/grizzly bear, arrows must weigh 900 grains total weight.

ISSUE: Wound rate is too high in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area. The reduction in arrow weight has accelerated the wound rate, due to penetration reduction. Lightweight arrows shoot well at targets, but are inadequate for hunting big game.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The data from the natal study on arrow penetration in South Africa demonstrated the most lethal arrows are a minimum of 650 grains for

big game. Heavier arrows are needed for “super big” animals – 900 grain. Many animals will needlessly be lost, if lethal weight standards are not adopted.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who, after making a good hit, lose the animal because of inadequate penetration to be lethal. The resource will benefit as wound rates will decline. Managers will know more closely what human induced mortality is, for sustained yield calculation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who do not understand that arrows must have deep penetration to be lethal, as bullets do.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? To require a three inch single blade (two blade) broadhead which is found to have deepest penetration. It complicated the proposal, but further addresses wound rate reduction.

PROPOSED BY: Jack Reakoff (HQ-02S-G-017)

PROPOSAL 144 - 5 AAC 92.530(7). MANAGEMENT AREAS. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Legal equipment for the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area consists of arrows and broadheads with a minimum combined weight of 425 grains for class one big game animals and a minimum of 540 grains for class two big game animals.

ISSUE: The Dalton Highway corridor is an entry level hunt for a significant number of archers. Many archers are using equipment that is designed for hunting smaller game from tree stands. This country is highly visible to all. This has resulted in a perceived increase in the number of marginal hits in a highly visible thoroughfare.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Public relations between other Dalton Highway users and archers will erode.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would directly improve the quality of resource and its pursuit. It provides a better definition of legal arrow weight.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All archers and the bow hunting community. Public relations between the archery community and the other wildlife and Dalton Highway users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Do nothing. This was rejected because of an ever increasing concern about poor public relations for hunting and friction between the bow hunting community and other users.

PROPOSED BY: Scotty B. Bennett (I-02S-G-045)

PROPOSAL 145 - 5 AAC 92.530(7)(B). MANAGEMENT AREAS. Amend the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area as follows:

The area is closed to hunting with firearms for big game, however big game may be taken with bow and arrow only. Small game and fur animals may be taken with .52 caliber rim fire rifle, shot going with number four shot or smaller, or bow and arrow.

ISSUE: There are no shotguns or .22 caliber rim fire weapons allowed for use inside the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area. It is impossible to utilize the small game appropriately in this area without the use of these firearms (which poses no threat to the pipeline).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Small game and fur animals will continue to go unharvested.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, with the use of .22 caliber rifle and shotguns the small game and fur animals can be harvested for use increasing the harvest by hunters and fulfilling Alaska's constitution.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunting users of the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None, there should be no suffering by any user group should this proposal be adopted.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Raymond H. Heuer (I-02S-G-014)

PROPOSAL 146 - 5 AAC 85.020. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR, 5 AAC 85.025. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR CARIBOU, 5 AAC 85.045. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE, 5 AAC 85.055. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR DALL SHEEP, 5 AAC 85.056. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR WOLF, and 5 AAC 92.003. HUNTER EDUCATION AND ORIENTATION REQUIREMENTS. Amend these regulations to provide the following:

Hunting in Dalton Highway Corridor would be by registration permit only. Permits may be obtained at the Fairbanks office, Department of Fish and Game, in person or by mail. Permits will require that a person be certified by the International Bowhunter education program and that certification number will be required for the permit. There will be an educational document handed

out with the permits stressing the potential problems and educating bowhunters how to avoid them. There will be a permit fee of \$10 to help offset the additional work load for the department and a condition of the permit will be that bowhunters must write their name and hunting license number in indelible ink or permanent marker on their arrows.

ISSUE: Archery road hunters in the Dalton Highway Corridor are creating problems with overcrowding, highway safety concerns, and hunter image problems.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Potentially more complaints and eventual loss of this area to hunting all together.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bowhunters – by minimizing negative image problems.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Increased workload for the department (should be offset by a fee for permit).

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A. Equipment restrictions – unlikely to make a difference. B. No hunting corridor – enforcement difficulties. C. No hunting unless a certain distance and/or time from vehicle travel – enforcement problems.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Bowhunters Association (SC-02S-G-007)

PROPOSAL 147 - 5 AAC 84.270(7). FUR BEARER TRAPPING. Open the trapping season for mink and weasels on November 1 in units 12, 19-21, 24 and 25 to correct an error in regulations, as follows:

UNIT	Open Season	BAG LIMIT
(7)		
Mink and weasel		
Units 12, 19-21, 24, and 25	Nov. 1- Feb. 28	No limit

ISSUE: Prior to October 1993, the regulations stated that the seasons for mink and weasels and for land otter started on November 1. In the regulations that followed, a typographical error appeared stating the seasons opened November 10. However, the Department of Fish and Game stated in trapping regulations pamphlet that the dates were November 1. During the spring 1998 meeting, the Board of Game changed the land otter season to reflect the correct opening date of November 1. However, the board inadvertently failed to similarly change the season for mink and weasels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Mink and weasel seasons in units 12, 19–21, 24, and 25 would open November 10. Mink and weasels caught incidental to marten trapping November 1-9 would be required to be turned over to the state.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Marten trappers who take mink or weasels November 1-9.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to trapping.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Continue to issue annual emergency orders to open mink and weasel seasons on the correct opening date of November 1.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-070)

PROPOSAL 148 - 5 AAC 85.015. CHILD HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BLACK BEAR; 5 AAC 85.020. CHILD HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR BROWN BEAR; 5 AAC 85.025. CHILD HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR CARIBOU; 5 AAC 85.030. CHILD HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR DEER; 5 AAC 85.035. CHILD HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR ELK; 5 AAC 85.040. CHILD HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR GOAT; 5 AAC 85.045. CHILD HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE; 5 AAC 85.055. CHILD HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR DALL SHEEP; 5 AAC 85.056. CHILD HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR WOLF and 5 AAC 85.057. CHILD HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR WOLVERINE. Amend these regulations to implement AS 16.05.255(i) – “Take a Child Hunting” as follows:

I would propose that all big game hunts in Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, and 26C excluding bison and muskox have an early hunt as provided by in AS 16.05.255(i). This would be a registration hunt and would only be in areas of units where registration and harvest hunts are already in place for the big game species to be hunted. This hunt would last for four days centered on the second weekend of August and be open for those hunts that are not already open at that time. The applicants would follow all game laws that pertain to that area and species that follow in the next general season. Example: If the youth and adult were to hunt in the Ferry Trail Management Area, they would only be able to hunt a spike-fork or 50-inch bull moose. As mandated by the new statute, the resident child (age 8-17) must be accompanied by an appropriate adult 21 years of age or older and any big game animal taken under hunt must be counted against the bag limits of both the child and adult.

ISSUE: I would like the board to address the problem of less younger people hunting and allowed under AS 16.05.255(i).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Less people will hunt as older generations stop hunting.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? My proposal will probably not change the quality of the resource, but should help to produce a new generation of hunters by providing hunting opportunities before they (youth) start school in the fall.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Many youth will get to hunt before school starts and they will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I do not think anyone will suffer if this is adopted.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I would like a youth season to include small game and a separate bag limit but these are not provided by in statute. Note: Big game hunting in Alaska may pose many dangerous situations. Any regulations for youth hunts should require direct adult supervision and language to make this enforceable.

PROPOSED BY: John Krieg (I-02S-G-026)

PROPOSAL 149 - 5 AAC 85.060(1). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR FUR ANIMALS. Amend this regulation as follows:

Units 12, 19-21, 24, 25, 26B and 26C: no closed season, infinite bag limit

ISSUE: Coyotes have greatly expanded their ranges in Alaska over the last 35-40 years. The hunting season and bag limits currently in force effectively allow hunters to harvest only two coyotes during the fall hunting seasons throughout the state. Coyotes no longer need this level of protection while Dall sheep need some relief from coyote predation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Two ADF&G research projects studying predation of coyotes on Dall sheep populations have been completed in GMU 20A. The first study indicated coyotes killed half of the Dall sheep that died during their first year of life. The second study found that coyotes killed about a quarter of sheep that died during the first year. Taken together with past and present sheep production and recruitment levels, these studies show coyote predation on Dall sheep is significant, and may well be holding the population at low levels. Dall sheep presently exist at less than half of the reported densities sustained in the northern Alaska Range from the 1960s through the 1980s. During that time, coyotes were scarce or absent. Since the mid 1980s coyote numbers have dramatically increased across Interior Alaska. Sheep declined precipitously in the 1990s, and remain well below past population objectives. If coyotes are taking a quarter to half of lambs born during their first year of life and provide virtually no measurable benefit to the people of Alaska while they continue to suppress Dall sheep (which provide immense measurable benefits to Alaskans) it seems incongruous to protect coyotes as though they were struggling to colonize the area. If some measures to curtail coyote predation are not taken, it is likely that Dall sheep population recovery will be slowed or curtailed by coyote predation. Increasing the hunting bag limit for coyotes will allow hunters the opportunity to limit or reduce coyote populations while they hunt in the fall. In Dall sheep

habitats, this should help sheep populations recover if hunters can be encouraged to harvest the maximum number of coyotes.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Future sheep hunters and the overall economy of Alaska. Dall sheep hunting was a major economic boon to Alaska's economy when sheep were more plentiful. It seems rational to presume if sheep were more abundant because coyotes were less so, the economy and well being of the people of the state should be well served.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody I can think of will suffer. If there were a market for coyote fur, trappers might suffer. As it stands now, this would not happen. Folks who oppose active wildlife management might be emotionally distressed by the thought of managing coyotes and sheep, but I would find it hard to say they would actually suffer. It is unlikely the increased harvest of coyotes which could result from this change would measurably affect coyote populations statewide. In local areas, however, it could provide some benefit to sheep populations.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: I have considered coyote control programs on Dall sheep ranges. This would probably be the most effective solution, but if we cannot even limit predation to benefit humans who depend directly on moose and caribou for food, it seems unlikely that controlling coyote populations simply in the interests of the Alaskan economy is even imaginable.

PROPOSED BY: Wayne E. Heimer (I-02S-G-052)

PROPOSAL 150 - 5 AAC 92.132. BAG LIMIT FOR BROWN BEARS and 5 AAC 92.165. SEALING OF BEAR SKINS AND SKULLS. Amend the regulations for bag limits for brown bear and the sealing requirements for bear skins and skulls, as follows:

- A person may not take more than one brown bear every four regulatory years, except that:
- (1) the bag limit for brown bear in Units 6 (except Unit 6(D)), 12, 13 (except in the Denali State Park Management Area), **19(D)**, 20(D) east of the east bank of the Gerstle River or north of the Tanana River, 20(E), **21(D)**, 22 (except 22(C)) [AND] 23, **24, and 25(D)**, is one bear per regulatory year; a bear taken in these units does not count against the one bear every four regulatory years' bag limit in other units;
 - (2) repealed 8/9/90;
 - (3) repealed 8/9/90;
 - (4) the bag limit for a resident hunting in the Northwest Alaska Brown Bear Management Area (5 AAC 92.530(16)), the Western Alaska Brown Bear Management Area (5 AAC 92.530(15)), or the Chignik Alaska Brown Bear Management Area (5 AAC 92.530(17)) with a brown bear registration permit is one bear per regulatory year; a bear taken under a registration permit in any of these brown bear management areas will count against the one bear every four regulatory years bag limit established for brown bears taken under a resident tag;

(5) the bag limit for a hunter in Units 16(B), [19(D), 21(D), 24, 25(D),]and 26(A) is one bear per regulatory year; a bear taken in these units will count against the one bear every four regulatory years' bag limit established for brown bears in other units;

(6) in no case may a person take more than one brown bear, statewide, in any regulatory year.

(a) No person may possess, transport, or export from Alaska, the untanned skin or skull of a bear unless the skin and skull have been sealed by an authorized representative of the department within 30 days after the taking, or a lesser time if requested by the department; however

(1) a brown bear taken in Unit [UNITS] 8, [12, 19(D), OR 25(D)]may not be transported from that unit [THOSE UNITS] until it has been sealed;

(2) [A BROWN BEAR TAKEN IN UNIT 20(D) OR 20(E) MAY NOT BE TRANSPORTED FROM THOSE UNITS, EXCEPT TO TOK, UNTIL IT HAS BEEN SEALED;]

ISSUE: This proposal is the first step in simplifying the tangled brown bear regulations by returning to the original 2 categories of brown bear bag limits and removing in unit sealing requirements.

In 1998, the board began liberalizing brown bear bag limits in areas with intensive management implications. The move was done conservatively, as the standard for years had been one bear every four years in most areas of the state. A new category of bag limit was created-one bear every year, but the bag limit counted in other areas of the state with a one in four year bag limit.

The new category has been confusing for the public, staff and FWP. Surveys indicate that most hunters are not interested in harvesting more than one brown bear in their life, and harvests have not increased dramatically in these areas.

In unit sealing requirements became the standard when the first one-bear-every-year bag limits were instituted. They were designed to prevent "bootlegging" or the harvest of a bear in a one-in-four area, then reporting it as being taken in a more liberal area. Over the years more and more areas have gone to the liberal seasons, and the need for sealing in-unit no longer exists. It is imposing an unnecessary burden on hunters, and in many cases there are few or no sealing officers in the area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Regulations governing brown bear hunting requirements will remain confusing.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Brown bear hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-072)

PROPOSAL 151 - 5 AAC 92.004. POLICY FOR OFF-ROAD VEHICLE USE FOR HUNTING AND TRANSPORTING GAME. Amend this regulation to include snowmachines as follows:

Biologists have noted snow depths for different species beyond which ungulate movement becomes greatly impeded. While there are many other factors that come into play, snow depth might serve as the primary indicator for determining where to make closures to high snowmachining.

ISSUE: Request the Department of Fish and Game to determine the impact of high snowmachine usage in areas of high ungulate density at times of high energy stress, as frequently occurs in mid to late winter when snow depths are unusually great, food resources are minimal and temperatures are at their minimum. Authorize the department to restrict or close snowmachine usage in areas at such times when snowmachining is deemed harmful to the wildlife resource.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Snowmachine use has increased more than ten fold in the past decade. Many biologists have observed changes in ungulate behavior as a result of snowmachine activity. The Alaska Wildlife Alliance carried out a study during a period of just moderate snow depth showed that stress hormone levels among moose in a high snowmachine use area adjoining Denali National Park were about ten to fifteen percent higher than in an area of no snowmachine use inside the park.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Hunters would have healthier ungulate populations to harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaskans including snowmachiners who want healthier ungulate populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Snowmachiners that are not concerned about or are unaware of their impact on wildlife ungulate populations during periods of high stress in mid to late winter.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Alliance (HQ-02S-G-101/SC-02S-G-008)

PROPOSAL 152 - 5 AAC 92.085(4). UNLAWFUL METHODS OF TAKING BIG GAME; EXCEPTIONS. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

All bear baiting in interior Alaska is banned until such time as the department by means of scientific study has thoroughly evaluated the impact that bear baiting is having on bears that are not shot at such sites.

ISSUE: The law states that: "You may not hunt brown/grizzly bears over bait or scent lures." There is much evidence that brown bears are attracted to baiting stations intended for black bears. The law also states that: "You may not take black bear cubs or sows accompanied by cubs." Black bear sows with cubs are as attracted to bear baiting stations as are other bears.

In both cases the bears that are not shot are learning to associate human scent and human foodstuffs as potential sources of food. This is a very dangerous habit to be teaching bears. Much property damage, many human injuries, and some human lives have been lost because bears had come to associate humans with food. A great many bears have also had to be needlessly killed

The board should ban bear baiting in interior Alaska until such time as the department by means of scientific study has thoroughly evaluated the impact that bear baiting is having on the large number of bears that are attracted to bear baiting stations that are not shot at such sites.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unnecessary property damage, human injuries and occasional loss of human life will continue. Many bears will continue to be shot as a result of having learned bad habits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It will reduce the number of bears learning to seek foodstuffs associated with humans, leading to increased DLPs, and bears having to be killed deliberately because they have become a danger to society. It will also reduce the number of brown bears or sows with cubs that are illegally or inadvertently killed at bear baiting stations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaskans, including bear-baiters wishing to have their technique evaluated from the standpoint of human safety as well as protection for the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Bear-baiters who would rather not have what they are doing evaluated from a human safety and protection for the resource perspective.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Alliance (SC-02S-G-012)/(HQ-02S-G-098)

PROPOSAL 153 - 5 AAC 92.510. AREAS CLOSED TO HUNTING and 5 AAC 92.550. AREAS CLOSED TO TRAPPING. Close various areas in the Interior Region as follows:

The Department of Fish and Game would select a number of prime habitat sites for one or more species on state land that are also accessible to the public. Bag limits for the range of the herd, flock, pack, small population or other logical unit for the given species of interest at that site would be reduced to zero.

ISSUE: The Constitution of Alaska states that wildlife is intended for the "common use" of all Alaskans and that wildlife laws shall apply "equally to all persons." Among the legitimate

beneficial uses of state-managed wildlife are consumptive uses such as sport hunting and subsistence harvesting, as well as such nonconsumptive uses as wildlife viewing, photography, maintenance of biodiversity, and scientific research.

Under Alaska law, the Board of Game has total control over the details of wildlife management, and it has sole authority to implement wildlife-related statutes. The only access which nonconsumptive users now have to the regulation-making process is by pleading for recognition of their needs and values to the board. It has a responsibility to recognize nonconsumptive user interests and to support hunting and trapping regulations that also serve to maximize wildlife viewing opportunities for all Alaskans.

The department should be asked by the board to identify sites on state land for all wildlife species of high viewer interest within the Interior Region where wildlife viewing opportunities could be maximized. The department needs to establish objective criteria for evaluating and improving wildlife viewing sites on state land that includes "reasonable" probability of sightings being made. ("Reasonable" might be defined as 10 percent for wolves, 30 percent for caribou, 30 percent for mountain goat, 50 percent for moose, 50 percent for Dall sheep, and 90 percent for brown bear per day visit per 100 visitors.)

Now is the time to be identifying and evaluating potential wildlife viewing sites. The department has received a massive amount of federal dollars specifically for the purpose of supporting wildlife viewing and non-game issues.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wildlife viewing opportunities will continue to be very limited on state land, complaints about lack of viewable wildlife on state land will continue, the state will continue to fail to optimize economic and substantial employment opportunities involving viewable wildlife. Wildlife will continue to be few in number and avoid being seen in areas of high accessibility.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Interpreting the "harvest" not as pounds of meat, but in terms of dollars added to the economy and total number of jobs created, the benefits could be enormous. Alaskan wildlife viewers already contribute a great deal to the economy. Tourists are drawn to Alaska primarily by the wish to see wildlife, creating in the process a billion dollar industry and over 30,000 instate jobs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Job opportunities and economic benefits would be improved at the local level. The state would benefit as a whole. Local hunters and trappers who took advantage of the new opportunities to expand their business in new ways, such as serving as guides, would benefit (Much like the department teaches bear baiting, perhaps it could offer courses in how hunters and trappers might develop new job opportunities involving wildlife viewing).

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one who is willing to broaden his or her horizon with respect to wildlife resource usage.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Alliance (HQ-02S-G-100/SC-02S-G-009)

NOTE: Under AS 16.05.930, the Board of Game may approve requests to transfer nondomestic animals from the state. The following request is before the board to transfer wolverines to a breeder outside of the state. The guidelines for granting such a request are found in the statute cited above. The board invites public comment on this request, and will schedule action on the request at the March 2002 meeting.

PROPOSAL 154 - REQUEST TO BOARD OF GAME.

Allow live trapped wolverines to be exported out of the Interior Region of the State of Alaska to existing wolverine breeders to improve the genetic stock of the breeders.

ISSUE: Allow live trapped wolverines to be exported out of the state to allow existing wolverine breeders to improve their genetic stock.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? 1. Wolverine breeders will have less genetic diversity in their stock. 2. Trappers will not be allowed to realize a higher profit that a live trapped and shipped wolverine would bring.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would allow trappers to receive a higher price for their product and provide for healthier captive populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska trappers, domestic wolverine populations, outside zoos, and outside animal breeders, and outside general public.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Timothy Gervais (I-02S-G-067)

PROPOSAL 155 - 5 AAC 85.045(5). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of units 7 and 14C, as follows:

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

(5)

Unit 7, the Placer River drainages, and that portion of the Placer Creek (Bear Valley) drainage outside the Portage Glacier Closed Area, and that portion of Unit 14(C) within the Twentymile River drainage

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

Aug. 20-Oct. 10

Aug. 20-Oct. 10

1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits for bulls will be issued in combination with nonresident hunts, and up to 70 permits for antlerless moose will be issued.

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Total moose observed during annual trend counts in 1997-1999 were 173, 181 and 116 moose, respectively. During those years, the ratios of the number of bulls per 100 cows were 30, 24 and 18, respectively. The ratios of the number of calves per 100 cows were 47, 30 and 23, respectively. Because of poor snow conditions, no surveys were flown during 2000 and 2001. The estimated population of 145 moose in 1999 is well below the management objective of 250; however, moose numbers have probably increased with 2 subsequent mild winters and low harvests. A population peak of 333 moose in 1990 probably exceeded the carrying capacity of the habitat, and an aerial survey completed 2 years later found that many of the moose had dispersed or died. The population also declined 25 percent to 30 percent during the severe winter of 1994-95. Harvest quotas and the number of permits issued were reduced in the late 1990s to allow the population to recover. Bull harvests during 1998 through 2000 were 18, 8, and 2 moose, respectively. No antlerless permits were issued during these years because of low population size and declining recruitment.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population will probably increase and could suffer major losses during a severe winter. Habitat may be overbrowsed, reducing carrying capacity in subsequent years, and road and train kills will increase.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who obtain a drawing permit, wildlife viewers and motorists driving in the Portage area. Visitor use is high and viewing is an important activity in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who are opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-079)

PROPOSAL 156 - 5 AAC 85.045(8). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.
Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 9C, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Seasons (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(8)		

Remainder of Unit 9(C)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose; however, antlerless
moose may be taken only
from Dec. 15–Jan. 15

Sept. 1–Sept. 15
Dec. 15–Jan. 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or
antlers with 3 or more
brow tines on one side

Sept. 5–Sept. 15

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. The remainder of Unit 9C consists primarily of the Alagnak (Branch) River. The average harvest during recent years is 4 antlerless moose per year. During a composition survey completed on November 1999, we counted 279 moose with ratios of 35 bulls per 100 cows and 5 calves per 100 cows. Access to the Alagnak River during December is primarily by aircraft or snowmachine. During many winters, poor travel conditions keep hunting effort low. Continued harvest of a few cows is sustainable by the moose population if calf recruitment returns to more normal levels, and continuation of this hunt will provide some additional harvest opportunity.

The extremely low calf recruitment noted in 1999 was not typical for this area, and may be a one-time anomaly. If surveys planned for this winter indicate that recruitment remains low, we will request that the board not reauthorize the antlerless season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The opportunity to take a few antlerless moose in the Alagnak (Branch) River drainage will be lost.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those hunters who have the opportunity to take an antlerless moose in the Alagnak (Branch) River drainage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who oppose any antlerless moose hunt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-080)

PROPOSAL 157 - 5 AAC. 85.045(12). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the drawing permit hunts for antlerless moose in Unit 14A, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits (12)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 14(A)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 400 antlerless moose permits may be issued	Aug. 20-Sept. 25 (General hunt only) Nov. 1-Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	No open season

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the board. During October 2001, the subpopulation of moose in Unit 14A was surveyed and estimated at 6,680 which is greater than the current post-hunt objective of 6,000 – 6,500 moose. The existing cow segment objective is 3,870 – 4,190, and we estimated 4,365 cows were in the population. During October 2001, we observed 19 bulls and 34 calves:100 cows. We previously surveyed the unit during December 2000 and estimated the population at 5,550 moose with 18 bulls and 37 calves:100 cows. Snow depth accumulation in the subunit during the 2000-2001 winter was inconsequential and survival of calves and adults was reportedly high. Predation by wolves and bears in the subunit was apparently lower than in recent past. Reported accidental mortality along highways and railroads was low for this subunit during the 2000-2001 winter. In addition, we estimated illegal hunting killed an additional 10-25 cow moose.

During fall 2001, we issued 50 antlerless moose drawing permits in the Matanuska River valley east of Palmer, which resulted in the harvest of 30 cows. The cow segment in this area of the subunit had increased and seemed to be reaching habitat carrying capacity. During 1999 and 2000, we issued no permits because the subpopulation estimate remained below objective levels.

However, we previously issued 470 antlerless moose permits during fall 1998, which resulted in 205 cows harvested.

If upcoming winter conditions are moderate, we anticipate issuing all 400 permits for the fall 2002 season. The number of permits to be made available will be determined following March recruitment surveys. Our strategy for harvesting cows from 7 different permit hunt areas within the subunit will be to concentrate antlerless moose permits in those areas where moose densities exceed available winter habitat and segment objectives for that hunt area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There would be no antlerless moose hunt. Portions of the Unit 14A moose subpopulation could grow beyond the ability of the habitat to sustain that population level. Increased incidences of starvation, conflicts with humans and vehicle collisions will occur.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; excessively high moose density can lead to nutritionally stressed animals in the harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All who wish a healthy, productive moose population in the Matanuska-Susitna valleys, and those who wish to use antlerless moose for human consumption.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Any who disagree with the harvest of antlerless moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-082)

PROPOSAL 158 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt on Elmendorf Air Force Base in Unit 14C, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
Unit 14(C), Elmendorf Air Force Base	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30

1 moose by drawing permit, by bow and arrow only; up to 15 permits may be issued.

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Moose on Elmendorf Air Force Base are part of a resident wintering population that also occupies Fort Richardson. A November 2001 census on Ft. Richardson, Elmendorf Air Force Base and upper Ship Creek yielded a population estimate of 555 moose. During September, up to 150 of these moose frequent lands managed by Elmendorf. A majority of these animals move to Fort Richardson during late fall and winter, many into areas where hunting is not allowed. Because the density of hunters on Fort Richardson has reached maximum manageable levels, the Elmendorf hunt provides additional hunter opportunity and helps achieve desired harvest levels. During the 1998, 1999, and 2000 seasons, hunters took 4 bulls and 4 cows, 6 bulls and 1 cow, and 4 bulls and 3 cows, respectively. Five antlerless permits were issued each year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Habitat may be over-browsed, reducing carrying capacity in subsequent years, and road and train kills will increase. The overall Fort Richardson-Elmendorf Air Force Base moose population is thought to have been above carrying capacity during the severe 1994-1995 winter. Browse was over-utilized across extensive areas during the severe winters of 1989-1990, 1991-1992, and 1994-1995. If cows are not harvested, the population could increase and suffer major losses during a severe winter.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bowhunters who draw permits. Persons living on or near Elmendorf Air Force Base who incur damage to their gardens and shrubs, and motorists on Elmendorf and in north Anchorage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to antlerless moose hunting, bow and arrow hunting, or hunting in general.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Long-term, large-scale habitat enhancement is desirable, but difficult because of costs and conflicts with military operations.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-084)

PROPOSAL 159 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Birchwood Management Area and the remainder of Unit 14C, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
Unit 14(C), that portion	Day after Labor Day	Day after Labor Day

known as the Birchwood Management Area

-Sept. 30
(General hunt only)

-Sept. 30

1 moose by drawing permit, by bow and arrow only; up to 25 permits may be issued

Remainder of Unit 14(C)

1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:

1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or

Day after Labor Day
-Sept. 30
(General hunt only)

Day after Labor Day
-Sept. 30

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits may be issued

Day after Labor Day
-Sept. 30
(General hunt only)

No open season

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Composition counts are not routinely flown in the Birchwood Management Area. However, we believe that a small resident population of 10-15 moose as well as an equal number of animals from Fort Richardson frequent the area. During the 1998, 1999, and 2000 seasons, archers took 1 bull and 2 cows, 1 bull, and 3 bulls, respectively. Five antlerless permits were issued each year.

The number of cow moose in those portions of the remainder of Unit 14C where antlerless moose hunts are held appears to be about the same as observed during the early 1990s. One hundred thirty-nine cows were counted during the fall 2001 trend counts in Knik/Hunter and Peters Creek count areas. An additional 88 cows were observed in the upper Ship Creek drainage, which is part of the Fort Richardson census area. The moose populations in these areas appear to be at or above carrying capacity. During the 1998, 1999, and 2000 seasons, hunters took 9, 2, and 7 cows in the 3 areas, respectively. Forty permits were issued in 1998 and 2000, and 50 permits were issued in 1999.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The opportunity to harvest antlerless moose will be lost, and urban moose-human conflicts will likely increase.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Persons who acquire permits for antlerless moose hunts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to antlerless moose harvest or hunting in general.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-085)

PROPOSAL 160 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Fort Richardson Management Area in Unit 14C, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
Unit 14(C), that portion of the Fort Richardson Management Area north of Eagle River	Day after Labor Day -Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Nov. 15
1 moose by drawing permit by muzzle-loading rifle; up to 35 permits may be issued		
Unit 14(C), Fort Richardson Management Area	Day after Labor Day -Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Nov. 15 Dec. 15-Jan. 15
1 moose per regulatory year by drawing permit, by bow and arrow only; up to 125 permits may be issued.	Dec. 15-Jan. 15 (General hunt only)	

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. A November 2001 census on Fort Richardson, Elmendorf Air Force Base and upper Ship Creek yielded a population estimate of 555 moose with a bull:cow ratio of 63 bulls per 100 cows and a calf:cow ratio of 33 calves per 100 cows. At the population peak of 622 moose observed during November 1994, the population exceeded the carrying capacity of local wintering areas. The moose population subsequently declined 45 percent on account of the severe winter of 1994-95 and deteriorating browse conditions within the area. Currently, the population is increasing and is above the management objective of 500 moose. Harvests for 1998, 1999, and 2000 were 28 bulls and 10 cows, 29 bulls and 9 cows, and 33 bulls and 15 cows, respectively. Ten antlerless permits were

issued for the fall hunts and 50 either-sex permits were issued for the winter hunts in 1999 and 2000.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population may again exceed the carrying capacity of the habitat if antlerless hunts are not authorized.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Muzzleloaders and bow hunters who draw permits. Persons living near Fort Richardson who incur damage to their gardens and shrubs and motorists on the Glenn Highway and in east Anchorage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who oppose antlerless moose hunting, and archery or muzzleloader hunting or hunting in general.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Long-term, large-scale habitat enhancement is desirable but difficult because of costs and conflicts with military operations.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and U. S. Army, Fort Richardson
(HQ-02S-G-083)

PROPOSAL 161 - 5 AAC 85.045(13). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area of Unit 15A, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(13)		
Unit 15(A), the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area		
1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 permits for spike-fork antlered moose may be issued; or	Sept. 15-Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15- Sept. 30
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 50 permits may be issued; the taking of calves, and females accompanied by calves is prohibited	Sept. 15-Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. A joint management objective developed for the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area (SLWMA) by the Department and U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service calls for a fall population of approximately 2 moose per square mile or about 130 moose counted during the November survey. The SLWMA was not counted during fall 2000 and 2001 due to unacceptable counting conditions. The last survey was completed on November 30, 1998 and covered about 90 percent of the hunt area. The survey yielded a count of 164 moose composed of 43 bulls (8 spike-fork, 7 yearlings with antlers 3 point or larger, 15 mid size, and 13 with antlers 50" or larger), 100 cows and 21 calves. The ratios observed were 43 bulls/100 cows and 21 calves/100 cows. Because the SLWMA is managed primarily for wildlife viewing, a second management objective requires that we maintain a minimum bull:cow ratio of 40 bulls/100 cows. The last permit hunt was held in 1999 when 40 permits were issued for antlerless and 20 for spike-fork antlered moose. Eight hunters were successful during the antlerless moose hunt but none during the spike-fork. Because a fall survey has not been completed since 1998, the antlerless hunts were not held in 2000 or 2001.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The SLWMA is a wintering area for moose. During moderate to severe winters, this area supports up to 300 moose, more than twice the desired resident population size. If resident moose are allowed to increase beyond the management objective, excessive use of the habitat will occur, affecting both resident and migratory moose that depend on this area. Viewing opportunities will be adversely affected as well.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Since this is a proposal to reauthorize an existing hunt, no resource or product improvements are expected.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wildlife viewers and hunters receiving permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals opposed to hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Increase the moose carrying capacity of the area. Additional habitat enhancement is expensive and no projects are currently planned.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
(HQ-02S-G-086)

PROPOSAL 162 - 5 AAC 85.045(13). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Unit 15C, as follows:

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

(13)

Unit 15(C), that portion south of the south fork of the Anchor River and northwest of Kachemak Bay

1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or	Aug. 20-Sept. 20 (General Hunt only)	Aug. 20-Sept. 20
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; the taking of calves, and females accompanied by calves, is prohibited; up to 50 permits may be issued	Aug. 20-Sept. 20	Aug. 20-Sept. 20

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. The Homer benchland in Unit 15C serves as traditional moose wintering range. Moose migrate into lower elevation areas when snow levels in upper elevations increase and much of the browse becomes unavailable. During moderate to severe winters, moose are concentrated onto the Homer benchland earlier and in greater numbers than during mild winters. Winter moose densities calculated as high as 6 moose per mile have resulted in severely overbrowsed habitat. Many willow stands remain decadent with low annual browse production. In some areas, shrubs are dying from severe overbrowsing.

Winter mortality of moose, primarily calves, from starvation has occurred every year since 1988. The magnitude of the problem has varied with the severity of the winters. The winters of 1998-99 and 1999-2000 have been severe with record snowfall occurring during 1998-99. Fifty-three moose were reported starved in 1998-1999. Additional mortality from defense of life and property kills and moose dying from accidents added to a record total of 71 dead moose. The winter of 2000-01 was recorded as mild with excellent overwinter survival.

The department initiated a program to improve habitat conditions on the Homer benchlands. Goals of this program are to reduce the moose population to allow decadent browse stands to recover. We estimated that it would take 5 to 10 years to reduce the moose population to a size that existing habitat could support. The existing antlerless moose hunt has been in place for 7 years.

During 1999, the season dates were changed to mirror the general moose season with only 7 moose reported taken. We issued no permits for the 2000 and 2001 season based on a lack of survey information.

The department's objective is to maintain this population at approximately 365 moose. We were not able to complete a fall composition survey due to poor snow conditions during November 2000. However, we counted 448 moose during a November 2001 survey, which is in excess of our management objectives. We recommend reauthorization of the antlerless hunt and anticipate issuing up to 30 permits for the fall 2002 hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The overall carrying capacity of this area will decline as decadent browse stands die off from continued overbrowsing.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The goal of the department is to maintain a healthy population of 365 moose. A limited antlerless moose hunt will maintain the herd at this optimum level.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wildlife viewers and hunters receiving permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals opposed to hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-087)

PROPOSAL 163 - 5 AAC 85.045(14). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt on Kalgin Island in Unit 16B, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(14)		
Unit 16(B), Kalgin Island		
1 moose per regulatory year, by registration permit only	Aug. 20 - Sept. 20	Aug. 20 - Sept. 20

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually. The population objective for this predator-free, 23-mi² island is a density of 1 moose/mi². Following a December 1998 survey, we estimated the population at 130-150 moose (27 bulls and 53 calves:100 cows), which is approximately 6 moose/mi². After 3 seasons of an "any moose" registration hunt, surveys conducted during October 2001 estimated 100-125 moose (29 bulls and 80 calves:100 cows) still inhabited the island, which is approximately 5 moose/mi².

Because of concerns of over-population and deteriorating habitat conditions, a drawing permit hunt for cows was initiated in 1995. During 1995-1998, human harvest from a drawing hunt for cows and an any-bull general hunt failed to slow the increase in the population. In an attempt to reduce the population quickly, the Board established a registration hunt for any moose for the fall 1999 season. The reported harvest for the 1999 season was 79 moose (50 cows, 29 bulls) from 438 permits issued. The reported harvest for the 2000 season was 62 moose (40 cows, 22 bulls) from 355 registration permits issued. From 143 permits issued in 2001, 28 moose (17 cows, 8 bulls) were harvested.

The density of moose on the island is still above objective levels. An "any moose" registration hunt is needed to provide additional mortality on this predator-free island population. A registration hunt also allows researchers monitoring this unique population to continue gathering biological information from specimens provided by successful hunters. The difficult hunting conditions and limited access should minimize the danger of overharvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Without a liberal harvest including cows, the population will quickly grow to exceed the island's carrying capacity, resulting in severe habitat damage and a dramatic decline in moose numbers through extensive starvation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If the island population size is kept at or near objective levels, moose will have adequate available forage and therefore, show less sign of being nutritionally stressed.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who make the effort to get to Kalgin Island will enjoy the opportunity to take any moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Seasonal residents of Kalgin Island may be concerned about hunters trespassing on their land and cabins.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A general season for any moose will also work to maintain low moose densities, but would diminish the ability to collect meaningful specimens. It would also provide more opportunity for misreporting of the harvest.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-088)

PROPOSAL 164 - 5 AAC 92.015(b). BROWN BEAR TAG FEE EXEMPTION. Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemption in Unit 13, as follows:

(b) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in that portion of Unit 13 outside of Denali State Park, ...

ISSUE: Brown bear tag fee exemptions must be reauthorized annually. The tag fee exemption in Unit 13 was enacted by the board during 1995 to provide increased hunting opportunity for brown bears. This tag fee exemption along with a bag limit change from 1 bear every 4 years to a bear every year, and a fall season extension was adopted by the board in an attempt to increase the brown bear harvest in Unit 13. In an effort to further increase harvests, the board during 1999 lengthened the spring season by an additional 15 days.

Unit 13 was designated as an intensive management area by the Board of Game with the objective of providing more moose and caribou for human use. Because brown bears are important predators of moose calves in Unit 13, the board determined that it was necessary to reduce brown bear predation on moose calves by increasing the harvest of brown bears. During their March 2001 meeting, the board developed for Unit 13 an intensive management population goal of 17,000-

21,900 moose and a harvest goal of 1,050-2,180 moose per year. These moose population and harvest goals have not been met.

Harvests of brown bears in Unit 13 have increased since more liberal seasons and bag limits, and the tag fee exemption were enacted. Brown bear harvests have increased from 97 bears during the 1994-95 season to 127 bears during 1995-1996, 139 during 1996-1997, 138 during 1997-1998, 125 during 1998-1999, 163 during 1999-2000 and 150 during 2000-2001.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Increased harvest of brown bears in Unit 13 may help accomplish intensive management goals for moose. Without the tag fee exemption, there may be less interest in brown bear hunting and incidental harvest levels will be lower.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Brown bear hunters will benefit from increased hunting opportunity. Hunters and viewers of moose will ultimately benefit from increasing moose populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals who are opposed to these management programs.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Elimination of the tag fee exemption, and attempting to accomplish intensive management through long seasons and a more liberal bag limit only.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-081)

PROPOSAL 165 - 5 AAC 85.045(20). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 22C and a portion of Unit 22D, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(20)		
Unit 22(C)		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull	Sept. 1-Sept. 14	
One antlerless moose by registration permit only; up to 20 antlerless moose may be taken	Sept. 15-Sept. 30	

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side

Sept. 1-Sept. 14

Unit 22(D), that portion within the Kougarak, Kuzitrin and Pilgrim River drainages

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 antlered bull

Aug. 1-Jan. 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side

Sept. 1-Sept. 30

...

Remainder of Unit 22(D)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from Dec. 1 through Dec. 31; no person may take a cow accompanied by a calf; only antlered moose may be taken from Jan. 1 through Jan. 31

Aug. 10-Sept. 14

Oct. 1-Jan. 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side

Sept. 1-Sept. 30

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. In October 1999, the board authorized a registration hunt for up to 20 antlerless moose in Unit 22C. The intent of the hunt is stabilization of the Unit 22C moose population, which is believed to be at or near carrying capacity of its winter range. The low bull:cow ratio (17 bulls:100 cows in November 2001 surveys) makes additional bull harvest ill-advised. Composition surveys during November 2001 in the Snake and Stewart river drainages show calf production continues to be relatively high (21 calves:100 cows). The registration hunt worked well during the last two years. In Sept. 2000, 16 of 20 permits were filled. In 2001 only ten permits were issued because of

concerns about higher than normal mortality rates and delayed calving following the severe winter of 2000-2001. Eight of the ten permits were filled. We recommend reauthorizing the antlerless hunt in Unit 22C.

Low recruitment rates are believed to be causing moose population declines in many parts of Unit 22. The only portion of Unit 22, other than Unit 22C, where we recommend continued authorization of antlerless moose hunting is in the remainder of Unit 22D. This area is relatively remote and difficult access limits hunting pressure. Most recent estimates of population size and recruitment provided by censuses and late winter surveys indicate the population is stable. We recommend that antlerless moose hunting be continued in the remainder of Unit 22D where the reported cow harvest is low and is not believed to be adversely impacting the population. The reported harvest in recent years in the remainder of Unit 22D has been low: one cow during the 1997-1998 season; three cows in 1998-1999; two cows in 1999-2000; and five cows in 2000-2001 based on data from village harvest surveys. The village harvest survey data (only collected in 2000-2001) probably provides a more realistic estimate of fairly consistent cow harvest over the last several years compared to the reported harvest using harvest tickets.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity for antlerless moose in portions of Unit 22 will be needlessly lost.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who wish to harvest an antlerless moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-090)

PROPOSAL 166 - 5 AAC 85.045(21). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 23, as follows:

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

(21)

Unit 23, that portion north of
and including the Singoalik
River drainage

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf

July 1-Mar. 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side

Sept. 1-Sept. 20

Unit 23, that portion in the Noatak drainage

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from Nov. 1 through Dec. 31; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf

Aug. 1-Sept. 15

Oct. 1-Dec. 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side

Sept. 1-Sept. 15

Remainder of Unit 23

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf

Aug. 1-Mar. 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side

Sept. 1-Sept. 20

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Moose populations appear stable in the areas of Unit 23 where antlerless harvest is permitted. The reported harvest of cows remains low throughout Unit 23.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity will be needlessly lost.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who wish to harvest an antlerless moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-091)

PROPOSAL 167 – 5 AAC 92.015(b). BROWN BEAR TAG FEE EXEMPTIONS. Reauthorize the current resident tag fee exemption for brown bear in Unit 22, as follows:

(b) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear...in Unit 22,....

ISSUE: The board must reauthorize the Unit 22 tag fee exemption annually or the fee automatically becomes reinstated. We recommend continuing the tag fee exemption.

The brown bear population in Unit 22 is higher than desired and brown bear predation on moose calves is believed to be depressing moose populations in many parts of the unit. Elimination of the tag requirement is part of our plan to incrementally increase annual bear harvest and reduce bear numbers in Unit 22. Eliminating the tag requirement allows hunters to harvest bears opportunistically and should increase harvest unit wide, encouraging harvest by a wider range of users, including village residents who are deterred from shooting bears by the need to purchase a tag.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The tag fee exemption would lapse and hunters in Unit 22 would be required to purchase \$25 tags for the 2002–2003 regulatory year.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents who are reluctant or unable to purchase the \$25 tag before hunting will be able to opportunistically and legally harvest a brown bear.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-089)

PROPOSAL 168 - 5 AAC 92.015(a). BROWN BEAR TAG FEE EXEMPTIONS. Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemption in the Western Alaska Brown Bear Management Area, the

Northwest Alaska Brown Bear Management Area, and the Chignik Brown Bear Management Area, as follows:

(a) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in the Western Alaska Brown Bear Management Area (5 AAC 92.530(15)), the Northwest Alaska Brown Bear Management Area (5 AAC 92.530(16)), or the Chignik Alaska Brown Bear Management Area (5 AAC 92.530(17)) if the hunter obtains a registration permit before hunting.

ISSUE: Brown bear tag fee exemptions must be reauthorized annually. Continuation of the tag fee exemptions listed above is necessary in order to facilitate the associated brown bear harvest programs. We believe it would be difficult to document subsistence harvest by residents hunting primarily for food if the tag fee is in effect. Prior to establishment of the management areas, little harvest was reported by subsistence hunters resident in the areas.

In addition to the tag fee waiver and registration permit, conditions that apply to subsistence hunting in the management areas include: salvaging the meat for human consumption, no use of aircraft for subsistence hunting of brown bears in the NWABBMA, and keeping the hide within the management area unless the skin of the head and front claws are removed at the time of sealing before being exported from the management area. The registration permit is a simple way to accommodate local subsistence hunting practices, while still conserving brown bear populations and obtaining harvest data.

Brown bear harvest appears to be within sustainable yield limits in each of these management areas. Harvest rates do not appear to have increased in response to registration hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The intent of the brown bear harvest programs in these areas will be compromised. There will be less interest and participation in these programs.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those residents who wish to take brown bear primarily for food in the brown bear management areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals who are opposed to these brown bear harvest programs.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-092)

PROPOSAL 169 - 5 AAC 85.045(1). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season at Berners Bay, as follows:

Resident

Units and Bag Limits	Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(1)		
Unit 1(C), Berners Bay drain- Oct.15 ages	Sept. 15–Oct.15 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15–

1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 permits may be issued

ISSUE: This status quo proposal is necessary to accommodate antlerless moose hunting in Berners Bay. The Berners Bay strategic moose management plan calls for a post-hunt population of 90 moose, post-hunt, and a bull to cow ratio of 25:100.

For the fall 1999 season 10 bull permits and 10 antlerless permits were issued; sixteen hunters spent 43 hunter–days to harvest 10 bulls and 5 cows. Fall 1999 aerial surveys enumerated 107 moose in Berners Bay, well above the management objective. The bull to cow ratio of 18:100 was lower than called for in the plan, and indicated that the cow segment of the population should be harvested to increase this ratio as well as to curtail population growth.

In the 2000 season, 10 bull permits and 10 antlerless permits were issued; 17 hunters spent 56 hunter-days to harvest 8 bulls and 7 cows.

In fall 2000 the Board of Game increased the allowable number of Berners Bay drawing permits from “up to 20” to “up to 30”, to be allocated by sex, based on survey results, by department biologists (this change went into effect in the 2001 season). During the fall 2000 survey, biologists enumerated 79 moose, resulting in a permit allowance of 10 bulls and 10 antlerless moose for the subsequent season. In the 2001 season, 17 hunters expended 45 hunter days and harvested 7 bulls and 6 cows.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population will continue to grow and could exceed carrying capacity of the habitat. The Berners Bay moose harvest will be restricted to bulls.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will have more opportunity to hunt moose. The moose population will benefit from either-sex harvests that will balance the herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-073)

PROPOSAL 170 - 5 AAC 85.045. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.
 Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in the Gustavus area, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(1)		
Unit 1(C), that portion west of Excursion Inlet and north of Icy Passage		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 bull by registration permit only	Sept. 15–Oct. 15 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15–Oct. 15
or		
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 10 permits may be issued	Nov. 15–Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	Nov. 15–Nov. 30

ISSUE: This proposal would retain the status quo necessary to continue the antlerless moose season in the Gustavus portion of Unit 1C. Department biologists conducted aerial surveys in this area during February 2000 and 2001, and enumerated 185 and 207 moose, respectively, and estimated a population of 250–300 animals. This area contains an estimated 6–8 square miles of productive winter range as identified by abundant willow stands. Department biologists conducted browse surveys in April 2000 and May 2001, and documented that nearly 90 percent of the current annual growth of willow twigs available to moose had been consumed. We believe that this high rate of utilization is not sustainable, and will likely prove detrimental to the willow shrubs if continued. A cow hunt provides the tool to decrease herd productivity, and hopefully prevent overutilization of critical winter browse and an ultimate decline of the moose herd due to reduction of browse vigor.

In the 1999 season, 144 people hunted moose at Gustavus, expending 825 hunter-days to harvest 42 bulls. In the 2000 season, 130 hunters spent 567 hunter-days, and harvested 45 bulls. In the 2001 season, 185 hunters took 858 hunter-days to harvest 46 bulls. Although the fall 2000 Board of Game authorized this antlerless hunt for the 2001 season, no permits were issued in order to let department biologists more adequately prepare hunters for this new, controversial hunt as well as gather additional data on browse abundance and quality.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population will continue to grow and could exceed the carrying capacity of the habitat, reducing the value of willow browse and leading to a herd decline.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will have more opportunity to hunt moose. The moose population will benefit from either-sex harvests that will balance the herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-074)

PROPOSAL 171 - 5 AAC 85.045. HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE.
Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season at Nunatak Bench, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(3)		
Unit 5(A), Nunatak Bench	Nov. 15–Feb. 15	Nov. 15–Feb. 15

1 moose by registration permit only; up to 5 moose may be taken

ISSUE: This proposal to retain the status quo is necessary to continue the any-moose hunting season at Nunatak Bench in Unit 5A. The Nunatak Bench strategic moose management plan calls for a post-hunt population of 50 moose in this area, and a harvest of 5 moose by 10 hunters, expending 60 days of effort. An aerial survey conducted in February 2001 revealed 54 moose, probably near the carrying capacity of the available habitat.

In the 1997 season, 9 permits were issued and only 2 hunters hunted, spending a total of 3 days to kill 2 bulls. In the 1998 season, 11 permits were issued, and 3 hunters took a total of 7 days to kill 1 bull. In the 1999 season 12 permits were issued, and 5 people hunted for a total of 14 days and did not kill any moose. In the 2000 season 15 permits were issued and 6 hunters took 2 bulls and 1 cow in 11 days of hunting. Data from the 2001/2002 season is not available at this time.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The harvest of moose at Nunatak Bench will be limited to bulls, contributing to the possibility of skewed sex ratios in the herd. Furthermore, moose habitat is not abundant in this area and if herd growth is not restricted by a limited cow harvest, carrying capacity of winter range may be exceeded.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will continue to have more opportunity to hunt moose. The moose population will benefit from either-sex hunts that will help balance the herd in this area of limited moose range.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-075)

PROPOSAL 172 - 5 AAC 85.045(4). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6A, as follows:

Seasons and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(4)		
Unit 6(A), all drainages into the Gulf of Alaska from Cape Suckling to Palm Point		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull by registration permit only; up to 30 bulls may be taken; or	Sept. 1-Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 drawing permits may be issued	Sept. 1-Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 5 drawing permits may be issued		Sept. 1-Oct. 31
Remainder of Unit 6(A)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or	Sept. 1-Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; up to 20 antlerless moose may be taken	Nov. 15-Dec. 31 (General hunt only)	

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers
or antlers with 3 or more
brow tines on one side; or

Sept. 1-Oct. 31

1 antlerless moose by
registration permit; up to 20
antlerless moose may be taken

Nov. 15-Dec.31

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. We recommend continuation of the antlerless season to promote population stability. The desirable post-hunt population size in Unit 6A west of Cape Suckling is 300 to 350 moose. A census completed during November 1999 yielded a population estimate of 400 moose with 13 percent calves. The reported antlerless harvest was 7 and 4 during 2000 and 2001, respectively.

The desirable post-hunt population size in Unit 6A east of Cape Suckling is 300 to 350 moose. Reported harvest was 19 bulls in 2000. Composition surveys completed earlier this year found only 13 percent calves in the population. No antlerless hunts were held because of continued poor calf survival. However, if recruitment does improve, antlerless hunts may be needed to hold the moose population at objective levels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If antlerless hunts are eliminated in Unit 6A, hunting opportunity will be needlessly lost.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Individuals who desire to hunt antlerless moose in Unit 6A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who are opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-076)

PROPOSAL 173 - 5 AAC 85.045(4). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6B, as follows:

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

(4)

Unit 6(B)

1 moose per regulatory year,
only as follows:

1 antlered moose
by registration permit only;
up to 30 antlered moose may
be taken; a moose may not be
taken until after 3:00 a.m. on
the day following the day on
which an airboat is used for
transportation, and all airboats
used for transportation must
display an ADF&G identifica-
tion number; or

Aug. 27- Oct. 31
(General hunt only)

No open season

1 antlerless moose by
drawing permit only; up
to 30 drawing permits may be
issued for antlerless moose;
during the time the registra-
tion permit hunt is in effect, a
moose may not be taken until
after 3:00 a.m. on the day fol-
lowing the day on which an
airboat is used for transporta-
tion, and all airboats used for
transportation must display an
ADF&G identification number.

Aug. 27- Oct. 31
(General hunt only)

No open season

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Desirable post-hunt population size is 300-350. Because of poor snow conditions, we have not been able to complete a census during the last several years. A composition survey completed during winter 2000 yielded an estimate of only 11 percent calves. Antlerless hunts have not been held during recent years because of continued poor calf survival. However, if recruitment does improve, antlerless hunts may be needed to hold the population at objective levels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the moose population in Unit 6B increases and a season is possible, antlerless hunts will provide additional hunting opportunity.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Individuals who desire to hunt antlerless moose in Unit 6B.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who are opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-02S-G-077)

PROPOSAL 174 - 5 AAC 85.045(4). HUNTING SEASONS AND BAG LIMITS FOR MOOSE. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6C, as follows:

Seasons and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(4) Unit 6(C) 1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 40 permits for bulls and up to 20 permits for antlerless moose may be issued	Sept. 1-Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season.

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. The current population objective, established in 1995, is to allow the population to increase to 400 moose by the year 2006, and to increase the harvest accordingly. The last census completed earlier this year yielded a count of 354 moose, 10 percent of which were calves. Because the available antlerless harvest quota in Unit 6C is currently harvested under a federal subsistence season administered by the U.S. Forest Service, we have not held the hunt since the 1999-2000 season. During the last two years the department administered the hunt (1998-1999 and 1999-2000), the reported harvest was 4 and 5 cows, respectively. We recommend reauthorizing the state antlerless hunt in the event that the federal subsistence hunt is cancelled. If recruitment improves, continuation of the antlerless hunts will be necessary to hold the population at objective levels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity will be lost, and the population may exceed the objective, which is based on the availability of adequate habitat during severe winters.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters desiring to take a moose in Unit 6C.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-02S-G-078)
