

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY
REVIEWER LETTER

January 2005

DEAR REVIEWER:

The Alaska Board of Game will consider the attached book of regulatory proposals at its **Spring 2005** meeting, to be held **March 4 – 13, 2005**, at the Coast International Inn, 3333 West International Airport Road, Anchorage, Alaska. The proposals generally concern changes to the regulations governing hunting, trapping, and the use of game in the Southcentral and Southwest regions, consisting of Game Management Units 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17, as well as certain deferred proposals from prior meetings, affecting Game Management Units 1, 2 and 19. Additionally, the board will consider certain statewide regulations pertaining to brown bear tag fee exemption, and reauthorization of antlerless moose hunts. Members of the public, organizations, advisory committees, and staff submitted these proposals, and are published essentially as they were received.

The proposals in this book are presented as brief statements summarizing the intended regulatory changes. In 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 from the regulation text.

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

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

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.

After you review the proposals, please 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

Public comments, in combination with ADF&G staff presentations, provide biological and socioeconomic data to form decisions by the Board of Game. 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 the board begins deliberations. As a practical matter, you are encouraged to send your written comments to the above Juneau address no later than 5:00 p.m. on February 18, 2005, to ensure inclusion in the board workbook. All comments received after that time 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 public testimony at the meeting during the public testimony portion of the agenda is always appreciated.

When providing written comments on the proposals in this proposal book, please consider the following simple tips to help ensure board members and the public more fully understand recommendations to the board:

Timely submission: Submit written comments by fax or mail at least two weeks prior to the meeting. Written comments received at least two weeks prior to the meeting are printed and cross referenced in the members' board workbooks. **Written comments on the March 2005 proposals must be received by 5:00 p.m. February 18, 2005 for inclusion and cross referencing to proposals in the board workbooks.** The written comments and cross references to proposals help board members during the meeting. Written comments received after the two-week period will be included as "late comments" and are not cross referenced. Materials received during the meeting are not cross referenced. Submit 20 copies of written comments provided during a board meeting to help avoid delay in distribution to board members by Board Support Section staff. Visit <http://www.boards.adfg.state.ak.us/> to view updated information about written comment deadlines, meeting calendars and meeting notices for the March 2005 meeting.

List the proposal number and state whether the comments support, oppose or recommend amendment(s): Include proposal number(s) in written comments, and specifically state whether the comments support, oppose, or recommend amendments to the proposal. This will help ensure written comments are correctly noted for the board members. If the comments support a modification in the proposal, please indicate "support as amended" and provide a preferred amendment in writing.

Provide an explanation: The board benefits greatly from understanding the pros and cons of each proposal. A brief description consisting of a couple of sentences is sufficient. Briefly explain why the written comments support, oppose or recommend amendment of the proposal. Board actions are based on a complete review of the factors involved in each proposal, not a mere tally of comments in support or opposition.

Write clearly: Comments will be photocopied. Use 8 1/2" x 11" paper and leave reasonable margins on all sides, allowing for hole punches on the left margin. Whether typed or handwritten, use dark ink and write legibly. **If commenting on more than one proposal, do NOT use a separate page for each proposal.**

Use the correct address or fax number: Mail written comments to Board Comments, ADF&G, P.O. Box 25526, Juneau, AK 99802, or fax them to 907-465-6094.

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

Submitting written comments during the board meeting: Provide 20 copies of written comments to the board secretary, who officially stamps and logs them into the record, and distributes them to the board members.

Additional copies of this proposal book are available at most offices of the Department of Fish and Game and at: <http://www.boards.adfg.state.ak.us>

A tentative agenda for the Spring 2005 Board of Game meeting is shown on page xi. A roadmap detailing the tentative order in which proposals will be considered will be available in February 2005 at <http://www.boards.adfg.state.ak.us/>

Updated status of the meeting: After the board meeting begins, a recorded telephone message will provide current updates on the board's agenda and schedule. Dial (800) 764-8901 (in Juneau, call 465-8901).

Additional accommodations: Persons with a disability needing special accommodations in order to comment on the proposed regulations should contact the Boards Support Section at (907) 465-4110 no later than February 18, 2005 to make any necessary arrangements.

Landa Baily, Executive Director
Alaska Board of Game
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
465-4011

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
 SPRING 2005 PROPOSAL BOOK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

PROPOSAL TOPICS

PROPOSAL NUMBER

Furbearer Trapping	1-12
Bison	13-14
Black Bear	15-21
Brown Bear	22-40
Caribou	41-46
Deer	47-49
Goat	50-52
Moose	53-96
Dall Sheep	97-101
Wolf	102-106
Wolverine	107-108
Other Fur Animals	109-110
Small Game	111-118
Predation Control Plans	119-128
Restricted Areas	129-147
Hunter Education	148-150
Permits	151-153
Tier II	154-157

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
TENTATIVE MEETING SCHEDULE
for 2005/2006 Meeting Cycle
as of January 4, 2005**

	<u>Dates & Location</u>	<u>Topic</u>
Fall 2005	November 11 – 15, 2005 Place to be announced Proposal Deadline: Tentatively Aug. 6, 2005 Written Comment Deadline: October 28, 2005	Arctic and Western Region and Statewide “A” List
Spring 2006	Date to be announced Place to be announced Proposal deadline to be announced Written comment deadline: Two weeks prior	Interior Region
Fall 2006	Date to be announced Place to be announced Proposal Deadline: To be announced Written Comment Deadline: Two weeks prior	Southeast Region

For information about the Board of Game, contact:

Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Boards Support Section
PO Box 25526
Juneau, Alaska 99802-5526
Phone: (907) 465-4110
Fax: (907) 465-6094

Web address: <http://www.boards.adfg.state.ak.us>

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 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.

Proposals for changes to regulations pertaining to reauthorization of antlerless moose hunts, 5 AAC 85.045, and brown bear tag fee exemptions, 5 AAC 92.015, will be taken up annually, at spring meetings.

The Board of Game does not consider proposals to statewide regulations in every meeting cycle. Instead, the Board of Game reviews statewide regulations on a four-year cycle, distributed between fall meetings, every other year. The list of statewide regulations and the associated "Cycle A" and "Cycle B" meeting schedule is set forth on the next page of this publication.

<u>Regulations for:</u>	<u>Will be considered:</u>		
SOUTHEAST REGION	Fall 2004	Fall 2006	Fall 2008
Game Management Units: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5			
SOUTHCENTRAL & SOUTHWEST REGIONS	Spring 2005	Spring 2007	Spring 2009
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			
ARCTIC AND WESTERN REGIONS	Fall 2005	Fall 2007	Fall 2009
Game Management Units: 18, 22, 23, 26A			
INTERIOR REGION	Spring 2006	Spring 2008	Spring 2010
Game Management Units: 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, 26C			
All GMUs: Brown Bear Tag Fees Reauthorization of Antlerless Moose Hunts			
STATEWIDE REGULATIONS (Chapter 92)	Fall 2005	Fall 2007	Fall 2009
Cycle "A" and Cycle "B" addressed in alternating two year periods			

Alaska Board of Game Statewide Regulations Schedule

STATEWIDE REGULATIONS: 5 AAC 92 CYCLE “A”: Fall 2005, 2009, 2013, 2017, etc.

- .001 Application of this Chapter
- .002 Liability for Violations
- .003 Hunter Education and Orientation Requirements
- .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 Scientific, Educational, Propagative, or Public Safety Purposes
- .034 Permit to Take Game for Cultural Purposes
- .039 Permit for Taking Wolves Using Aircraft
- .047 Permit for Using Radio Telemetry Equipment
- .104 Authorization for Methods and Means Disability Exemptions
- .106 Intensive Management of Identified Big Game Prey Populations
- .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 Scientific and Educational Purposes
- .450 Description of Game Management Units
- .990 Definitions

STATEWIDE REGULATIONS: 5 AAC 92 CYCLE “B”: Fall 2007, 2011, 2015, 2019, etc.

- .035 Permit for Temporary Commercial Use of Live Game
- .037 Permit for Falconry
- .040 Permit for Taking of Furbearers with Game
- .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 Restrictions 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

BOARD OF GAME
As of January 4, 2005

MEMBER'S NAME AND ADDRESS	TERM EXPIRES
Mike Fleagle, CHAIR 3821 W. 67 th Avenue Anchorage, Alaska 99502	3/1/2007
Ron Somerville, VICE CHAIR 4506 Robbie Road Juneau, Alaska 99802	3/1/2005
Pete Buist PO Box 71561 Fairbanks, Alaska 99707	3/1/2005
Ben Grussendorf 1221 Halibut Point Rd. Sitka, AK 99835	3/1/2007
Cliff Judkins PO Box 874124 Wasilla, Alaska 99687	3/1/2006
Sharon McLeod-Everette PO Box 81213 Fairbanks, Alaska 99708	3/1/2006
Ted Spraker 33350 Skyline Drive Soldotna, Alaska 99669	3/1/2005

Alaska Board of Game members may also be reached at:
ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
Boards Support Section
P.O. Box 25526
Juneau, AK 99802-5526
PHONE: (907) 465-4110 FAX: (907) 465-6094

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 465-6095
Art Hughes, Publication Tech. 465-4111

Board of Game

Landa Baily, Executive Director 465-6098
Rena Balzer, Publication Spec. 465-6097

Lori Van Steenwyk, Administrative Assistant 465-6096
Clare St. Sure, Administrative Clerk III 465-4110

REGIONAL OFFICES

Arctic Region

Charlie Gregg
PO Box 689
Kotzebue, AK 99752
Phone: (907) 442-1717
Fax: (907) 442-2847

Southeast Region

Art Hughes
PO Box 25526
Juneau, AK 99802-5526
Phone: (907) 465-4111
Fax: (907) 465-6094

Interior Region

Justin Crawford
1300 College Road
Fairbanks, AK 99701-1599
Phone: (907) 459-7263
Fax: (907) 474-8558

Southwest Region

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

Southcentral Region

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

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.boards.adfg.state.ak.us>

Note: Western Region area advisory committees are assigned to Boards Support Section staff as follows:

Central Bering Sea A.C. – Joe Chythlook
Central Kuskokwim A.C. – Justin Crawford

Lower Kuskokwim A.C. – Joe Chythlook
Lower Yukon A.C. – Sherry Wright

Alaska Board of Game

GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC TESTIMONY & ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY

Persons planning to testify at the March 4 – 13, 2005 Board of Game hearing must fill out a blue PUBLIC TESTIMONY SIGN-UP CARD and turn it in to the board's staff. Persons providing written material for the board members must provide at least **20 copies** to the staff, **submitted with your blue testimony card. Provide a name and date on the first page of written material and identify the source of graphs, if included in materials.**

When the board chairman calls your name, please go to the table; state your name and whether you represent a group or organization. When you are finished speaking, please wait for any questions board members may have regarding your comments.

When you testify you may not ask questions of the board members or of department staff. This is your chance to make comments on proposals before the board members. If board members and/or department staff need clarification, they will ask you questions. A person using derogatory or threatening language to the board will not be allowed to continue speaking.

Generally, the board allows individuals and organizations five minutes for oral testimony. The board chairman will announce the length of time for testimony.

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

PLEASE NOTE: The time limit on testimony does NOT include questions the board members may have on an individual's, organization's or Advisory Committee representative's testimony.

**DRAFT ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
SOUTHCENTRAL AND SOUTHWEST REGIONS**

March 4 – 13, 2005

West Coast International Inn, 3333 W. International Airport Rd, Anchorage, AK

TENTATIVE AGENDA

NOTE: This Tentative Agenda is subject to change throughout the course of the meeting.

This Tentative Agenda is provided to give a general idea 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. Persons wishing 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 4, 2005, 8:30 AM

OPENING BUSINESS

Call to Order; Introductions of Board Members and Staff

Board Member Ethics Disclosures

Purpose of Meeting (overview)

STAFF AND OTHER REPORTS (a complete list will be available at the meeting)

Saturday, March 5, 2005, 8:30 AM

PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE ORAL TESTIMONY

DEADLINE FOR SIGN-UP TO TESTIFY will be announced at the meeting.

Public testimony will continue until persons signed up before the deadline, and who are present when called by the Chair to testify, are heard.

Sunday, March 6, 2005, 8:30 AM

Continue/Conclude public testimony

BOARD DELIBERATIONS at conclusion of public testimony

Monday, March 7, 2005 through Sunday, March 13, 2005

Continue/Conclude board deliberations

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, including Petitions, Findings, Resolutions, Letters, Other

ADJOURN

SPECIAL NOTES

A. This agenda is TENTATIVE and subject to change during the meeting. A list of staff reports and roadmap will be available at the meeting. Scheduled updates can be obtained by calling the board's recorded message phone. Phone Number: **1-800-764-8901** (in Juneau call: 465-8901).

B. Advisory Committee representatives can present their reports either at the beginning or end of the "Oral Public Testimony." The committee representative should notify the board secretary whether they prefer to present their report at the beginning or end of public testimony.

C. The State of Alaska, Department of Fish and Game complies with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). Individuals with disabilities who may need auxiliary aids, services, and/or special modifications to participate in this hearing and public meeting should contact 465-4110 no later than February 18, 2005 to make any necessary arrangements.

PROPOSAL 1 - 5 AAC 92.170. Sealing of marten, lynx, beaver, otter, wolf and wolverine. Modify regulation for GMUs 6-11, and 13-17 as follows:

Do away with sealing of beaver. Make harvest reporting mandatory.

ISSUE: Unneeded regulation and cost to department.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Department of Fish and Game will continue to put out money.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Allen Dubord (SC-05S-G-053)

PROPOSAL 2 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Amend the regulation to read:

GMU 9 open season August 10 – March 31... no limit.

ISSUE: Predator to game animal ratio. At present one predator to two game animals as reported by department staff.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Low calf to cow ratios will continue to decline.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence hunters of GMU 9.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Wolf population.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Naknek/Kvichak AC (SW-05S-G-002)

PROPOSAL 3 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Allow use of firearm from April 15 through May 31 in GMU 11 as follows:

During April 15 – May 31 a firearm may be used to take four beaver per regulatory year provided the meat is salvaged for human consumption.

ISSUE: With icy conditions, overflow and weather it can be hard to harvest beaver under the current trapping regulations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Those folks that consume beaver (primarily Alaska Natives) will not have access to this food without great difficulty in following the current trapping regulations.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? By having this only open for firearms six weeks a year it can be greatly regulated. The meat is very good in the spring and you will still have a prime hide.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those that eat beaver meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered six per person but settled on four beaver per person initially until we see what level of interest is present.

PROPOSED BY: Dean Wilson Jr.

(HQ-05S-G-045)

PROPOSAL 4 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping, and 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking fur animals. Modify trapping season for wolves in GMU 14B and 16A; and prohibit steel traps and leghold snares smaller than 3/32 inch diameter, as follows:

Close wolf trapping season in Units 14B and 16A on April 30 instead of March 31, with the same stipulations concerning snare size and leghold traps that currently apply in GMU 13.

ISSUE: The moose population is below population objectives, and wolves are part of the problem. These GMUs often have a lot of snow and good access in April. Wolves that can be taken in April on a hunting license (possibly while spring bear hunting) can't be legally sold. The close of wolf hunting and trapping should align with each other.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? An additional opportunity to harvest wolves will be missed. Moose numbers will stay low without additional help against predation.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters and moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who oppose additional wolf harvest.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley AC

(SC-05S-G-029)

PROPOSAL 5 - 5 AAC 84.270(14). Furbearer trapping. Modify the wolverine trapping regulation for GMUs 13B and 13E as follows:

Open season GMU 13B and 13E: November 10 to February 28, no limit. The use of a firearm to harvest wolverine from January 31 to February 28 is illegal.

ISSUE: Wolverine trapping season is too short in GMU 13B and 13E.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Trappers will continue to not be able to harvest the resource.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Have longer season but with restrictions that disallow sets targeting wolverine after January 31. Rejected because past experience says that it is stated by Fish and Wildlife Protection may claim that it will be too hard to enforce.

PROPOSED BY: Allen Dubord

(SC-05S-G-054)

PROPOSAL 6 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Allow use of firearm from April 15 through May 31 in GMU 13 as follows:

During April 15 – May 31 a firearm may be used to take four beaver per regulatory year provided the meat is salvaged for human consumption.

ISSUE: With icy conditions, overflow and weather it can be hard to harvest beaver under the current trapping regulations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Those folks that consume beaver (primarily natives) will not have access to this food without great difficulty in following the current trapping regulations.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? By having this only open for firearms six weeks a year it can be greatly regulated. The meat is very good in the spring and you will still have a prime hide.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those that eat beaver meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered six per person but settled on four beaver per person initially until we see what level of interest is present.

PROPOSED BY: Dean Wilson Jr. (HQ-05S-G-044)

PROPOSAL 7 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Modify Lynx trapping season in GMUs 14A and 14B as follows:

Open season for lynx December 1 – January 31; no bag limit.

ISSUE: Lynx season is currently closed in GMUs 14A and 14B because the lynx harvest tracking strategy is flawed. This strategy relies on the harvest of kits in the previous year’s sealing data and an estimate of the current hare population to estimate lynx population potential. I know of no hard data on hare pellet counts, track counts or other hare population census work to provide hare population estimates, yet the lynx season remains closed despite the lack of justification.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The season will continue to be closed on lynx. There will be a continued loss of opportunity to harvest lynx.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Changing to the proposed dates will reduce incidental catch and provide only prime pelts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All trappers and hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Kenneth Barber (HQ-05S-G-033)

PROPOSAL 8 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Modify lynx trapping season as follows:

The lynx trapping season would be January 1 through February 28.

ISSUE: The current lynx management plan causes varied season dates for lynx trapping in GMUs 13, 14, and 16 based on hare density. This approach is ineffective and either unnecessarily restricts harvest or allows trapping for lynx at times when the hides are not prime.

Lynx harvest in southcentral Alaska is presently managed by the Lynx Harvest Tracking Strategy. This plan adjusts trapping seasons as hare populations fluctuate. As populations increase, the seasons are expanded, frequently, beyond the time hides are prime. As the populations decrease, the seasons are reduced limiting trapping opportunities. This reduction is in the belief that lynx can be held until the next hare increase. This belief violates the basic tenet of wildlife management, i.e., you cannot stockpile wildlife. When hare populations decrease the lynx die off. Trapping is a proportional activity (the fewer lynx – the fewer trapped) and does not substantially impact a reduced population. By reducing predator numbers during declining prey cycle, the remaining population will potentially benefit from a higher prey/predator ratio and remain healthier overall.

In this flawed management plan, trappers are denied trapping opportunity in some years, while afforded the opportunity to harvest unprimed lynx in other years. In both cases trappers are faced with lost opportunity and a wasted resource.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Trappers will continue to lose opportunities to harvest this renewable resource or harvest lynx when the pelt is not prime.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Changing to the proposed dates would assure only prime pelts will be harvested providing the best possible hides to the garment market.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers and the fur industry.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Nick Steen (HQ-05S-G-032)

PROPOSAL 9 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Prohibit trapping beaver in GMU 15C as follows:

In GMU 15C, the area bounded by the Anchor River (south fork), Beaver Creek, Beaver Creek Flats, and Fritz Creek (east fork) on the north and the Sterling Highway and East End Road to the south to be closed to the trapping of beaver for three to five years to allow an increase in population, to be followed by a survey of active lodges and limited trapping as warranted.

ISSUE: Over the past 15 years there has been a decline in the beaver population. Although the harvest data reflects more the number of people trapping, it would appear those that do, have to go further from Homer to find beaver. It may explain why less people trap here. In exploring the Twitter Creek, Fritz Creek, Beaver Flats areas, there are much fewer active beaver lodges and ponds

today than 15 or 20 years ago. The floods of 2002 obviously also impacted many beaver, coupled with an increased coyote population and predation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If this is not addressed, there will continue to be a decline in active beaver lodges, to the detriment of local trappers and the local economy.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by restoring the numbers, it will allow for greater harvest at a time the fur industry as a whole is growing and demand for quality furs likewise. This will be an economic benefit to our local trappers, and an economic benefit for the tourism industry.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? First of all, the trappers. Second, tourists. It is amazing to me how many of our summer visitors come to see wildlife, including even the indomitable beaver. I have to look at economic benefits. I see both a benefit to trappers, and for the local tourist industry.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trappers in the short term. But, for the long-term good, I do not see anyone suffering. If we continue to allow trapping as we are doing now, the numbers will only continue to decrease to the ultimate detriment of our local trappers, to say nothing of the tourism industry.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1. Do nothing. Would result in a continuing downward population trend. 2. Lower harvest numbers. Would help, but slower recovery. 3. Curtail the season. Same as 2; I believe we are past this point. 4. Close the season for a limited time, of three to five years, then monitor recovery and proceed accordingly. I believe the beaver have the ability to recover rather quickly. However there are other factors, i.e., coyotes, whose numbers seem to have increased and pose predator risk to beaver.

PROPOSED BY: Mildred "Milli" Martin (HQ-05S-G-038)

PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping, and 5 AAC 85.060. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals. Prohibit trapping and shooting of marmots in Unit 15C, with exceptions, as follows:

In Unit 15C, the area bounded by the Anchor River (south fork), Beaver Creek, Beaver Creek Flats, and Fritz Creek (east fork) on the north and the Sterling Highway and East End Road to the south to be closed to the trapping/shooting of marmots, except in the remote possibility of nuisance animals in developing areas, and should be so clearly stated in both trapping regulations and hunting regulations. At this time, the season is never closed. If you want to shoot one, you have to have a trapping license. How many people know that? How many bother to read that part? This needs to be clearly stated in the hunting regulations as well.

ISSUE: Since moving to our homestead off East Skyline Drive in 1980, hoary marmots have totally vanished. In 1980 they were still very much seen and heard along the steep bluff slopes above Homer. In the mid 1980s one wandered into my garage. It is quite an experience to be in an

enclosed area when a hoary marmot lets loose its shrill call. That was the last one I have seen or heard in the Homer area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Without an effort to halt the hunting of marmots, and possibly a reintroduction of marmots, they will be known in Homer history books only. Marmots were a part of this ecosystem and are no more.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by building up resident populations, not only could there be hunting/trapping, but also an economic effect in that we are finding more and more of our summer visitors who want to see wildlife such as marmots. I see this as another benefit to the greater Homer community. B&B's would certainly use this opportunity in their advertising for guests. And as the attached letter attests, the Alaska Center for Coastal Studies would provide an education program with their trails program to educate the public about the value of marmots. That is a needed element. Many of us have witnessed indiscriminate shooting of these animals, (see attached e-mail) and it is my hope we can curtail that through education. Although the bluff area is building up, marmot traditionally live in very steep, inaccessible areas. Dogs pose a lesser danger than a well aimed rifle.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? As noted above, increased marmot populations would be a benefit to the local tourist industry. If we can get the numbers up, obviously hunting and trapping would also be available, particularly to the local community.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? We all do, when we are not willing to recognize and act to protect a native wildlife species.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1. Do nothing. The greater community loses because a native species has been eradicated. 2. Impose a bag limit and season. Too little, too late, there are no marmot left in the Homer bluff.

PROPOSED BY: Mildred "Milli" Martin (HQ-05S-G-036)

PROPOSAL 11 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Modify the regulation as follows:

GMU 17. Open season November 10 – April 30. No limit.

ISSUE: Loss of economic opportunity for trappers to harvest a valuable furbearer in wolves due to the duration of the trapping season. I would like the board to extend the wolf trapping season in Unit 17 from ending March 31 to ending April 30.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Trapping for wolves will remain limited to the current season resulting in a loss of opportunity for additional harvest and income. Trapping conditions often remain good in April and the healthy wolf population can support additional harvest by trappers. ADF&G has no estimate on the number of wolves in the area, however many individuals in the communities of the area have observed more wolves in recent years than past

years indicating the health of the wolf population. The hunting season for wolves currently runs through April 30. Ten other GMUs have wolf trapping seasons that end April 30, including Unit 19 which borders Unit 17. As a result, this regulation would create consistency of the wolf trapping season in bordering GMUs. To minimize the catch of other nontarget furbearers I support the stipulation that during April it will be illegal to trap with a steel trap or with a snare smaller than 3/32 inch in diameter as is the case in other GMUs where the wolf trapping season is longer than the general trapping season.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal does not address quality directly, however it does specifically address increased opportunity for consumptive use of a valuable furbearer. Primeness of hides could be an issue in April. However, when winter conditions support active trapping in April (i.e. cold enough for good snow and frozen waterways for travel) hides should predominantly remain prime or exhibit minor flaws.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers and those who use wolf pelts for crafts will have the opportunity for additional income, which will benefit the local economy.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Craig Schwanke (SW-05S-G-011)

NOTE: This proposal was deferred from the March 2004 meeting.

PROPOSAL 12 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.
Require use of breakaway snares for trapping wolves statewide as follows:

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game has developed a breakaway snare. The new regulation would require trappers to use this type of snare for wolves.

ISSUE: At present there is no requirement for trappers to use breakaway snares. The snares currently used by many trappers catch large animals such as moose. A snare around the mouth or leg will ultimately result in the animal's death.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? These unfortunate animals will continue to die a slow and painful death.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who values the animal resource and does not believe that it should be wasted.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There would be an expense to replace or modify existing snares, but the cost would be far outweighed by the beneficial effects on the resource. I know trappers who currently use breakaway snares and they report that their trapping harvest is not diminished by the use of the breakaway snare.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I did not consider any other solutions.

PROPOSED BY: Virgil Umphenour (HQ-05S-G-099)

PROPOSAL 13 - 5 AAC 92.xxx. Special provisions for Delta bison permit hunt. Create a new regulation to limit the number of drawing permits per household as follows:

No party hunt applications accepted for Delta bison hunt.

ISSUE: Two members of same family drawing a Delta bison permit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continue awarding more than one drawing permit to families of most popular hunt in the state.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Individual hunt applicants.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Party hunt applicants.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Richard A. Link (HQ-05S-G-028)

PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 85.010. Hunting seasons and bag limits for bison. Amend this regulation as follows:

Eliminate drawing permit hunt for bison in GMU 11 and GMU 13D.

ISSUE: The drawing permit bison hunt in GMU 11 and GMU 13D is causing trespass on Ahtna Regional Corporation land. The drawing permit hunt for bison in GMU 11 and GMU 13D should be eliminated so that hunters will not trespass on Ahtna Corporation's land.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Ahtna Corporation lands will continue to be trespassed by the bison hunters, who hunt in GMU 11 and GMU 13D. The lack of enforcement by the Department of Public Safety, and the lack of the public's awareness or disregard of private lands results in trespass on Ahtna Regional Corporation lands.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The shareholders and landowners of Ahtna Corporation will benefit, and trespass on their lands may be somewhat reduced by the elimination of this bison drawing permit hunt in GMU 11 and GMU 13D. The shareholders will be able to hunt for moose on their lands without increased competition from other hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The people who apply for a bison hunt in GMU 11 and GMU 13D will not be able to hunt bison in these units; however, there are other bison hunt areas in Alaska where they can hunt for bison.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A solution that could be considered is cross deputization of Ahtna employees patrolling on Ahtna Corporation lands. The Department of Public Safety could work cooperatively with Ahtna Corporation to implement this kind of program on Ahtna Regional Corporation lands.

PROPOSED BY: Ahtna Tene Nene' Subsistence Committee (SC-05S-G-001)

PROPOSAL 15 - 5 AAC 85.015(2). Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear. Shorten the season for black bear in GMU 6D as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(2)		
...		
Unit 6(C) [AND 6(D)] 1 bear	Sept. 1 – June 30	Sept. 1 – June 30
<u>Unit 6(D)</u> <u>1 bear</u>	<u>Sep. 8-June 10</u>	<u>Sep. 8-June 10</u>

ISSUE: The number of bear hunters is rapidly increasing in GMU 6D, and the department expects this trend to continue. Harvest has begun to impact the bear population, as indicated by: 1) a decline in number of bears harvested despite increasing effort, 2) increase in the proportion of females harvested, 3) increase in the number of days hunted per bear killed, and 4) anecdotal evidence from charter boat operators.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The black bear population will decline and hunting opportunity lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The black bear population will be conserved for hunting and viewing.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Black bear hunters in the long term and wildlife viewers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who prefer to hunt during the proposed closed season.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Reducing the bag limit to one bear every two years, however, there is a positive finding of customary and traditional use of bears in Unit 6. Various other season restrictions were considered but the dates proposed will conserve female bears while still providing fall and spring hunting opportunity. A registration hunt was considered and rejected because of the cost and staff time involved.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05S-G-090)

PROPOSAL 16 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear. Shorten the black bear season and reduce the bag limit in Unit 6D as follows:

September 1 - June 10. One black bear every two regulatory years; a black bear wounded and lost shall be considered as taken.

ISSUE: Increasing hunting pressure and wounding loss of black bears in Unit 6D.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? With the increasing number of hunters coming to Prince William Sound, the black bear population could decline, resulting in long-term loss of hunting opportunity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. With reduced harvest the black bear population will be sustained.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? In the long-term, hunters and wildlife viewers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters and guides who prefer to hunt black bears later in June. Those who harvest a black bear every year.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Various combinations of season dates, but the one selected is most likely to result in enough females being protected, while minimizing the loss of opportunity. Dividing Unit 6D into two hunting areas with western Prince William Sound having a more restricted season, however, the fast ferry expected in the summer of 2005 may allow more hunters the mobility to launch from Cordova.

PROPOSED BY: Copper River/Prince William Sound AC (SC-05S-G-007)

PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear. Modify the black bear hunting regulation for GMU 6D as follows:

Create a registration hunt for black bears in GMU 6D.

ISSUE: Overharvest of black bears in GMU 6D.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Potential depletion of species to the point that aggressive reduction in season and bag limits will be required.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This form of management allows the ADF&G management personnel the flexibility of closing the season at a predetermined harvest level which insures that the over harvest of black bears will not occur during the next two years, a period of very active development in western Prince William Sound. By ensuring the protectin of the resource from over harvest the quality of the hunt will be maintained and the overall average size of harvested bears should be maximized which benefits the hunter and the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both the hunters and the black bear population in Unit 6D. The hunters will benefit by having the ability of hunting the entire season as it is now managed, September 1 to June 30 as long as the projected harvest levels are not exceeded. Baiting will not be curtailed during any of the season as a means to limit the harvest. Black bear populations will not be overharvested thus the overall size of the average bear should be maintained at its maximum. Hunters do not wish to overharvest the black bear population as the resulting loss of hunting opportunities and decrease in the size of the average bear are the inevitable result. Insuring that the season is closed at a predetermined harvest amount protects the hunters resource and the health of the population.

Another big benefit is that it allows the department the ability to compensate for the possible large increase in hunting pressure due to harbor expansions and road extensions taked place in Whittier. The harbor is scheduled to double in size in the next year resulting in a possible dramatic increase in hunting pressure to an area already showing clear signs of overharvest. This is the only management tool that guarantees that the overharvest of black bears in Unit 6D will not continue to occur. Any other technique will be at the mercy of additional hunters that may arrive. With the population already showing clear signs of overharvest it's in the best interests of both the hunter and the black bear population not to, in essence, gamble on the next two years harvest levels.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Proponents who wish to curtail or eliminate the hunting opportunities for black bears in Unit 6D. Hunters who can only hunt at the very end of the season as its presently managed. I believe all the hunters would rather forgo the hunt than overharvest the black bear population though, including commercial guides.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Reduction in season and bag limits. The main reasons I rejected these ideas are:

1. Reduction in the season opening dates would only force more hunters into a smaller time frame for the hunt. This would decrease the quality of the hunt for the individual and, in my opinion, have a very limited effectiveness on reducing the overall harvest levels, especially if a large increase in hunting pressure occurs due to the harbor expansions in Whittier. Indeed, the harvest levels may still increase even though the season was reduced which would result in drastic measures possibly being required in the next round of board meetings for Unit 6D. It also would possibly eliminate some of the more desirable dates for the hunting season such as late spring or early fall which are the times of year with the best weather typically.
2. Reducing the bag limits to one bear every two years is very difficult to manage. Other solutions are more effective and do not limit the hunters ability to participate in the hunt yearly.

PROPOSED BY: Wade Willis (SC-05S-G-056)

PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Modify the regulation for GMUs 6, 7, 9, 11-19 as follows:

Black bear when hunted from a registered bait station may be hunted on the same day as a person has been airborne. Specifically it would say; (8) A person who has been airborne may not... However does not apply to... (F) Black bear when taken at a registered bait station between April 15 and June 30.

ISSUE: Inability of bear baiters to hunt on the evening of the day that they fly to their remote bear baiting location. This tends to inhibit use of airplanes to establish registered bait stations in remote locations. So, bear baiting activity is more concentrated near road or river access areas. Since black bear are major predators on moose calves in the spring and since baiting reduces black bear predation on moose by giving bear alternate food sources and by removing some bear from the population it would be good to encourage more bear baiting over a wider area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Black bear will continue to cause significant losses of moose calves and some hunting opportunity will be lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It would improve the number and quality of the moose and caribou resource by reducing black bear predation on calves at the most vulnerable time of their lives.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who would like to access their bait stations by private aircraft. Moose and caribou calves and hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow same day airborne hunting for black bear in general. Rejected because we felt that it would be less likely to receive Board of Game approval.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Bowhunters Association (SC-05S-G-062)

PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Modify the regulation for GMUs 6, 7, 9, 11-17 and 19 as follows:

Allow same day airborne hunting of black bear. Ideally this would be statewide, but since this meeting deals only with Southcentral I will propose a trial run in those GMUs which are under consideration at this meeting. The new regulation would say:

(8) A person who has been airborne may not ... However does not apply to ... (F) Black bear in GMUs 6, 7, 9, 11-17 and 19

ISSUE: High black bear populations and low moose populations. Black bear have been shown to be major predators on moose calves. We need a way to encourage higher harvest of black bear over a wide area of the state.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Persistent low recruitment of moose due to high calf mortality.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would improve the quality of the moose resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who might like the opportunity to hunt black bear on the same day that they have been airborne.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A few black bear over a wide area of the state. There is not likely to be any biologic harm to the bear population by this change in regulations.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Same change statewide; rejected only because this meeting is not considering statewide issues. Plus making a change like this in only one area of the state may be better to be certain that there are no adverse consequences.

PROPOSED BY: John Frost (SC-05S-G-061)

PROPOSAL 20 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs and hides. Modify requirement to salvage black bear meat and hides in GMUs 9, 10, 16B, 18, 19 (except for 19D) and 21-26 as follows:

From January 1 – May 31, in Units 9-10, 16B (except evidence of sex and skull for sealing), 18, 19 (except 19D), and 21-26, the meat must be salvaged; from June 1 – December 31, either the hide or meat must be salvaged.

ISSUE: The requirement to salvage unwanted and valueless hides of black bear harvested for the consumption of their meat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? An unnecessary burden of salvaged hides (unwanted) will be placed on hunters increasingly dependent on bear meat due to no available moose.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Rural residents of GMU 16B and meat hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No sealing requirements; would lose valuable biological information.

PROPOSED BY: Mount Yenlo AC (HQ-05S-G-012)

PROPOSAL 21 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear. Increase bag limits for black bear in GMUs 14A and 14B as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
<u>Unit 14A and 14B</u> [UNIT 14]		
<u>3 bears</u> [1 BEAR]	No closed season (General hunt only)	No closed season.

ISSUE: Unnecessary restriction on available harvest. By limiting the number of black bears harvested it limits those hunters who rely on the meat and hides with no biological reason for doing so.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Lost opportunity to harvest available resource.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will be able to take additional black bears for use.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Based on available information this would not have a significant biological impact on either the resource or the species in the two GMUs.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemption in Region II as follows:

- (a) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in the following units:
 - (1) Unit 11;
 - (2) Unit 13, that portion outside of Denali State Park;
 - (3) Unit 16(B) ...
- (b) In addition to the units as specified in (a) of this section, if a hunter obtains a subsistence registration permit before hunting, that hunter is not required to obtain a resident tag to take a brown bear in the following units:
 - (1) Unit 9(B);
 - (2) Unit 9(E), that portion including all drainages that drain into the Pacific Ocean between Cape Kumliun and the border of Unit 9(D) and Unit 9(E);
 - (3) Unit 17;

ISSUE: Brown bear tag fee exemptions must be reauthorized annually. In March of 2003 the board eliminated the tag fee requirement in GMU 11. The department did not support the current tag fee exemption in GMU 11, and continues to advocate for tag fee exemptions only in intensive management areas where populations of moose and caribou have been found to be important for high levels of harvest for human consumption, and where increased bear harvests are desired and sustainable. GMU 11 moose and caribou populations do not meet these criteria.

GMU 13 was designated as an intensive management area by the board with the objective of providing more moose and caribou for human use. The board enacted the tag fee exemption in GMU 13 and liberalized the bag limit during the 1995 meeting to provide increased hunting opportunity and increase the brown bear harvest in GMU 13. In an effort to further increase harvests, the board lengthened the spring season by an additional 15 days in 1999, and extended the season to year-round in 2003.

In March of 2003 the board liberalized brown bear hunting regulations including the tag fee exemption in GMU 16B to increase the harvest of brown bears. GMU 16B has been identified as an intensive management area. Continuation of the exemption is necessary to encourage hunters to take brown bears in this unit.

In March of 2004 the board reorganized the brown bear subsistence hunting system eliminating the subsistence management areas and placing the subsistence hunts under the individual game management areas. Tag fee exemptions also need to be reauthorized for these hunts and are listed in (b) above. This exemption reduces the cost to hunters taking brown bears for subsistence purposes.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Increased harvest of brown bears may help accomplish intensive management goals for moose and caribou in GMU 13 and moose in GMU

16B. 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-05S-G-080)

PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC 92.132. Bag limit for brown bears. Modify the regulation for GMUs 6-11, and 13-16 as follows:

In GMUs 6-11, and 13-16 a wounded black or brown bear counts as the bag limit. A wounded brown bear does not count against the one bear every four regulatory years bag limit established in 5 AAC 92.132 but as the bag limit for the regulatory year. In this section, “wounded” is defined as any sign of blood or sign of being hit by a hunting projectile.

ISSUE: Hunters who wound animals will often search for a relatively short time for the animal and then determine that “he wasn’t hit bad, he’ll make it” and then continue hunting for another animal. The knowledge that they can try again often causes some individuals to take marginal shots. This is ethically unacceptable and results in waste of wild life.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A loss of wildlife constitutes a loss of opportunity for others. It is a continuation of an unethical hunting practice if not curtailed.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? A healthy and abundant resource short of wounded animals benefits everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters benefit from ethical hunting practices and reduction of wasted wildlife.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those individuals who wound an animal and do not retrieve them.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Professional Hunters Association (SW-05S-G-014)

PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC 92.165. Sealing of bear skins and skulls. Remove in-unit and seven-day sealing requirements in Units 6A, B, and C as follows:

[(2) IN UNITS 6(A), 6(B) AND 6(C), BROWN BEAR TAKEN MUST BE SEALED WITHIN SEVEN DAYS AFTER THE TAKING AND MAY NOT BE TRANSPORTED FROM UNIT 6, EXCEPT TO YAKUTAT, UNTIL SEALED,]

ISSUE: Guides and hunters often have difficulty getting out of the field in time to meet the short sealing deadline because of weather or logistics. In-unit sealing requirement is not necessary to monitor the harvest effectively. Regulations would be simplified and hunters would be required to seal bears within 30 days.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters and guides will continue to be unnecessarily burdened with strict sealing requirements.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Quality of the hunt would be improved.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and guides.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Remove seven-day sealing deadline but continue in-unit sealing requirement. Flight and ferry schedules sometimes conflict with office business hours, which is inconvenient to hunters and staff.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05S-G-091)

PROPOSAL 25 - 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 GMU 6D as follows:

Remainder of GMU 6D, resident and nonresidents, one brown bear every regulatory year. No closed season.

ISSUE: Brown bear—remainder of Unit 6D residents and nonresidents, one bear every four regulatory years, October 15 to May 25.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Overpopulated, hard on moose.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? No one.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alan H. McHone (HQ-05S-G-020)

PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC 92.061. Special provisions for Unit 8 brown bear permit hunts.
Modify special provisions as follows:

1. Require a signed guide-client agreement to be submitted to ADF&G in Kodiak at time of application for a permit. The agreement would have to be postmarked no later than the same deadline of permit application deadline, or received by fax or in person at the Kodiak ADF&G by same. The agreement would be held on file to be used to check against the drawing list and disqualify anyone who did not have a legitimate agreement.
2. Guides would have to be registered in Unit 8 and certified in the hunting area at the time he signs the guide-client agreement.
3. Guides would only be allowed to sign as many guide-client agreements for a particular hunt area as there are nonresident permits available for that area (i.e., if three nonresident permits were available for a particular area, each registered guide for that area could only sign three agreements with clients that were applying for those permits.)
4. Successful permit drawing winners would need to purchase their brown bear tag in order to secure their permit. If the bear tags were not purchased, and proof of purchase was not provided to ADF&G in Kodiak by the deadline date of (August 6 for fall hunts, February 18 spring hunts), the permit would be offered to the alternate winner.

ISSUE: Guides submitting names of clients that have no intention of hunting and are unaware they were even submitted. Nonresident hunters applying for permits without first making sure that they could contract with a guide registered in the area. Large hunting operators putting in excessively large numbers of names, thereby flooding the system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will have increased challenges with flooding of the system. This will eventually make the alternates list very cumbersome and noneffective. We will experience increased negative publicity among hunters and booking agents throughout the hunting world due to the increased uncertainty of hunters obtaining permits with a legitimate outfitter on Kodiak Island.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? (1) By requiring a guide client agreement on the front end of their permit application (2) by a pre-registered guide, we can insure with much less confusion and anticipation that our nonresident hunters will have a more positive hunting experience on Kodiak Island. This will cut down the work for ADF&G in Kodiak as the alternate list should eventually become less likely to be used as all hunters submitted have properly planned to hunt. (3) By limiting each registered guide to only contracting with the number of clients that there are permits available for in a hunt area we increase the integrity and ethical image we want to maintain in the premier area of

hunting “Kodiak Brown Bear.” This also will decrease the amount of work involved in administering the Kodiak bear permits by ADF&G. Increased permit applications decrease the chances for a hunter to draw, which can adversely effect the quality of “the Kodiak Bear hunt.” (4) By requiring the successful hunt winner to purchase their brown bear tag by the deadline we increase the early-on investment therefore insuring the possibility that the permit will get used and not burnt by an applicant not planning to hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This is a positive solution all around: for ADF&G in Kodiak it creates a smoother system to administer. The guides’ ability to all be on equal grounds in possibility of drawing a successful hunter. The hunters’ chances of drawing a successful permit with a qualified guide are increased therefore creating a ore positive hunting experience all around.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The only ones to suffer are: 1) Large operators flooding the draw with names, some of these operators are charging fees to submit applicants and file the forms for large numbers of hunters that will not succeed in the draw. 2) Applicants that do not intend to hunt but wish to lock up a permit that won’t get used.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Steven H. Perrins (SC-05S-G-023)

PROPOSAL 27 - 5 AAC 92.061. Special provisions for Unit 8 brown bear permit hunts.
Amend the regulation as follows:

Any brown bear wounded and not recovered in GMU 8 is considered "taken" by the hunter. The hunter must validate his permit and will not be eligible for another bear in the unit for four years. Wounded is defined as any blood or sign of being hit by a hunting projectile.

ISSUE: A clean kill is the goal of a skillful hunter. When an animal is wounded, the code of ethics mandates, that the wounded animal is now the focus of the hunt. The persistence of the responsible hunter in recovering a wounded animal is the hallmark of a quality sportsman, and Kodiak bear hunts are considered one of the premier hunts in the world. We feel that if a Kodiak bear is wounded it should be considered the same as a bear that is killed (filling the bag limit of the hunter).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued unaccounted harvest of brown bears in GMU 8.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? An undetermined amount of wounding loss occurs with bears in GMU 8. The proposed change will also improve the quality of hunter and the hunting experience for Kodiak bears.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who respect the sport of hunting and the bears they pursue.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who wish to continue to hunt after wounding a bear.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Including all big game animals in this proposal instead of just brown bears. This was rejected because we wanted to start with bear hunting and possibly expand it to other big game later.

PROPOSED BY: Kodiak AC (HQ-05S-G-062)

PROPOSAL 28 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend regulation to read:

GMU 9C Naknek River drainage; residents: one bear every two years; nonresidents: one bear every four years.

ISSUE: Excess of bears in the Naknek River drainage causing low calf to cow ratio with moose population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued low calf to cow ratio with decreasing trend.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Bear population.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Naknek/Kvichak AC (SW-05S-G-001)

PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend the regulation as follows:

Close the season for brown bear in Unit 9C—the drainages of Funnel Creek, Moraine Creek and Battle Creek from their headwaters to their outflows into Kukaklek Lake.

ISSUE: We have been watching and photographing brown bears in this area for the past four years. The first year we saw more than 40 bears in an eight-hour period. These were a mixture of females, sows with cubs, juveniles, and big boars. In subsequent years, we have seen fewer and fewer bears, particularly cubs and big boars. Last summer, we saw approximately 15 bears during a 12-hour period and having to walk a wide area to spot them. When we first started our trips to this area, the average number of bears taken was in the seven to eight per season. The harvest of seven to eight

brown bears per season reflects the historical take for this area. According to the department harvest data for the 2003-04 season, 34 bears (27 males and seven females) were taken in this area of GMU 9C. This does not include the bears that were wantonly killed and left. A dead cub from a poaching incident was found on our trip this past summer, casting a sadness over our entire group for the remainder of the trip. This is the third season in a row that the harvest has been abnormally high. This is an unsustainable and unacceptable level of brown bear harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This is an outstanding area for bear viewing and photography. On our trips, we have met individuals and families from across the country and from other parts of the world that have come to see the marvelous Alaska brown bear in their natural setting. We can attest how exciting, even for an Alaskan to see numbers of brown bears of all ages chasing salmon in these streams. We can only imagine the thrill it must be for nonresidents. If the harvest is not drastically reduced, the brown bears will no longer provide the great attraction for photographers and tourists. We have recommended bear viewing trips to a number of our friends. If the quality of these trips continues to be diminished, we will be reluctant to urge people to spend their cash this way. The loss of tourist dollars to Alaska will be significant. This is money that stays in the state.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quality of brown bear viewing will be greatly improved. It will also enhance the viewing in the McNeil Sanctuary since the bears move back and forth between these areas. Because of their McNeil experiences and being in close proximity with trophy trout fishermen, these brown bear are acclimated to human presence. Killing a bear that is conditioned to human activity does not qualify as “fair chase” nor is it what a hunter should want or expect. As photographers and wildlife viewers, it is important to be able to see animals ranging from cubs to big adults of both sexes. The value of this extraordinarily high quality viewing area is hard to overestimate. If protected, it will provide increasing income for the Alaskans and delight to an incalculable number of visitors.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The experiences of photographers and wildlife viewers will be greatly improved. The growing number of businesses that rely on a healthy brown bear population will benefit; including air taxis, lodges and guide services. This area can only grow as a prime brown bear viewing region and will continue to attract people to experience an incredible opportunity to see brown bears of all ages and both sexes in their own habitat. It is an experience we will remember for the rest of our lives and we hope that others will too.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There may be one or two licensed hunting guides that have operated in this area. There are also unguided hunters who hunt in these drainages. The segment that we recommend for closure is a small part of GMU 9C.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? As an alternative, we considered recommending that the annual harvest of brown bears be reduced to no more than seven to eight per year, and also to delay the start of the season to the middle of October. We reject these because the brown bears population needs time to recuperate after several years of over harvest. We also reject it because the monetary value of this resource is much greater alive and healthy than as a trophy.

PROPOSED BY: Jules and Peg Tileston

(HQ-05S-G-053)

PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend as follows:

Delay opening of the brown bear hunting season until October 15 rather than the current date of October 1 in the portion of Unit 9C as follows: the drainage of Funnel Creek, Moraine Creek and Battle Creek from their headwaters to their outflows into Kukaklek Lake.

ISSUE: Throughout September and October sport fishermen and bear viewers heavily use the above portion of Katmai Preserve. Late in the fall spawning salmon are most plentiful on these shallow creeks and bears congregate there in high numbers. Brown bear hunting is an incompatible concurrent use during this period. The reasons for incompatibility include 1) unsafe conditions for firing high-powered rifles among recreational users and 2) killing and removing bears while viewers, photographers and anglers are watching.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Other recreationalists will be threatened or even injured by rifle fire. The image of bear hunting, if not hunting in general, will be tarnished by concurrent uses.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Hunting and sports fishing/bear viewing are not compatible activities. To shoot a bear in the presence of fishermen or viewers is not what the sport hunter expects or wants; to have gunfire and animals harvested in their presence is not what the recreational user expects or wants. To temporarily separate these very different activities would improve the quality of experience for all parties utilizing the resource as well as addressing safety concerns.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups. By separating user groups all will have a better experience. Harvest should not be affected by this delay of season—this separation would in fact put hunters and hunting in a better light with the non-hunting community. The chances of an accident involving a fisherman or viewer would be eliminated—presently with large numbers of non-hunters still on the stream there is a chance of a gun accident or possible incident involving an injured bear.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Closure of the area to hunting during the fall hunt period.

PROPOSED BY: Ken and Chris Day

(HQ-05S-G-052)

PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Modify the regulation for GMU 10 as follows:

The board should separate the resident and nonresident allocation in the Unimak drawing. As resident use of the area is in jeopardy of dropping off to nothing, an allocation of 40 percent of the permits to nonresident use is a reasonable compromise. It would allow commercial operations to continue to be viable while not allowing nonresident guided effort to dominate this unique hunting opportunity. The department should be directed to administer the nonresident drawing in the same way as the Unit 8 brown bear nonresident drawing.

ISSUE: Nonresident and resident drawing permitting for Unimak brown bear hunting opportunities is common pool.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? As nonresident hunting opportunities dwindle in Alaska for a variety of reasons, for all species, the competition between commercial entities to secure permitting for their clients intensifies with the advent of internet marketing as well as the state's permit drawing application process being online. The practice of flooding the drawing by booking agents, guide consortiums, and aggressive individual guides will soon become common. Resident hunting opportunities, regulated by permitting should not be jeopardized by this process.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal enhances consistency in harvest and allocation of opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters who may be squeezed out of hunting opportunities by commercial entities. Guides who prefer to operate without jeopardizing resident opportunities and who are interested in a stable environment in which to market their services. Who will be hurt?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The entities either resident or nonresident that provide booking services, or drawing application services or their guides who employ aggressive marketing practices coupled with draw flooding to maintain dominance in the opportunity allocation process.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Leave as is. Will not stop the problem.

PROPOSED BY: Rob Holt (SC-05S-G-058)

PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Modify the season for brown bear in GMU 13 as follows:

Brown/grizzly bears may be taken over bait from March 15 to June 10 and from August 15 to November 1.

ISSUE: Too many brown/grizzly bears in GMU 13 in combination with other predators, causing very low calf survival in moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose calf survival will continue to be very low preventing the moose population from increasing and eventually reaching the population objective utilizing the available habitat.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Not applicable to the bears, the moose resource can be improved over time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bear hunters and moose hunters and others who nonconsumptively use moose resources.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? This proposal is intended to get the issue of additional bear harvest on the table. No other solutions were discussed yet.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks AC (I-05S-G-003)

PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Increase bag limit for brown bear in GMU 15 as follows:

The allowable brown bear harvest for all of Unit 15 is 50 bear annually.

ISSUE: Too many brown bears.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be more defense of life or property kills, maybe people killed, certainly more moose killed.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Defense of life or property kills will go down. Moose population will be helped.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Central Peninsula AC (SC-05S-G-011)

PROPOSAL 34 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Modify the season and bag limit for brown bear in GMU 15 as follows:

There will be a brown bear hunt from April 25 through May 10. A maximum of 25 brown bears may be taken.

ISSUE: Spring brown bear hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Opportunity is lost to hunt brown bear early.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Persons who favor an early hunt, moose population as there would be a reduction in the blossoming brown bear population, and people who are forced to kill brown bears in defense of life or property.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who have a perception of a low brown bear population on the Kenai Peninsula.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Central Peninsula AC (SC-05S-G-012)

PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Modify bag limits for brown bear in GMU 16A as follows:

A grizzly bear can be harvested every year provided that a sow and cubs cannot be taken.

ISSUE: Change the regulatory time period from taking a grizzly bear every four years to one grizzly every year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Predation on moose calves will keep increasing resulting in a lower harvest and moose population.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It will increase the moose harvest potential.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters in general - that hunt grizzly bears while hunting moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one I am aware of.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? This might be the best overall solution to the bear predation problem.

PROPOSED BY: Dane Wagner (SC-05S-G-004)

PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Modify brown bear hunting season and bag limit in GMU 16B as follows:

Allow residents and nonresidents: Two bears every regulatory year.

ISSUE: The inability to achieve board harvest objective of at least a three-year average of 28 female brown bears over the age of two years. Sport hunters target primarily bigger bears which tend to be boars.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The brown bear population will not decline as was the goal of the board.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the proposal would allow bear hunters to shoot a smaller bear first then wait for a bigger one also.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bear hunters, guides, and the department.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Bear skimmers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? One bear over 22-inch skull and one under; there would be problems in judging this in the field.

PROPOSED BY: Mount Yenlo AC (HQ-05S-G-013)

PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend the regulation as follows:

All of GMU 17B open to residents and nonresidents: One bear every regulatory year, September 10 – May 25.

ISSUE: Local subsistence resident hunters have noticed a serious decline in the GMU 17B bull moose population on the Nushagak drainage up river from Harris Creek and the upper Mulchatna drainage. Both areas use to be the main traditional hunting grounds for the August 20 – September 15 resident registration village hunters with a high success rate. However, for the past few years the local subsistence hunters seldom even hunt those areas because their success rate has been extremely low.

A. The Board of Game moose population objective for GMU 17B is 4,900 – 6,000 moose. The March 9-28, 2002 GMU 17B eastern moose population estimation survey count was 1,953 moose and the March 15-21, 2001 GMU 17B western population estimation survey count was 1,202 moose for a total GMU 17B population count of 3,155 moose. This is only 52 percent, or half of the GMU 17B Board of Game population objective. The bull:cow ratio in both of these surveys could not be determined. These population surveys also calculated a very low calf percentage of 3.9 percent in eastern GMU 17B and 5.1 percent in western GMU 17B. This same May 9, 2002 memorandum concerning GMU 17B moose survey stated, “With the low calf survival observed in the subunit, it’s unlikely we will achieve the population objectives established any time soon.”

B. The GMU 17B hunter and harvest data from 1983 – 2003 shows an alarming increase of nonresident moose hunters. These hunters are primarily hunting in the upper Nushagak drainage above Harris Creek and the upper Mulchatna rivers where the 2001 and 2002 estimated moose

population surveys were conducted. From 1983 to 2000 this area experienced an alarming 1209 percent increase in nonresident hunters with a harvest increase of 631 percent. The GMU 17B moose is on the decline but the brown bear population is on the increase. Local residents are seeing more and more bears along the GMU 17B rivers but very few moose calves after mid June due to the high bear predation. This would support the low calf percentage data of 3.9 percent in eastern GMU 17B and 5.1 percent in western GMU 17B. However, by September 20, the bears are away from the rivers and in the hills where access is much more difficult. Extending the brown bear season to September 10 would allow more hunter access to brown bears, even out the ratio between moose and bears in GMU 17B and allow the moose population to rebound.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the decline of the GMU 17B bull moose population, observed by the local subsistence residents, is not reversed, it will continue to decline, reaching a critical low and will not be able to recover again due to the high bear predation on moose calves in these areas.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The 1209 percent increase of nonresident moose hunters and their 631 percent harvest increase over the past 20 years is having a devastating impact on the subsistence hunting and harvesting of moose for the local residents in these traditional GMU 17B hunting areas. Controlling the number of bears will allow the moose population to begin to rebound again.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The moose population will benefit, because the hunting pressure will be reduced allowing the moose population to increase. The resident and nonresident big game hunters will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Roger Skogen (SW-05S-G-006)

PROPOSAL 38 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Modify brown bear season in GMU 17B as follows:

Brown bear season in Unit 17B would open September 10.

ISSUE: Brown bear season in Unit 17B. Overpopulation of bears.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose populations will suffer as the brown bear population is very high.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It would allow for a quality mixed bag hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and guides who want the opportunity to harvest a brown bear while the moose season is open.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Perhaps hunters and guides who use airplanes who can locate bears later in the season.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Last session the board allowed one bear every year to reduce brown bear populations, but few hunters wish or can afford to do this - it is ineffective.

PROPOSED BY: Tom Swenor (HQ-05S-G-022)

PROPOSAL 39 - 5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize the current resident tag fee exemptions for brown bear in Units 18, 22, 23 and 26A as follows:

(a) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in the following units:

- ...
- (8) Unit 22;
- (9) Unit 23;

(b) In addition to the units as specified in (a) of this section, if a hunter obtains a subsistence registration permit before hunting, that hunter is not required to obtain a resident tag to take a brown bear in the following units:

- ...
- (4) Unit 18;
- ...
- (7) Unit 22;
- (8) Unit 23, that portion including all drainages, except the Baldwin Peninsula north of the Arctic Circle;
- ...
- (10) Unit 26(A).

ISSUE: The board must reauthorize brown bear tag fee exemptions annually or the fee automatically becomes reinstated. We recommend continuing resident tag fee exemptions for the general season and subsistence season hunts in Region V (Units 18, 22, 23, and 26A).

General Season Hunts: Reauthorizations are needed for: Unit 22, where the tag fee has been exempted for five years, and Unit 23, where the tag fee has been exempted for the current regulatory year. Tag fee exemptions are desired to allow: 1) incremental increase in annual harvest, 2) opportunistic harvest by resident hunters, and 3) harvest by a wide range of users. Increased harvest is acceptable because bear populations are believed to be high in these units. In Unit 22, brown bear populations are generally higher than desired and brown bear predation on moose calves is believed to be depressing moose populations in many parts of this unit. In Unit 23, brown bear populations appear to be high based on reports from long time local residents, commercial operators and observations by department staff.

General season brown bear harvest rates are within sustained yield limits and exempting the resident tag fee has not caused dramatic or unexpected increases in overall harvest. In Unit 22, during the tag-free period resident harvest has increased to a three-year average annual harvest of 86 bears, although during this period other regulatory changes were implemented and contributed to increased harvest. In Unit 23, harvest data from the current tag fee exempted year are still incomplete but a large increase in harvest in response to tag-free hunting has not been detected by the department. In general harvests have increased slowly since 1961 although there has been substantial annual variability in harvest levels. The increasing trend in overall harvest is probably most influenced by the increasing human population in Alaska rather than the result of regulatory changes. Annual variability in harvests is probably most affected by weather.

Subsistence Season Hunts: Reauthorizations are needed for Units 18, 22, 23, and 26A. Previously these units were included in brown bear management areas that have received annual tag fee exemptions since their inception in the early 1990s. Currently, subsistence brown bear hunts are administered on a game management unit basis (adopted by the board, March 2004) and this proposal reflects reauthorizations based on GMUs instead of management areas. Brown bear subsistence hunt requirements include: 1) registration permit, 2) tag fee exemption, 3) salvaging meat for human consumption, 4) no use of aircraft in Units 22, 23 and 26A, 5) no sealing requirement unless hide and skull are removed from subsistence hunt area, and 6) if sealing is required, the skin of the head and front claws must be removed and retained by the department at the time of sealing. Continuing the tag fee exemption helps facilitate participation in the associated brown bear harvest programs maintained by the department for subsistence hunts.

Subsistence brown bear harvest rates are low and well within sustained yield limits and exempting the resident tag fee has not caused an increase in subsistence harvest. In Unit 18, we estimate one to three bears are taken annually in subsistence hunts. In Unit 22, five bears have been reported harvested during the previous ten-year period and this is less than 1 percent of the total brown bear harvest in the unit. In Unit 23, since 1992 an average of five bears are harvested annually and this is less than 10 percent of the total brown bear harvest. In Unit 26A, very few bears are taken annually by subsistence hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The tag fee exemption will lapse and hunters will be required to purchase \$25 tags for general season and subsistence hunts in the 2005-2006 regulatory year. The brown bear harvest will be unnecessarily reduced.

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

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.

PROPOSAL 40 - 5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize the current resident tag fee exemptions for brown bear in Units 19A, 19B, 19D, 20D, 20E, 21B, 21C, 21D, 24 and 25D as follows:

(a) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in the following units:

- ...
- (4) Unit 19(D);
- (5) Unit 20(D);
- (6) Unit 20(E), that portion outside of Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve;
- (7) Units 21(B), 21(C), 21(D);
- ...
- (10) Unit 25(D).

(b) In addition to the units as specified in (a) of this section, if a hunter obtains a subsistence registration permit before hunting, that hunter is not required to obtain a resident tag to take a brown bear in the following units:

- ...
- (5) Units 19(A) and 19(B), that portion downstream of and including the Aniak River drainage;
- (6) Unit 21(D);
- ...
- (9) Unit 24;
- ...

ISSUE: The board must reauthorize brown bear tag fee exemptions annually or the fee automatically becomes reinstated. We recommend continuing resident tag fee exemptions for the general season and subsistence season hunts in Region III (Units 19A and 19B downstream of and including the Aniak River drainage, 19D, 20D, 20E outside of Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve, 21B, 21C, 21D, 24, and 25D).

General Season Hunts. Annual reauthorizations are needed for:

Unit 19D. The brown bear tag and fee requirement for Unit 19D was eliminated by the Board of Game for the 1998–1999 regulatory year. This tag fee exemption was designed to increase the harvest of brown bear to benefit moose calf survival. Calf mortality studies in the unit have indicated brown bears are a significant predator on moose calves. Prior to the tag fee exemption, reported harvest of brown bears averaged two bears/year. Since the exemption was implemented reported harvest has averaged 3.8 bears/year. The estimated population in Unit 19D is 165 bears (13 bears/1000 mi²), based on extrapolation of estimates obtained in other areas. The tag fee exemption has increased the harvest, however the harvest is still below levels required to significantly reduce the effect of brown bears on moose calf survival.

Unit 20D. The tag fee exemption was implemented in 1995 for portions of Unit 20D primarily to increase the harvest of brown bears to reduce predation on moose and caribou calves. The tag fee exemption was expanded to all of Unit 20D in 2003. Current Unit 20D brown bear hunting regulations include an Aug. 10–Jun. 30 hunting season with a bag limit of one bear/year.

The current Unit 20D brown bear harvest objective adopted by the board in March 1995 is five to 15 bears/year. Observations by local residents, hunters, and pilots indicate that brown bears are common in Unit 20D. Harvest has increased since the tag fee exemption was implemented. Mean annual brown bear human-caused mortality from both hunting and nonhunting is within the harvest objective, and averages 12 bears/year, and has ranged from three to 20 bears/year. Much of the increase was in the southwest portion of Unit 20D where mortality of brown bears killed in defense of life and property and kill of nuisance bears in the vicinity of Delta Junction is significant.

The board adopted a Macomb caribou herd population objective of 600–800 caribou with a sustainable harvest objective of 30–50 caribou/year. During fall 2004 the population was estimated to be 550–600 caribou. The calf:cow ratio of 40:100 was the highest since 1984 and substantially higher than the 19 calves:100 cows observed in 2003. The harvest objective of 30–50 bulls per year was not met with a preliminary reported harvest in fall 2004 of seven caribou. The harvest was low due in part to more restrictive registration permit hunt conditions implemented in 2004 to achieve a sustainable harvest.

The Unit 20D moose management objectives have not been met. The board adopted a population objective of 8,000–10,000 moose with a sustainable harvest objective of 500–700 moose/year. The 2003 population estimate for southern Unit 20D was 4,456 moose. The 1999 estimate for northern Unit 20D was 2,395 moose. Reported harvest during the 2003 hunting season was 227 moose.

Unit 20E. The current tag fee exemption was implemented in 2002 for Unit 20E, excluding Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve, to help reduce the brown bear population because of concern about bear predation on moose calves. The brown bear population in Unit 20E was estimated at 475–550 in 2002. Harvest averaged 15 bears per year during the ten regulatory years prior to the current tag fee exemption and has averaged 17 bears per regulatory year during the two years since the exemption was put in place.

Units 21B, 21C, 21D, and 24. The tag fee has been exempted for only one fall in these units. Tag fee exemptions are desired to allow an increase in harvest because bear populations are believed to be high in these units and can likely support additional take.

The six-year mean reported harvest was 7.5 (regulatory years 1996–1997 through 2001–2002) bears in Units 21B, 21C, 21D combined. During that period, the sex ratio of the harvests was 68 percent males: 32 percent females. A conservative harvest of 23 bears is likely sustainable. In Unit 24, reported harvest has rarely exceeded 15–20 bears since 1961, and the six-year mean harvest is 15.3 bears (regulatory years 1996–1997 through 2001–2002). During that same period, the sex ratio of the harvests was 64 percent males: 36 percent females in Unit 24. A

conservative harvest of 51 bears is likely sustainable. Demand for brown bears in both areas is low and hunting success is low due to dense forested habitat in most of the area.

Unit 25D. The Unit 25D brown bear tag and fee requirement was eliminated by the board beginning in the 1998–1999 regulatory year. The board has identified the moose population in Unit 25D as important for providing high levels of human consumption. The tag fee exemption was intended to increase harvest reporting and also to increase harvest of brown bear to benefit moose calf and adult survival. Prior to the exemption, relatively few local residents purchased a tag because they generally do not hunt specifically for brown bears. However, some brown bears are taken incidental to encounters in or near communities or fishing and hunting camps. Calf mortality studies in Interior Alaska, including Unit 25D, indicate brown bears are often an important predator on moose calves. Prior to the tag fee exemption, reported harvest was 0–5 bears per regulatory year. During regulatory years 1998–1999 through 2003–2004, reported harvest was 0–10 bears, and preliminary data indicate that one was taken in fall 2004. The tag fee exemption appears to have increased reporting and may have increased the harvest, however the harvest is still below a level that would significantly reduce the effect of brown bear predation on moose calf survival.

Subsistence Season Hunts. Annual reauthorizations are needed for:

Units 19A and 19B, that portion downstream of and including the Aniak River drainage. Previously these units were included in Western Alaska Brown Bear Management Area (WABBMA) and have received annual tag fee exemptions since their inception in the early 1990s. Currently, subsistence brown bear hunts are administered on a game management unit basis (adopted by the Board of Game, March 2004), and this proposal reflects reauthorizations based on units instead of the management area. This tag fee exemption was designed to allow for the subsistence use of brown bears for food. An average of 60 permits were issued annually in the entire WABBMA from 1999 to 2003. The average reported harvest has been 3.2 bears per year.

Units 21D and 24. Previously these units were included in Northwest Alaska Brown Bear Management Area and have received annual tag fee exemptions since their inception in the early 1990s. Currently, subsistence brown bear hunts are administered on a game management unit basis (adopted by the Board of Game, March 2004), and this proposal reflects reauthorizations based on units instead of the management area. This tag fee exemption was designed to allow for the subsistence use of brown bears for food. Subsistence brown bear harvest rates are low, are well within sustained yield limits, and exempting the resident tag fee has not caused an increase in subsistence take. In both units, we estimate one to two bears are taken annually in subsistence hunts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The tag fee exemption will lapse and hunters will be required to purchase \$25 tags for general season and subsistence hunts in the 2005-2006 regulatory year. The brown bear harvest will be unnecessarily reduced.

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

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? People who do not feel brown bears should be harvested incidentally, without the 25\$ tag fee.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05S-G-081)

PROPOSAL 41 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Shorten drawing permit hunting seasons for caribou in GMU 7 and establish registration hunting season for residents in GMU 7 and 15.

End drawing permit season by September 30 (virtually no effort or harvest currently takes place by drawing permit holders after this date according to ADF&G records). Establish registration hunt beginning October 20 for residents. Rut has ended; large bulls are again edible, as are the smaller bulls and cows. This also allows time for drawing permit harvest reports to reach the department for tabulation. Typically, about 20 animals are taken by drawing permit holders, leaving approximately 15 to 25 additional animals that could be taken by registration hunt, depending on herd size (historically 350 to 500 animals), and the drawing permit harvest. Difficult access and deteriorating weather and light conditions should effectively limit participants to a reasonable level and not excessive success rate.

Registration hunt: August 10 to September 30 (or earlier at department discretion – currently runs August 10 to December 31). Registration permit season: October 20 to December 31, or until permissible harvest limit is reached.

ISSUE: There exists a virtually unused portion of an established season and accompanying unrealized harvest potential on the Kenai Mt. caribou herd.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo. Hunting opportunity goes unrealized.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Cold weather reduces potential insect contamination, facilitates quality meat through fast cooling/keeping of carcass, and permits a more leisurely and careful dressing out and retrieval from the field.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters who are physically and mentally capable of utilizing a challenging hunting opportunity will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Current drawing permit numbers and hunt area remains the same, as does the effectively utilized portion of the drawing hunt season.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Increase number of permits above currently issued 250 permits (already authorized). Rejected as it would not change the seasonal hunting use patterns, nor geographic use patterns, but would increase the density level of hunters in the field in the currently used times and places. This may actually reduce current drawing harvest levels by forcing the animals back into the more remote core areas more quickly. Establish muzzle loader, October-December registration hunt. Rejected as the department prefers access and season restrictions as necessary, rather than a weapons restriction.

PROPOSED BY: Kenai/Soldotna AC (SC-05S-G-031)

PROPOSAL 42 - 5 AAC 85.025(3). Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Amend the bag limits in Unit 9D as follows:

Units and Bag Limits (4)	Resident Open season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open season
Unit 9(D)		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 <u>bull, or</u> [CARIBOU]	Aug. 10-Sept. 30	
1 <u>antlerless caribou</u>	Nov. 15-Mar. 31	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull		Sept. 1-Sept. 30 [(ODD YEARS ONLY) SEPT. 1-OCT. 10 (EVEN YEARS ONLY)]

ISSUE: The Southern Peninsula Caribou Herd is declining in Unit 9D. During the winter of 2002 the USFWS counted 4,100 caribou in Unit 9D and 1,200 caribou on Unimak Island. In 2004 only 1,872 caribou were counted in Unit 9D and 1,006 caribou on Unimak Island. The decline in the Unit 9D segment of the population is partially attributed to low calf survival and recruitment observed in Unit 9D during the fall of 2003 and 2004 (eight and seven calves: 100 cows in the fall of 2003 and 2004, respectively).

A cooperative, interagency (the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) management plan was adopted in April 1994 for the Southern Peninsula Caribou Herd. This plan sets the following population and management objectives:

1. Sustain a total population of 4000–5000 animals
2. Maintain a fall bull:cow ratio of 20–40:100
3. Discontinue harvest when the herd is below 2500 animals

4. Provide limited harvest of bulls when the herd exceeds 2500 animals as long as there are at least 20 bulls:100 cows
5. Phase-in cow harvests when the population reaches 3500. If the population reaches 4000, harvests will be increased to prevent further growth.

Because the current caribou population size of the Southern Peninsula Caribou Herd (Unit 9D and Unimak Island combined) is less than 3,500 caribou, the cow harvest needs to be phased out. This proposal restricts the resident harvest to bulls and shortens the nonresidents season to September 1 through September 30 in the Unit 9D portion of the caribou range, where the population is declining.

Allowing resident to continue harvesting cows may affect the population’s potential to produce caribou calves in the future and may ultimately hasten the decline of the caribou herd. Restricting the resident bag limit to bulls-only in September and to antlerless caribou during the winter does not limit caribou hunting opportunity for residents and is a conservative step taken to address the declining population status of this herd by managing the human harvest of caribou.

Recognizing the importance of this caribou population as a food resource for Alaskan residents, the nonresident season is also shortened in even-numbered years by this proposal. The shorter season is expected to reduce the bull harvest by 9 percent.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the population continues to decline, further restrictions in seasons and bag limits will be required, resulting in a loss of caribou hunting opportunity for all Unit 9D caribou hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskan residents and nonresidents

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05S-G-087)

PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Restrict Tier II permits for caribou in GMU 13 as follows:

One caribou per household. More families would benefit by limiting Tier II caribou permits to one per household.

ISSUE: We would like to see more individuals be able to draw a Tier II permit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The same individuals will continue to draw Tier II permits with competition from other hunters.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? More hunters would be able to participate.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Families who have drawn several permits per household.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Tok Cutoff-Nabesna Road AC (SC-05S-G-019)

PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Modify number of Tier II permits, and create drawing permit for caribou in GMU 13 as follows:

After the board revisits and determines a realistic amount necessary for subsistence, a regulation would read, for example, 500 caribou by Tier II permit and (the remaining number for the allowable harvest) by drawing permit. A Tier II qualified hunter is not eligible for a drawing permit.

ISSUE: The use of the entire “number able to produce” as the subsistence amount necessary for determining the number of Tier II permits for Nelchina Caribou harvest. A previous Board of Game adopted “all that can be provided” as the formula amount necessary (A.N.). A subsequent board, working the same process for moose in the same GMU, came to a number for A.N. that was related to the historic number of households and amount of game needed. If the A.N. for Tier II moose is working, then a relationship between use and a real number can be found for Nelchina caribou. Under the present system, no new Alaskan resident can ever hope to qualify for a Tier II caribou permit. They are certainly reserved under the present findings. Children of 40-plus year Alaskan residents cannot qualify for this hunt even if they have hunted and eaten from this population since they were born, as soon as they establish their own “household.”

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo of eligible caribou hunters. Other hunters will lose all interest in supporting the management of big game in this GMU because they can’t participate.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Not applicable for subsistence considerations. The resource and its harvest would be unchanged by this proposal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans who can never qualify under the present A.N. finding.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Status quo.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Having the board change the Tier II criteria. Rejected because those discussions are already planned and it’s almost impossible to not discriminate by zip

code asking any other question than “How long have you used/eaten resources from this population?”

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks AC (I-05S-G-002)

PROPOSAL 45 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Create archery hunt for caribou in GMU 13 as follows:

I would propose a bow hunt for Unit 13. It could be an open hunt or limited entry.

ISSUE: Increased hunting opportunities for the caribou of Unit 13.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Long-time users of Unit 13 will continue to be denied the opportunity to hunt caribou.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Persons willing to pass the bow hunter course.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I don’t believe anyone will suffer from this option.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Changes in Tier II regulations made me eligible for a short time, then ineligible again. I think this would allow the opportunity to hunt without a significant increase in harvest.

PROPOSED BY: William Leslie (I-05S-G-001)

PROPOSAL 46 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Lengthen hunting season for caribou in GMU 16B as follows:

Resident and nonresident hunters – one bull – August 10 to October 10 or August 10 to October 15.

ISSUE: Caribou season in Unit 16B changed in 2000 to closing September 20 instead of October 10. In the past three years a total of 38 hunters hunted and only six caribou were harvested. Three resident hunters and three nonresident hunters killed these caribou. These caribou do not come into the area most accessible to hunting until after the snow drives them down. In a 42 day season we are not touching this herd. I propose to extend the season as it was in the past prior to 2000 to close October 10 or possibly extend it to October 15 giving more hunters an opportunity to harvest a nice animal. The few commercial operators that generated an income for themselves which in turn generated license and nonresident tag sales as well as an influx of money into the economy were adversely effected and have had no chance to regain this. No one is benefiting from this resource.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This herd will not be hunted and no revenue will develop for the state or local communities. The resource will not be used in any fashion.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? With the caribou season extended the additional revenue to the state would enhance all game resources. The fact that caribou hunters are in the field can also help us to harvest some more grizzly bear, which badly need to be harvested in this area to help the moose and sheep recovery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Commercial operators would have the chance to hunt as before the change in season of 2000. The State of Alaska would receive needed revenue from nonresident tag sales badly needed after the 40 percent budget cuts this year. Other game in the area would benefit if any bears were killed during this hunt that is not normally taken (October 1-10). The state economy would benefit from any money brought in by nonresident hunters. Resident hunters would have a chance to hunt caribou in Unit 16B when they were accessible.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I cannot think of anyone that would be adversely effected by this change back to what was in effect for so many years.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Steven H. Perrins (SC-05S-G-024)

NOTE: This proposal was deferred from the November 2004 meeting.

PROPOSAL 47 - 5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer. Require a registration permit for deer hunting in Unit 2 as follows:

A registration permit is required for all deer hunting in Unit 2. Under the terms of this registration, permit hunters need to report their harvests within 15 days of the close of the hunting season. This new regulation would apply to Unit 2 only.

Should the board support this proposal for a state registration permit, the federal regional advisory council would encourage state and federal managers to develop a single permit that may be used for hunters hunting under either state or federal regulations. Joint permits have been used for a number of hunts and in many subsistence fisheries throughout the state. The use of a joint permit reduces the regulatory burden on the public and provides better management data.

ISSUE: Under current State of Alaska hunting regulations, deer hunters in Southeast Alaska are required to have harvest tickets, but they are not required to complete harvest reports subsequent to the end of the hunting season. Limited deer harvest information has been available from voluntarily returned post season mail-out surveys.

The council has found that this information is incomplete and often does not have the accuracy needed to support council recommendations on federal subsistence management regulations,

particularly for the harvests coming from rural communities. The council and the Federal Subsistence Board would like to be able to use the data a registration permit hunt will provide in order to fulfill their responsibility to provide for subsistence needs while limiting the adverse effects of federal subsistence regulations on nonsubsistence hunters.

Over the past nine years, the council and the Federal Subsistence Board have received proposals annually, concerning deer management in Southeast Alaska. Proposals concerning Unit 2 have raised difficult management issues. The council makes recommendations to the Federal Subsistence Board for proposals affecting Units 1-5. The council and the board need the greater accuracy and specificity provided by requiring registration permits for all deer hunting taking place under federal subsistence or state hunting regulations in Unit 2.

Federal registration permits with stringent reporting requirements have been required of federally qualified subsistence hunters taking antlerless deer in Unit 2 since 1998. Beginning with the 2003-2004 season, federal permits have also been required for use by all federally qualified subsistence hunters wishing to take deer on federal land in Unit 2 during the July 24-Aug. 31 federal season and during the August 1-21, 2003 and August 1-15, 2004 time period when federal land in Unit 2 has been closed to nonfederally qualified hunters. These federal permits require hunters to report their harvests and hunting activity within 15 days after taking their legal limit or at the end of the hunting season and are the federal equivalent of state registration permits. Hunters who do not turn in federal permits risk prosecution and may not receive federal permits in subsequent seasons.

Returns for these Unit 2 federal-permit deer hunts has been excellent, typically with an above 90 percent rate of return at the end of the season. Similar return rates have taken place for permits issued in the federal designated hunter program for deer and moose throughout the region. These experiences with the federal permits lead the council to predict a mandatory reporting requirement can work well in rural Southeast Alaska.

The Federal Subsistence Board has authorized the council to initiate a planning process to develop approaches for deer management in Unit 2; the first meeting of the council subcommittee working on Unit 2 deer management issues took place in Ketchikan, May 26-28, 2004. As this planning proceeds, better deer harvest amount and location of harvest data will be needed. The council needs the reporting requirement in place for the coming 2005-2006 season.

No one likes additional regulations or reporting requirements. However, the council submits good management of subsistence by the federal subsistence program requires a more thorough and accurate assessment of deer hunting success than is available without a reporting requirement. Subsistence hunters have shown they are willing to accept the permit and reporting requirements needed to insure conservation of the deer resource and continuation of federal subsistence hunting opportunities. Careful management of subsistence resources is part of the ethic of subsistence. The council predicts that all ethical hunters will gratefully participate in the mandatory reporting needed to conserve and manage the deer herd.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If nothing is done, the state and federal regulations for deer in Unit 2 will be based on inadequate data for harvest numbers and distribution of harvest. This may lead to management decisions that adversely affect both federally qualified

subsistence hunters and other hunters. Reliance on poor data may affect conservation of the deer resource. The cooperative deer management planning effort initiated in 2004 will be hampered by inadequate data.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The regulation change would improve management decisions for deer in both the federal and state regulatory systems.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All ethical hunters are likely to benefit from the adoption of this proposal. The council, Federal Subsistence Board, and federal managers will have better information to fulfill legally required federal regulation and management responsibilities. The department may also be able to use this information to improve its management of Unit 2 deer.

More accurate harvest information will help insure federally qualified subsistence hunters' need for deer will be met. Better data may also reduce impacts on nonsubsistence hunters when the federal subsistence priority requires restrictions to be placed on their hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? All hunters will share a minor "burden on the public" of being required by regulation to report.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The council considered requesting the Federal Subsistence Board to require a federal permit for all hunting on federal lands in Unit 2. The council rejected this option because it would cause further divergence between federal and state management regimens. Should the board fail to provide a registration permit hunt, the council may approach the Federal Subsistence Board with this request.

PROPOSED BY: Southeast Alaska Regional Advisory Council (HQ-05S-G-097)

PROPOSAL 48 - 5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer. Prohibit hunting with guides and transporters in GMU 6D as follows:

There will not be guided and transported hunts on the following islands in GMU 6D: Naked Island, Peak Island, Story Island, Hawkins Island and Hinchbrook Island.

ISSUE: There is an unprecedented increase in guided and transported deer hunting effort in eastern and central Prince William Sound, competing with local subsistence needs.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? At the rate of increase in harvest, local subsistence needs will not be met in the near future.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local subsistence hunters will have future opportunity secured.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides and transporters will have vast opportunity in the remainder of Prince William Sound.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Herb Jensen (SC-05S-G-041)

PROPOSAL 49 - 5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer. Increase bag limit and extend season for deer in GMU 8 as follows:

Remainder of GMU 8: Season August 1 – December 10. Bag limit of two bucks.

ISSUE: The Kodiak deer population is being kept artificially low and well below average historic levels by the continued harvest of does and fawns. Department staff estimated the population two years ago at 50,000 animals and cautioned the board that these were very loose numbers when doe and fawn killing was introduced. Since that time there have been two very mild winters in Kodiak creating less than normal winter mortality. A population of 50,000 deer would create a density of around 17 deer on every square mile of Kodiak Island, including lakes, glaciers, muskeg, open tundra and mountain peaks, along with other unsuitable habitat. Even after the two very mild winters the deer density is nowhere close to this level. In quality habitat the density would have to be around 30-40 deer per square mile to attain this population and anyone who has been there the last few years knows this is not the case.

The present deer population should be around 25,000 to 30,000 based on current deer densities. Department staff stated the historic deer population had maximized in the mid-to late-1980s at an estimated 150,000 animals. Most people agree that is too high of a population and detrimental to the habitat. I believe the target population was around 70,000 animals. The island does not presently have half of the target population.

Prior department testimony contained comments supporting the fawn and doe harvest. Included in these was that the buck-to-doe ratio was extremely high, though I do not remember the actual numbers given, staff supported this by saying hunters had complained of not finding any bucks and seeing many does. Staff also said late-born fawns indicated that there were not enough bucks to breed the does during first estrous and does were being bred during the second and third estrous. My research has shown that a more likely reason for late-born fawns is that the young does can actually go into estrous their first year though later than mature does. When a population is very low, as the deer population was after the spring of 1999, a larger percentage of does are born to help the population rebound. This large population of young does was going into estrous between December and March, creating the late-born fawns. Over the last few years, in the populations I have observed, the buck-to-doe ratio has consistently been between four and seven does per buck. One reason many hunters have had difficulty in finding bucks is that the last few falls have been very mild with little or no snow through December to drive the deer to the beach.

It has consistently been stated that Kodiak hunters want deer for meat. This is true. It is very important to be aware that residents of Kodiak Island qualify for federal subsistence hunting on deer and that the state seasons and bag limits do not restrict Kodiak residents on federal land in any way. The vast majority of the unit is federal land. By adopting this proposal the board would only be restricting harvest by unit nonresidents who are sport hunting and harvest on state land. It would be an excellent study to document the changes in the population dynamics between the population with fawn and doe harvest compared to the population without fawn and doe harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The deer population will continue to remain well below maximum sustainable harvest levels.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Future deer hunters on state land.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who harvest fawns and does on state land.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A) Limit season and bag limits on state land to the same as the road system. Rejected because the pressure on state land is not anywhere close to the road system and the population can support the present amount of pressure if the bag limit were restricted to two bucks only.

B) Limit bag limit to one buck. Rejected because the present buck-to-doe ratio is high enough to allow all does to be bred even with a substantial (not overly so) harvest of bucks.

C) Restrict season to end in November. Rejected because bucks usually hold their entlers through the first week of December, thereby allowing hunters to identify the bucks. Closing the season on December 10 would also limit flock shooting on the beach from boats when the deer have been driven to the beach by snow.

D) Close the season entirely. Rejected because though the population is not anywhere near the targeted population or maximum sustainable yield levels it is large enough to sustain a reasonable buck harvest.

E) Limit the bag limit to three bucks. Rejected because the state land is nearer to the town of Kodiak, the main population center of the unit. Equal bag limits with federal lands would put undue pressure on the more easily accessible state land and decrease the pressure on less accessible federal land. By having a one deer higher bag limit on federal land, pressure would be distributed more evenly throughout the island.

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson

(HQ-05S-G-016)

PROPOSAL 50 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Prohibit the taking of nannies accompanied by kids in Unit 6.

ISSUE: Each nanny harvested is counted as two goats toward the harvest quota. This will ultimately reduce hunting opportunity for those willing to harvest a billy. Orphaned kids are less likely to survive the winter. This proposal is consistent with actions the board has taken in adjacent units 7 and 13D.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued loss of hunting opportunity; shortened seasons.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this regulation will reduce female harvest and subsequent kid mortality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who wish to see improved hunting opportunities in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Small reduction in harvest for a few hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Taking of nannies prohibited. Sexing goats in the field can be difficult for unexperienced hunters and results in female goats accidentally shot.

PROPOSED BY: Copper River/ Prince William Sound AC (SC-05S-G-008)

PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Modify the regulation for GMU 8 as follows:

The desired number of goats on Kodiak is around one thousand animals. The current population is approximately 1400. Mountain goat hunting opportunities for nonresident hunters only exist within the boundaries of the guide use area. In order to alleviate the problem I would like to see each guide use area in Unit 8 allocated four permits. If an area has goats in it, harvest opportunities will exist there, if not the permits will go unused. Currently all of Unit 8 is covered by goat permit areas. These nonresident drawing applications should be administered exactly the same way as the nonresident Kodiak nonresident brown bear permit drawing.

ISSUE: Resident and nonresident goat permits are in the same drawing pool.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The practice of flooding the drawing with nonresident applications by application services, booking agencies or guides interested in dominating opportunities regulated by the drawing is, with internet marketing and the states application process being online, becoming a reality in many areas on Kodiak Island. Residents will be shut out of hunting opportunities by the numbers in areas where goat habitat is state land. Guides competing with each other for opportunities for their activity will displace residents in the process. In sole use guide areas (National Wildlife Refuge lands). In order to secure consistent opportunities, even of modest numbers, some guides will load the drawing, even in these areas.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Resource harvest by guides will most likely edge toward larger males, improving management consistency.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? (1) Resident hunters who do not want to have their opportunity to draw a permit diminished by entities flooding the drawing. (2) Wildlife managers who are interested in consistent rather than sporadic harvest levels. Guides who would like to offer goat hunting opportunities without unnecessarily competing with residents for that opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Commercial entities relying on flooding the drawing to capture more opportunities to satisfy their needs.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Other solutions: Change from drawing to registration hunt. This is unacceptable due to no significant means of controlling commercial efforts from transporters as well as guides.

PROPOSED BY: Rob Holt (SC-05S-G-057)

PROPOSAL 52 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Modify season as follows:

Unit 14A, south and east of the Matanuska River:

Residents and nonresidents: One goat [. PERMIT AVAILABLE IN PERSON IN ANCHORAGE, PALMER, and SOLDOTNA BEGINNING AUG. 20] **by drawing permit**.
Sept. 1 – Oct. 31

Remainder of Unit 14C:

Residents and nonresidents:

One goat [. PERMIT AVAILABLE IN ANCHORAGE, PALMER, AND SOLDOTNA BEGINNING AUG. 20] **by drawing permit**.
Sept. 1 – Oct. 15

OR one goat by bow and arrow only. Permit available in person in Anchorage, Palmer, and Soldotna beginning Aug. 20.
Oct. 16 – Oct. 31

ISSUE: Increasing numbers of mountain goat hunters in a portion of GMU 14 and a subsequent loss of opportunity to hunt mountain goats during the latter portion of the season while under current emergency-order closure regulation, which have been implemented during recent registration permit hunts for mountain goats. A loss in aesthetic quality of the hunting experience.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Complete aerial surveys of the GMU 14 goat population have not been conducted the past four years. Partial surveys were conducted incidental to sheep surveys in 2002 for GMU 14A, resulting in a total of 135 mountain goats

observed. A complete aerial survey of mountain goats was conducted within the Lake George and Twenty-Mile River portions of GMU 14C during 2000. Partial goat surveys for the remainder of GMU 14C have been incidental to sheep surveys. Results of the GMU 14 surveys suggest that the mountain goat population may be in decline. Because of a limited departmental budget, additional goat surveys in the near future are unlikely.

Mountain goat hunting in GMU 14 was the most restrictive in the early 1980s, when a maximum of 100 drawing permits were issued. Since 1984, mountain goat hunting has been regulated through registration permit hunts. This action resulted in a substantial increase in harvest.

Harvests during the GMU 14A registration permit hunt (RG 866) have remained constant under a 7 percent annual harvest guideline (1999-2003). However, the number of permits issued has varied somewhat. This can be attributed to emergency order closures in some years when the registration permit harvest approached sustained yield (2000-2002). As a consequence of emergency order closures, hunter opportunity during the latter portion of the season was preempted.

Harvests and hunter effort in the Lake George portion of GMU 14C has risen dramatically (1999-2003), resulting in nearly a five-fold increase in harvest and a doubling of permits issued. Speculation is that following implementation of an October drawing permit season length extension in GMU 7 and GMU 15, goat hunters who formerly hunted those units under a registration permit system in October, were displaced to other areas having later registration permit seasons. There has also been an alarming increase in nonresident hunter effort and a related increase to the harvest. Access to most of the Lake George area within GMU 14C is good and coupled with its proximity to large human population centers, makes this an attractive registration hunt for goat hunters.

A significant number of department personnel are involved with administering the GMU 14 registration permit goat hunts. The department's budget and personnel are already under strain as a result of more pressing management issues and a loss of funding. With an expected increase in overall numbers of GMU 14 registration permit goat hunters to continue, the registration permit hunt strategy for GMU 14 mountain goats will result in additional burden for the department.

Registration permit hunt strategies oftentimes have the potential for overachieving harvest quotas and exceeding harvest guidelines. Excessive harvests of female mountain goats have proven detrimental to goat populations. Under registration permit strategies, the potential is there to overharvest the female cohort of the mountain goat population, the net result of which would be a reduction in available quotas in subsequent years and a loss in hunting opportunity. The department can more effectively manage the GMU 14 mountain goat population through drawing permit strategies.

If the board adopts this proposal, it is important to include the Twenty-Mile River drainage into the drawing permit system, as an increase in hunter effort and harvest in this area can be expected if left to the current registration permit hunt strategy.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If this proposal is not adopted by the board, the number of mountain goat hunters will continue to rise in GMU 14, with a probable negative effect on the goat population. Productivity of the population is likely to suffer with a subsequently higher human-related mortality of female mountain goats, the result of which would be the lowering of available quotas and a loss of opportunity for hunters. Hunter congestion will increase exponentially, resulting in additional loss to the aesthetic quality of the hunting experience. Instances of emergency order closures for that portion of GMU 14 under mountain goat registration permit strategies is likely to occur at more frequent intervals, resulting in additional lost opportunity for hunters. The department will continue to apply time and financial expense to a system that currently does not benefit all hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Mountain goat hunters, as those persons wishing to pursue mountain goats late in the season will have the opportunity to do so without threat of an emergency order closure preempting the season and to do so under aesthetically pleasing conditions. The department, as a significant amount of administrative time and funding spent processing GMU 14 registration permit goat hunters can be allocated to other more important functions and programs. The GMU 14 mountain goat population, in that the department can more effectively manage the goat population and increase hunter opportunity over the longterm.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters that wish to have unlimited access to mountain goat hunting opportunities. Some guides which entertain a high volume of nonresident clientele.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Closing the GMU 14 mountain goat season; this was rejected because all management objectives are currently being met, at present there is not a biological concern and the goat population can support a reasonable harvest at this time.

Leaving the current registration permit system in place and increasing quota amounts; this was rejected because the GMU 14 goat population cannot sustain additional harvest. Hunter dissatisfaction with the highly congested and competitive nature of the registration permit hunt will continue. In the long-term, hunter opportunity would be significantly reduced.

PROPOSED BY: Rob Hardy (HQ-05S-G-035)

NOTE: This proposal was deferred from the November 2004 meeting after adopted amendments.

PROPOSAL 53 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose; 5 AAC 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures. Modify as follows:

Antlerless changes: Lengthen antlerless season to 3 weeks; Split antlerless hunt into 3 separate drawing hunts, one week each. (discretionary) Bull changes: Shift season to begin Sept. 1; Only allow people to hold one moose permit in SE. Separate bull registration hunt in Gustavus from other registration hunts in SE. (discretionary) Discontinue issuing bull permits one week prior to season start. (discretionary) Separate registration permittees in time, to prevent overcrowding (only allow certain number of people to hunt at a time-discretionary)

5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. (a) ...

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

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; or	<u>Sept. 1 – Sept. 30</u> [SEPT. 15-OCT. 15] (General hunt only)	<u>Sept. 1 – Sept. 30</u> [SEPT. 15-OCT. 15]
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 100 permits may be issued	<u>Nov. 10 – Nov. 30</u> [NOV. 15-NOV. 30] (General hunt only)	<u>Nov. 10 – Nov. 30</u> [NOV. 15-NOV. 30]

...
AAC 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures. The department may apply any or all of the following additional conditions to a permit hunt, when necessary for management of the species hunted:

- ...
 (7) only a specified number of permittees may hunt during the same time period, and a permittee may hunt only in a specified subdivision within the permit hunt area;
 ...
 (12) a permittee may hunt only during specified time periods;
 ...
 (19) a person may be limited to one big game registration permit at a time in **Units 1 and 20E** [UNIT 20(E)]. ...

PROPOSED BY: Department of Fish and Game at the request of the board (HQ-05S-G-104)

PROPOSAL 54 - 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 (4)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------

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-Nov. 30 (General hunt only)
---------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 drawing permits may	Sept. 1-Nov. 30 (General hunt only)
-------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------

be issued

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 5 drawing permits may be issued

Sept. 1- Nov. 30

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- Nov. 30
(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- Nov. 30

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. The department recommends 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 February 2002 yielded a population estimate of 300 moose with 13 percent calves. The reported antlerless harvest was two and three during 2003 and 2004, respectively.

The desirable post-hunt population size in Unit 6A east of Cape Suckling is 300 to 350 moose. A census completed during February 2002 yielded a population estimate of 285 moose with 15 percent calves. No antlerless hunts were held because of previous poor calf survival and population level below the management objective. 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-05S-G-063)

PROPOSAL 55 - 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 (4)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
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	Aug. 27- Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season

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 identification number.

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Desirable post-hunt population size is 300-350. A census completed during February 2002 resulted in a population estimate of 200 moose with 13 percent calves. Antlerless hunts have not been held during recent years because of continued poor calf survival and population level below the management objective. 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-05S-G-064)

PROPOSAL 56 - 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 (4)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
Unit 6(C)	Sept. 1-Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season.
1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 40 permits for bulls and up to 20 permits for antlerless moose may be issued		

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. A census completed during February 2002 yielded an estimate of 340 moose, 20 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, the department has not held the hunt since the 1999-2000 season. The department recommends 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-05S-G-065)

PROPOSAL 57 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish archery only hunt for moose in GMUs 7 and 15 as follows:

Archery only August 10 – August 17, one bull with spike-fork or 50 inch antlers or antlers with three or more brow tines on at least one side.

ISSUE: All of the Kenai Peninsula archery hunters are forced to hunt in Units 15A and 15B causing considerable crowding during the early archery season. In the last ten years over 55 percent of the total general season moose harvest has occurred in Unit 15C but there is no early archery season in that area. This change would make the early archery season peninsula-wide and help distribute both hunting pressure and harvest availability.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Crowding in Units 15A and 15B will continue to escalate.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All peninsula archery hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Possibly rifle hunters in Units 7 and 15C who may not want an early archery season in the ir area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Make this addition apply only to Unit 15C where the largest harvests on the peninsula continue to occur.

PROPOSED BY: Kenai/Soldotna AC (SC-05S-G-030)

PROPOSAL 58 - 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:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(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	Aug. 20-Oct. 10 (General hunt only)	
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 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		
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits for bulls will be issued in combination with resident hunts		Aug. 20-Oct. 10

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. A population peak of 333 moose in 1990 probably exceeded the carrying capacity of the habitat, and an aerial survey completed two 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 and early 2000s to allow the population to recover. No antlerless permits were issued in 2000-2003. Because of poor snow conditions, no surveys were flown during 2000, 2001, and 2002. A count in fall 2003 found 185 moose (27 bulls, 106 cows, 52 calves), which indicated an increasing population approaching the carrying capacity; therefore, five antlerless permits were issued in 2004. Bull harvests during 2002, 2003, and 2004 (preliminary) were five, nine, and eight. Only one cow was harvested in 2004 (preliminary).

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? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive.

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-05S-G-066)

PROPOSAL 59 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish Archery Season in GMUs 7, 15, 14, 13 and 16 as follows:

A certified bow hunter archery season to be established in a corridor on each side of these roads in areas and time of year determined by the department to reduce the numbers of moose that would otherwise be subject to wander into the roads. This hunt could be a drawing, a registration, or subject to closure due to numbers harvested, to be decided by the department.

ISSUE: Every year, there are signs along Sterling, Parks, and Glenn highways saying “Give Moose a Break” with the numbers of moose killed so far. These numbers run in the hundreds and this does not address the cost of lives, injuries and the destruction of property.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose will continue to be mangled, people hurt and vehicular property destroyed.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The meat recovered would not be mangled by vehicles.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters, their families and all who they share the meat with.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The state currently donates meat of moose killed on highways to the needy. This could continue. However, vehicular collision is dangerous and much of the meat is unusable.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The above mentioned donation of meat from vehicular collisions to the needy. However, the issue of injuries and loss of property is not addressed by this solution.

PROPOSED BY: Douglas L. Rader (HQ-05S-G-006)

PROPOSAL 60 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the season and bag limits for moose in GMU 13 as follows:

One bull with spike antlers or 50-inch antlers or four or more brow tines on one side for Unit 13.

ISSUE: Low large bull moose numbers and problem hunters are having distinguishing a fork-horn bull and one that has a small palm with three or more points.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Less bull moose surviving to enter the large breeding and huntable population.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Allowing younger bull moose to grow older and bigger.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters, viewers and moose numbers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Copper Basin AC (SC-05S-G-014)

PROPOSAL 61 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend this regulation as follows:

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

Unit 13

1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:

1 bull by Tier II subsistence hunting permit; up to 150 permits may be issued; or	Aug. 15 – Aug. 31 (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 at least one side.	Sept. 1 – Sept. 20	No open season.

A person may not possess a Unit 13 (U13) Harvest ticket and a general moose harvest ticket during the same regulatory year.

ISSUE: Unlimited competition for a limited number of legal bull moose in GMU 13 has caused a number of problems. People are concerned about the expanding trail system, increased ATV usage, the lack of refugia for moose, the lack of large bull moose, and the declining bull population. This proposal asks moose hunters to choose to hunt in GMU 13 or to hunt elsewhere. Individuals with alternate moose hunting opportunities will hunt in other areas thus reducing pressure in GMU 13.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued unlimited hunting pressure in GMU 13 will exacerbate current problems. The trail system will expand further, refugia for moose will diminish and bull:cow ratios will not improve.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who choose to hunt only in GMU 13 for moose will enjoy less crowded hunting and presumably more legal bull moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those individuals who hunt in multiple GMUs and who are unwilling to make the choice to hunt for moose exclusively in GMU 13 or to hunt elsewhere.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Limiting ATV usage, drawing permit hunts etc.

PROPOSED BY: Copper Basin AC (SC-05S-G-032)

PROPOSAL 62 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify season in GMU 14 and GMU 16 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
... Unit 14(A)		
1 bull, with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side, by bow and arrow only; or	Aug. 10 – Aug. 17	Aug. 10 – Aug. 17
1 bull, with spike-fork antlers [30] or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or	Aug. 20 – Sept. <u>20</u> [30]	Aug. 20 – Sept. <u>20</u>
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only...;		
Unit 14B:		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side by bow and arrow only; or	Aug. 10 – Aug. 17	
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side;	Aug. 20 – Sept. <u>20</u> [30]	
Unit 16A:		
1 bull, with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side by bow and arrow only; or	Aug. 10 – Aug. 17	Aug. 10 – Aug. 17
1 bull, with spike-fork antlers or [30] 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side;	Aug. 20 – Sept. <u>20</u> [30]	Aug. 20 – Sept. <u>20</u>

ISSUE: The GMU 14A bull:cow ratio has declined from what was observed during previous aerial surveys (1999-2003) and is nearing the lower end of what is considered healthy bull:cow ratios. The GMU 14B moose population and harvest objectives are not being met. The GMU 16A moose population and harvest rate are well below management objectives. Align the closing dates of GMUs 14A, 14B and 16A to match the closing dates of Region II GMUs adjacent to them.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The GMU 14A moose population is estimated at approximately 6,500 moose, which is at or near the upper end of the population objective. However, bull:cow ratios have dropped from the previous three-year norm. The 2003 aerial survey indicated a bull:cow ratio of 21:100. This is approaching the lower end of what is considered a healthy bull:cow ratio. The 2004 aerial moose survey suggests that the bull:cow ratio may have dropped even further. GMU 14A is a popular hunting unit, adjacent to large metropolitan areas that contain over half of the state's human population. Hunter access within GMU 14A is considered excellent; with many roads, trails, rivers, lakes and landing strips throughout. GMU 14A has a later moose season closing date than those units which are adjacent to it (GMUs 7, 13, 15, and 16B). A late moose season closing date, that takes in part of the moose rut, along with the unit's popularity with hunters and good access within the unit, has compromised the bull:cow ratio. By closing the season ten days earlier and aligning it with that of other units nearby, the bull moose population will be allowed to recover to more healthy levels.

GMU 14B encompasses the northwest slope of the Talkeetna Mountains and is bounded on the north, east and west by GMUs 13 and 16. This unit is rugged and access is limited; restricted to one major highway along the western boundary of the unit, and a few trails, lakes and landing strips within the unit. The GMU 14B moose population has been in decline for nearly a decade. This population has been found important for high levels of human consumptive use and the moose population is currently below management objectives. While the bull:cow ratio is considered high, overall bull numbers remain low. This unit currently has an August 20 – September 30 moose season. With hunting restrictions and earlier closing dates for other units adjacent to GMU 14B, and a regionwide human population increase, this unit has seen a gradual influx of hunters in recent years. By closing the season at an earlier date, this will align the season to match that of other units within Region II and will protect a portion of the moose population until other means can be implemented to increase their numbers.

GMU 16A lies in the northern tier of Region II and is bordered by a large national park. Large predators are considered abundant in this unit and travel freely in and out of the park. Wolves have been found to be present at high levels in GMU 16B, which forms the southern boundary of GMU 16A, and there is currently a wolf predation control program in effect within GMU 16B. The GMU 16A moose population is currently well below the objective (3,500-4,000). The most recent aerial survey of GMU 16A was conducted in 2000, in which the moose population was estimated at approximately 2,400 moose. A previous aerial survey conducted in 1994 had a population estimate of approximately 3,300 moose. Anecdotal information from hunters, guides and persons living within the unit have indicated a decline in the moose population. Aerial survey results support that presumption. Although the 2000 bull:cow ratio (28:100) was above

that of Unit 16B, it is not considered overly excessive. Overall bull numbers are low, considering the low population density. GMU 16A currently has a moose hunting season date of August 20 – September 30. By shortening the season ten days to match that of other units within Region II, which have a closing date of September 20, a portion of the bull cohort will be protected in a declining low-density moose population. As with GMU 14B, until other means can be implemented to achieve management objectives for the GMU 16A moose population, the September 20 closing date should remain in effect.

By aligning all road-system units within Region II to have similar season closing dates, will prevent bootlegging or cross-boundary harvest ticket validation of moose taken by hunters. By having all road-system units within Region II closing on the same date, enforcement will have better success in the investigation and prosecution of illegal closed-season harvest cases. By closing all road-system units within Region II on the same date, this will prevent those units which have declining moose populations and/or low bull:cow ratios, from being subjected to an influx of hunters seeking advantageous opportunity in an “island” unit that has a later closing date.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Aligning season dates for GMUs 14A, 14B and 16A with the closing dates of surrounding units, will slightly reduce the bull harvest in areas where the moose population is in steady decline, or where bull:cow ratios are below satisfactory levels. Hunters tend to pursue moose later in September, if possible, to have the added benefit of hunting during the rut. This makes bulls vulnerable to human-caused mortality and can have serious consequences in areas with low bull:cow ratios or severely depleted populations. With a majority of closure dates aligned for GMUs within Region II, hunters will be less likely to move to another unit with an unhealthy or depleted moose population in order to have additional hunting opportunity later in September, when bull moose are more vulnerable.

By slightly reducing the harvest of bulls in populations with falling bull:cow ratios or depleted numbers of bulls, the social structure of the moose herd will function in a more natural state under the presence of a variety of age-classes of moose, and productivity of the population will be less influenced by human-caused mortality. Until other methods are enacted to slow the decline of GMUs 16A and 14B moose populations, or to increase the GMU 14A bull:cow ratio, it is of vital importance to reduce human-caused mortality of bull moose to a more acceptable level.

Aligning season dates also aids enforcement with the investigation and prosecution of hunters that illegally kill moose in an adjoining unit that has an earlier closure date, and who validate their harvest ticket for a unit having a later season. Region II is vast but has a limited number of patrol officers. There are several areas within Region II where boundaries between GMUs share the same drainage. If season dates between units and within a drainage do not coincide, this increases the possibility of closed season poaching of moose and other game. It is important for the board to consider season dates of surrounding units and management objectives for each unit when considering proposals that will enhance or decrease hunter opportunity and the harvest of game.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Persons that have traditionally hunted moose within GMUs 14A, 14B and 16A, in that fewer nonlocal hunters will be inclined to travel to a unit having a shortened season outside of the rut, to hunt moose. All moose hunters over the long-term; as bull:cow ratios are enhanced and moose populations stabilize, hunting opportunity will increase. Wildlife enforcement; as closed season violations will be easier to identify and prosecution a more likely outcome of the investigation of suspected violators.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters that prefer to hunt moose later in the season during the rut.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Closing the GMUs 16A and 14B general moose season. This was rejected because bull:cow ratios are above that which are needed for reproduction within the population. There are enough bulls within both moose populations to satisfy productivity requirements of a declining low-density moose herd, and also provide a reasonable amount of hunting opportunity.

Reducing the GMUs 14A, 14B and 16A general moose season by five days during the latter portion of September (Aug. 20 - Sept. 25). This was rejected, as it does not grant enough protection for GMU 14A bull moose from an intense hunter effort during the early stage of the rut (late September). As with the later closing date (August 20 – September 30), it also has the potential of exceeding the harvestable surplus of bull moose within GMUs 14A, 14B and 16A.

Leaving the season dates as is. This was rejected because evidence indicates that if the harvest were not reduced by a reasonable amount in the near future, the overall health of the GMU 14A bull moose cohort could become a serious concern. Likewise, GMUs 14B and 16A moose populations cannot support an increase in hunter effort or bull moose harvest, both of which are possible with a later closing date in a unit surrounded by other units with earlier closing dates.

PROPOSED BY: Rob Hardy (HQ-05S-G-047)

PROPOSAL 63 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

Adopt the following registration permit and drawing permit moose seasons and bag limits for Units 14A, 14B, remainder of 14C, and 16A:

August 10-17, certified archers only, one bull with a spike or fork antler by registration only, or one antlerless moose by drawing permit only.

August 20 - Friday before Labor Day weekend, one bull with a spike or fork antler by registration only, or one antlerless moose by drawing permit only.

Day after Labor – September 20, one antlered moose by registration only, or one antlerless moose by drawing permit only.

This approach is modeled after successful moose hunts conducted in Interior Alaska units.

Season dates were specifically chosen to protect the resource, align with concurrent seasons, and provide local hunters maximum opportunity to hunt and harvest legal moose.

ISSUE: Below are suggested tools for managing the hunt:

- A. Require hunters obtain registration permits on or before August 5—this would reduce ADF&G staff time spent issuing permits during hunting seasons, should slightly reduce participation, and give managers a preseason idea of how many hunters may participate.
- B. Limit hunter participation to one southcentral Alaska moose permit (drawing, registration, Tier II, or proxy) per year—this would provide higher quality hunting opportunities for a maximum number of people and further reduce ADF&G’s workload.
- C. One registration permit could be issued for all four game management sub units, with permits available over the internet and at ADF&G offices. If, even with these time saving suggestions, certain ADF&G offices don’t want to be bothered with issuing registration permits, then perhaps permits could be available through license vendors. Many license vendors carry licenses and harvest tickets simply as a means of getting customers in the door. What better opportunity for such vendors, than to have an opportunity to issue registration permits highly valued by their customers.
- D. ADF&G could further divide subunits into smaller hunt areas that can be managed separately. The 2004 Unit 20A antlerless moose hunt was managed in this manner, with specific areas closed by emergency order if quotas of harvestable surplus moose were taken before the scheduled end of a season. Season(s) would remain open in areas with unfilled quotas. With data provided by a registration hunt, and if sufficient harvestable surplus moose remained available, ADF&G managers could also extend a registration season in a specific area or areas. Data gained from registration hunts facilitates achieving the constitutional mandate to manage natural resources for maximum benefits.
- E. Consider registration hunt fees. In light of budget shortfalls within ADF&G, and realizing registration hunts cost additional money, I believe most ethical Unit 14A, 14B and 16A moose hunters would gladly pay a reasonable registration fee, dedicated to local moose management, in exchange for increased legal harvest opportunity provided by this hunt.
- F. Drawing permits for antlerless moose could be used during any or all scheduled seasons, however, antlerless permits shall not be made available in units with moose populations below management objective population ranges.

After 2004 moose seasons closed in Units 14A, 14B, and 16A, Department of Public Safety made public that Mat-Su Valley personnel had developed 58 case files and confiscated 44 sets of sublegal antlers from bull moose killed by hunters primarily in Units 14 and 16 during the 2004 season. The DPS personnel also speculated the total number of sublegal bull moose killed could number three to five times what authorities had uncovered. Rough calculations show three to five times 44 equals 132 to 220 sublegal bull moose may have been killed by hunters in Units 14A, 14B, and 16A during the 2004 hunting season. For the five year period from 1999-2003, the total reported bull moose harvest from these subunits averaged 536 bull moose per year. So, under current hunting regulations and assuming a similar harvest during 2004, 24-41 percent of bull moose killed by hunters in these subunits during the past hunting season may, in fact, be sublegal animals.

Fifteen years ago 100 percent of bull moose killed by Mat-Su hunters during moose hunting season could qualify as legal animals, since the bag limit at that time was simply, one bull. After severe winters depleted Mat-Su moose populations, and with an influx of additional hunters contributing to over harvest what bull moose were still available, ADF&G developed spike-fork, 50-inch, three brow tine regulations where only moose with a spike or fork antler or an antler with three or more brow tines or antlers 50 inches or more in width were legal for harvest. Spike-fork, 50-inch, three brow tine regulations reduced the number of bull moose killed, thereby allowing the Board of Game to lengthen what had been a September 1 – 20 moose season to current archery only August 10 – 17 and general August 20 – September 30 moose seasons.

Spike-fork, 50-inch, three brow tine regulations more than doubled the length of moose hunting seasons and provided hunters additional days of moose hunting opportunity, however, the number of illegal bull moose killed during the hunting seasons increased from essentially zero to what now may be 24 to 41 percent of bulls harvested in these subunits. In addition ethical hunters who pass up what now are sublegal or questionably legal bull moose, each year lose substantial future harvest opportunity, since many of these animals are killed later in the season by other hunters, before the moose could ever develop clearly legal antlers.

The magnitude of this problem, where potentially 40 percent of bull moose killed may be sublegal animals cannot be overstressed, therefore, I respectfully request the Board of Game adopt an alternative hunting strategy for Units 14A, 14B, and 16A where most hunters can quickly and easily identify legal antlered moose. This strategy should reduce the number of illegal animals killed, allowing hunters to harvest more legal moose, while maintaining moose herds at management objective levels, and providing reasonable length hunting seasons.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If something is not done there is a high likelihood large numbers of sublegal bull moose will continue to be killed during hunting seasons in Units 14 and 16A. Illegal moose will be left in the field and wasted, snuck home and eaten regardless of regulations, and/or turned in to authorities. Each situation is bad for the public, moose hunters, and moose hunting. Ethical hunters who realistically judge and pass up illegal or questionably legal bulls will continue to lose harvest opportunity since sublegal bulls will continue to be killed by others, before developing clearly legal antlers.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would provide an opportunity to harvest formerly illegal bull moose (which are already being killed during hunting seasons) as legal moose while maintaining harvests at sustainable levels. This should facilitate legal moose being taken home for utilization rather than wastage of illegal animals left in the field.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters would gain an opportunity to hunt in a situation where they can quickly and easily tell if most moose are legal. Ethical hunters, who have been passing up what are now illegal or questionably legal moose, only to have others kill them later that season would gain increased harvest opportunity. Many hunters would benefit from the opportunity to harvest a moose in a less time intensive hunt than provided by current regulations. Certified archery hunters would gain an opportunity to use their antlerless moose drawing permits during archery season. More hunters would gain special moose permit opportunities if hunters were

limited to one southcentral Alaska moose permit per year. The entire public could benefit from registration hunt data used to further maximize benefits from local moose populations. The public could benefit from registration hunt fees dedicated to improved moose management in the Mat-Su Valley. Hunters and the entire public could benefit from moose seasons where substantially less illegal animals are killed.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters wanting to harvest larger antlered moose on, or before Labor Day would be limited to a spike or fork antlered bull or would need to hunt in other units. Hunters who enjoy later moose seasons would have less opportunity in Mat-Su Valley after September 20. With in-season data generated by registration hunts, hunters would likely see some specific areas closed after the available harvestable surplus moose were taken, and before the scheduled end of a season. Hunters who previously used multiple southcentral Alaska moose permits in one year may have to choose which permit they prefer. Hunters who use proxy permits to kill multiple moose in southcentral Alaska in one year could lose some harvest opportunity.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered a general season for antlered moose, but believe this registration option, which provides early hunts restricted to spike or fork bulls, would provide additional hunting opportunity while minimizing the kill of sublegal bulls. Rather than kill illegal or questionably legal moose during the earlier spike-fork restricted seasons, it is hoped most hunters would wait until the season allowing harvest of any antlered moose. The “any antlered moose” season could be scheduled later and/or for a shorter duration, and I would have no objection. A drawing permit hunt for any antlered moose should substantially reduce the number of illegal moose killed, while providing a higher quality hunt for those hunters lucky enough to win a permit. However, a drawing permit hunt would likely exclude most hunters from participating on a yearly basis. The “remainder of 14C” could be excluded from this proposal, however, in recent years bull to cow ratios have been near the top or above management objective ranges in this sub-unit and some additional harvest opportunity seems warranted. Another thought would be the earlier season spike-fork registration and antlerless moose drawing permit options could be excluded from that portion of the proposal dealing with Unit 14C.

PROPOSED BY: Andy Couch (HQ-05S-G-057)

PROPOSAL 64 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation to include the following moose antler sealing requirements:

Antlers from moose harvested in Units 14 and 16A antler restricted hunts must be presented to an ADF&G representative for sealing within five days of the date of kill. Antlers must be attached to the skull plate for sealing purposes and accompanied by the harvest or permit report.

ISSUE: In the fall of 2004 a Department of Public Safety made public, information indicating as much as 24-41 percent of bull moose killed by hunters in Units 14 and 16 during the hunting season may, in fact, be sublegal bull moose. From talks I’ve had with several DPS personnel since that time, it has become evident that the bulk of illegal kills seem to be made on animals judged to have three or more brow tines on at least one antler, which really have only two brow tines or less. Most

of the antlers from illegal bulls have antler widths less than 45 inches, yet seem to be significantly large enough that hunters should not be mistaking them for spike or fork antlered bulls.

Researching antler data has been difficult, but hopefully I will have more complete information before the Board of Game meeting. I would mention, that when I talked to ADF&G it seems a substantial number of moose harvest reports from hunters who killed moose may be submitted without the required antler data. Antler data should be of primary importance in units where the harvest of moose is restricted by antler regulations—and especially when the units in question have a documented problem with illegal kill of sublegal bull moose.

Moose populations along the road system in Alaska may be the most economically important wildlife populations in the entire state. Many fur bearers, sheep, black bears, and brown bears all have sealing requirements to help gather biological data concerning each species. Since moose are such an important species to the State of Alaska, and since there has been a documented high illegal kill in Units 14 and 16A, and since there may be a substantial amount of required information not being reported on harvest reports from successful moose hunters within these units, and since there have been multiple moose hunting violations within the Mat-Su Valley where hunters have attempted to use substitute antlers to transport illegal moose, I therefore propose a sealing requirement for moose antlers taken within antler restricted hunts in Units 14 and 16A.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If something is not done an unacceptably high illegal kill of sub-legal bull moose will likely continue on an ongoing basis under current Units 14A, 14B, and 16A spike-fork, 50-inch, three brow tine moose regulations.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The public and ethical hunters who pass up illegal or questionably legal moose will benefit if other hunters start making more accurate judgments before killing moose, as a result of this requirement to have antlers sealed. ADF&G and the public could gain a considerable amount of information on moose antler structure and common mistakes made by hunters when judging antlers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? ADF&G staff time will be needed to seal moose antlers, but in order to validate any continuation of spike-fork, 50-inch, three brow tine moose regulations in Units 14 and 16A, wildlife protection personnel concerns with high levels of illegal kill during the hunting season must be thoroughly examined and antler information should be documented.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I believe illegal moose kill during Units 14 and 16A spike-fork, 50-inch, three brow tine moose hunting seasons is a real and substantial problem, therefore, I have submitted an entire suite of proposals in an attempt to get something done about this problem.

PROPOSED BY: Andy Couch (HQ-05S-G-061)

PROPOSAL 65 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the season and bag limit for bull moose in Units 14A, 14B, and 16A as follows:

August 10 – September 30, one antlered moose by drawing permit only.

ISSUE: At a fall 2004 Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee meeting a the Department of Public Safety presented information indicating as much as 24-41 percent of bull moose killed by hunters in Units 14 and 16 during the hunting season may, in fact, be sublegal bull moose. When I asked myself, if as an advisory committee member, I have a responsibility to do something about this information, there was only one answer.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If I do nothing about this problem, then I will be partially responsible for supporting a management system with an illegal kill as high as 41 percent of bulls harvested during Unit 14 and 16 moose seasons. In my opinion, supporting a management system that promotes such a large percentage of illegal kill as, “okay,” would be totally inappropriate and irresponsible. I know many other hunters feel the same way, and I believe the general public would be totally appalled by these figures, where an illegal harvest of 24-41 percent of bulls killed during the moose hunting season is considered not only acceptable, but the best management option available.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? In general, I dislike drawing permit only hunts for moose, because they take away hunters opportunity to hunt on a yearly basis, however, if given a choice between spike-fork, 50-inch, three brow tine regulations with the illegal harvest resulting from such regulations, and a drawing only hunt for antlered bulls, I would now choose the drawing option. I believe an overwhelming majority of the public, which is mainly non-hunters, would also choose the option for considerably less illegal kill and wanton waste.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who believe an illegal harvest approaching 24-41 percent or more of all bull moose killed during a hunting season is unacceptable. Non-hunters and wildlife watchers who would likely view considerably more live bull moose at the end of the hunting season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Depending on the number of permits issued, most Unit 14 and 16 hunters may not be able to participate on a yearly basis.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Registration hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Andy Couch (HQ-05S-G-058)

PROPOSAL 66 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunts in Unit 14A as follows:

**Resident
Open Season**

**Units and Bag Limits
(12)**

**(Subsistence and
General Hunts)**

**Nonresident
Open Season**

Unit 14(A)
1 moose per regulatory year,
only as follows:

...

1 antlerless moose by Aug. 20-Sept. 25 No open season
drawing permit only; up to 500 (General hunt only)
antlerless moose permits Nov. 1 – Nov. 15
may be issued (General hunt only)

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the board. During November 2003, the subpopulation of moose in Unit 14A was surveyed and estimated at 6,564 which was slightly greater than the post-hunt objective of 6,000 – 6,500 moose. During this survey the department observed 20 bulls and 29 calves:100 cows. Snow depth accumulation in the subunit during the 2003-2004 winter was considered normal and survival of calves and adults was average.

During 1999 and 2000, the department issued no permits because the subpopulation estimate remained below objective levels. In 2001 the department resumed the antlerless hunts because the population had recovered and actually exceeded objectives. The Unit 14A population is now at the upper end of management objectives. The department strategy for harvesting cows from seven different permit hunt areas within the subunit was to concentrate antlerless moose permits in those areas where moose densities were highest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Portions of the Unit 14A moose subpopulation could grow beyond the ability of the habitat to sustain that population level. Increased cases 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? Those who disagree with the harvest of antlerless moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-05S-G-067)

PROPOSAL 67 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish a drawing permit for any moose in the upper Ship Creek drainage of Unit 14C as follows.

Units and Bag Limits (12)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
<u>Unit 14(C), that portion of the Ship Creek drainage upstream of the Fort Richardson Management Area</u>	<u>Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)</u>	<u>Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30</u>
<u>1 moose by drawing permit, up to 50 permits may be issued</u>		

ISSUE: Moose use the upper Ship Creek drainage throughout the year. However, the highest density appears to be in fall and early winter when rutting and post-rut concentrations occur. In most years, accumulated snow packs force most of the moose out of the upper Ship Creek drainage by early December. The moose move to lower-elevation wintering areas on Fort Richardson, Elmendorf AFB, and other portions of the Anchorage Bowl. A November 2003 census on Fort Richardson, Elmendorf Air Force Base and upper Ship Creek yielded a population estimate of 649 moose with a bull:cow ratio of 58 bulls per 100 cows and a calf:cow ratio of 40 calves per 100 cows. Because access into the upper Ship Creek drainage is limited, most of the harvest has occurred during a late-season hunt on Fort Richardson and Elmendorf. However, the moose population is so high that drawing-permit hunters on the military reservations have been unable to reduce the population to the population objective of 500 moose. Fort Richardson is used for military training and restrictions on hunters have made it more difficult to harvest moose. Increased training demands on Fort Richardson have concentrated hunters in small hunt areas; therefore, increasing the number of permits on Fort Richardson is not a good solution. Forty antlerless permits were issued for upper Ship Creek drainage in 2003 and 2004. Legal bulls were spike-fork 50 inch three brow tines and the open season for cows and bulls was the day after Labor Day to September 30. Hunters took two cows and at least ten bulls in 2003 and two cows and at least six bulls in 2004.

An any-moose hunt so close to the road system and population centers is likely to be very popular. Large numbers of moose hunters live nearby in Anchorage and the Mat-Su Valley. A drawing hunt in upper Ship Creek will allow the department to increase opportunity and harvest in an area with limited access, while controlling the number of hunters to avoid overcrowding and overharvest.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Moose populations not stressed by winter food

shortages are healthier and more productive. An any-moose hunt should allow greater harvests in an area with limited access.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose will continue to be under-harvested, with concomitant problems in nearby urban areas and occasional large die-offs during severe winters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters.

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Registration hunt, however administratively impossible to manage with the number of potential hunters.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05S-G-092)

PROPOSAL 68 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

Moose season and bag limit for remainder of GMU 14C including Chugach State Park Management Area but excluding the Twentymile drainage: Day after Labor Day – September 30, one antlered moose by registration permit.

ISSUE: A department Fall 2003 moose census in GMU 14C estimated an all-time high of 649 moose in the Ship Creek/Fort Richardson count area. The observed bull to cow ratio was 58 bulls to 100 cows. The data from this area is used as the primary count for estimating moose population and bull to cow ratios within GMU 14C. The numbers of moose were so high in GMU 14C that large numbers of animals died after heavy snowfalls during the winter. Many moose died from malnutrition or were hit by cars, but the result was lots of underutilized dead moose.

This situation illustrates that current spike-fork, 50-inch, three brow tine moose hunting regulations, along with restricted areas, and difficult access within GMU 14C have allowed the moose population to grow larger than the range can support. To better maximize benefits from the moose resource, reduce vehicle collisions, and reduce winter confrontations with humans, I propose establishing a registration moose hunt with a bag limit of one antlered bull.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will continue to grow beyond what the range can support during heavy snow winters, and then a significant portion of the population will die and be wasted whenever a winter with heavy snow occurs.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Allowing hunters to harvest more surplus moose provides improved utilization of these animals for food over the current starving deaths or moose-vehicle collisions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters would gain a hunting opportunity where they could quickly and easily determine the legality of most moose. Hunters would gain increased harvests. Drivers would experience less moose collisions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who prefer less hunting in GMU 14C, but with safeguards provided by difficult access, restricted areas, and a moose population that often exceeds management objectives there is little chance of overharvest.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Different season.

PROPOSED BY: Andy Couch (HQ-05S-G-054)

PROPOSAL 69 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

Moose season and bag limit for remainder of GMU 14C including Chugach State Park Management Area but excluding the Twentymile drainage: Day after Labor Day – September 25, one antlered moose.

ISSUE: A department Fall 2003 moose census in GMU 14C estimated an all-time high of 649 moose in the Ship Creek/Fort Richardson count area. The observed bull to cow ratio was 58 bulls to 100 cows. The data from this area is used as the primary count for estimating moose population and bull to cow ratios within GMU 14C. The numbers of moose were so high in GMU 14C that large numbers of animals died after heavy snowfalls during the winter. Many moose died from malnutrition or were hit by cars, but the result was lots of underutilized dead moose.

This situation illustrates that current spike-fork, 50 inch, three brow tine moose hunting regulations, along with restricted areas, and difficult access within GMU 14C have allowed the moose population to grow larger than the range can support. To better maximize benefits from the moose resource, reduce vehicle collisions, and reduce winter confrontations with humans, I propose establishing a general moose hunt in GMU 14C with a bag limit of one antlered bull.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will continue to grow beyond what the range can support during heavy snow winters, and then a significant portion of the population will die and be wasted whenever a winter with heavy snow occurs.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Allowing hunters to harvest more surplus moose provides improved utilization of these animals for food over the current starving deaths or moose-vehicle collisions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters would gain a hunting opportunity where they could quickly and easily determine the legality of most moose. Hunters would gain increased harvests. Drivers would experience less moose collisions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who prefer less hunting in GMU 14C, but with safeguards provided by difficult access, restricted areas, and a moose population that often exceeds management objectives there is little chance of overharvest.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Registration hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Andy Couch (HQ-05S-G-055)

PROPOSAL 70 - 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 14(C).

Units and Bag Limits (12)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
Unit 14(C), that portion known as the Birchwood Management Area	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 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, the department believes that a small resident population of 10 to 15 moose as well as an equal number of animals from Fort Richardson frequent the area. Five antlerless permits were issued during 2003 and 2004. Archers took one bull in 2003 and two bulls in 2004 (preliminary). Very little public land exists in this management area and most of it is city parkland closed to discharge of weapons. Large parcels of land owned by Eklutna Native Corporation could not be hunted by permittees because no access permits were issued.

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. The moose populations in these areas appear to be at or above carrying capacity; however, because the department has not had funding to conduct annual trend counts in these drainages, the number of antlerless permits was reduced from 30 to 20 in 2000. Hunters in Knik/Hunter took three cows in 2003 and one cow in 2004. Hunters in Peters Creek took one cow in 2003 and none in 2004.

The upper Ship Creek drainage is currently included in the “remainder of 14C” and an additional 40 antlerless permits were issued in 2004 for upper Ship Creek. If the department’s proposal for a new drawing hunt in the area passes, it will remove upper Ship Creek drainage from the “remainder of 14C” and create a new drawing hunt for any moose.

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? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive.

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-05S-G-069)

PROPOSAL 71 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reinstate the antlerless moose season in the Anchorage Management Area in Unit 14C as follows:

Resident	
Open Season	
(Subsistence and	Nonresident

Units and Bag Limits (12)	General Hunts)	Open Season
...		
Unit 14(C), that portion known as the Anchorage Management Area	Day after Labor Day -Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season

1 **moose** [BULL WITH SPIKE FORK ANTLER] by drawing permit by bow and arrow, shotgun, or muzzleloading **black-powder** rifle only; up to 50 permits may be issued; **no person may take an antlered bull unless it has a spike-fork antler;** this hunt will be held at the department's discretion

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually. The antlerless moose season in the Anchorage Management Area was not reauthorized by the board in 2003, and the opportunity to hold a moose hunt in the Anchorage Management Area was lost (except for a spike-fork hunt intended to coincide with the antlerless hunt). During summer, an estimated 200-300 moose inhabit the Anchorage metropolitan area. This number increases to 700-1,000 moose during the winter. Many of these moose come from the upper Campbell Creek valley, which lies within Chugach State Park. Moose numbers are high in this count area; a record 213 moose were counted during November 1998; however, numbers have declined due primarily to starvation during severe winters. One hundred sixty-one moose (41 bulls, 90 cows, 30 calves) were counted in fall 2001 and 117 moose (21 bulls, 79 cows, 17 calves) were counted in fall 2003. Most of these moose move into the metropolitan area during December or January, where high densities of moose cause severe overbrowsing in some areas, and lead to increased incidences of collisions with motor vehicles and adverse conflicts with humans.

The last moose hunt in the Anchorage Management Area occurred during the mid-1980s. An archery-only registration hunt in Chugach State Park adjacent to the Hillside residential area in 1983 was very controversial with the public. The board modified this regulation in 1999 to allow the use of shotguns and muzzleloading rifles by drawing permit only in the upper Campbell Creek area. However, the Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation never revised the regulation that prohibits discharge of firearms in this portion of Chugach State Park, and the hunt was not held during the two years it was authorized.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will continue to overbrowse winter habitat and mortality of moose attributable to collisions with vehicles and starvation during severe winters will continue.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who acquire permits for antlerless moose hunts. People who believe there are too many moose in the Anchorage Bowl.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to hunting antlerless moose, hunting moose in parks, or hunting in general.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05S-G-084)

PROPOSAL 72 - 5 AAC 085.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorize 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 2003 census on Fort Richardson, Elmendorf Air Force Base, and upper Ship Creek yielded a population estimate of 649 moose with a bull:cow ratio of 58 bulls per 100 cows and a calf:cow ratio of 40 calves per 100 cows. This record-high estimate is similar to the previous population peak of 622 moose

observed during November 1994, when 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 well above the management objective of 500 moose. Harvests for 2000, 2001, and 2002 were 33 bulls and 15 cows, 14 bulls and 19 cows (affected by military base closures beginning on September 11), and 27 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 2000-2002. The number of either-sex permits was increased to 55 in 2003, raising the total number permits issued to 125.

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? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive.

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-05S-G-068)

PROPOSAL 73 - 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 -Dec. 15 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Dec. 15
1 moose by drawing permit, by bow and arrow only; up to 25		

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 2003 census on Ft. Richardson, Elmendorf Air Force Base and upper Ship Creek yielded a population estimate of 649 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. The Board of Game authorized a winter hunt and additional permits for Elmendorf beginning in 2003. Five antlerless and five either-sex permits were issued in 2003 and 2004. During the 2003 season, hunters took four bulls and six cows and in 2004 (preliminary), six bulls and three cows.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Habitat may be overbrowsed, 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 overutilized 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? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive.

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 and Elmendorf Air Force Base
(HQ-05S-G-070)

PROPOSAL 74 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Eliminate permit requirement in GMU 15 as follows:

Allow moose hunters to hunt the GMU 15 permit hunt area and keep the 50-inch minimum horn restriction without having to be issued a special permit.

ISSUE: Lack of reasonable opportunity for moose hunters to access the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge between Skilak Lake and Tustumena Lake for harvesting moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose will continue to not be harvested in any appreciable numbers due to the few permits that are given out and go unharvested.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local hunters who cannot afford the time and money to go on a trophy moose hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Reduced permit application fees to the department for this area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: J.K. Johnson (HQ-05S-G-005)

PROPOSAL 75 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Establish resident only muzzleloader hunting in GMU 15.

ISSUE: To open a resident only muzzleload (black powder primitive weapons) hunting season prior to the regular rifle hunting season but after the archery season. Dates to be considered for a muzzle load season; this proposed muzzleload hunt to be for Kenai residents only; a drawing permit hunt for cow moose; legal to shoot any bull moose; possibly the completion of a muzzle loader hunter safety course before being allowed to hunt in this fashion, and a proficiency test.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A continued loss of a quality hunting experience and opportunity for Kenai Peninsula residents.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. If any bull moose muzzleload hunt were developed it would take the pressure off the very young spike and fork bulls as well as the older very large bull moose over 50 inches. Ask me about genetics.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Kenai Peninsula residents who shoot muzzleloaders. Kenai Peninsula moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? That separate seasons for other big game species should be included, but decided that a muzzleload moose season should be developed first to see how it works out, see if there are problem areas.

PROPOSED BY: Kenneth Bingaman (HQ-05S-G-027)

PROPOSAL 76 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify moose season in GMU 15A as follows:

Season to open October 1 to November 1.

ISSUE: The hunting season for permit hunt 522 opens too late (Oct. 20-Nov. 20) occurring most years with too much snow on the ground restricting access most years.

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunter who draws permit 522.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Richard A. Link (HQ-05S-G-029)

PROPOSAL 77 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the hunting season for moose in GMU 15A as follows:

Move the GMU 15A season dates to September 20 through October 20.

ISSUE: Consider changing this moose permit's season time from October 20 - November 20 to September 20 - October 20. There are several valid reasons for this request.

A. Access to this area is very difficult even under ideal weather conditions. Obviously Mystery Creek road is the main access point for this hunt and as winter gets closer this particular road becomes impassible. As stated in the permit information, horses are really necessary for a successful hunt and when the road closes due to snow and ice, it makes it even more difficult to access this area with horse trailers.

B. The rut is nearly over by October 20 and speaking from years of hunting in this area if you can't call the success rate is dramatically reduced. This area is becoming increasingly more difficult to see as the trees mature and as I experienced this year assisting my wife in her permit hunt, the rut effort was nearly over by the October 20. Areas I have previously seen and heard cow/bull rut activity were completely quiet at this late date.

C. Those that do draw a permit and plan to hunt with horses are concentrated in a small area because of the accessibility issue. Changing the season date would improve this and spread the effort over a larger area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nothing, however it's my understanding this area has a good bull/cow ratio and the justification for this hunt was to make those large bulls more accessible and somewhat easier to harvest. I think this was a great idea, nevertheless when one considers the access issues and the poor visibility in most of this area, successful hunts are far and few between.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hopefully those that actually are lucky enough to draw this permit may have an average chance harvesting a moose. As it currently stands and as the past success rate demonstrates, the chance of success is limited.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No adverse affect in my opinion.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: R. Daniel Green (HQ-05S-G-034)

PROPOSAL 78 - 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 (13)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
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	Sept. 15-Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season

by calves is prohibited

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 two moose per square mile or about 130 moose counted during the November survey. The SLWMA was last counted during November 2003 and yielded a count of 98 moose composed of 17 bulls (five yearlings, six mid size, and six with antlers 50 inches or larger), 67 cows and 14 calves. The ratios observed were 26 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. Because conditions did not allow for a count in 2004, the department recommends maintaining the hunt, but not issuing permits for the fall 2005 season.

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 re-authorize 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 U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
(HQ-05S-G-071)

PROPOSAL 79 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change season in GMU 15C as follows:

Moose season opening August 15 – September 15. Bull only.

ISSUE: Change moose season from September 1 – 30 to August 15 – September 15.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters prefer not to hunt during rut or mating season. Rainy seasons floods lakes and difficult to get around.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Getting in and out to games before floods.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nanwalek Village hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Later dates on seasons, harder to find after mating, taste, skinny.

PROPOSED BY: Nick M. Tanape Sr. (SC-05S-G-005)

PROPOSAL 80 - 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 (13)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
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 often holds high moose densities in winters when deep snow pushes the moose down into human populated areas. These deep snow winters result in a high number of moose dying due to malnutrition and increased negative interactions with aggressive moose and humans.

In the fall of 2001, 448 moose were counted in the permit area and 22 percent were calves. Fifty permits were issued in 2002, 2003, and 2004 resulting in a harvest of 24, 26, and 21 cows,

respectively. We recommend reauthorization of the antlerless hunt and anticipate issuing up to 50 permits for the fall 2005 hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Deep snow winters will result in a high number of moose deaths due to malnutrition and continued conflicts between aggressive moose and humans.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? A limited antlerless moose hunt may improve overall browse quality.

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-05S-G-072)

PROPOSAL 81 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify resident and nonresident seasons in GMU 16A as follows:

In GMU 16A: Resident and nonresident harvest: August 20 through September 25.

ISSUE: Overharvest of available surplus moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Driving the bull-to-cow ratio below 20 bulls/100 cows could cause the breeding problems in a population that is at least 30 percent below objective.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It increases the long-term survivability of the moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? In the short-term, moose hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A shorter season. The status of the GMU 16A moose population is unclear since the last census was in 2000.

PROPOSED BY: Mount Yenlo AC (HQ-05S-G-010)

PROPOSAL 82 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify Tier II hunt in GMU 16B as follows:

Remainder of GMU 16B: One bull by permit Tier II. November 15-February 28.

ISSUE: Overharvest of available surplus moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Potential breeding problems in a low density moose population due to not enough bulls.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It ensures that there are enough bulls to breed cows in a low density population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? In the shortterm, moose hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Shorter general season; rejected as code requires Tier II when surplus falls below 200 animals.

PROPOSED BY: Mount Yenlo AC (HQ-05S-G-009)

PROPOSAL 83 - 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 (14)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
Unit 16(B), Kalgin Island	Aug. 20 - Sept. 20	Aug. 20 - Sept. 20
1 moose per regulatory year, by registration permit only		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually. The population objective for this predator-free, 23-mi² island is 20-40 moose a density of 1-1.75 moose/mi². Following a November 2003 survey, the department counted 125 moose which is approximately five moose/mi².

Because of concerns of overpopulation and deteriorating habitat conditions, a drawing permit hunt for cows was initiated in 1995. In an attempt to reduce the population quickly, the board established a registration hunt for any moose for the fall 1999 season. The department believes that the moose population on Kalgin Island remains above objective levels.

The "any moose" registration hunt is recommended to provide additional mortality on this predator-free island population. A registration hunt also allows the department to continue gathering biological information from specimens provided by successful hunters. The difficult hunting conditions and limited access will minimize the danger of overharvest. Allowing the continued harvest of calves provides an additional management tool needed to reduce population productivity.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Without a liberal harvest including cows and calves, the population will continue to exceed the island's carrying capacity, resulting in habitat damage and ultimately decline in moose numbers through 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 have the opportunity to take any moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Seasonal residents of Kalgin Island have been concerned about hunters trespassing on their land and cabins. The current season dates concentrate hunter activity when most seasonal residents are present.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A general season for any moose will also work to lower moose densities, but would diminish the ability to collect biological information.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05S-G-073)

PROPOSAL 84 - 5 AAC 92.108 Identified big game prey populations and objectives. Modify moose population objective in GMU 16B as follows:

The population objective for moose in GMU 16B should be 10,000 to 13,000 moose, or between 1.5 and two moose per square mile of available habitat.

ISSUE: The current moose population objective is not high enough to achieve the minimum, much less the maximum, harvest objective.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will be managed to a level that will not allow the harvest objectives to be achieved.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? A higher moose population will allow for achievement of harvest objectives.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All wildlife and user groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A higher minimum. However, we decided not to as a compromise position.

PROPOSED BY: Mount Yenlo AC (HQ-05S-G-011)

PROPOSAL 85 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the regulation as follows:

A September 5-15 nonresident lottery drawing hunt for 50 inch or four brow tine bull moose for GMU 17B. The number of lottery drawing permits will be established on a yearly basis dependent upon the GMU 17B bull moose population estimations. The resident registration moose hunt from August 20 – September 15 would not change.

ISSUE: Local residents have noticed a serious decline in the GMU 17B bull moose population on the Nushagak drainage up river from Harris Creek and the upper Mulchatna drainage. Both areas used to be the main hunting grounds for the local August 20 – September 15 resident registration village hunters with a high success rate, but for the past few years these local hunters seldom even hunt those areas because the success rate has been extremely low.

A. The board moose population objective for unit GMU 17B is 4,900 – 6,000 moose. The March 9-28, 2002 GMU 17B eastern moose population estimation survey count was 1,953 moose and the March 15-21, 2001 GMU 17B western population estimation survey count was 1,202 moose for a total GMU 17B population count of 3,155 moose. This is only 52 percent or half of the GMU 17B board population objective. The bull:cow ratio in both of these surveys could not be determined. These population surveys also calculated a very low calf percentage of 3.9 percent in eastern GMU 17B and 5.1 percent in western GMU 17B. This same May 9, 2002 memorandum concerning GMU 17B moose survey stated, “With the low calf survival observed in the subunit, it’s unlikely we will achieve the population objectives established any time soon.”

B. The GMU 17B hunter and harvest data from 1983-2003 shows an alarming increase of nonresident hunters. These hunters are primarily hunting in the upper Nushagak drainage above Harris Creek and the upper Mulchatna rivers where the 2001 and 2002 estimated moose population surveys, mentioned above, were conducted. In 1983 there were a total of 31 nonresident hunters in GMU 17B with 22 moose harvested. This is a success rate of 70.1 percent. In 2000 the numbers peaked with an alarming 1209 percent increase of 375 nonresident hunters with a total 2000 harvest at 139 moose, a 631 percent harvest increase but only a 39 percent success rate. A significant decline from the previous 70.1 percent. The average success rate since 2000 has remained about 36 percent. Harvest data for 2004 was unavailable at the drafting of this proposal. The 36 percent harvest must take into account that many of these nonresident hunters have the advantage of being dropped off with a small plane in areas where legal bull moose have been spotted and or located on a Global Positioning System, guided by a professional guide, or a combination of the above.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the decline of the GMU 17B bull moose population, observed by the local residents, is not reversed, it will continue to decline, reaching a critical low and will not be able to recover again due to the wolf and bear predation in these areas.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. During the 2004 hunt, the guided and drop-off hunters in GMU 17B were tripping over one another. Every guide or outfitter I spoke to stated that the quality of the moose hunt had diminished over the past four years. Limiting the number of moose hunters in GMU 17B by having an annual lottery drawing will control the number of hunters allowing the moose population to rebound and insuring a future quality hunt for everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The moose population will benefit because the pressure will be reduced allowing the moose population to increase. The hunter will benefit because with fewer hunters and more moose the odds of a successful hunt will increase. The guide or outfitter will benefit because they will be able to provide a higher quality hunt for each client.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The guides or outfitters who take ten or more moose hunters each year may see a drop in their client numbers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Roger Skogen (SW-05S-G-008)

PROPOSAL 86 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the regulation as follows:

Residents: one bull by permit; nonresidents: no open season.

ISSUE: Local residents have noticed a serious decline in the GMU 17B bull moose population on the Nushagak drainage up river from Harris Creek and the upper Mulchatna drainage. Both areas used to be the main traditional hunting grounds for the local August 20 – September 15 resident registration village hunters with a high success rate, but for the past few years these local hunters seldom even hunt those areas because their success rate has been extremely low. These traditional hunting areas are being depleted of moose.

A. The Board of Game moose population objective for GMU 17B is 4,900 – 6,000 moose. The March 9-28, 2002 GMU 17B eastern moose population estimation survey count was 1,953 moose and the March 15-21, 2001 GMU 17B western population estimation survey count was 1,202 moose for a total GMU 17B population count of 3,155 moose. This is only 52 percent, or half of the GMU 17B Board of Game population objective. The bull:cow ratio in both of these surveys could not be determined. These population surveys also calculated a very low calf percentage of 3.9 percent in eastern GMU 17B and 5.1 percent in western GMU 17B. This same May 9, 2002 memorandum concerning GMU 17B moose survey stated, “With the low calf survival observed in the subunit, it’s unlikely we will achieve the population objectives established any time soon.”

B. The GMU 17B hunter and harvest data from 1983 – 2003 shows an alarming increase of nonresident hunters. These hunters are primarily hunting in the upper Nushagak drainage above Harris Creek and the upper Mulchatna rivers where the 2001 and 2002 estimated moose population surveys, mentioned above, were conducted. In 1983 there were a total of 31 nonresident hunters in GMU 17B with 22 moose harvested. This is a success rate of 70.1 percent. In 2000 the numbers peaked with an alarming 1209 percent increase of 375 nonresident hunters with a total 2000 harvest at 139 moose, a 631 percent harvest increase but only a 39 percent success rate. A significant decline from the previous 70.1 percent. The average success rate since 2000 has remained about 36 percent and harvest data for 2004 was unavailable at the drafting of this proposal. The 36 percent harvest average must take into account that many of these nonresident hunters have the advantage of being dropped off with a small plane in areas where legal bull moose have been spotted and or located on a Global Positioning System, guided by a professional guide, or a combination of the above.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the decline of the GMU 17B bull moose population, observed by the local subsistence residents, is not reversed, it will continue to decline, reaching a critical low and will not be able to recover again due to the high wolf and bear predation in these areas.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. During the 2004 hunt, the guided and drop-off hunters in GMU 17B were tripping over one another. Every guide or outfitter I spoke to stated that the quality of the moose hunt had diminished over the past four years. The 1209 percent increase of nonresident moose hunter and their 631 percent harvest increase over the past 20 years is having a devastating impact on the subsistence hunting and harvesting of moose for the local residents in these traditional GMU 17B hunting areas. The local residents have been crowded out of these traditional subsistence GMU 17B areas and the harvestable moose are being depleted by the nonresident hunters and the commercial industry that surrounds them. Limiting the number of moose hunters in GMU 17B will allow the moose population to rebound and insure a future quality hunt for everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The moose population will benefit, because the pressure will be reduced allowing the low GMU 17B moose population to rebound again.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The guides or outfitters with clientele consisting only of nonresident moose hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Roger Skogen (SW-05S-G-007)

PROPOSAL 87 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation to allow hunting in GMU 17C for Alaska residents only on both sides of Wood River during the December winter hunt.

ISSUE: Unsafe crossing the Wood River because of warm weather conditions. Open winter moose season on the west side of Lake Aleknagik and Wood River.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Local residents from Manokotak, Aleknagik, Togiak, Dillingham wouldn't be able to hunt because of unsafe ice conditions crossing the north side of Wood River. There is no bridge or road to cross.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All residents of Alaska that hunt during this hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Local Alaskan residents that can't cross the Wood River because of unsafe ice conditions.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Build a bridge.

PROPOSED BY: Village of Manokotak (SW-05S-G-010)

NOTE TO REVIEWER: This proposal addresses only the Sunset provision of this regulation, established in the March 2004 meeting.

PROPOSAL 88 - 5 AAC 85.045(17). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Extend the nonresident moose hunting closure in Unit 19A 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 antlered bulls per regulatory year; up to 28 antlered bulls 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.
Remainder of Unit 19(A)		

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 antlered bull by registration permit only Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

[UNTIL SEPTEMBER 1, 2005,]
No open season.
[BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 1,
2005,
SEPT. 1 - SEPT. 20]

ISSUE: In March 2004 the Board of Game considered the Central Kuskokwim Moose Management Plan (CKMMP) and several regulatory proposals that resulted from the planning effort. The moose management planning process came about because of concerns by local central Kuskokwim residents that moose populations were declining, making it very difficult to fulfill their subsistence needs. The Central Kuskokwim Moose Management Planning Committee (CKMC) did not reach consensus on recommendations for nonresident moose hunting regulations in Unit 19A. The majority recommendation was to close Unit 19A to nonresident hunting. The alternative viewpoint was to provide limited nonresident moose hunting opportunity in Unit 19A though a registration permit system with a proposed harvest quota of 15 bull moose with 50-inch antlers or antlers with four or more brow tines on one side. While the committee did not reach consensus on a specific harvest management program, all participants agreed to the strategy included in the CKMMP to “Manage moose conservatively to reduce human-caused mortality while the moose population is low and rebuilding. As the moose population and harvestable surplus increases, reduce restrictions on harvest to increase hunting opportunities.”

At the March 2004 meeting the board adopted a proposal to close Unit 19A to nonresident moose hunting but placed a one year sunset on the nonresident closure and asked that the matter be brought back for further consideration at the March 2005 meeting. The board also established a registration permit system for resident moose hunting in the fall and eliminated the resident winter season in Unit 19A.

This proposal has been submitted at the request of the board. Some action by the board to continue the nonresident closure or limit nonresident hunting is needed. It is not likely that the moose population can provide for both a reasonable subsistence opportunity for Alaska residents and an unrestricted nonresident opening. If there is consideration of providing nonresident hunting opportunity in Unit 19A, the first option that should be considered is a registration permit hunt with a small harvest quota of 15 bulls or less, as was the minority recommendation of the CKMC in March 2004. The Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee and the CKMC will review all new data on the status of the moose populations and the fall 2004 harvest and develop recommendations to the board for action on this proposal.

An average of 53 nonresidents hunted moose in Unit 19A from 1999 through 2003. Nonresidents comprised 25 percent of the average reported effort (1999-2003) in Unit 19A. The average success rate (1999-2003) for nonresidents was 35 percent. The average reported nonresident

harvest from 1999 through 2003 was 19 moose. The average reported resident harvest was 66 moose from 1999 through 2003.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The regulation will revert to the nonresident season that existed previous to the fall 2004 nonresident closure which was a 20 day season of September 1-20 and a bag limit of one bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with four or more brow tines on one side. If no action is taken to close or restrict the nonresident season in Unit 19A it is possible that moose harvest will be higher than desired in consideration of the overall mission of the Central Kuskokwim Moose Management Plan to rebuild the moose population in Units 19A and 19B.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Resident hunters would continue to have reduced competition for the already low number of available moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The CKMC considered many possible approaches to regulating moose hunting in Unit 19A as part of the program to rebuild the moose population. The main other solution considered was to establish a nonresident registration permit hunt with a harvest quota of 15 bull moose, as described above. The committee also considered restricting moose harvest to subsistence hunters only through a Tier II system but did not recommend that approach. Other solutions may be considered by the CKMC at its meeting to be held in February 2005 prior to the board meeting.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game at the request of the board
(HQ-05S-G-085)

PROPOSAL 89 - 5 AAC 85.045(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize and modify antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20A as follows:

Units and Bag Limits (18)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------

Unit 20(A), the Ferry Trail Management Area, Wood River Controlled Use Area, Healy-Lignite[-]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; or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 25
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; or

Sept. 1 - Dec. 10

1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only; by muzzle-loading firearms only; up to 75 permits may be issued

Nov. 1 - Nov. 30

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; 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 muzzle-loading firearms only; up to 75 permits may be issued

Nov. 1 - Nov. 30

Remainder of Unit 20(A)

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 - Sept. 25
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only;

Sept. 1 - Dec. 10
(General hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1 - Sept. 25

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. The primary justification for the Unit 20A antlerless hunts are to limit growth of the moose population and to provide the opportunity to harvest a surplus of antlerless moose in an effort to meet subsistence and intensive management harvest objectives. Recent surveys indicate the number of cow moose (excluding calves) in Unit 20A is 9500-10,000 and increasing at an estimated 3 to 4 percent annually. Research in the central portion of the unit indicates the moose population is experiencing density-dependent effects, such as low productivity, relatively light calf weights, and heavy browsing of winter forage. As a result, the department recommended to the board a harvest of 600 antlerless moose in regulatory year 2004 to limit population growth. To achieve that goal, the department recommended the September 1-25 drawing permit hunt for antlerless moose in the central portion of Unit 20A be liberalized to a unit-wide registration hunt during September 1 – December 10 (or closed by emergency order when 600 antlerless moose had been taken). The department also recommended the continuation of calf moose hunts, but that they be included in the antlerless hunt rather than conducted as separate drawing permit hunts. Calf harvests are more compensatory than adult harvests, especially in high density, food limited moose populations like Unit 20A, and, in theory, overall yield would be expected to increase. Increasing yield is desirable for any hunted moose population, but it is paramount in units with intensive management regulations such as Unit 20A. The board adopted the department’s recommendations at the spring 2004 meeting. In regulatory year 2004, 5366 registration permits were issued and the reported harvest of antlerless moose at the end of November was 562. The harvest goal of 600 may be reached by the end of the hunt period. This compares to an average annual reported harvest of just 79 antlerless moose (1996-1998 and 2000-2003; hunt not held in 1999) and previous high of 137 antlerless moose in 2003. Based on the high level of participation and increased harvest, this hunt was very successful in its first year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Unit 20A moose population may increase, which may result in further deterioration of the habitat and may exacerbate a population decline in years with severe winter conditions. The opportunity to hunt a harvestable surplus of cow and calf moose will be lost and subsistence needs in the western Tanana Flats and intensive management harvest objectives for Unit 20A may not be met.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, hunting opportunity and harvest will increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence hunters will benefit from the opportunity to harvest cow and calf moose in the western Tanana Flats. In the remaining antlerless hunt areas, all hunters will benefit by having the opportunity to harvest cow moose for meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05S-G-074)

PROPOSAL 90 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Require 50-inch antlers or antlers with four or more brow tines on one side in GMU 20B, Salcha River drainage.

ISSUE: Moose in GMU 20B, Salcha River drainage – change bull size from one bull to parallel the rest of GMU 20B, that is 50-inch or four or more brow tines on one side.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? With as much pressure that the Salcha is getting lately from GMU 20A restrictions, there will not be a bull large enough to breed in time.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Quality of resources will improve by having an equal horn restriction in GMUs 20B and 20A, relieving hunting pressure on Salcha.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone, as you will at least see subordinate bulls, than not see any due to shooting any bull.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one as within time it will increase population (bulls).

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Drawing permits – as it would discriminate against land owners.

PROPOSED BY: James Piippo (HQ-05S-G-015)

PROPOSAL 91 - 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 Creamer's Refuge		
1 bull with spike-fork or greater antlers by bow and arrow only, or	Sept. 1 - Sept. 30 (General hunt only) Nov. 21 - Nov. 27 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1 - Sept. 30 Nov. 21 - Nov. 27
1 antlerless moose by bow and arrow only, by drawing permit only; up to 150	Sept. 1 - Sept. 30 (General hunt only) Nov. 21 - Nov. 27	Sept. 1 - Sept. 30 Nov. 21 - Nov. 27

permits may be issued in the Fairbanks Management Area; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area, **or**

(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by muzzle-loader by drawing permit only; up to 10 permits may be issued; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area

Nov. 21 - Nov. 27

Nov. 21 - Nov. 27

Unit 20(B), remainder of the Fairbanks Management Area

1 bull with spike-fork or greater antlers by bow and arrow only, **or**

Sept. 1 - Sept. 30
(General hunt only)
Nov. 21 - Nov. 27
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1 - Sept. 30
Nov. 21 - Nov. 27

1 antlerless moose by bow and arrow only, by drawing permit only; up to 150 permits may be issued; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area

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 by registration permit only; or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 25
(Subsistence hunt only)
Jan. 10 - Feb. 28

No open season.

(Subsistence hunt only)

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

Sept. 11 - Sept. 25

No open season.

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually.

Fairbanks Management Area (FMA):

The purpose of this antlerless hunt is to provide the opportunity to harvest a surplus of cow moose in the FMA and potentially reduce moose-vehicle collisions and nuisance moose problems.

Population estimates in the FMA and adjacent areas as well as anecdotal information indicate high but 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. Between 1997 and 2002 more moose were reported killed in moose-vehicle collisions than were reported taken by hunters. In addition, moose nuisance complaints continue to place significant demands on department staff. To increase hunting opportunity and harvest, and reduce moose-vehicle collisions, the department increased the number of drawing permits for antlerless moose by archery hunting only from 25 in 1999 to 50 in 2000, 75 in 2001 and 2002, 100 in 2003, and 150 in 2004. Correspondingly, harvest during the antlerless hunt increased from 11 in 1999 to 38 in 2004 (not including the November 21-27 harvest). Between 1997 and 2000, an average of 103 moose were reported killed by vehicles annually in the FMA. That number dropped to 71 in 2001, which was encouraging but short-lived, as the number jumped to 116 in 2002. At this time, the department does not have sufficient data to evaluate the effect of higher antlerless moose harvests on moose-vehicle collisions or moose nuisance problems. Population estimates, trend surveys, harvest data and anecdotal observations indicate the current harvests are sustainable.

Minto Flats Management Area (MFMA):

The primary purpose of this antlerless hunt is to provide for subsistence needs. In 2004, the board replaced the Tier II subsistence hunt (100 permits with a bag limit of one moose during September 1-20 and January 10 – February 28) with a registration hunt (bag limit of one moose during September 1-25 and January 10 – February 28). In addition, there is a 15-day general hunt (September 11-25) for bulls only with antler restrictions (spike-fork or 50 inch or four or more brow tines) to provide for additional hunting opportunity and to help meet intensive management harvest objectives for Unit 20B.

Population estimation surveys indicate the moose density within the MFMA is high but stable. The reported harvest of cow moose taken during the subsistence hunt has averaged 24 (1996-2003) and the reported harvest during the fall portion of the 2004 registration hunt was 12 females. This harvest of approximately one percent and two percent of the MFMA moose population has been demonstrated to be sustainable. The department is currently meeting both the subsistence needs and the management objective of 30 bulls:100 cows for this area.

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 or increase. In the MFMA, if the subsistence harvest is restricted to bulls only, the general season may have to be further restricted or eliminated to maintain the desired bull:cow ratio.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, hunting opportunity and harvest will increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence hunters benefit from the opportunity to harvest cow moose in the MFMA hunt. In the FMA, hunters benefit by having the opportunity to harvest cow moose, and urban residents may benefit from reduced moose-vehicle collisions and moose-human conflicts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05S-G-075)

PROPOSAL 92 - 5 AAC 85.045(19)(22). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize antlerless moose hunting seasons in Units 21D and 24 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 by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Aug. 27 - Aug. 31 (Subsistence hunt only)	
1 bull by registration permit only; or	Sept. 1 - Sept. 20 (Subsistence hunt only)	
1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 320 permits may be issued in combination with	Sept. 5 - Sept. 25	

Unit 24, that portion within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area; or

1 bull

Dec. 1 - Dec. 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 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 from Sept. 21 - Sept. 25; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or

Sept. 5 - Sept. 25

1 bull

Dec. 1 - Dec. 10

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 5 - Sept. 25

...

(22)

...

Unit 24, that portion within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose by registration permit only; or

Aug. 27 - Aug. 31
(Subsistence hunt only)

1 bull by registration permit only; or

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

1 bull

Dec. 1 - Dec. 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

Aug. 1 - Dec. 31

No open season.

1 moose; however; antlerless moose may be taken only from Sept. 21- Sept. 25

Unit 24, that portion of the North Fork of the Koyukuk River drainage within the Gates of the Arctic National Park

1 moose; however; antlerless moose may be taken only from Sept. 21 - Sept. 25; or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 25

No open season.

1 bull

Dec. 1 - Dec. 10

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 and North Fork of the Koyukuk River drainages within the Gates of the Arctic National Park

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from 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 the Gates of the Arctic National Park

RESIDENT HUNTERS :

1 moose; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from Sept. 21 - Sept. 25; or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 25

1 bull

Dec. 1 - Dec. 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 geographic areas described in regulation can be supported by present moose populations on a limited basis only (i.e., potlatch harvest). Conservative management strategies have been implemented in a step-wise progression outlined by the Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan developed in 2001. Consistent with the management plan, winter antlerless seasons were closed by the board in 2004, and fall antlerless moose seasons have been closed by emergency order during each of the past four years. The fall antlerless seasons will be closed again by emergency order during 2005. Local advisory committees have requested that fall antlerless seasons be closed by emergency order, rather than be deleted from regulation, to

facilitate hunts in the future if the moose population improves. Fall 2004 surveys in seven trend-count areas in Unit 21D and southern Unit 24 suggest stable or modestly improving moose numbers. Trend counts in three areas of northern Unit 24 suggest poorer productivity and recruitment. Conservative harvest is still needed in both units.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The opportunity will be lost to harvest antlerless moose when the population can sustain it.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will maintain the opportunity to harvest antlerless moose when the population can sustain this segment of the harvest.

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

Close the antlerless harvest for all seasons currently open; continue the antlerless harvest during the winter seasons only; close the fall antlerless seasons by emergency order.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05S-G-076)

PROPOSAL 93 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(20). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 22C and the remainder of Unit 22D as follows:

Units and Bag Limits (20)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
Unit 22(C)		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull by registration permit only, or	Sept. 1-Sept. 14	
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only;	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

by registration
permit only

...

Remainder of Unit 22(D)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose; however, antlerless
moose may be taken only
from Dec. 1 through Dec. 31;
a person may not take a calf or 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, by registration
permit only.

Sept. 1-Sept. 14

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Two areas in Unit 22 require reauthorization: Unit 22C, and the remainder of Unit 22D.

In October 1999, the board authorized a registration hunt for antlerless moose in Unit 22C and the department manages this hunt with a quota of up to 20 permits annually. 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 Unit 22C moose population grew steadily throughout the 1990s and in spring 2001 was estimated at 557 moose. This estimate exceeds the department management goal by 18 percent and adds to concern that the population may exceed the carrying capacity of the winter range. Yearling recruitment is highest in Unit 22C and generally exceeds 20 percent. However, the bull:cow ratio is low, varying between 10 to 20:100 cows. The low bull:cow ratio makes additional bull harvest ill-advised.

The antlerless moose registration permit hunt in Unit 22C has worked well since being implemented in fall 2001. In the first year of the hunt (2001) only ten permits (eight successful) were issued because of concerns about higher than normal mortality rates and delayed calving following the severe winter of 2000-2001. In the next three years (2002 – 2004), all 20 permits were issued and 11, 12, and 12 moose were harvested annually. The department recommends reauthorizing the antlerless moose hunt in Unit 22C to achieve the moose population objectives for this unit.

In other parts of Unit 22, low recruitment rates are believed to be causing moose population declines. However, the only portion of Unit 22, other than Unit 22C, where the department

recommends continued authorization of antlerless moose hunting is in the remainder of Unit 22D. This area is relatively remote and difficult access is limiting hunting pressure. Most recent estimates of population size and recruitment provided by censuses indicate the population is stable. A census completed in March 2002 resulted in calf:adult ratio of 17 calves:100 adults and a recruitment rate of 14 percent in this area of Unit 22D. The reported cow harvest in recent years in the remainder of Unit 22D has been low and is not having an adverse impact on the population: 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 village harvest survey in 2001). There has been no reported cow harvest since the 1999-2000 season, but village harvest survey data suggests low harvest occurs and probably provides a more realistic estimate of annual cow harvest over the last several years compared to the reported harvest using harvest tickets. The department recommends antlerless moose hunting be continued in the remainder of Unit 22D.

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? Not applicable.

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-05S-G-077)

PROPOSAL 94 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(21). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 23 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits (21)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------

Unit 23, that portion north of and including the Singoalik River drainage

RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 moose by registration permit only; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from Nov. 1-Dec. 31;	July 1 - Dec. 31
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------

a person may not take a calf
or a cow accompanied
by a calf; or

1 bull with 50-inch antlers
or antlers with 4 or more
brow tines on one side
Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or
antlers with 4 or more brow tines
on one side by drawing permit
only; up to 125 permits may
be issued in all of Unit 23
Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

Remainder of Unit 23

RESIDENT HUNTERS: Aug. 1 - Dec. 31

1 moose by registration
permit only; however,
antlerless moose may be taken
only from Nov. 1-Dec. 31;
a person may not take a calf
or a cow accompanied
by a calf; or

1 bull with 50-inch antlers
or antlers with 4 or more
brow tines on one side
Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or
antlers with 4 or more brow tines
on one side by drawing permit
only; up to 125 permits may
be issued in all of Unit 23
Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Moose density is currently low in large portions of Unit 23. As a result, in November 2003 the board restricted moose hunting for resident and nonresident hunters. These restrictions substantially shortened the resident antlerless moose season and limited the harvest of antlerless moose to hunters who register for registration permit hunt RM880. Historically, the reported harvest of cow moose has been low throughout Unit 23 despite liberal antlerless seasons. The department does not think maintaining this shortened antlerless season will endanger Unit 23 moose populations.

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? Not applicable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters who need to harvest an antlerless moose when caribou or other game is unavailable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The department considered not requesting reauthorization of the Unit 23 antlerless moose season. The department rejected this option because all Unit 23 advisory committees reached consensus at a joint meeting in July 2003 that the antlerless moose season should be limited to November and December throughout the unit. This was presented as a proposal to the board in November 2003 and was passed. There has been insufficient time to evaluate the effects of this regulatory change.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05S-G-078)

PROPOSAL 95 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(24). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in GMU 26A, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(24)		
...		
Unit 26(A), that portion west of 156° 00' W. longitude and north of 69° 20' N. latitude		
1 moose; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf; or	July 1 - Aug 31	No open season.
1 bull	Sept. 1 - Sept. 14	No open season.

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Each year a small percentage of moose (primarily bulls and cows without calves) disperse away from the major river drainages and across the coastal plain, and provide the only opportunities for harvest in the northwestern portion of GMU 26A where moose are normally scarce. Overall, the moose

population in the unit is increasing and the small number of cow moose that disperse and could be harvested under this reauthorization proposal will have very little impact on the growth of the population. During the 2004 hunting season there were no reported harvests of cow moose in this area which supports the department assessment that an antlerless season would have little impact on the moose population.

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? Not applicable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters who need to harvest an antlerless moose when caribou or other game is unavailable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05S-G-079)

PROPOSAL 96 - 5 AAC 92.xxx. Special provisions for Southcentral moose permit hunts.
Create a new regulation to provide the following:

Hunters may be issued only one Southcentral Alaska permit (drawing, registration, Tier II, or proxy) to hunt moose per year.

ISSUE: As southcentral Alaska's human population has grown, moose harvest opportunities for individual hunters in the region have decreased. In many instances, opportunities to hunt moose in certain hunt areas are limited to holders of special permits. Other hunters who do not have a permit are excluded from the same hunting opportunity. I would like to propose a regulation change that would allow a maximum number of hunters the opportunity to participate in southcentral Alaska permit hunts for moose during any given year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Some hunters will continue using multiple southcentral Alaska moose permits in the same year, while other hunters will be denied the opportunity to use even one permit.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? A maximum number of hunters would be able to participate in higher quality moose permit hunt experiences. More hunters would have the opportunity to harvest moose in southcentral Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who currently use multiple Southcentral Alaska moose permits in one year would have to choose which permit they prefer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Andy Couch (HQ-05S-G-056)

PROPOSAL 97 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Establish hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep in GMUs 7, 9, 11, 13, 14A, 14B 15 and 16 as follows:

Create hunts where it would be biologically sustainable in these GMUs.

ISSUE: Available harvest of Dall sheep not being utilized. Currently there are a number of GMUs that have registration hunts for Dall sheep that do not have any harvest of ewes. We would like to create a regulation that would allow/encourage managers to allow a drawing permit hunt in these GMUs of up to ten ewes by drawing permit if it is biologically sustainable.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Lost opportunity to harvest game and provide for sustenance.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who enjoy harvesting and eating meat from Dall sheep.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Based on the premis this would only occur where biologically sustainable it would not result in harm to anyone.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage AC (SC-05S-G-033)

PROPOSAL 98 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Modify the regulation for GMU 14 as follows:

The governor's tag recipient sheep season opens August 1.

ISSUE: We need to increase the value of the governor's sheep tag by opening the sheep season on August 1 – 9 for the recipient. The first year the permit sold for \$200,000. In recent years the permit has languished around \$20,000 - \$40,000. Hunters are unwilling to pay more because they have to compete with other hunters. Most other states offer exclusive hunting opportunities for governor's permittees.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The monetary value of this tag will continue well below its potential.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? By increasing the monetary value of the resource we improve the quality of said resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? More money will be generated for sheep studies, management and surveys.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Open the season ten days after the close of the regular season. Rejected because of inclement weather.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Foundation for North American Wild Sheep (SC-05S-G-051)

PROPOSAL 99 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Modify the regulation for GMU 14C as follows:

Create six new drawing hunts for archery hunting only. Three hunts each of the two areas in Organ Mountain on the south side of Eagle River from Heritage Creek to the south fork of Eagle River and Indian Creek—drainages flowing into the west side of Indian Creek. There would be only one permit for each hunt because the areas are small and even two bow hunters simultaneously in the areas would detract from the quality of each others' hunts. The hunts would be from September 1-10, September 11-20 and September 21-30. The hunts would be for full curl or better rams only.

ISSUE: There are currently opportunities for high quality/low impact hunts for sheep in a couple areas of Unit 14C that are going to waste. These areas are Organ Mountain on the south side of Eagle River from Heritage Creek to the south fork of Eagle River and Indian Creek – drainages flowing into the west side of Indian Creek.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? In two relatively small areas near Anchorage there will continue to be a large number of Dall rams which will simply die of old age and thus be wasted. A carefully controlled low impact hunt could give a few lucky hunters the opportunity for a very high quality hunting experience without harming the resource. Additionally if these areas were open to hunts, the governor's auction sheep hunt might bring in more funds to be used for sheep management.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Both of these areas are known to hold high numbers of legal sized rams. Currently this resource is being wasted and this proposal would allow the chance for archers to take bigger rams. It should also enhance the value of the Governor's permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? 1) Bow hunters by having increased opportunity to take a trophy ram. 2) Rifle hunters who might benefit from sheep that move out of these previously closed areas into open hunting areas. 3) The State of Alaska and all sheep if the potential of very big rams in these areas increases the value of the governor's permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Rifle hunts in these areas - rejected because the areas are small and close to high use viewing and hiking areas. Earlier seasons - rejected because more likelihood of conflict with tourist hikers and viewers in August in these areas.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Bowhunters Association (SC-05S-G-063)

PROPOSAL 100 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Amend the regulation for GMU 14C as follows:

Create a new archery permit hunt for each subunit in which there are already permit sheep hunts. Each new hunt would be one permit only. It would be for a full curl or better ram only. The dates of the hunt would be from August 1 until August 9. Stipulate that the holder of the governor's sheep tag could hunt in any of those hunt areas in which firearms are allowed for big game hunting during this period using any weapon that he desired.

ISSUE: Provide additional opportunity for high quality/low impact trophy Dall sheep hunts and simultaneously enhance the value of the governor's sheep permit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Some quality trophy sheep hunting opportunities will be lost and the governor's permit will continue to sell for a relatively low amount compared to what it might generate.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? 1. A few bow hunters for trophy sheep. 2. The governor's permit holder since he could essentially begin his hunt competing with only a small number of bow hunters before the regular firearms hunts start. 3. Department of Fish and Game through greater revenues from the governor's permit. 4. Possibly some sheep as they would be subjected to a low level of pressure from one bow hunter prior to the opening of rifle season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The holders of the first permits to hunt sheep from August 10-20 because the sheep might be more alert and a couple of rams might be missing.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: John Frost (SC-05S-G-060)

PROPOSAL 101 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Modify restrictions in GMU 14C to allow sheep hunting as follows:

- a. Implement a permit area consisting of: On the north side of the Eagle River drainage downstream but not including Dishwater Creek and upstream from Falling Water Creek, including Falling Water Creek, on the south side of Eagle River downstream from, but not including Organ Creek, including all tributaries draining into Indian Creek and all tributaries draining into Turnagain Arm between Falls Creek and Indian Creek, not including Falls Creek.
- b. Issue one drawing permit only for this implemented area.
- c. This permit area is excluded from all other multiple area hunts.
- d. Permit season August 20 – September 30.

ISSUE: There are areas within Unit 14C that have high ram populations that are currently closed to hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This excellent resource will not be utilized.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this proposal will give the opportunity of the successful permit applicant to have a chance of an exceptional hunting experience in areas that have excellent mature ram population that to date have had no harvest in the past. The mature ram population is being underutilized at this time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Any hunters who have a desire to hunt this excellent permit area will have the chance to draw this exceptional permit hunt opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anyone who is opposed to sheep hunting in Chugach State Park.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Foundation for North American Wild Sheep (SC-05S-G-025)

PROPOSAL 102 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Authorize the use of snow machines to hunt wolves in GMU 6-11 and 13-17 as follows:

In GMUs 6-11 and 13-17, the use of snow machines is allowed for the taking of wolves until the quota is filled. To be reported by Department of Fish and Game. All hunters and trappers will be required to report all wolves harvested five days after to the department.

ISSUE: The use of snow machines in taking wolves in GMUs 6-11 and 13-17.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The wolf population will keep growing.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It will help with the predator control problem.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers and hunters in these units.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Michael S. Rosetti (HQ-05S-G-004)

PROPOSAL 103 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf. Modify hunting season and bag limit for wolf in GMU 9 as follows:

GMU 9 residents and nonresidents: 10 wolves per day from August 10 through May 25.

ISSUE: Extend the wolf season to May 25 so spring bear hunters may have an opportunity to harvest wolves.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wolf populations will continue to rise.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Increase caribou recovery in GMU 9E.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and residents in GMU 9. State of Alaska through increased tag sales.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Year around wolf season. Did not think it would be acceptable.

PROPOSED BY: Gary W. King (HQ-05S-G-024)

PROPOSAL 104 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf. Modify the regulation as follows:

Add to the current regulation "except wolves" in GMU 9.

ISSUE: Remove the restriction that prevents a guide or assistant guide from taking wolves while he is under contract to guide.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Many missed opportunities to harvest wolves on guided hunts because the guide is not currently allowed to shoot.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Increase caribou recovery in Unit 9E.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters, guides and residents in Unit 9.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I realize this is not an ADFG regulation but it is a place to start as there is no Guide Board to suggest this change.

PROPOSED BY: Gary King (HQ-05S-G-023)

PROPOSAL 105 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf. Change the bag limit for wolves to unlimited as follows:

Nondalton Tribal Council believes that the only feasible solution would be to open the season to trappers and/or the people living in GMU 9B.

ISSUE: The problem in GMU 9B is an overpopulation of wolves which has had a detrimental effect on the large game animals. The overpopulation of wolves is also threatening the health and welfare of the residents and their domestic animals, mainly sled dogs.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The wolves are right at the outskirts of town and many sightings have been made in town. The results of the wolves moving into populated areas range from no moose and caribou to dogs being killed and eaten while tied up outside. The wolves are depleting their supply of food and coming into the village to find food. Sightings of the largest wolf packs ever seen by many people are becoming quite common. The sounds of wolf packs howling near or in the village every night is also common.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quality of or improving the resources harvested is the most likely outcome of predator control. The moose and caribou should return to the area. More flora damage from all-terrain vehicles, for hunting, would be minimized by not having to travel further and over pristine land.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The residents of GMU 9B would benefit from the harvest of plentiful game animals. Trappers in the area would benefit in plentiful food and harvested furs for sale. Local artisans would have materials readily available again.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Nondalton Tribal Council (HQ-05S-G-002)

PROPOSAL 106 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Create exception to allow snowmachines and motorized land vehicles to take wolves in GMUs 9B and 17B, as follows:

Allow the pursuit of wolves with a snowmachine or ATV.

ISSUE: The overpopulation of wolves and not being able to harvest wolves efficiently with the use of a snowmachine or ATV.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose and caribou populations will continue to decline and the wolf harvest will continue to be low.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? With a snow machine hunters or trappers can be more selective.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lake Iliamna AC (HQ-05S-G-025)

PROPOSAL 107 - 5 AAC 85.057. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolverine. Modify the bag limit as follows:

Wolverine bag limit in Units 7 and 15 is two.

ISSUE: Wolverine bag limit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Depletions.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Nancy Hillstrand (SC-05S-G-046)

PROPOSAL 108 - 5 AAC 85.057. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolverine. Modify the regulation for GMU 13 as follows:

Wolverine. GMU 13 nonresidents. No open season.

ISSUE: Allow for more wolverine to be taken by residents.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, allowing for more wolverine to be harvested by residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides may hear from nonresidents.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Allen Dubord

(SC-05S-G-055)

PROPOSAL 109 - 5 AAC 85.060. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals. Prohibit hunting of lynx in GMUs 8 and 10 as follows:

Close hunting harvest in any GMU and/or subunit where lynx are closed to trapping.

ISSUE: Currently in these two GMUs we have an open hunting season and a closed trapping season for lynx. Historically, the harvest of lynx by hunting has been minimal or nonexistent. However in the past few years predator calling has increased in popularity and can result in more significant numbers of lynx being harvested by hunters. If there is a concern about the lynx population that results in eliminating trapping, we should also eliminate hunting in these same areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? An unintended harvest of lynx could result and have a negative impact on the overall lynx population.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All individuals who enjoy healthy lynx populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those would wish to harvest lynx in areas closed to trapping lynx.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage AC

(SC-05S-G-035)

PROPOSAL 110 - 5 AAC 85.060. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals. Modify hunting season in GMUs 9B and 17B as follows:

Allow shooting of beavers during the trapping season.

ISSUE: Overpopulation of beaver.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Beaver will continue to be overpopulated and the harvest low.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Hunters and trappers can be more selective.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lake Iliamna AC

(HQ-05S-G-026)

PROPOSAL 111 - 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Modify the regulation for GMUs 6-11 and 13-17 as follows:

Manage sea ducks by game management unit as well as individual bag limit on individual species.

ISSUE: Overall population management of sea ducks does not consider individual species or geographic areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Localized depletions of individual species with no management oversight.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Nancy Hillstrand

(SC-05S-G-044)

PROPOSAL 112 - 5 AAC 92.100. Unlawful methods of hunting waterfowl, snipe, and cranes, and 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Modify the regulation for GMUs 6-11 and 13-17 as follows:

Four sea ducks per day, no more than two per species for resident and nonresident hunts. No hunting from a boat.

ISSUE: Intensive guided sea duck hunting by a small number of guides in easily accessible narrow small bays causes the tendency of locally depleting resident birds. Year after year of hammering these specific bays dwindles individual resident populations of sea duck species.

Sea duck behaviors as well as sensitive reproductive strategy works against these birds. These behaviors are:

1. Site Fidelity. Guides know where to take paying customers in specific bays and even bights within wintering bays where resident birds faithfully return year after year. Once a bay is depleted of preferred species, guides take their clients to the next bay so they are unwittingly systematically removing resident birds.
2. Tight Rafting when stressed. When stalked, pursued or uneasy, many sea duck species move in close formation and return flyover behavior can work against stabilized populations of resident species in small geographic areas.

Sea ducks need the same management system of our state GMUs as do other hunted species. The present system of overall population management does not address localized depletions of sea ducks in small geographic areas or specific bays. Each area has unique characteristics and human demography that is not taken into consideration.

Guided hunts with need of guaranteed results from monetary incentive have the potential to systematically remove resident species for trophy collections. Once removed it appears to take decades, if ever, to grow back. More birds are killed than are needed to provide for these collectors. The crippling rate, estimated at 60 percent, is excessive and not condoned in other species. This is not acceptable for a non-food based hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Nancy Hillstrand

(SC-05S-G-043)

PROPOSAL 113 - 5 AAC 92.100. Unlawful methods of hunting waterfowl, snipe, and cranes.

Amend the regulation as follows:

Boats must be beached; no movement of boats while hunters are shooting from shore.

ISSUE: Herding of sea ducks with boat while hunters are on shore.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Localized depletions.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Nancy Hillstrand (SC-05S-G-042)

PROPOSAL 114 - 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Amend this

regulation to provide the following:

Manage goldeneyes by species as a sea duck—barrows or common.

ISSUE: Goldeneye are not separated into species—barrows and common. They are a sea duck with unique behaviors of strong site fidelity.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Some bays hold barrows, some hold commons; localized depletions. Goldeneyes are down in surveys.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Nancy Hillstrand (SC-05S-G-045)

PROPOSAL 115 - 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Amend this regulation in Unit 13 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits General Hunts) (3)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and Open Season	Nonresident
Ptarmigan (rock, willow, and white-tailed) ...		
Units 6(D), 7, 11, and [13] 14 – 16	Aug. 10 – Mar. 31	Aug. 10 – Mar. 31
10 per day, 20 in possession		
<u>Unit 13</u>		
<u>10 per day, 20 in possession</u>	<u>Aug. 10 – Nov. 30</u>	<u>Aug. 10 - Nov. 30</u>
<u>5 per day, 10 in possession however, a season may be announced during which the bag limit is more than 5 per day, 10 in possession</u>	<u>Dec. 1 – Mar. 31</u>	<u>Dec. 1 – Mar. 31</u>

ISSUE: Ptarmigan populations exhibit large fluctuations in abundance but do not always follow a classic seven to ten year cycle. Various biotic and abiotic factors influence chick production and overwinter survival resulting in rapid and substantial population declines. However, if environmental conditions are favorable, these bird species can respond quickly and become plentiful for a few years.

Harvest impacts ptarmigan 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 limit in highly accessible areas that experience heavy winter harvest. During population lows, it would be beneficial to have a low bag limit to reduce the additive component of harvest. During population highs, bag limits should reflect the increased availability of birds.

Ptarmigan and grouse hunting popularity has increased during the past ten years and there is evidence that hunting in the more accessible areas needs to be managed closely. Managing ptarmigan 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. 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.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Hunters will have more opportunity in years where the population is high.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Ptarmigan hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Snowmachine hunters who take high numbers of birds annually regardless of population status.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? In- or pre-season changes by emergency order, or closing the season early by emergency order during population lows.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05S-G-088)

PROPOSAL 116 - 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Authorize migratory bird hunting in GMU 13 as follows:

Permit shooting 25 geese or ducks per household unit or family.

ISSUE: Permission for migratory bird hunting for geese and ducks.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Perhaps illegal hunting of ducks, etc.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, but there is plenty of ducks and geese.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All who are interested in eating ducks. I grew up on this and would like to see it opened in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Fritz Geffe (HQ-05S-G-003)

PROPOSAL 117 - 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Prohibit hunting for ptarmigan in GMU 15C as follows:

In Unit 15C, the area bounded by the Anchor River (south fork), Beaver Creek, Beaver Creek Flats, and Fritz Creek (east fork) on the north and the Sterling Highway and East End Road to the south to be closed to the hunting of ptarmigan (for up to five years) to enable the recovery of ptarmigan numbers in this area, and advertised and clearly stated in the regulations so the public is aware. I believe an outright hunting closure for a few years to see how the recovery progresses would be best, and then implement a limited hunt, based on recovery observations, until the numbers recover sufficiently. My sense is, that because of increased human population and hunting demand, in order to protect the flocks, a generous bag limit may not be reasonable again. But, that has to be determined as we see how the recovery occurs.

ISSUE: In the 24 years that I have lived in the Homer area I have personally seen a dramatic decline in the ptarmigan numbers. Historically, because of the rich blueberry growth in the hills above Homer, ptarmigan would come in, in the fall to feed. The homesteaders have described to me how the skies turned white with huge flocks of ptarmigan in the fall. That has not occurred in many years. In the winter, especially those years of heavy snow, the birds come down from the higher elevations to feed among the willow along the Homer bench. But, not recently. In addition, the newer model snow machines are so powerful, so fast, that these birds of limited flight ability can no longer escape a determined hunter. Bag limits have remained very generous in spite of increased hunting pressure and dwindling stock.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If current bag limits continue, I believe we will see a total elimination of ptarmigan in the greater Homer/Caribou Hills area very soon. Certainly if this issue is not addressed, we are faced with a total loss of these native game birds in this area. Because of illegal releases we are seeing an increase in pheasant in this area. They are not native, they do not belong here. The ptarmigan does.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It is my desire to see a return of sustainable numbers of ptarmigan, both for the hunting of this wonderful game bird, and viewing. The latter is a growing interest, and could easily be tied in to the Shore Bird Festival or local summer birding activities, if we have the numbers. I see this as a local economic opportunity, both for hunting and viewing. Everything we can do to improve the attractiveness of this area will result in more jobs and opportunities for our citizens.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Certainly the local hunters, hunters statewide who have enjoyed hunting these birds for so many years. In addition, local residents and tourists. Many of us enjoyed viewing these birds, as they fed among the willow, hearing their calls, or in the fall as they flush from the rich blueberry patches.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I believe it is the greater community who suffers. As stated above, these game birds have provided hunting opportunities and are treasured in many local

kitchens. And I see an economic niche for bird viewing that has not as yet been tapped, for lack of birds.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1. Do nothing. Birds will continue their decline until none are left in the area. 2. Lower the bag limit. This was done some years ago, and has only aided the steep decline in numbers.

PROPOSED BY: Mildred "Milli" Martin (HQ-05S-G-037)

PROPOSAL 118 - 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Prohibit hunting of sandhill cranes in GMU 15C as follows:

Since there has been no monitoring of the local crane population nor any available harvest data, there is no justification for a crane season with an arbitrary bag and possession limit. Thus, the hunting of sandhill cranes in GMU 15C south of 60° N latitude, which lies just south of Ninilchik, should be prohibited. Closing the crane season here also is warranted due to the increased mortality caused by Homer's escalating bald eagle predation on cranes as well as increasing losses of cranes, especially colts, because of more roaming dogs.

ISSUE: Based on personal observations and anecdotal reports, the overall sandhill crane population in the Kachemak Bay area was markedly lower last summer than the previous five years for which some records were kept. During summer 2003 many more cranes were seen at certain locations compared to this past summer. At one site below Waterman Canyon, where counts as high as 110 were noted the previous summer, few were noted this year. At one hayfield near East End Road only 30-40 birds were sometimes present compared to often more than 100 last year. Almost daily observations were made of open fields along the western portions of East End Road and the eastern end of Skyline Drive, but the large flocks seen in past years were absent.

To observe sandhill cranes in other areas around Homer, a slow, low-flying surveillance aircraft was chartered on July 27. Only 46 cranes were noted during two hours of flying between the Fox River Flats and North Fork Road. A replicate aerial survey with a different aircraft flown on August 14 revealed only 33 sandhill cranes. Flocks seen in cut fields generally represent non-breeders or failed breeders. It is difficult to see cranes with colts (chicks) since they usually stay in territories near cover. Unfortunately since no known prior crane surveys of the Homer area have been flown by either the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, no comparisons with previous crane numbers are possible.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Cranes that spend summers in the Homer area likely will continue to decline and like willow ptarmigan, hoary marmots, and certain other species eventually probably will virtually disappear.

I believe there are four main reasons for the evidently diminishing crane population in this region.

1. Because of extensive winter-feeding of eagles in more neighborhoods and mainly on the Homer Spit (500 pounds per day) the local bald eagle population has burgeoned with counts up to 650. Eagles harass and prey on cranes. This summer bald eagles were witnessed attacking and

killing four adult sandhill cranes in flight at different locations. According to the International Crane Foundation, eagles are major predators on cranes and often disrupt migration.

2. Loose dogs often kill colts and injure defending adults. Since summer 2000, dogs reportedly have killed at least ten sandhill cranes. Regrettably no animal control ordinances exist in the Kenai Peninsula Borough, except inside city limits.
3. As more fields are being subdivided, crane feeding and nesting habitat is being lost.
4. Another mortality factor is hunting, which is difficult to assess with no local harvest or baseline population data available. Once sandhills migrate out of Alaska, they are safe from legal hunting. British Columbia, Washington, Oregon, and California, where Kachemak Bay's cranes presumably winter, do not permit crane hunting. Population and harvest data are needed to justify continued hunting of the small subpopulation in the Homer area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, any means of reducing summer resident crane mortality in the Kachemak Bay region enhances the dwindling crane population, which the vast majority of residents and tourists enjoy watching along East End Road, Diamond Ridge, Skyline Drive, and other areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The large majority of Homer area people who enjoy observing, hearing, and photographing cranes. Cranes are among the most revered birds because of their unique social behavior.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The relatively few hunters in the Homer area who shoot local cranes.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Reduce bag/possession limit to one crane, but the Homer area breeding population appears so precariously low that any hunting mortality is ill-advised without first ascertaining the local crane population and obtaining harvest data. Neither ADF&G nor USFWS biologists have any plans to survey cranes in the Kachemak Bay area mainly due to lack of funds.

PROPOSED BY: Edgar Bailey (SC-05S-G-017)

PROPOSAL 119 - 5 AAC 92.125. Wolf predation control implementation plan. Authorize aerial wolf hunting in GMU 9B as follows:

Residents are permitted to shoot wolves from aircraft, or on foot. Radios will be allowed to be used between aircraft and ground personnel.

ISSUE: Wolves depleting the moose and caribou population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be little to no moose left for subsistence use.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? With less wolves, the moose population would be able to recover.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The people who depend on moose for their subsistence and those who would use the wolf pelts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Landing and shooting: Too hard to land near, get out and shoot. Trapping only; too hard to trap and would not be effective. Do nothing; this would only allow the problem to continue.

PROPOSED BY: James Walsh (HQ-05S-G-001)

PROPOSAL 120 - 5 AAC 92.125. Wolf predation control implementation plan. Create a wolf predation control implementation plan as follows:

Create a predator control plan for portions of GMU 9E and the Naknek drainage in GMU 9C.

ISSUE: The Northern Alaska Peninsula Caribou Herd (NAPCH) has been in decline since 1990. This proposal would prevent further decline of this herd by implementing a predator control program as soon as possible.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The NAPCH will continue to decline in population size.

The best available estimate by the department indicates the current number of this herd may be as low as 4,000 animals. This is a sharp decline from the 6,600 animals estimated in the year 2002. These are small numbers of animals compared to the peak population of this herd of about 20,000 animals in the late 1980s. The NAPCH is below the population objective identified for the herd under the intensive management regulation 5 AAC 92.108 of 12,000 – 15,000 caribou established by the board. The declining trend of the population is very alarming.

Creation of a predator control implementation plan in GMU 9E and the Naknek drainage in GMU 9C as soon as possible will increase calf and cow survival and prevent a further decline in the overall herd population caused by wolves. This is necessary for the NAPCH population to reach the department's current management objective. With the low calf survival rate, coupled with natural mortality and predation of adult caribou, the population continues to sharply decline.

The NAPCH has been in Tier II status since 1999. Nonresident hunting has been banned since then. In 1999, a high of 600 state Tier II permits and 60 federal subsistence hunting permits were issued. The numbers of both state and federal permits issued have continued to decline along with the annual drop in NAPCH population. In 2004, only 100 Tier II permits and ten federal subsistence hunting permits were issued. Some communities in GMU 9E received no Tier II permits in 2004 and few federal permits. The harvest numbers are well below the harvest objectives under intensive management. Discontinuing nonresident hunting and limiting resident hunting have neither reduced the high cow and calf mortality rates nor increased the population size of this herd.

A 1999 the department report to the board suggested that much of the decline in the NAPCH may have been a result of habitat degradation due to overgrazing in the winter range, and advised against implementing any predator control methods at that time. The report also cited the cyclical nature of caribou populations. However, at that time the department's population estimate of the herd was 9,200. There were enough animals to wait and see what the longer term population trends were going to be and what effects reduced human harvests would have on the population.

The Bristol Bay Native Association agrees that poor habitat and grazing areas may be factors in the continuing population decline of the herd, but they are not the sole factors. Predation by wolves is also a factor. Theoretically, restrictions and limits on hunting mitigate mortality of the herd caused by humans, and the continuing decrease in the herd population mitigate further degradation of the habitat and grazing areas. However, even with these mitigating measures, the population has continued to decline. Predation by wolves is an unmitigated factor. Disease, low calf weights, and low female pregnancy rates are clear indications of poor range conditions. Thus, weaker and smaller animals are easy prey and more susceptible to wolf predation. Additional measures are needed to prevent the further decline of this herd. Mitigation measures to discontinue and severely limit human harvests have occurred. The poor habitat and grazing range are mitigated by fewer animals. Yet wolf predation continues unmitigated. At current population levels, high overwintering mortality may cause the population to fall below the minimum size needed for future growth.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by decreasing the mortality of calves and cows, and increasing the NAPCH population size.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The residents of Alaska and residents in GMU 9E and GMU 9C who depend upon the NAPCH.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The "Intensive Management Options for the NAPCH" document lists other options, such as artificial range enhancements and vaccines to reduce parasites and disease. These methods are not proven and are not practical, and would be expensive and strictly experimental.

Further hunt restrictions will not be effective to prevent a further decline of the herd since the hunt currently only targets bulls, which are above the management objectives and requirements for potential population growth.

PROPOSED BY: Bristol Bay Native Association (HQ-05S-G-014)

PROPOSAL 121 - 5 AAC 92.125. Wolf Predation Control Implementation Plan. Amend the predation control plan to halt all aerial and same-day airborne predation in GMUs 13A, B, & E until:

1. The programs meet the standards and recommendations of the NRC study.
2. The programs receive broad public support.
3. The programs are proven to be economically feasible for Alaskans.

ISSUE: In 1995, the State of Alaska commissioned the National Research Council (NRC) to prepare a study of Alaska's previous predator control programs, and develop standards and recommendations for future programs. The State paid \$318,000 for this study. The results were published in 1997 and entitled, Wolves, Bears and Their Prey in Alaska. The study incorporated scientific, sociologic and economic information on predator control from expert scientists inside and outside of Alaska. According to the study, important standards and recommendations should be met prior to, during and after implementation of predation control programs in Alaska.

In 2002, the State of Alaska reinstated aerial and same-day airborne wolf killing, overturning a public ban of the practice through two statewide referenda. Today, predation control programs have been approved by the board for seven areas encompassing tens of thousands of square miles of Alaska. Up to 580 wolves are currently being targeted by aerial or same-day airborne teams.

According to a recent paper by Dr. Vic VanBallenberghe, entitled, Biological Standards and Guidelines for Predator Control in Alaska: Application of the National Research Council's Recommendations, dated November 16, 2004, a vast majority of the NRC recommendations and standards for these programs have not been met. As a result, Dr. VanBallenberghe and others believe the control programs as proposed will provide unexplainable or unclear results at best, wasted effort and failed response on the part of ungulate populations at worst.

In the past year, the department advised against predator control in one area, and made no recommendation for two others because they lacked key data necessary to justify the predator control program. Regardless, the board approved these programs.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? According to scientists, the track record of managing both eruptions and declines of key wildlife populations in Alaska is weak. Without appropriate safeguards to the design of predator control programs, the negative, long-term consequences may well outweigh any short-term increases in ungulate numbers that might be achieved.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal addresses improving and/or maintaining the quality of Alaska's natural and healthy ecosystems by recognizing the important role predators like wolves and bears play in maintaining healthy populations of ungulates. Science has proven repeatedly that long-term damage to ecosystems occurs when they are manipulated for the benefit of a single species.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska's healthy ecosystems, in addition to all people who appreciate and respect Alaska's wildlife.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None at this time.

PROPOSED BY: Defenders of Wildlife

(SC-05S-G-048)

PROPOSAL 122 - 5 AAC 92.125. Wolf Predation Control Implementation Plan.

Include a wolf control program in Unit 13C with the same stipulations as for Units 13A and 13B.

ISSUE: Subunit 13C to include a wolf control program.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continuing decrease in the moose and caribou program.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it would help the moose and caribou population to increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? No one.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Copper Basin AC

(SC-05S-G-013)

PROPOSAL 123 - 5 AAC 92.125 Wolf Predation Control Implementation Plan. Establish wolf predation control plan in GMU 13C as follows:

Include GMU 13C in the aerial wolf control plan already in place in areas of GMU 13.

ISSUE: We would like to see the number of wolves reduced in GMU 13C, expanding the existing aerial wolf control area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The numbers of moose and caribou will continue to decline.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Moose and caribou numbers in GMU 13 would increase if a predator control program were implemented.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence users of the moose and caribou resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? This is the only viable solution to the continuing decline in ungulate populations. Liberal season and bag limits for predators are already in place and not having an effect on populations.

PROPOSED BY: Tok Cutoff-Nabesna Road AC

(SC-05S-G-018)

PROPOSAL 124 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose; 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful means of taking big game; exceptions; 5 AAC 92.108. Identified big game prey populations and objectives; and 5 AAC 92.125. Wolf Predation Control Implementation Plan.

Shorten the moose season for moose in GMUs 14A, 14B and 16A; create predator control plan; establish intensive management; allow use of snow machines and land and shoot to take wolves, as follows:

Remove the last five days of September (close it on Sept. 25 instead of Sept. 30) and enact a predator control implementation plan and intensive management strategies to include the use of snow machines to pursue wolves, and land and shoot for wolves.

ISSUE: Predators have hurt ungulate populations, especially moose. GMUs 14B and 16A moose populations are well below objectives, and the bull/cow ratio in GMU 14A is barely above the minimum. Many Alaskans who count on moose as a wild meat resource are having a hard time obtaining it.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose numbers will stay low and hunters will transfer hunting pressure elsewhere around the state.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Shortening the moose season and increasing the harvest of predators, will increase the survivability of moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters and all outdoor persons who enjoy seeing ungulates as well as bear and wolves.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who oppose intensive management to provide abundant wildlife of all species.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley AC

(SC-05S-G-028)

PROPOSAL 125 - 5 AAC 92.125. Wolf Predation Control Implementation Plan. Create a wolf control plan in GMU 15 as follows:

Allow the taking of up to 100 wolves off the peninsula. A wolf bounty might be appropriate since the hides are worthless.

ISSUE: Too many wolves on the Kenai Peninsula. There is no value in the flea bitten hides so no one is trapping or hunting them. They are ravaging the moose population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Adult moose and calves will be killed in ever increasing numbers. Wolves are killing moose and leaving them lay.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who wants a stable moose population

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who believe that game management should be left to mother nature.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Central Peninsula AC (SC-05S-G-010)

PROPOSAL 126 - 5 AAC 92.125. Wolf Predation Control Implementation Plan; and 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Modify these regulations as follows:

Add all of GMU 17 to the areas identified by the board for active management of predator populations. Or, lift the chase/pursue clause from the methods and means in Unit 17 for hunting wolves. “Not take game from a motorized vehicle except in GMU 17... provided that a snowmachine or boat may be used to take wolves provided that the snowmachine is not moving or the boat motor has been idled down or turned off.”

ISSUE: With my 13 years of guiding experience in the area, I can say that wolf populations are increasing throughout GMU 17. The customary area practice of hunting wolves is to use snowmachines to chase and catch up to wolves close enough to try a shot. This practice is not legal under current law. Yet I have never heard of a person being prosecuted. As a guide I cannot risk committing an intentional violation and therefore I cannot take clients on this type of hunt. GMU 17 wolf regulations should be the same as GMU 18 and 19 “where snowmachines may be used to take wolves” ... provided animals are not shot from a moving snowmachine. I would also recommend the same allowance be made to include “and from a motorized boat provided the engine has been turned off or idled down.”

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Locals will continue to hunt however. The wolves will increase. The moose and caribou populations will eventually suffer higher losses. I lose the opportunity to make money and provide an enjoyable hunt, and the state continues to lose an effective and uncontroversial method to control wolves. The state will continue to fight for or against airborne control/hunting when other options exist that make money for everyone instead of costing everyone money.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Moose and caribou would be in better shape physically and population wise with a controlled wolf population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All persons that hunt wolves will have a legal method to realistically pursue wolves. All persons that eat moose and caribou from the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some might say trappers but they too would benefit.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Eliminate nonresident tag fee. Would help some for fall hunts but my clients seem to think \$30 is reasonable enough to take a poor gamble at a slim possible chance. Open the season earlier/longer. Would have little effect and the hides would not be as good.

PROPOSED BY: Don Duncan (I-05S-G-007)

PROPOSAL 127 - This proposal has been omitted from this proposal book, as the material originally submitted to the Board of Game is an Agenda Change Request, rather than a proposal. The board's process for addressing Agenda Change Requests can be found in 5 AAC 92.005.

(This space is intentionally left blank.)

PROPOSAL 128 - This proposal has been omitted from this proposal book, as the material originally submitted to the Board of Game is an Agenda Change Request, rather than a proposal. The board's process for addressing Agenda Change Requests can be found in 5 AAC 92.005.

(This space is intentionally left blank.)

(This space is intentionally left blank.)

PROPOSAL 129 - 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting, 5 AAC 92.550. Areas closed to trapping, and 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled Use Areas. The Board of Game will be reviewing and potentially eliminating or modifying all areas in Region II, Southcentral, currently closed to hunting and trapping, and all controlled use areas.

5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting. (a) The following areas are closed to hunting as specified:

...

(7) Unit 6

(A) the **Goat Mountain Goat Observation Area**, which consists of that portion of Unit 6 bounded on the north by Miles Lake and Miles Glacier, on the south and east by Pleasant Valley River and Pleasant Glacier, and on the west by the Copper River, is closed to the taking of mountain goat;

(B) the **Heney Range Goat Observation Area**, which consists of that portion of Unit 6(C) south of the Copper River Highway and west of the Eyak River, is closed to the taking of mountain goat;

(8) Unit 7

(A) the **Portage Glacier Closed Area** in Unit 7, which consists of Portage Creek drainages between the Anchorage-Seward Railroad and Placer Creek in Bear Valley, Portage Lake, the mouth of Byron Creek, Glacier Creek and Byron Glacier, is closed to hunting; however, migratory birds and small game may be hunted with shotguns after September 1;

(B) the **Seward Closed Area** in Unit 7, which consists of the south side drainage of the Resurrection River downstream from the Kenai Fjords National Park's eastern boundary, and Resurrection Bay drainages between the mouth of the Resurrection River and the mouth of Lowell Creek, are closed to the taking of big game, except black bear;

(C) the **Cooper Landing Closed Area**, which consists of that portion of Unit 7 bounded by Juneau Creek, beginning at its confluence with the Kenai River, then upstream to the confluence of Juneau Creek and Falls Creek, then easterly along Falls Creek and the north fork of Falls Creek and over the connecting saddle to Devils Creek, then southeasterly along Devils Creek to its confluence with Quartz Creek, then southwesterly along Quartz Creek to the Sterling Highway, then westerly along the Sterling Highway to the Kenai River, and then westerly along the Kenai River to the point of beginning at the mouth of Juneau Creek, is closed to the taking of Dall sheep and mountain goat;

(D) the **Resurrection Creek Closed Area**, which consists of the drainage of Resurrection Creek downstream from Rimrock and Highland Creeks, including Palmer Creek, is closed to the taking of moose; *(The department intends to recommend amending this proposal to eliminate or decrease the size of this closed area.)*

(E) the **Russian River Closed Area**, which consists of the area within 150 yards from each side of, and including, the Russian River, from the outlet of Lower Russian Lake downstream to the confluence of the Russian River and Kenai River are closed to hunting during June and July;

(9) **Unit 9**

(A) in Unit 9, the **McNeil River State Game Sanctuary** and contiguous tidelands are closed to hunting and trapping; access to the sanctuary is by permit only under 5 AAC 92.065;

(B) repealed 7/1/2003;

(C) that portion of **Unit 9 extending south and east of McNeil River State Game Sanctuary** to the boundary of Katmai National Park and Preserve, and including any state land within the boundaries of Katmai National Park and Preserve, is closed to brown bear hunting;

(10) **Unit 10**

(A) **Unit 10, except Unimak Island**, is closed to the taking of Canada Geese; and *(The department intends to recommend amending this proposal to eliminate this closed area, as this closure is addressed under seasons and bag limits.)*

(B) **Otter Island in the Pribilof Islands** is closed to hunting; *(The department intends to recommend amending this proposal to eliminate this closed area.)*

(11) **Unit 13**

(A) the **Paxson Closed Area** in Unit 13(B), which consists of the eastern drainage of the Gulkana River lying west of the Richardson Highway and the western drainage of the Gulkana River between the Denali Highway and the north end of Paxson Lake where the Gulkana River enters Paxson Lake, is closed to the taking of big game;

(B) the **Sheep Mountain Closed Area** which lies along the Glenn Highway in Unit 13(A) and is bounded by a line from Caribou Creek, Milepost 107 Glenn Highway, then easterly along the Glenn Highway to Milepost 123, then north to Squaw Creek, then

downstream to Caribou Creek, then down Caribou Creek to the point of beginning, is closed to the taking of mountain goat and Dall sheep;

(12) **Unit 15**

(A) the **Moose River Closed Area** near Sterling in Unit 15(A), which consists of the area on and within one-quarter mile of the Moose River between the Kenai National Moose Range boundary and the Sterling Highway, is closed to the taking of waterfowl;

(B) the **Kenai Moose Research Center Closed Area** in Unit 15(A), which consists of that area within the outer boundary fences of the Kenai Moose Research Center, located west and south of Coyote and Vixen Lakes is closed to hunting;

(C) the **Russian River Closed Area**, which consists of the area within 150 yards from each side of, and including, the Russian River from the outlet of Lower Russian Lake downstream to the confluence of the Russian River and Kenai River are closed to hunting during June and July;

(13) **Unit 17**: all islands and adjacent waters within one-half mile of each island in the **Walrus Islands State Game Sanctuary**, as described in AS 16.20.092, except for those islands known as the Twins and their adjacent waters are closed to hunting; however, hunting may occur on Round Island and its adjacent waters from September 10 - October 20;

5 AAC 92.540 Controlled Use Areas. In the following areas, access for hunting is controlled as specified:

...

(2) **Unit 9**

(A) the **Naknek Controlled Use Area**:

(i) the area consists of that portion of Unit 9(C) within the Naknek River drainage upstream from and including the King Salmon Creek drainage;

(ii) the area is closed to the use of any motorized vehicle except an aircraft, boat, or snowmachine for hunting, including the transportation of hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of game, from August 1 through November 30; however, this provision does not apply to a motorized vehicle on the Naknek-King Salmon, Lake Camp, and Rapids Camp roads, and on the Pike Ridge and King Salmon Creek trails, and on frozen surfaces of the Naknek River and Big Creek;

(B) the **Izembek Controlled Use Area**:

(i) the area consists of that portion of Izembek National Wildlife Refuge (NWR), commonly known as the Left Hand Valley and Right Hand Valley, bounded on the west by a line beginning at Moffet Point and continuing easterly and southerly around Moffet Lagoon along the mean high tide line to Blaine Point (locally known as Strawberry Point), then southerly along a line to the northern shore of Kinzarof Lagoon, continuing easterly and southerly around Kinzarof Lagoon along the mean high tide line to a point on the eastern entrance of Kinzarof Lagoon; bounded to the south, east, and north by the Izembek NWR boundary;

(ii) the area is closed to the use of any motorized vehicle, except outboard motor-powered boats, for hunting, including the transportation of hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of game;

(C) The **Bristol Bay Controlled Use Area:**

(i) the area consists of all drainages in Unit 9(E) south of Cape Menshikof draining into Bristol Bay

(ii) the area is closed during May, June and July to the use of airboats, for hunting bear, including the transportation of bear hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of bear;

(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, 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;

(ii) the area is closed to the use of any motorized vehicle or pack animal for big game hunting, including the transportation of big game hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of big game from August 5 through August 25; however, this provision does not prohibit motorized access, or transportation of game, on the Richardson Highway, or the use of aircraft to and from the Charlie Boyd airstrip (63 29' 30" N. lat., 144 50' 45" W. long.) along the Johnson River;

(B) the **Sourdough Controlled Use Area:**

(i) the area consists of that portion of Unit 13(B) bounded by a line beginning at the confluence of Sourdough Creek and the Gulkana River, then northerly along Sourdough Creek to approximately mile 148 of the Richardson Highway, then northerly along the Richardson Highway to the Middle Fork Trail at approximately mile 170 of the Richardson Highway, then westerly along the trail to the Gulkana River, then southerly along the east bank of the Gulkana River to its confluence with Sourdough Creek, the point of beginning;

(ii) the area is closed to the use of any motorized vehicle for hunting, including the transportation of hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of game; however, this provision does not prohibit motorized access, or transportation of game, on the Richardson Highway, Sourdough and Haggard Creeks, Middle Fork, and Haggard Creek trails, or other trails designated by the department;

(C) the **Clearwater Creek Controlled Use Area:**

(i) the area consists of that portion of Unit 13(B) north of the Denali Highway, west of and including the MacLaren River drainage, east of and including the eastern bank drainages of the Middle Fork of the Susitna River downstream from and including the Susitna Glacier, and the eastern bank drainages of the Susitna River downstream from its confluence with the Middle Fork;

(ii) the area is closed to the use of any motorized vehicle for hunting, including the transportation of hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of game, except for brown/grizzly bears, wolves, and small game from March 15 through April 30; however, this provision does not prohibit motorized access, or transportation of game, on the Denali Highway;

(D) the **Tonsina Controlled Use Area:**

(i) the area consists of that portion of Unit 13(D) bounded on the west by the Richardson Highway from the Tiekkel River to the Tonsina River at Tonsina, on the north along the south bank of the Tonsina River to where the Edgerton Highway crosses the Tonsina River, then along the Edgerton Highway to Chitina, on the east by the Copper River from Chitina to the Tiekkel River, and on the south by the north bank of the Tiekkel River;

(ii) the area is closed to the use of any motorized vehicle or pack animal for hunting, including the transportation of hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of game, from July 26 through September 30;

...

(4) **Unit 15**

(A) the **Kenai Controlled Use Area:**

(i) the area consists of that portion of Unit 15(A) north of the Sterling Highway;

(ii) the area is closed to use of aircraft for hunting moose, including the transportation of a moose hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of moose; however, this provision does not apply after 12:01 a.m., September 11, and does not apply to the transportation of a moose hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of moose by aircraft to or from a publicly owned airport;

(B) the **Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area:**

(i) the area consists of Unit 15(C);

(ii) the area is closed to the use of any motorized vehicle except an aircraft or boat for moose hunting, including the transportation of moose hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of moose from September 11 through September 14 and September 17 through September 20; however, this provision does not apply to the use of a motorized vehicle on a highway maintained by the state or borough or on the gravel portions of Oilwell and Brody Roads;

(iii) during the periods specified in (ii) of this subparagraph, a hunter who travels by motorized vehicle on the Unit 15(C) highway system and then leaves and travels off that highway system in that motorized vehicle may not hunt moose, including transporting moose hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of moose, or in any other manner initiate or participate in moose hunting activities, until after the hunter returns the motorized vehicle to the Unit 15(C) highway system; upon returning the motorized vehicle to that highway system, the hunter may initiate or participate in legal moose hunting activities so long as the hunter leaves the motorized vehicle on the Unit 15(C) highway system; *(The department intends to recommend amending this proposal to clarify use of highway vehicles on private roads)*

(5) **Unit 17**

(A) the **Upper Mulchatna Controlled Use Area:**

- (i) the area consists of Unit 17(B);
- (ii) the area is closed to the use of any motorized vehicle for hunting big game, including the transportation of big game hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of big game from August 1 through November 1, except that the use of an aircraft or a boat is not prohibited, and a motorized vehicle in a legally permitted hunting camp is not prohibited;

5 AAC 92.550. Areas closed to trapping. The following areas are closed to the trapping of furbearers as indicated:

...

(2) **Unit 9:** the drainages of McNeil River, Mikfik Creek and all other drainages into McNeil Cove which extends from Akjemguiga Cove on the north to McNeil Head on the south, located at the head of Kamishak Bay, in the lower Cook Inlet are closed to trapping; access to the McNeil River State Game Sanctuary is by permit only;

(3) **Unit 14(C) (Anchorage Area):**

(A) the drainages into Eklutna River and Eklutna Lake, within Chugach State Park except Thunderbird Creek and those drainages flowing into the East Fork of the Eklutna River upstream from the bridge above the lake;

(B) the Eagle River Management Area;

(C) that portion of Chugach State Park outside of the Eagle River, Anchorage, and Eklutna Management areas is open to trapping under Unit 14(C) seasons and bag limits, except no trapping of wolf, wolverine, land otter, or beaver is allowed;

(D) all land and water within the Anchorage Management Area as described in 5 AAC 92.530 (3);

(E) in the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge in Unit 14(C), described in AS 16.20.031 : all land and water south and west of and adjacent to the toe of the bluff that extends from Point Woronzof southeasterly to Potter Creek;

(F) the Fort Richardson Management Area, except for beaver, muskrat, mink, weasel, and coyote on Fort Richardson, and except for beaver and coyote on Elmendorf Air Force Base;

(4) **Unit 15:**

(A) within the city limits of Homer (Unit 15) as those limits existed in November 1987;

(B) the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area, consisting of that portion of Unit 15(A) bounded by a line beginning at the easternmost junction of the Sterling Highway and the Skilak Loop Road (milepost 58.0), then due south to the south bank of the Kenai River, then southerly along the south bank of the Kenai River to its confluence with Skilak Lake, then westerly along the north shore of Skilak Lake to Lower Skilak Lake Campground, then northerly along the Lower Skilak Lake Campground Road and the Skilak Loop Road to its westernmost junction with the Sterling Highway, then easterly along the Sterling Highway to the point of beginning; *(The department intends to recommend amending this proposal to eliminate this closed area, the closure to trapping is contained within the management area description.)*

(C) that portion of Unit 15(B) east of the Kenai River, Skilak Lake, Skilak River, and Skilak Glacier is closed to the trapping of marten; (*The department intends to recommend amending this proposal to eliminate this closed area.*)

(D) the Kenai Moose Research Center Closed Area in Unit 15(A), which consists of that area within the outer boundary fences of the Kenai Moose Research Center, located west and south of Coyote and Vixen Lakes is closed to trapping;

(5) **Unit 17:** all islands within the Walrus Islands State Game Sanctuary as described in AS **16.20.092** [16.05.110] are closed to trapping;

ISSUE: The Board of Game has requested review of the history, and discussion concerning, the continuing need for all closed areas and controlled use areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? All areas will remain unchanged.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who wish to hunt or trap in the closed areas, or use motorized access in the controlled use areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who wish the areas to remain closed.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game at the request of the board.

(HQ-05S-G-086)

PROPOSAL 130 - 5 AAC 92.530(18). Management areas. Clarify the definition of firearms allowed for hunting in the Palmer – Wasilla Management Area as follows:

...

(B) the area is closed to hunting except that

- (i) big game may be taken by **muzzleloading** black-powder firearm, shotguns with slugs, and bow and arrow only;
- (ii) small game and fur animals may be taken by **muzzleloading** black-powder firearm, shotgun, air rifle, falconry, or bow and arrow only;
- (iii) waterfowl on Finger Lake may be taken by falconry, and bow and flu-flu arrow only;

ISSUE: The current definition of firearms allowed in regulation was intended to limit hunters to “short-range” firearms to reduce the potential for problems with the discharge of firearms in the higher density housing and developed areas of the greater Palmer - Wasilla area. Under the current definition of firearms allowed for hunting big game and small game in the Palmer – Wasilla Management Area, any modern firearms that use black-powder cartridges are legal to hunt with. Some of these firearm calibers, such as the GOV .45-70, are available in smokeless

and black-powder cartridges making it difficult to enforce and consequently a potential problem with the use of modern cartridge ammunition with higher velocities and longer range potential.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The current regulation will allow for the use of cartridge ammunition in firearms capable of using both black-powder and smokeless cartridge ammunition. This will continue to be difficult to enforce and provide an opportunity for some individuals to circumvent the current regulation and use modern cartridge ammunition in the Palmer – Wasilla Management Area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, there will be less chance of having higher velocity modern rifle ammunition used for hunting in the Palmer – Wasilla Management Area, thereby reducing the potential for problems with the use of high velocity rifle ammunition in congested areas around Palmer and Wasilla.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents of the Palmer and Wasilla area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who want to hunt in the Palmer-Wasilla Management Area with rifles that use black-powder cartridge ammunition.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05S-G-089)

PROPOSAL 131 - 5 AAC 92.530. Management Areas. Modify the Skilak Loop Management Area as follows:

Skilak Loop Management Area open for the taking of small game and fur animals from Oct. 1 to March 1 by firearms. No firearm discharge within 1/4 mile of any campground.

ISSUE: No hunting of small game and fur animals in the Skilak Loop Management Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued denial of an outdoor activity enjoyed by many. Loss of an outstanding small game hunting area.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those people who enjoy hunting small game and fur bearers during the long winter months.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, as nobody visits this area in the winter.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Richard A. Link

(HQ-05S-G-030)

PROPOSAL 132 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled Use Areas. Create exception to allow motorized vehicles in the Clearwater Creek CUA as follows:

ORVs (ATV, snowmachine, motorized boats or airboats) may be used in the Clearwater Creek CUA for wolf and bear hunting whenever the season for wolf and/or bear is open.

ISSUE: Season for use of ORVs in the Clearwater Creek CUA. Closing the spring season on April 30 prevents on-snow hunting which, at the elevation of the area, could continue until June. More predators could be harvested if the seasonal use by ORVs were extended. For the rest of the hunting season, ORV use should be considered in the Clearwater Creek CUA for wolf and bear hunting only. Even allowing motorized boats on the MacLaren River would help.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Especially brown/grizzly bear harvests will continue to be low and moose calf survival will be very low in the Clearwater Creek CUA.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Although wolves and bears would be harvested, moose calf survival would improve to help the overall population grow toward the unit's population objectives.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans who want to harvest and/or see moose on excellent moose habitat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one would suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Extended seasons, corridor opening such as trails and rivers. Rejected because it would not be as effective as just opening for the subject species.

PROPOSED BY: Interior Airboaters Association

(I-05S-G-004)

PROPOSAL 133 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled Use Areas. Restrict motorized vehicle use for moose hunting in GMU 6B as follows:

Unit 6B, moose may not be taken until after 3:00 a.m. following the day on which any motorized transportation is used with the exception of highway vehicles on the maintained surface of the Copper River Highway, Carbon Mountain road, and clear creek boat launch. Motorized vehicles may begin to transport hunters and their gear beginning September 4.

ISSUE: The nonmotorized season begins in Unit 6B September 1, the motorized season begins September 5 - October 31. This management area has been one of continuous debate due to the nature and terrain of the hunt. In 1995-96, the board, at the request of both department personnel and the advisory committee, disallowed same day airboating. There was a concern at the level of

control for rate of harvest. Since then some have started using jet boats to access the area to hunt. This gives a significant advantage to one segment of the users.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Airboat and fixed wing hunters will continue to be disadvantaged.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Airboat and fixed wing hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who wish to hunt the same day with a jet boat and return to town.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo. The majority of the advisory committee felt putting the same restrictions on all who hunt using motorized vehicles should be consistent. This change will lead to more equal hunting opportunity.

PROPOSED BY: Copper River/Prince William Sound AC (SC-05S-G-006)

PROPOSAL 134 - 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting. Prohibit hunting within 1/4 mile of residence or campground in GMUs 7, 15A, 15B and 15C as follows:

The use of any motor vehicle for hunting on any public or private road is illegal. No loaded weapons of any kind while enroute to hunting area; this means no ammunition in clips or magazines until in the field or hunting area. No hunting within 1/4 mile of any private residence or any public or private campground.

ISSUE: No road hunting and no hunting within 1/4 mile of a campground or any private residence.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Increased danger to private residences and general population. What we have is hunters driving around with loaded high-powered rifles with total disregard for private property when shooting at game animals from vehicles.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This will ensure ethical fair chase hunting, plus safety for both the hunters and the public.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All residents living outside of cities. There is a 1/4 mile law for campgrounds; it needs to encompass private residences, too.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Short of making hunting illegal where no one would hunt. I hunt and enjoy hunting but ethically with fair chase, the only way the sport can be saved.

PROPOSED BY: Donald D. Tirrell

(HQ-05S-G-008)

PROPOSAL 135 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled Use Areas. Restrict off-road vehicle use for hunting and trapping in GMU 8 as follows:

ATVs cannot be used to transport game, furbearers, or equipment used for hunting and trapping west of Rough Creek in the Ugak Bay drainages, except on designated trails. (There presently are no designated trails.)

ISSUE: Illegal ATV use.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Habitat destruction.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Beneficiaries of quality habitat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Illegal ATV users.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson

(HQ-05S-G-018)

PROPOSAL 136 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled Use Areas. Amend the regulation for GMU 9 as follows:

(2) (A) the Naknek Controlled Use Area: (i) the area consists of all of GMU 9C north of the Naknek River with the exception of those trails listed in (ii). [UNIT 9C WITHIN THE NAKNEK RIVER DRAINAGE UPSTREAM FROM AND INCLUDING THE KING SALMON CREEK DRAINAGE.]

ISSUE: Close a loophole in the present controlled use area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The hunters will continue to come in through the back door.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those hunters using the back door.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Naknek/Kvichak AC

(SW-05S-G-004)

PROPOSAL 137 - 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting. Modify the regulation as follows:

Repeal paragraphs (a)(9)(C) dealing with GMU 9, as follows:

[THAT PORTION OF UNIT 9 EXTENDING SOUTH AND EAST OF MCNEIL RIVER STATE GAME SANCTUARY TO THE BOUNDARY OF KATMAI NATIONAL PARK AND PRESERVE, AND INCLUDING ANY STATE LAND WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF KATMAI NATIONAL PARK AND PERSERVE, IS CLOSED TO BROWN BEAR HUNTING;]

ISSUE: The Park Service was negotiating with the Naknek/Kvichak Advisory Committee and the State of Alaska, to trade state land (Unit 9A and 9C as described in C) for Park Service land (westernmost portion of Naknek Lake). Per the Park Service request, the Naknek/Kvichak Advisory Committee agreed to vote to close said state land to brown bear hunting with the understanding that efforts for the land swap would continue and they have not.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nothing.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Naknek/Kvichak AC

(SW-05S-G-005)

PROPOSAL 138 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled Use Areas. Amend the regulation as follows:

GMU 9, subunits 9C and 9E, an ATV or snowmachine may be used to take wolves provided that animals are not shot from a moving motorized vehicle.

ISSUE: Allow the use of an ATV or snowmachine to position a hunter in the harvesting of wolves in GMU 9.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The continued decline of the North Peninsula caribou herd.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Caribou population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Wolf population.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Naknek/Kvichak AC (SW-05S-G-003)

PROPOSAL 139 - 5 AAC 92.550. Areas closed to trapping. Prohibit trapping within 1/4 mile of roads and residences in GMU 9C as follows:

No trapping within 1/4 mile of any drivable road or full-time residence. A sign indicating that traps are in the area must be visible from the road.

ISSUE: Family pets, mainly dogs, are getting caught in leghold traps (and snares) that are set close to roads and residences. If the pet survives, the owner is faced with decisions and costs of veterinary care.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Family pets will continue to be cruelly injured and pet owners will continue to suffer emotionally and financially the consequences of their pets getting trapped.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Pet, pet owners.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Sandra Bryan (HQ-05S-G-046)

PROPOSAL 140 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled Use Areas. Create an exception in GMU 13 as follows:

Sourdough Controlled Use Area is closed to using motorized vehicles for big game hunting including transportation of hunters, their hunting gear and or parts of game. However, this does not prohibit motorized access or transportation of game on the Richardson Highway, Sourdough and Haggard Creeks, Middle Fork, and Haggard Creek trails, or other trails designated by the department.

ISSUE: It is not a problem, but more of an inconvenience for small game hunters. Some people who use this area in the winter would like to be able to hunt small game (birds, rabbits) when using the trails and lakes by snowmobiles. The area should remain closed to the motorized taking of big game to give subsistence users and others without four-wheelers and such an area to hunt without competition from more mobile hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Small game will be prohibited in this area. The area should remain a controlled use area to provide an area in which motorized vehicles are not allowed.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Small game hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Paxson AC (SC-05S-G-016)

PROPOSAL 141 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Allow motorized vehicles in GMU 13D as follows:

In GMU 13D, Tonsina Controlled Use Area, motorized vehicle drawing. You can use a motorized vehicle of 500 pounds or less to hunt with five tags.

ISSUE: Tonsina Controlled Use Area. Open to drawing for using motorized vehicle 500 pounds or less for hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose in Dust Creek and Kimble are dying of old age.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Get wolves and bears. The tag holders could get back in there farther.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Any Alaska resident hunter that draws it.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Open Tonsina Controlled Use Area—no restriction. Reject due to hunting pressure.

PROPOSED BY: Alan H. McHone (HQ-05S-G-021)

PROPOSAL 142 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Remove vehicle restrictions in GMU 15 as follows:

Remove vehicle access restrictions in GMU 15.

ISSUE: Vehicle closure not removed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People harvesting moose are losing meat due to early season in hot weather. Letting people use vehicles will reduce waste of resources.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, less waste of game meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Public, ease law enforcement workload.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Several considerations were made regarding the necessity for vehicle use in the area and rejected based on the “hands off” approach of game management in Region 2.

Asking for a return to a later moose hunting season (October). Later harvest will provide more time for breeding and prevent meat spoilage from butchering and packing a harvested animal.

The rationale for this is that larger bulls are more likely to negotiate corridors in the fragmented area and evade keystone predators; therefore successfully breeding and maintain genetic diversity to the population. Secondly, the later season allows for sex traits to form allowing for proper data collection and evaluation about the population.

PROPOSED BY: Darrel Williams (SC-05S-G-002)

PROPOSAL 143 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Modify the regulation for area 3 in GMU 15C as follows:

Just delete restricted area 3. When this regulation was put into effect, the spike fork/50 inch rule had not been implemented. It was intended to reduce bull harvest and is no longer needed.

ISSUE: Remove restricted area 3 in Unit 15C which closes Unit 15C to motorized vehicles during set dates of the open season for moose hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wanton waste—moose may not be able to be removed from the field for up to 4 days after kill. (Spoilage depends on weather.)

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Moose harvested can be transported and processed immediately to reduce spoilage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All moose hunters who would use a motorized vehicle.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1. Allow motorized use during midday (10 am to 3 pm) and at night from one hour after sunset to one hour before sunrise. 2. Allow transportation of moose—must have a validated harvest tag on person if going to kill site.

PROPOSED BY: Doug Gordon (SC-05S-G-059)

PROPOSAL 144 - 5 AAC 92.540(4)(B). Controlled use areas. Modify controlled use area in GMU 15C as follows:

Eliminate the Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area.

ISSUE: Eliminate the Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This regulation is a problem for several reasons:

This regulation was put into place primarily to slow down the moose harvest in the area under an “any bull” regulation. The board implemented a “spike-fork, 50-inch” requirement regulation in the area that has achieved the desired result of slowing down the moose harvest in this area and other areas of the Kenai Peninsula.

There is no definitive list of highways (defined in 5 AAC 92.990(22) as the drivable surface of a constructed road) maintained by any agency. No one is sure of exactly what is maintained or not maintained by the borough or the state. This becomes a judgment call by the department or Fish and Wildlife personnel.

The area restrictions only apply to moose hunters, their gear and moose parts. Motorized use can still occur by bear and other big game hunters, small game hunters, and recreational users. Complaints of illegal activity by motor vehicle users that are not moose hunting are reported to the authorities. These reports dispatch enforcement personnel to legal activity and tie up valuable enforcement time and personnel, which should be used patrolling other areas.

The current Controlled Use Area (CUA) creates an area which benefits moose hunters that have cabins or who maintain permanent camps through the moose season inside the boundaries of the CUA. The CUA discriminates against hunters who do not have facilities within the CUA or who cannot stay within the confines of the CUA due to work or other commitments. This CUA becomes an allocation issue and allocates the moose to those hunters who can stay in the area for the majority

of the hunting season (cabin and permanent camp owners) and discriminates against those who cannot stay for long periods of time.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal addresses the allocation of moose in the area, the enforceability of the regulation, and the biological necessity for the regulation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters who hunt in GMU 15C within the Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area who cannot remain in the area for long periods of time will benefit from the deletion of this CUA. Enforcement personnel will benefit because they will not be tasked with enforcing difficult or nonenforceable regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who own cabins and permanent camps and who can stay inside the Lower Kenai CUA for longer periods of time will suffer if this CUA is deleted from regulation. If this proposal passes, these hunters mentioned above will face more hunting competition throughout the season. The resource will not suffer because of the benefits provided to the moose population by the “spike-fork, 50-inch” regulation that is in place.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions have been considered.

PROPOSED BY: Larry L. Lewis (HQ-05S-G-043)

PROPOSAL 145 - 5 AAC 92.540(4)(B). Controlled use areas. Modify access in controlled use area in GMU 15C as follows:

(B) the Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area:

(i) the area consists of Unit 15C

(ii) the area is closed to the use of any motorized vehicle except an aircraft or boat for [MOOSE] hunting, including the transportation of [MOOSE] hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of [MOOSE] **game** from September 11 through September 14 and September 17 through September 20; however, this provision does not apply to the use of a motorized vehicle on **private property, or access directly to or from the highway system to or from private property,** a highway maintained by the state or borough or on the gravel portions of **Tustumena Lake Road,** Oilwell, and Brody Roads:

(iii) during the periods specified in (ii) of this subparagraph, a hunter who travels by motorized vehicle **on private property, directly to or from the highway system to or from private property or,** on the Unit 15(C) highway system and then leaves and travels off that **private property, access route to or from the highway system directly to or from private property or** highway system in that motorized vehicle may not hunt [MOOSE] **game**, including transporting [MOOSE] hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of [MOOSE] **game**, or in any other manner initiate or participate in [MOOSE] hunting activities, until after the hunter returns the motorized vehicle to **the private property or** the Unit 15(C) highway system; upon returning the motorized vehicle to that **the private property or** highway system, the hunter may initiate or participate in legal [MOOSE] hunting activities so long as the hunter leaves the motorized vehicle on the **the private property or** Unit 15(C) highway system.

ISSUE: Moose hunters residing in Unit 15C have been placed in the position of either knowingly or inadvertently violating a regulation simply by driving to their homes, other private property or anywhere else off of state or borough roads during the closed periods in GMU 15C Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area (CUA).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose hunters residing in Unit 15C will continue to be placed in the position of either knowingly or inadvertently violating a regulation simply by driving to their homes or anywhere else off of state or borough roads during the closed periods. The GMU 15C Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area was originally created to protect moose bull-cow ratios by preventing overharvest of bulls due to the availability of offroad motorized vehicle access throughout most of the lower, west side of the Kenai Peninsula. Spike-fork 50-inch regulations have since been implemented on the Kenai Peninsula and bull-cow ratios are stable at approximately 30 bulls to 100 cows. Moose harvest levels are well within department management guidelines for GMU 15C. There is no apparent biological justification for this regulation. Historically, this regulation has been selectively enforced and those enforcement efforts have been concentrated on ATV usage in areas of GMU 15C east of the highway system. Many moose hunters who hunt in the easternmost part of the CUA suggest that moose availability is directly impacted by the presence or absence of motorized vehicles in the area. Quality of the hunt notwithstanding; that is not a biological issue and moose hunters living in and/or traveling to areas off the highway system (i.e., Tustumena Lake Road beyond state maintenance, private subdivision roads and other private property such as businesses, churches, parking lots and egresses, home driveways, etc.) in GMU 15C will continue to unknowingly or inadvertently violate state regulations during the closure periods. Furthermore, hunters who have legally harvested moose in any other GMU in Alaska but live or otherwise own or access property off state or borough maintained roads in GMU 15C may not legally transport themselves, their gear or moose parts to their homes or other private property during the closed periods.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No. My proposal only addresses the inconvenience and possible legal complications of a well-intentioned state regulation that puts law abiding moose hunters in the position of inadvertently or purposely violating a state game regulation by going to or from their homes or other private property.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters who wish to remain law abiding citizens

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Asking for an outright repeal of the Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area.

PROPOSED BY: Larry L. Lewis (HQ-05S-G-042)

PROPOSAL 146 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled Use Areas. Allow motorized vehicles in GMU 15C as follows:

The entire state is open to horses; it is not fair to close one of the very few areas open to ORVs for the pleasure of one individual.

ISSUE: The closure to motorized vehicles from September 11-14 and 17-20 for the benefit of one man or outfitter with horses.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A lot of spoiled moose meat from waiting for four days to get it out of the field.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Less spoilage – waste of meat harvested during closed periods.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who hunts the area with ORVs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one – the rest of the state is open to the individual with the horse.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Break the law to save my meat.

PROPOSED BY: Mike Doneaster (HQ-05S-G-007)

PROPOSAL 147 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou, and 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the regulation as follows:

The hunting of moose and caribou will be closed to nonresident hunters extending two miles on either side of the GMU 17B watershed drainages to include the Mulchatna River and its watershed drainages, the Nushagak River including Harris Creek, Klutuspak Creek, King Salmon River, Chichitnok River, and its watershed drainages, and the Nuyakuk River. The resident registration moose hunt from August 20 – September 15 will not change.

ISSUE: Local subsistence resident hunters have noticed a serious decline in the GMU 17B bull moose population on the Nushagak drainage up river from Harris Creek and the upper Mulchatna drainage. Both areas used to be the main hunting grounds for the local August 20 – September 15 resident registration (RM583) village hunters with a high success rate. However, for the past few years these local subsistence hunters seldom even hunt those areas because the success rate has been extremely low.

A. The board moose population objective for unit GMU 17B is 4,900 – 6,000 moose. The March 9-28, 2002 GMU 17B eastern moose population estimation survey count was 1,953 moose and the March 15-21, 2001 GMU 17B western population estimation survey count was 1,202 moose for a total GMU 17B population count of 3,155 moose. This is only 52 percent or half of the GMU 17B board population objective. The bull:cow ratio in both of these surveys could not be determined. These population surveys also calculated a very low calf percentage of 3.9 percent in eastern GMU 17B and 5.1 percent in western GMU 17B. This same May 9, 2002 memorandum concerning

GMU 17B moose survey stated, “With the low calf survival observed in the subunit, it’s unlikely we will achieve the population objectives established any time soon.”

B. The GMU 17B hunter and harvest data from 1983-2003 shows an alarming increase of nonresident hunters. These hunters are primarily hunting in the upper Nushagak drainage above Harris Creek and the upper Mulchatna Rivers where the 2001 and 2002 estimated moose population surveys, mentioned above, were conducted. In 1983 there were a total of 31 nonresident hunters in GMU 17B with 22 moose harvested. This is a success rate of 70.1 percent. In 2000 the numbers peaked with an alarming 1209 percent increase of 375 nonresident hunters with a total 2000 harvest at 139 moose, a 631 percent harvest increase but only a 39 percent success rate. A significant decline from the previous 70.1 percent. The average success rate since 2000 has remained about 36 percent. Harvest data for 2004 was unavailable at the drafting of this proposal. The 36 percent harvest must take into account that many of these nonresident hunters have the advantage of being dropped off with a small plane in areas where legal bull moose have been spotted and or located on a Global Positioning System, guided by a professional guide, or a combination of the above.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the decline of the GMU 17B bull moose population, observed by the local subsistence residents, is not reversed, it will continue to decline, reaching a critical low and will not be able to recover again due to the high wolf and bear predation in these areas.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The 1209 percent increase of nonresident moose hunter and their 631 percent harvest increase over the past 20 years is having a devastating impact on the subsistence hunting and harvesting of moose for the local residents in these traditional GMU 17B hunting areas. The local residents have been crowded out of these traditional subsistence GMU 17B areas, the harvestable moose is being depleted, and the caribou migration routes altered by the nonresident hunters and the commercial industry that surrounds them. Creating a two mile nonresident closed area on either side of these GMU 17B drainages will control the number of hunters allowing the moose population to begin to rebound and the caribou to return insuring subsistence hunting for future generations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The moose population will benefit, because the hunting pressure will be reduced allowing the moose population to increase. The subsistence hunter will benefit, because with fewer hunters and more moose and return of the caribou the odds of a successful hunt will increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The guides or outfitters will have to hunt with nonresident hunters two miles off the GMU 17B rivers and their tributaries.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Roger Skogen (SW-05S-G-009)

PROPOSAL 148 - 5 AAC 92.003. Hunter education and orientation requirements. Amend this regulation as follows:

Require hunters using bait in Unit 6D to complete a bear hunting clinic given by the department before that person can register a black bear station.

ISSUE: Springtime recreational activity is increasing annually in Prince William Sound. For most units which bear baiting occurs in areas of high human activity, hunters are required to complete a bear hunting clinic or equivalent. Hunter education has shown to increase hunter awareness of legal and ethical responsibilities, thus reducing conflicts among hunters and other user groups. In addition, we have asked the board to consider the increased rate of harvest in Prince William Sound in other proposals. Requiring completion of a bear hunting clinic would, at least initially, decrease the number of bait stations in Prince William Sound, without eliminating opportunity.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Increasing conflicts among bear hunters and other users. High harvest of bears over bait is contrary to other efforts to reduce overall harvest.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Quality of the hunt would improve.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Spot and stalk hunters, general public.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who wish to harvest black bears over bait in Unit 6D.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Prohibit bear baiting in Unit 6D, or a western portion of Unit 6D. Probably not necessary, too drastic a resolution to this manageable problem.

PROPOSED BY: Copper River/ Prince William Sound AC (SC-05S-G-009)

PROPOSAL 149 - 5 AAC 92.003. Hunter education and orientation requirements. Amend the regulation as follows:

Tier II Moose GMU 13 – August 15 to August 31

A youth resident hunter (12-17 years old) who has successfully completed a Basic Certified Education Course, may hunt on behalf of a GMU 13 Tier II permit holder under a direct immediate supervision of the permit holder.

ISSUE: We would like the board to add a provision to the Tier II GMU 13 moose hunt that would allow a permit holder to take a youth hunting with him or her. As is currently allowed in the Tier II GMU 13 caribou hunt, a youth should be allowed to hunt on behalf of a GMU 13 Tier II moose permit holder under the direct supervision of the permit holder. In order to participate, the youth would have to be between the ages of 12 and 17 and have completed a hunter education course. We are particularly concerned that experienced hunters, such as elders, have the opportunity to pass on knowledge to the younger generation. Adding the requested provision will provide such an opportunity.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The elders will not be able to teach the younger generation their valuable hunting skills, customs and traditions. The elders will not be able to pass on customary and traditional methods of hunting for moose, such as tracking a moose, cutting a moose in the Ahtna traditional method, and harvesting the head, stomach, liver, heart, bones, fat, legs, and hide of the moose.

Sharing a moose hunting trip with a youth will enable the elder to bond with the youth, and keep the hunting experience being passed on from generation to generation. The youth will learn to hunt, respect the outdoors, the elder's knowledge and wisdom, and caring of moose meat.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it may help to have a younger person helping to hunt for an elder to take a moose and to learn how to preserve the meat, cut the meat, and to learn the hunting skills from an elder.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who is eligible to hunt under the Tier II GMU 13 moose will benefit if this regulatory action is taken to allow a youth to hunt on behalf of an elder.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Extend the Tier II Moose hunting season 15 more days. To do this would bring about an enforcement problem for the Public Safety officers when they are in the field patrolling the sport hunters and subsistence use moose hunters who would be hunting moose during the same days.

Reinstate the rural priority. The Constitution of the State of Alaska would have to be amended, and this will not occur.

PROPOSED BY: Ahtna Tene Nene' Subsistence Committee (SC-05S-G-040)

PROPOSAL 150 - 5 AAC 92.003. Hunter education and orientation requirements. Modify hunter education and orientation requirements in GMU 14A as follows:

Remove the requirement for licensed or certified hunters to attend this class. Many Alaskan hunters have been hunting for years, and this places a burden on them to attend a class that offers very little beneficial information to those with years of hunting experience.

ISSUE: Current regulations require that all hunters must complete the shotgun hunter education to hunt in the GMU 14A Palmer-Wasilla Management Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Experienced or certified hunters will be required to take training for shotguns that is burdensome and does not teach about shotguns.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans that are being forced to spend time and money to attend an extra class.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Do away with shotgun training completely.

PROPOSED BY: Bruce Knowles (HQ-05S-G-041)

NOTE: This proposal was deferred from the March 2004 meeting.

PROPOSAL 151 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures. (a)

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

...

(8) a person who has been issued a permit, or that person's proxy under 5 AAC 92.011, shall return the permit harvest report to the department within the time period stated on the permit; in addition to other penalties provided by law for failure to report harvest, and except as provided in (c) of this section, if a permittee or the permittee's proxy fails to provide the required report for a drawing permit, registration permit, Tier I subsistence permit, or Tier II subsistence permit, the permittee **will** [MAY] be ineligible to be issued a drawing, registration, Tier I subsistence, or Tier II subsistence permit during the following regulatory year;

ISSUE: The board has requested a proposal making it mandatory for a person who has not reported their hunt activities to be ineligible for any permits the following regulatory year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will continue to use its discretionary authority to withhold permits from hunters who have not reported.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Over the long-term there should be a higher degree of compliance as all hunters who fail to comply will lose some hunting opportunity the next year. Better compliance would allow the department to manage hunts on a finer scale and provide more hunting opportunity within and across years. In some cases, up to 20 percent of the hunters fail to report on registration hunts requiring significant staff time to contact hundreds of hunters who fail to report as required. Greater compliance will allow the department to spend the time and money used to contact hunters for field surveys and monitoring programs that could result in greater hunting opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Many hunters could have additional hunting opportunity because department resources currently used to contact hunters who do not report can be used for other management activities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who fail to report their permit hunt activities will lose subsequent hunting opportunity for the many drawing, registration and other permit hunts across the state. If the proposal passes, the department will not have its current discretion on implementation of the regulation. Educational programs that depend on that discretion to gain voluntary compliance will no longer be possible.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game at the request of the board
(HQ-05S-G-093)

PROPOSAL 152 - 5 AAC 92.034. Permit to take game for cultural purposes. Amend the regulation as follows:

Give discretionary authority to the commissioner for the issuance of multiple education permits for big game hunts.

ISSUE: Lack of opportunity for new hunters to engage in big game hunting and a need for continuing education programs to instill those new hunters sound ethics and conservation principles.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A continued decline in hunter recruitment, which could have negative consequences for the future of hunting and conservation.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaskans interested in sound conservation of Alaska's wildlife and preserving Alaska's hunting heritage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Not applicable.

PROPOSED BY: The Hunter Heritage Foundation of Alaska
(SC-05S-G-052)

PROPOSAL 153 - 5 AAC 92.072. Community subsistence harvest hunt area and permit conditions. Modify the regulation for GMUs 6-11 and 13-17 as follows:

Subsistence permit winners will identify members of their immediate or extended household to be the hunter. Permit winner must be present at all times with permit hunter. Rules should allow for permit winner to educate their family members and significant individuals of their traditional activity of a yearly meat harvest.

ISSUE: The rule that only allows the subsistence permit holder to be the hunter needs to be changed. It needs to allow for individuals, identified by the permit holder, to be the hunter—while at all times the permit holder must be present and accompany hunter in the field.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Loss of opportunity for permit holders (generally older head of households) to pass on the experience of being the family hunter. Allows for teaching and education that otherwise the non-hunters do not take as seriously—they change roles from being meat packers to meat providers.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, just the quality of the out-of-doors hunt experience.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All subsistence permit holders who wish to pass down traditional hunting experiences with others significant to them.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Joe and Candie Caraway (SC-05S-G-064)

PROPOSAL 154 - 5 AAC 92.062. Priority for subsistence hunting; Tier II permits; 5 AAC 92.070 Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system. Amend these regulations to provide the following:

Suspend the Tier II application form.

ISSUE: - 5 AAC 96.615(a)(2) “the circumstances of the proposal otherwise must require expedited consideration by the board, such s where the proposal is the result of a court decision.”

Sequence of events follow:

1. Judge Tan’s decision June 16, 2003, 3AN-00-8814 CI..
2. Board of Game met June 17, 2003, removing a portion of the Tier II permit application form due to court decision.
3. On or about June 27, 2003, I requested the Board of Game set aside their action, suspend the Tier II form until finality of decision from the Supreme Court of Alaska, 3AN-00-8814 CI, under appeal.
4. The board declined my request because of hardship due to short notice for those Alaskans who have exclusive use of the Tier II process.
5. I petitioned the board February 29, 2004 with substantial documentation requesting a public meeting, deletion of the Tier II permit application form and a request for a letter from the Board to the Attorney General of Alaska removing AS 16.05.257 from statute.
6. The board interpreted my petition as comment with no response to my petition. I admit my correspondence was not identified as a petition but expertise and legal assistance to the board should have prevailed and identified my input to the board as a petition.

7. After correspondence from board staff, July 26, 2004, I resubmitted an appeal, October 25, 2004, not an emergency appeal as identified in the letter, November 16, 2004. My appeal was filed under the agenda continued on from the Board of Game meeting, Fairbanks, February 2004.

8. Administrative Procedure Act Sec. 44.62.230. Procedure on petition notes due process for petition.

The Board of Game continues to evade my petition request. Legal action has occurred, 5 AAC 96.615(a)(2). Thousands of residents are being discriminated against by a Tier II scheme under review by the Supreme Court of Alaska. Please honor my petition. Schedule a public meeting. Suspend the Tier II application Form until finality is rendered by the Alaska Supreme Court.

Request the Attorney General of Alaska remove AS 16.05.257 as a result of numerous decisions by the Alaska Supreme Court since statehood. I have documented these cases in my prior petition request. Those residents being discriminated against would appreciate equal time from the Board of Game.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Warren E. Olson (HQ-05S-G-060)

NOTE TO REVIEWER: Proposal 155 began as proposal 28 at the March 2004 Board of Game meeting. The board deferred proposal 28 to the November 2004 meeting and charged an interim committee to evaluate the Tier II permitting system. Deferred proposal 28 was before the Board of Game at the November 2004 meeting as proposal 71. The board took action on proposal 71 by creating and deferring proposal 71A and proposal 71B. The board thereafter instructed the department to use proposals 71A and 71B as starting points to prepare this proposal for the March 2005 meeting. The November 2004 proposals 71A and 71B are provided in this proposal book as proposals 156 and 157, together with proposal 155, for the public's convenient reference. THE BOARD WILL TAKE COMMENTS ON PROPOSALS 155, 156 AND 157.

The board's Subsistence Committee's ongoing work on this important issue may result in further meetings between the time of publication of this proposal book and the March 2005 board meeting. Please monitor <http://www.boards.adfg.state.ak.us> for information on this important issue.

PROPOSAL 155 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou; 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. 5 AAC 92.074. Community Harvest Hunt Areas and 5 AAC 92.XXX. Subsistence Harvest Areas and Conditions.

This proposal clarifies the deferred Tier II proposal from the board subcommittee.

5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. (a)

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(8)		
<u>Units 13A, 13B, 13C, 13D, and 13E within the Copper River/ Cantwell Subsistence Harvest area</u>		
<u>SUBSISTENCE HUNTERS:</u>		
<u>1 caribou by subsistence harvest permit only</u>	<u>Aug. 10 – Sept. 20</u> <u>Oct. 21 – Mar. 31</u>	
<u>OTHER RESIDENT HUNTERS:</u>		
<u>1 caribou by drawing permit only ; up to XXX permits may be issued</u>	<u>Aug. 10 – Sept. 20</u>	
<u>NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:</u>		<u>No open season.</u>
<u>Remainder of Unit 13</u>	<u>Aug. 10 – Sept. 20</u>	<u>Aug. 10 – Sept. 20</u>
<u>ALL HUNTERS:</u>		
<u>1 caribou by drawing permit only; up to XXX permits may be issued</u>		
[UNIT 13]	[AUG. 10-SEPT. 20 [(SUBSISTENCE HUNT ONLY)] [OCT. 21-MAR. 31] [(SUBSISTENCE HUNT ONLY)]	[NO OPEN SEASON.]
[1 CARIBOU PER REGULATORY YEAR BY TIER II PERMIT ONLY; UP TO 10,000 PERMITS MAY BE ISSUED; THE COMMISSIONER SHALL CLOSE THE SEASON BY EMERGENCY ORDER WHEN UP TO		

5,000 CARIBOU HAVE BEEN
TAKEN BY TIER II HUNTERS]

...

5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(9)		
Unit 11		
<u>SUBSISTENCE HUNTERS:</u>		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side, by subsistence harvest permit only	<u>Sept. 1 – Sept. 20</u> [AUG. 20 – SEPT. 20]	[AUG. 20 – SEPT. 20]
<u>OTHER RESIDENT HUNTERS:</u>	<u>Sept. 1 – Sept. 20</u>	
<u>1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side</u>		
<u>NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:</u>		<u>No open season.</u>

...

(11)

**Units 13A, 13B, 13C, 13D, and 13E
within the Copper River/
Cantwell Subsistence Harvest area**

SUBSISTENCE HUNTERS:

**1 bull by Tier II
subsistence hunting permit;
up to 150 permits
may be issued; or**

**Aug. 15-Aug. 31
(Subsistence hunt
only)**

1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side, by subsistence harvest permit only

Sept. 1 – Sept. 20

OTHER RESIDENT HUNTERS:
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side

Sept. 1 – Sept. 20

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

Remainder of Unit 13

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by Tier II subsistence hunting permit; up to 150 permits may be issued; or

Aug. 15-Aug. 31
(Subsistence hunt only)

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

Sept. 1 – Sept. 20

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

Sept. 1 – Sept. 20

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only up to XXX permits may be issued

5 AAC 92.074. COMMUNITY HARVEST HUNT AREAS. (a) The commissioner may issue community subsistence harvest permits for designated big game species in the area specified in this section:

(b) **Chalkyitsik Community Harvest Area** for moose: That portion of Unit 25(B) including the drainage of the Salmon Fork River and drainage of the Black River downstream from Bear Mountain Creek, and that portion of Unit 25(D) including the Black River drainage upstream from Englishshoe Bar and the portion of the Porcupine River drainage from the lower mouth of Curtis Slough upstream to the upper mouth of Rock Slough and the drainage of the Grass River north of the south bank of the Grass River east of 144° 15' W longitude.

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

(d) Copper River/Cantwell Subsistence Community Harvest area: the area consists of Unit 11, Unit 13A east of the Lake Louise road and Tyone River, Unit 13B east of the Maclaren River, Unit 13C, Unit 13D east of the Nelchina River, and 13E west of Wells Creek, north of the Denali Highway and west of the Parks Highway.

5 AAC 92.XXX. Subsistence Harvest Areas and Conditions. (a) Subsistence Harvest Areas are established in the following areas with the following conditions:

(1) Copper River/Cantwell Subsistence Community Harvest area: the area consists of Unit 11, Unit 13A east of the Lake Louise road and Tyone River, Unit 13B east of the Maclaren River, Unit 13C, Unit 13D east of the Nelchina River, and 13E west of Wells Creek, north of the Denali Highway and west of the Parks Highway.

(A) the purpose of the Copper River/Cantwell Subsistence Harvest Area is to protect the Copper River/Cantwell Customary and Traditional Harvest and Use Pattern identified by the Board, which was developed and is still practiced by the original Ahtna residents of the area, and has been passed down to other, more recent, residents of the area and to other participants in the harvest and use pattern.

(B) The Board has established special subsistence permit seasons, with relatively liberal seasons and bag limits, for moose and caribou in the Copper River/Cantwell Subsistence Harvest area, in order to provide a reasonable opportunity for subsistence harvests by participants in the Copper River/Cantwell Customary and Traditional Harvest and Use Pattern.

(C) The Department has authority to attach a variety of conditions, as it deems necessary, to the moose and caribou subsistence permits referenced above under 5 AAC 92.052. In addition to those discretionary conditions, the Department shall attach the following conditions to these permits:

(i) a permittee is prohibited from taking any type of game or furbearer in any area of the state other than within the Copper River/Cantwell Subsistence Harvest area, for the remainder of the regulatory year.

(ii) the permittee may not use an aircraft, a recreational vehicle, or an off-road vehicle with a gross vehicle weight of greater than 8,000 pounds, within the area for caribou or moose hunting purposes, including transportation of hunters, hunting equipment or harvested game to or from the field during open seasons for moose and caribou;

(iii) the permittee must salvage, for human consumption, from moose and caribou taken within the area, all edible meat from the forequarters, hindquarters, ribs, neck, backbone and head, as well as the heart and liver. Meat of the forequarters, hindquarters, and ribs must remain naturally attached to the bones until delivered to the place where it is processed for human consumption.

ISSUE STATEMENT FOR PROPOSED CHANGES TO ORIGINAL PROPOSAL:

Modification of area: Copper River/Cantwell Subsistence Harvest Area: The original proposal does not clearly identify the subsistence harvest area and underestimates the historical

subsistence areas of the region. It leaves out some communities with traditional subsistence use of the area. By including portions of GMUs 13A, 13C, and 13E (near Cantwell), the community use patterns are better addressed. All of GMU 11 was included in the subsistence zone. Over half of GMU 11 is classified as National Park lands and only federal subsistence hunting is allowed.

Traditional subsistence areas within the Copper River basin are covered by GMUs 11 and 13. GMU 12 is eliminated in this proposal because of the mixing of different caribou herds and moose populations within this subsistence zone. It is extremely difficult to determine harvests, set quotas and monitor population trends. Eliminating GMU 12 should not present a problem for most subsistence hunters.

Modification of caribou seasons: This proposal retains the existing dates of the caribou hunting season: Aug. 10 – Sept. 20 and Oct. 21- Mar. 31. There has always been opposition to hunting Nelchina caribou during the rut. Often the rut occurs near the road and hunting harassment could interfere with breeding. To achieve maximum herd productivity, critical time periods like the rut and migration to calving areas should be free of disturbance. Additionally, studies show caribou meat taken during the rut is much less palatable to most individuals. Maintaining the August hunt period will allow children to hunt or participate before school starts. Passing along traditional knowledge to younger generations is important for subsistence users.

The dates of the resident and nonresident drawing hunt were changed to create one drawing hunt for both residents and nonresidents outside the subsistence area. Other resident hunters who win a drawing permit would be allowed to hunt the entire unit, under a shorter season. Limiting the caribou harvest to a yearly quota is an absolute biological requirement. A quota would be set for both bulls and cows (for both hunts) and either could be closed by emergency order after the quota for each sex was reached.

All of GMU 11 was eliminated from open caribou seasons. Harvesting of Mentasta caribou is certain if caribou hunting occurs in either GMU 11 or GMU 12. This herd numbers just under 300 and due to mixing with Nelchina animals, hunting cannot be sustained at any level at this time. Caribou herds cannot be managed without harvest information, and caribou harvested from one herd could potentially be reported for an adjacent herd. Management of mixed herds is problematic, and overharvests would be likely.

Modification of moose seasons and bag limits: The Tier II hunt for any bull would be maintained and the resident subsistence bag limit would change from 1 bull to 1 bull with spike-fork, 50-inch or three brow tines antlers. The three brow tine regulation will allow subsistence hunters to take smaller bulls with three brow tines, a larger component of the GMU 13 bull population. Under historic unit-wide harvests of bulls with three brow tines, the bull:cow ratio was maintained at 18:100 cows, so this regulation ensures reasonable bull numbers after the hunting season. Season dates for all hunts would be the same. The bag limit for other resident hunters stays the same.

In GMU 11 the harvest for moose is very low and not expected to increase.

Furbearers were added to the exclusive use provision: Since trapping is a major part of traditional subsistence activities, individuals claiming subsistence use in this zone will be limited in their harvest of furbearers, as well as game within the zone boundaries. Someone hunting in the subsistence zone would only be able to trap in the zone and nowhere else.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game, at the request of the board.

(HQ-05S-G-094)

NOTE TO REVIEWER: The November 2004 Board of Game's proposal 71 was amended and deferred to the March 2005 Board of Game meeting. Please see related proposal 155.

PROPOSAL 156 - 5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system. Modify the Tier II point scoring system, as follows:

5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system. (a) A Tier II subsistence permit applicant's "customary and direct dependence on the game population by the subsistence user for human consumption as a mainstay of livelihood" may provide up to **40** [60] points. It is measured by the following indicators and points:

(1) the number of years in which the applicant has hunted on or eaten from the game population, plus the number of years in which the applicant would have hunted on or eaten from the game population but did not because state regulations canceled the hunt on the game population during a given year or years, or because the state did not issue the applicant a permit to hunt on the game population for which the applicant applied; 1 point is given for each year, up to **30** [50] points; and

(2) the number of years in which a member of the applicant's household has hunted on or eaten from the game population, plus the number of years in which that member of the applicant's household would have hunted on or eaten from the game population but did not because state regulations canceled the hunt on the game population during a given year or years, or because the state did not issue that member of the applicant's household a permit to hunt on the game population for which that member of the applicant's household applied; **.333** [.2] points are given for each year, up to 10 points.

(b) The "ability of a subsistence user to obtain food if subsistence use is restricted or eliminated" may provide up to **60** [40] points. It is measured by the following indicators and points:

...

(2) the availability of food for purchase in the community where most of the applicant's household's store-bought food was purchased during the past year, which may provide up to **30** [10] points, as calculated by the department's current Tier II cost-of-food index; the number of points received by an applicant may not exceed the points calculated by the department using the cost-of-food index for the community nearest the applicant's residence; and

(3) the cost of gasoline in the community where most of the applicant's household's gasoline was purchased during the past year, which may provide up to **30** [10] points; the number of points received by an applicant may not exceed the points calculated by the department using the cost of gasoline for the community nearest the applicant's residence.

(c) An applicant's total score is the sum of points given under (a) and (b) of this section, up to a maximum of 100 points.

ISSUE: The majority of Tier II permits issued go to urban Alaskan and subsistence users from rural Alaska have repeatedly complained that they stand little or no chance in the process. The Board is concerned about balancing permits issued so that all subsistence users have an opportunity to participate.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People that truly depend upon caribou as a mainstay of livelihood will be prevented from obtaining a permit.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People that truly depend upon Nelchina caribou for subsistence uses.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who continue to embellish their use of the resource.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Several variations of point changes were considered.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game at the request of the board
(HQ-05S-G-095)

NOTE TO REVIEWER: The November 2004 Board of Game's proposal 71 was amended and deferred to the March 2005 Board of Game meeting. Please see related proposal 155.

PROPOSAL 157 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou; and 5 AAC 85.045 Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend these regulations as follows:

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

Resident	
Open Season	
(Subsistence and	Nonresident

Units and Bag Limits

General Hunts)

Open Season

(6)

**Units 11, 12, 13B, and 13D
within the Gulkana/Copper
River Subsistence Harvest area**

SUBSISTENCE HUNTERS:
**2 caribou, by subsistence harvest
permit only**

Sept. 1 – Mar. 31

OTHER RESIDENT HUNTERS:
1 bull by drawing permit only

Sept. 1 – Sept. 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

Remainder of Unit 11 [AND
THAT PORTION OF 12 WEST OF
THE NABESNA RIVER WITHIN
THE DRAINAGES OF JACK
CREEK, PLATINUM CREEK,
AND TOTSCHUNDA CREEK]

No open season.

No open season.

(7)

Unit 12, that portion
east of the Nabesna
River and south of the
winter trail from the
Nabesna River to Pickerel
Lake to the Canadian border

Sept. 1-Sept. 20
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1-Sept. 20

1 bull by registration
permit only; the season
will be closed when 20
bulls have been taken

Unit 12, that portion
west of the Glenn
Highway (Tok Cutoff) and
south of the Alaska Highway
within the Tok River
drainage

Sept. 1-Sept. 20

No open season.

1 bull

Unit 12, that portion west of the Glenn Highway (Tok cutoff) and south of the Alaska Highway, excluding the Tok River drainage

1 bull by registration permit only; up to 50 bulls may be taken in combination with Unit 20(D), in that portion south of the Tanana River

Aug. 10-Sept. 30 No open season.

Remainder of Unit 12

1 caribou may be taken by registration permit only during a winter season to be announced by emergency order

(Winter season to be announced) No open season.

(8)

Remainder of Unit 13
1 bull by drawing permit only;
up to XXX permits may be
issued

Aug. 10 – Sept. 20 **Aug. 10 – Sept. 20**

[UNIT 13]

[AUG. 10-SEPT. 20 [NO OPEN SEASON.]
[(SUBSISTENCE HUNT ONLY)]
[OCT. 21-MAR. 31]
[(SUBSISTENCE HUNT ONLY)]

[1 CARIBOU PER REGULATORY YEAR BY TIER II PERMIT ONLY; UP TO 10,000 PERMITS MAY BE ISSUED; THE COMMISSIONER SHALL CLOSE THE SEASON BY EMERGENCY ORDER WHEN UP TO 5,000 CARIBOU HAVE BEEN TAKEN BY TIER II HUNTERS]

5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

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

(9)

**Units 11, 12, 13B, and 13D
within the Gulkana/Copper
River Subsistence Harvest area**

SUBSISTENCE HUNTERS:
**1 bull, by subsistence harvest
permit only**

Sept. 1 – Mar. 31

OTHER RESIDENT HUNTERS:
**1 bull with spike-fork antlers
or 50-inch antlers or antlers
with 4 or more brow tines
on one side**

Sept. 1 – Sept. 20

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

Remainder of Unit 11

[AUG. 20-SEPT. 20]

[AUG. 20-SEPT. 20]

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

Sept. 1 – Sept. 20

1 bull with spike-fork
antlers or 50-inch antlers
or antlers with 4 [3] or more
brow tines on one side

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

Sept. 1 – Sept. 20

**1 bull with 50-inch antlers
or antlers with 4 or more
brow tines on one side
by drawing permit only
up to XXX permits may be
issued**

(10)

[UNIT 12, THAT PORTION
DRAINED BY THE LITTLE TOK
RIVER UP-STREAM FROM AND
INCLUDING THE FIRST EASTERN
TRIBUTARY FROM THE HEADWATERS
OF TUCK CREEK]

[AUG. 24-AUG. 28]
[SEPT. 8-SEPT. 17]

[SEPT. 8-SEPT. 17]

[1 BULL WITH SPIKE-FORK ANTLERS
OR 50-INCH ANTLERS OR ANTLERS WITH 4
OR MORE BROW TINES ON ONE SIDE]

[UNIT 12, THAT PORTION LYING EAST OF THE NABESNA RIVER AND SOUTH OF THE WINTER TRAIL RUNNING SOUTHEAST FROM PICKEREL LAKE TO THE CANADIAN BORDER]

[SEPT. 1-SEPT. 30]

[SEPT. 1-SEPT. 30]

[1 BULL WITH 50-INCH ANTLERS OR ANTLERS WITH 4 OR MORE BROW TINES ON ONE SIDE]

Remainder of Unit 12

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1 – Sept. 20

[AUG. 24-AUG. 28
SEPT. 8-SEPT. 17]

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only up to XXX permits may be issued

Sept. 1 – Sept. 20

[SEPT. 8-SEPT. 17]

(11)

Remainder of Unit 13

[1 MOOSE PER REGULATORY YEAR, ONLY AS FOLLOWS:]

[1 BULL BY TIER II SUBSISTENCE HUNTING PERMIT; UP TO 150 PERMITS BE ISSUED; MAY BE ISSUED; OR]

[AUG. 15-AUG. 31
(SUBSISTENCE HUNT ONLY)]

[NO OPEN SEASON.]

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1 – Sept. 20

[NO OPEN SEASON.]

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

Sept. 1 – Sept. 20

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only up to XXX permits may be issued

5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.(a) The following conditions and procedures for permit issuance apply to each permit hunt:

...

(5) except as provided in (6) of this subsection, **and in 5 AAC 92.072**, a permit is nontransferable; however, the department may reissue an invalidated Tier II subsistence hunting permit to the highest-ranked applicant remaining in the original pool of eligible applicants;

(6) at the discretion of the commissioner, a permit may be transferred for scientific purposes only;

(7) immediately after killing a big game animal for which a permit is required, the permittee, [OR] **the permittee's** [HIS OR HER] proxy under 5 AAC 92.011, **or a community harvest hunter under 5 AAC 92.072**, shall cancel the permit by removing the permit day and month on which the kill was made, without obliterating or destroying any other day and month printed on the permit;

(8) a person who has been issued a permit, [OR] that person's proxy under 5 AAC 92.011, **or a community harvest hunt administrator under 5AAC 92.072**, shall return the permit harvest report to the department within the time period stated on the permit; in addition to other penalties provided by law for failure to report harvest, and except as provided in (c) of this section, if a permittee or the permittee's proxy fails to provide the required report for a drawing permit, registration permit, Tier I subsistence permit, or Tier II subsistence permit, the permittee may be ineligible to be issued a drawing, registration, Tier I subsistence, or Tier II subsistence permit during the following regulatory year;

...

(d) A permittee under this section, **or a community harvest hunter under 5 AAC 92.072**, must keep the permit in possession while hunting.

5 AAC 92.072. Community subsistence harvest hunt area and permit conditions. (a) The commissioner or the commissioner's designee may, under this section and 5 AAC 92.052, issue community-based subsistence harvest permit and harvest reports for big game species where the board has established a community harvest hunt area under (b) of this section and 5 AAC 92.074.

(b) The board will consider proposals to establish community harvest hunt areas during regularly scheduled meetings to consider seasons and bag limits for affected species in a hunt area. Information considered by the board in evaluating the proposed action will include:

(1) a geographic description of the hunt area;

(2) the sustainable harvest and current subsistence regulations and findings for the big game population to be harvested;

(3) a custom of community-based harvest and sharing of the wildlife resources harvested in the hunt area; and

(4) other characteristics of harvest practices in the hunt area, including characteristics of the customary and traditional pattern of use found under 5 AAC 99.010(b).

(5) whether a specific allocation should be made to the community harvest hunt, and the details of any such allocation.

(c) Where the board has established a community harvest hunt area for a big game population, residents may elect to participate in a community harvest permit hunt in accordance with the following 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 the estimated number of individuals who will subscribe 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 the age of 16;

(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 people subscribing to the hunt exceeds the original estimate.

(D) must collect validated harvest reports from hunters following the take of individual game animals, record harvest information for individual animals taken, and collect biological samples or other information as required by the department for management;

(E) must provide the department with harvest information within a specified period of time when requested, and a final report of all game taken under the community harvest permit within 15 days of the close of the hunting season; and

(2) a resident who elects to subscribe to a community harvest permit:

(A) may not hold a harvest ticket or other state hunt permit for the same species where the bag limit is the same or for fewer animals during the same regulatory year, however a person may hold harvest tickets or permits for same-species hunts in areas with a larger bag limit following the close of the season for the community harvest permit;

(B) may not subscribe to more than one community harvest permit for a species during a regulatory year;

(C) must have in possession when hunting and taking game a community harvest report issued by the hunt administrator for each animal taken;

(D) must validate a community harvest report immediately upon taking an animal; and

(E) must report harvest and surrender validated harvest reports to the hunt administrator within 5 days, or sooner if required by the department, of taking an animal and transporting it to the place of final processing for preparation for human use and provide the hunt administrator with information and biological samples required under terms of the permit.

(d) Seasons for community harvest permits will be the same as those established for other subsistence harvests for that species in the geographic area included in a community harvest hunt area. The total bag limit for a community harvest permit will be equal to the sum of the individual bag limits established for other subsistence harvests for that species in the hunt area. Seasons and bag limits may vary within a hunt area according to established subsistence regulations for different game management units or other geographic delineations in a hunt area.

(e) Establishment of a community harvest hunt area will not constrain nonsubscribing residents from participating in subsistence harvest activities for a species in that hunt area using individual harvest tickets or other state permits authorized by regulation, nor will it require any resident eligible to hunt under existing subsistence regulations to subscribe to a community harvest permit.

(f) The department may disapprove an application for a community subsistence harvest permit from a hunt administrator who has previously failed to comply with requirements in (c)(1) of this subsection.

(g) The department may approve an application for a community subsistence harvest permit in which residents of communities who have received individual subsistence permits, such as Tier II permits or subsistence hunt registration permits, propose to pool their permits in accordance with this section. If such an application is approved, then the individual permits must be delivered to the hunt administrator and thereafter be treated in accordance with all requirements for harvest reports in this section. Specific individual permit conditions which conflict with the requirements of this section supersede the conflicting requirements of this section.

5 AAC 92.074. Community harvest hunt areas. (a) The commissioner may issue community subsistence harvest permits for designated big game species in the area specified in this section:

(b) **Chalkyitsik Community Harvest Area** for moose: That portion of Unit 25(B) including the drainage of the Salmon Fork River and drainage of the Black River downstream from Bear Mountain Creek, and that portion of Unit 25(D) including the Black River drainage upstream from Englishshoe Bar and the portion of the Porcupine River drainage from the lower mouth of Curtis Slough upstream to the upper mouth of Rock Slough and the drainage of the Grass River north of the south bank of the Grass River east of 144° 15' W longitude.

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

(d) Gulkana/Copper River Subsistence Community Harvest area: the area consists of Units 11 and 12 west of the Chitina and Nabesna rivers and south of ???; Unit 13B, east of and including the Gulkana and Delta rivers; and Unit 13D.

5 AAC 92.XXX. Subsistence Harvest Areas and Conditions. (a) Subsistence Harvest Areas are established in the following areas with the following conditions:

(1) the Gulkana/Copper River Subsistence Harvest area; the area consists of Units 11 and 12 west of the Chitina and Nabesna rivers and south of ???; Unit 13B, east of and including the Gulkana and Delta rivers; and Unit 13D;

the purpose of the Gulkana/Copper River Subsistence Harvest Area is to protect the Gulkana/Copper River Customary and Traditional Harvest and Use Pattern identified by the Board, which was developed and is still practiced by the original Ahtna residents of the area, and has been passed down to other, more recent, residents of the area and to other participants in the harvest and use pattern.

The board has established special subsistence permit seasons, with relatively liberal seasons and bag limits, for moose and caribou in the Gulkana/Copper River Subsistence Harvest area, in order to provide a reasonable opportunity for subsistence harvests by participants in the Gulkana/Copper River Customary and Traditional Harvest and Use Pattern.

The department has authority to attach a variety of conditions, as it deems necessary, to the moose and caribou subsistence permits referenced above under 5 AAC 92.052. In addition to

those discretionary conditions, the Department shall attach the following conditions to these permits:

(i) a permittee is prohibited from taking any type of game in any area of the state other than within the Gulkana/Copper River Subsistence Harvest area, for the remainder of the regulatory year.

(ii) the permittee may not use an aircraft, a recreational vehicle, or an off-road vehicle with a gross vehicle weight of greater than 8,000 pounds, within the area for caribou or moose hunting purposes, including transportation of hunters, hunting equipment or harvested game to or from the field during open seasons for moose and caribou;

(iii) the permittee must salvage, for human consumption, from moose and caribou taken within the area, all edible meat from the forequarters, hindquarters, ribs, neck, backbone and head, as well as the heart and liver. Meat of the forequarters, hindquarters, and ribs must remain naturally attached to the bones until delivered to the place where it is processed for human consumption.

5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. (a) Subject to additional requirements in 5 AAC 84 - 5 AAC 85, a person taking game shall salvage the following parts for human use:

...

(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. In addition,

(1) for moose and caribou taken before October 1 in Unit 9(B), Unit 17, Unit 18, those portions of Unit 19(A) within the Holitna/Hoholitna Controlled Use Area, Unit 19(B), and Unit 23, the edible meat of the front quarters and hindquarters must remain naturally attached to the bone until the meat is transported from the field or is processed for human consumption;

(2) for caribou taken before October 1 in Unit 21(A), the edible meat of the front quarters and hindquarters must remain naturally attached to the bone until the meat is transported from the field or is processed for human consumption;

(3) for moose taken before October 1 in Units 21 and 24, and for caribou taken before October 1 in Unit 24, the edible meat of the front quarters, hindquarters, and ribs must remain naturally attached to the bone until the meat has been transported from the field or is processed for human consumption.

(4) for moose and caribou taken within the Gulkana/Copper River Subsistence Harvest area, the edible meat of the front quarters, hindquarters, and ribs must remain naturally attached to the bone until the meat is transported from the field or is processed for human consumption;

5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. (a) In addition to the definitions in AS 16.05.940, in 5 AAC 84 - 5 AAC 92, unless the context requires otherwise.

(xx) "recreational vehicle" includes motorhomes, trailers, fifth-wheel trailers, and pickup campers intended or used for human shelter, meal preparations and other aspects of camping;

ISSUE: Nelchina caribou and GMU 13 moose hunts are, perhaps, the most in demand in the state, with tens of thousands of interested participants from nearby, road-accessible urban areas; as well as the Lower 48. At the same time, these animals are key components of subsistence lifestyles pursued by, primarily, local area residents. The board is obligated, by state statute, to

regulate so as to ensure that a reasonable opportunity for these subsistence uses is perpetuated. The board is also obligated, by the same and other state statutes, to manage for high levels of human consumptive use, consistent with sustained yield principles, and to provide for consumptive uses other than subsistence uses, if the harvestable surplus is sufficient. Likewise, the board must prefer resident over nonresident uses of these species, whenever necessary to provide for resident levels of human consumptive use.

Based on past board discussion and findings and on the information compiled and submitted by ADF&G subsistence experts over the years, it is clear that the subsistence uses of Nelchina caribou and GMU 13 moose originated with the area's indigenous inhabitants, the Ahtna group of Athabaskan people. As others emigrated to the area, or traveled to and from it from other nearby areas, these age-old, Ahtna-based customary and traditional uses were adopted by many non-native users as well.

On the other hand, many Alaskans have hunted moose and caribou in the area for recreational or other reasons which are not reflective of a subsistence lifestyle. There seems to be a broad consensus that the current regulatory scheme fails to provide a reasonable opportunity for many genuine, but relatively young, subsistence users to practice a subsistence lifestyle while, at the same time, it provides what resembles a "grandfather rights" system for a very limited number of increasingly elderly users who, in many cases, are relatively affluent and do not truly participate in any recognizable customary and traditional subsistence use pattern. The current scheme, thus, fails to provide reasonable opportunity for subsistence uses as well as the objective of a high level of use for all consumptive uses.

These failures are attributable, in large part, to an extremely complex legal framework which, among other things, prohibits the board from making distinctions among subsistence users, and then allocating based upon those distinctions, except under the Tier II framework; requires that, except in Tier II situations, the board must allow all Alaskans to participate in any subsistence hunting opportunity it creates; and requires the board to focus on uses instead of users in a situation where, under even the best of conditions there will never be a sufficient biological capacity to provide harvestable surpluses which can meet the immense demand for these animals. These legal constraints are compounded by the fact that, as urban-based, relatively affluent users have introduced more complex technology and equipment into the hunt, subsistence users have striven to adopt those same technological innovations in an effort to remain competitive and obtain the wild foods upon which their lifestyles depend. It has, thus, become increasingly difficult to distinguish the subsistence uses from the other uses, even as the board strives to keep its focus on uses. In a nutshell, the situation has become the single most contentious, and intractable, problem facing the board.

To address the situation the board set up a committee comprised of board members and interested users, aided by a wide variety of staff biologists, anthropologists, regulatory and legal specialists. The committee has recommended that the board examine several new ideas, either singly or in combination, to address this problem. This proposal is an initial attempt at doing so. It cannot be emphasized enough that this is a preliminary and completely innovative approach, which the board expects to be frequently revised and improved, if it, or any aspect of it, is adopted. Nothing should be viewed as foreordained. The board is publishing this proposal so that

the public may suggest changes, deletions, additions, and details which the board and staff may have overlooked, and so that informed public comment and input will be elicited.

The goal of this proposal is to, first, more precisely define and characterize the subsistence use or uses which the board is obligated to protect. By doing so, the board will then be able to more closely tailor its regulations to provide for that use.

Assuming the board can define specific characteristics of the underlying customary and traditional use, those characteristics are likely to include details about the length of time that the pattern of use has existed; timing and efficiency of hunting activities; traditional hunting areas, traditional processing techniques; customs and traditions associated with the use including the passing down of traditional knowledge and formalized, traditional sharing and distribution practices; and how the use of moose and caribou is merely a part of a much larger subsistence use pattern involving many fish and game resources from the local area.

After the board understands more precisely the pattern of the customary and traditional use, the board will be able to, and is essentially required to, determine how many users fit into that pattern. It is highly likely that in doing so, the board will conclude that only a relatively small number of users are truly participating in a subsistence use, and that the majority of users are involved in some other type of use. If this is shown to be true, then the board, while obligated to provide a reasonable opportunity for the subsistence use, may also be able to provide for other uses, assuming adequate harvestable surpluses.

The board proposes to provide a reasonable opportunity for subsistence uses by delineating an area encompassing the traditional hunting territories of the Ahtna and other local residents, within which permits are issued that provide seasons and bag limits that are as liberal as possible for subsistence users. However, since liberal seasons and bag limits are a powerful attractant for other users, and since the board generally cannot limit participation in subsistence opportunities which it creates, the board is looking at the following options.

First, while all Alaskans may participate in subsistence opportunities the board creates, one of the primary characteristics of a genuine customary and traditional use is that it is a component of a larger subsistence lifestyle, involving reliance on a great variety of fish and game resources which are all derived from within a defined hunting and fishing territory, and which are acquired through the most efficient and economical means and methods available. It follows, then, that those who truly are subsistence users in a given location will tend to confine their hunting and fishing activities to that location, and indeed this is the pattern which the board has observed throughout rural Alaska.

Therefore, the board would require interested subsistence hunters who designate the area within which they practice their subsistence hunting to forego all other hunting opportunities elsewhere in the state, so any Alaskan could decide to participate in the liberal caribou and moose hunting opportunities within the special subsistence hunting area created by this proposal, but anyone who chooses to do so must give up all other hunting opportunities, for all species of game, outside of the subsistence hunting area for the remainder of that regulatory year. This will not be

a burden to genuine subsistence users, but will greatly inconvenience those who falsely claim to be subsistence users in order to take advantage of liberal subsistence seasons and bag limits.

Second, because use of aircraft, recreational vehicles, and large, specialized off-road vehicles is not characteristic of any customary and traditional use the board is familiar with, and the use of such vehicles for hunting purposes generally fails the test of efficiency and economy, subsistence hunters in the area will be prohibited from using these vehicles.

Third, because subsistence uses, by definition, place the highest value on the meat from a harvested animal, and typically utilize all edible parts of a harvested animal, subsistence users in the area will be required to salvage all meat, plus the liver and heart, as well as to leave most of the meat on the bone until it is delivered to the place of processing.

Also, subsistence uses are usually group or community activities. Formalized, traditional sharing and distribution practices, within the community, are also important characteristics. Therefore, subsistence users will be permitted, if they choose, to participate in the community harvest program. Thus, community members will be able to pool their subsistence permits and designate a few hunters to take all of the community's moose and caribou, if that is desired.

If the above provisions work as intended, genuine subsistence uses, and users, will have been accommodated with more liberal hunting opportunities than have existed for decades, but those interested in hunting moose and caribou in the area for other than subsistence purposes will have been discouraged, without being prohibited, from falsely claiming to be subsistence users in order to do so. By reducing this pool of purported subsistence users, other opportunities, for other uses, can probably be allowed. The board proposes to do so according to the following general outline.

First, within the special subsistence hunting area, Alaska residents who are not subsistence hunters may continue to hunt moose and caribou, but with much more restrictive seasons and bag limits than are available to subsistence hunters. On the other hand, these hunters will not be limited from other hunting opportunities, nor will their means and methods be restricted to the same extent as subsistence users. To reduce conflicts with subsistence users, and to emphasize the importance of subsistence activities, they will, however, be required to transport meat on the bone just as subsistence users must. At least at the outset, nonresidents will be prohibited from hunting with the special subsistence hunting area.

In the remainder of GMU 13, a few customary and traditional uses, primarily of moose, still occur, although the vast majority of these uses will have been accommodated through the special subsistence harvest area. It is the board's view that the remaining subsistence uses for moose are accommodated through the general season, both within and outside of the subsistence harvest area, while if there are any remaining subsistence uses of caribou, those users have a greater chance of harvest than at any time in the recent history by virtue of the increased accessibility of caribou to all interested hunters, both within and outside of the special subsistence area, in this proposal.

Likewise, other uses of moose and caribou in Unit 13 and adjacent areas are permitted, under this proposal. Because the board anticipates that the subsistence uses will have been fully accommodated, other uses can also be allowed. Other uses of caribou by residents are allowed, both within and outside of the special subsistence area, by drawing permit. Nonresident caribou hunting, by drawing permit, is allowed only outside of the special subsistence harvest area. Other uses of moose, by residents, are allowed by harvest ticket inside of the special subsistence harvest area, but there are no nonresident uses. Outside of the special subsistence harvest area, other resident uses of moose are allowed by harvest ticket and nonresident uses are allowed by drawing permit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If there are no changes along the lines of those proposed above, the status quo will be maintained, meaning that the state's most contentious and complex game issues will continue to divide Alaskans and plague managers. Over time, the Tier II hunts for caribou and moose will consume the entire harvestable surpluses for both species in the areas, and the pool of successful applicants is likely to increasingly be comprised of elderly and relatively immobile, long-time residents, eliminating all middle-aged and younger users.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The strict salvage and meat-on-bone requirements are designed to improve the quality of meat taken from this area, and reduce incidents of waste, and have proven to do so in other areas of the state where similar rules have been adopted.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The vast majority of Alaskan hunters, who have largely been ineligible to hunt in these areas, will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The few long-time successful Tier II applicants, who traditionally hunted outside of the especial subsistence area, will no longer have a virtual guarantee of receiving a caribou hunting permit which allows access to their preferred area. All other users, including other Tier II applicants, will see greatly increased access by virtue of this proposal.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The board considered asking the Joint Boards of Fisheries and Game to revise the boundaries of the Anchorage/Kenai/Mat-Su Nonsubsistence Area and/or the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence Area to include the western portion of GMU 13, such that a continuous nonsubsistence area would run from south of Seward to north of Fairbanks. Nonsubsistence area determinations are a complex process, involving a detailed examination of the socio-economic characteristics of the area in question, and focusing on uses of both fish and game resources. The outcome of such an effort could, by no means, be assured.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Board of Game, based on recommendations from the Subsistence Committee (HQ-05S-G-096)
