

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY  
**REVIEWER LETTER**

DEAR REVIEWER:

December 2005

The Alaska Board of Game will consider the attached book of regulatory proposals at its **Winter 2006** meeting, to be held **January 27-29**, at the 4th Avenue Theater in Anchorage, Alaska. The proposals generally concern Statewide Cycle A changes to the regulations governing hunting and the use of game as well as deferred proposals from previous board meetings. Members of the public, organizations, advisory committees, and staff have submitted these proposals, which are published essentially as they are received.

The proposals 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.

The proposals are set forth in the Table of Contents, which 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 prior 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 reviewing 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 comment, in combination with Advisory Committee comments and ADF&G staff presentations, provide the Board of Game with useful biological and socioeconomic data to form decisions. 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 mail or fax your written comments to the above Juneau address no later than **5:00 p.m. on January 13, 2006**, 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 may not be printed in the board workbook. Written comments will also be accepted during the board meeting and public testimony during the public testimony portion of the meeting is always appreciated. **Written comments become public documents.**

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. Comments received at least two weeks prior to the meeting are printed and cross referenced in the board

members' workbooks. Written comments received after the two-week period will be included in the workbooks as "late comments" and are not cross referenced. Materials received during the meeting also are not cross referenced. If you provide written comments during a board meeting, submit 20 copies to Board Support Section staff, who will distribute your written comments to board members. If including graphs or charts, please indicate the source.

**List the Proposal Number:** Written comments should indicate the proposal number(s) to which the comments apply. Written comments should specifically state "support" or "opposition" to the proposal(s). 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.

**Do Not Use Separate Pages When Commenting on Separate Proposals:** If making comments on more than one proposal, please do not use separate pieces of paper. Simply begin the next set of written comments by listing the next proposal number.

**Provide an Explanation:** Please briefly explain why you are in support or opposition of the proposal. Board actions are based on a complete review of the facts involved in each proposal, not a mere calculation of comments for or against a proposal. Advisory committees and other groups also need to explain the rationale behind recommendations. Minority viewpoints from an advisory committee should be noted in advisory committee minutes along with the majority recommendation. The board benefits greatly from understanding the pro and cons of each issue. A brief description consisting of a couple of sentences is sufficient.

**Write Clearly:** Comments will be photocopied so please use 8 1/2" x 11" paper and leave reasonable margins on all sides, allowing for hole punches. Whether typed or handwritten, use dark ink and write legibly.

**Use the Correct Address or Fax Number:** Mail written comments to Board of Game Comments, ADF&G, P.O. Box 25526, Juneau, AK 99802; or fax them to 907-465-6094; or deliver them to a Regional Boards Support Office.

Pertinent policies and findings, proposals, written comment deadlines, meeting calendars and notices for the Board of Game meetings are posted on the Board Support website at <http://www.boards.adfg.state.ak.us/>.

A tentative agenda for the January 2006 Board of Game meeting is shown on page x. A roadmap detailing the tentative order in which proposals will be considered will be available in January 2006 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 January 13, 2006 to make any necessary arrangements.

Kristy Tibbles, Executive Director  
Alaska Board of Game  
Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
(907) 465-4110

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME  
FALL 2005 PROPOSAL BOOK  
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page Number
Reviewer Letter .....	i – ii
Table of Contents .....	iii
Tentative Meeting Schedule .....	iv
Board of Game Meeting Cycle .....	v – vi
Board of Game Membership Roster .....	vii
Boards Support Section Staff .....	viii
Guidelines for Public and Advisory Committee Testimony .....	ix
Draft Agenda .....	x
Proposals .....	1 – 40

**PROPOSAL TOPICS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER**

Lynx Seasons .....	1
New Regulations .....	2 – 6
Hunter Education and Youth .....	7 – 8
ORV Use .....	9
Harvest Tickets and Reports .....	10 – 11
Taking Game by Proxy .....	12 – 15
Big Game for Certain Ceremonies .....	16 – 17
Permits .....	18 – 27
Tier II .....	28 – 30
Unlawful Take Exceptions .....	31
Predation Control .....	32 – 33
Sealing Requirements and Salvage .....	34 – 37
Feeding of Game .....	38 – 44
GMU Descriptions .....	45 – 49
Definitions .....	50 – 55

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME  
TENTATIVE MEETING SCHEDULE  
as of November 2005**

	<u><b>Dates &amp; Location</b></u>	<u><b>Topic</b></u>
Winter 2006	January 27 – 29, 2006 Anchorage Proposal Deadline: November 18, 2005 Written Comments: January 13, 2006	Statewide Cycle A
Spring 2006	March 10 – 20, 2006 Fairbanks Proposal Deadline: December 9, 2005 Written Comments: February 24, 2006	Interior Region
Fall 2006	November 10 – 15, 2006 Location: TO BE ANNOUNCED Proposal Deadline: TO BE ANNOUNCED Written Comments: Two weeks prior to meeting	Southeast Region
Spring 2007	March 2 - 12, 2007 Anchorage Proposal Deadline: TO BE ANNOUNCED Written Comments: Two weeks prior to meeting	Southcentral & Southwest Regions

\*\*\*\*\*

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>		
<b>SOUTHEAST REGION</b>	Fall 2006	Fall 2008	Fall 2010
Game Management Units: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5			
<b>SOUTHCENTRAL &amp; SOUTHWEST REGIONS</b>	Spring 2007	Spring 2009	Spring 2011
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			
<b>ARCTIC AND WESTERN REGIONS</b>	Fall 2005	Fall 2007	Fall 2009
Game Management Units: 18, 22, 23, 26A			
<b>INTERIOR REGION</b>	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			

## ALASKA BOARD OF GAME STATEWIDE REGULATIONS SCHEDULE

### STATEWIDE REGULATIONS: 5 AAC 92 CYCLE “A”: 2006, 2010, 2014, 2020

- .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
- .013 Migratory bird hunting guide services
- .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
- .030 Possession of wolf hybrid prohibited
- .031 Permit for Selling Skins and Trophies
- .033 Permit for Sci., Ed., Propagative, or Public Safety Purposes
- .034 Permit to Take Game for Cultural Purposes
- .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
- .115 Control of predation by bears
- .165 Sealing of Bear Skins and Skulls
- .170 Sealing of Marten, Lynx, Beaver, Otter, Wolf, and Wolverine
- .171 Sealing of Dall sheep horns
- .200 Purchase and Sale of Game
- .210 Game as Animal Food or Bait
- .220 Salvage of Game Meat, Furs, and Hides
- .230 Feeding of Game
- .250 Transfer of Muskoxen for Sci. and Ed. Purposes
- .450 Description of Game Management Units
- .990 Definitions

### STATEWIDE REGULATIONS: 5 AAC 92 CYCLE “B”: 2008, 2012, 2016, 2022.

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

**BOARD OF GAME**  
As of August 25, 2005

<u>MEMBER'S NAME AND ADDRESS</u>	<u>TERM EXPIRES</u>
<b>Mike Fleagle, CHAIR</b> 3821 W. 67 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Anchorage, Alaska 99502	3/1/2007
<b>Ron Somerville, VICE CHAIR</b> 4506 Robbie Road Juneau, Alaska 99802	3/1/2008
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
Carl M. Morgan, Jr. PO Box 243 Aniak, AK 99557	3/1/2008
Ted Spraker 33350 Skyline Drive Soldotna, Alaska 99669	3/1/2008

**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

**NOTE:** Anyone may provide written comments on proposals published in this proposal booklet. To be published in the Board of Game's Winter 2006 Board workbook, written comments must be received via fax or postal service by Boards Support Section personnel no later than 5:00 p.m. January 13, 2006. A postmark is not sufficient. Fax or mail your written comments to the Boards Support Section at the Headquarter office in Juneau (shown on next page). Written comments on the proposals contained in this proposal booklet sent to individual board members or to ADF&G personnel, and not to Boards Support Section personnel, will not be published in the Board of Game's Winter 2006 board workbook.

**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  
**Scott Crass**, Publications Tech. II 465-4046

Board of Game

**Kristy Tibbles**, Executive Director 459-6098  
**Rena Balzer**, Publications Spec. II 465-6097

**Lori Van Steenwyk**, Administrative Manager 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) 442-2420

Southeast Region

**Scott Crass**  
PO Box 25526  
Juneau, AK 99802-5526  
Phone: (907) 465-4046  
Fax: (907) 465-6094

Interior Region

**Rita St.Louis**  
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/>



# ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

## GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC TESTIMONY & ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY

Persons planning to testify before Board of Game hearings 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; and **submit with your blue testimony card**. Do not wait until it is your turn to testify to submit written material, as it may not be distributed to the board in time for your testimony. **Provide a name and date on the first page of written material and identify the source of graphs or tables, if included in materials.**

When the chairman calls your name, please go to the microphone; state your name and whom you represent. At the front table, a green light will come on when you begin speaking. A yellow light will come on when you have one minute remaining. A red light will indicate that your time is up. When you are finished speaking, please stay seated and wait for any questions board members may have regarding your comments.

**If you wish to give testimony for more than one group** (i.e., yourself plus an organization, or advisory committee), you only need to turn in one sign-up card, listing each group you will be representing. When you begin your testimony, state for the record the group you are representing. Keep your comments separate for each group. For example: give comments for the first group you are representing, then after stating clearly that you are now testifying for the second group, give comments for that group.

Please be aware that when you testify you may not ask questions of board members or of department staff. This is your chance to make comments on proposals before the board. 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 five minutes for oral testimony, whether you testify for yourself or on behalf of an organization. The board chairman will announce the length of time for testimony at the beginning of the meeting.

Advisory Committee representatives are usually allowed 15 minutes to testify, and should restrict testimony relating to what occurred at the advisory committee meeting(s). Testimony should be a brief summary of the minutes of the meeting and copies of the minutes should be available for the board members. 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 for you.

~ DRAFT ~  
**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME**  
**Statewide Cycle A**  
**January 27 – 29, 2006, Anchorage, Alaska**  
**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, or 465-8901 in Juneau, for a recorded message on daily progression through the meeting.

**Friday January 27, 2006, 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:**

**PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE ORAL TESTIMONY:** Oral public testimony will begin immediately upon conclusion of staff reports.

**DEADLINE FOR SIGN-UP TO TESTIFY**

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

**Saturday, January 28, 2006, 8:30 AM**

**CONTINUE PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE ORAL TESTIMONY**

At the conclusion of public testimony the Board will begin deliberation on the proposals.

**Sunday, January 29, 2006, 8:30 AM**

**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 a roadmap will be available at the meeting. Scheduled updates will be available on the board's recorded message phone. Phone Number: 1-800-764-8901; in Juneau call 465-8901.

**B.** Advisory Committee representatives may present their reports either at the beginning or end of the "Oral Public Testimony." The committee representative should notify the boards' staff 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 January 13, 2006 to make any necessary arrangements.

**PROPOSAL 1 - 5 AAC 85.060. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals.** Extend framework seasons for lynx hunting seasons in the units managed under the lynx harvest tracking strategy as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(4) Lynx		
Units 1- <del>5</del> [6], 8, and 10	No open season.	No open season.
Units <u>6</u> , 7, 11, <b><u>and 13-16</u></b> , [AND 15]	<b><u>Nov. 10 – Feb. 28</u></b> [NOV. 10-JAN. 31] (General hunt only)	<b><u>Nov. 10 – Feb. 28</u></b> [NOV. 10-JAN. 31]
2 lynx		
[UNITS 14 AND 16]	[DEC. 15-JAN. 15	[DEC. 15-JAN. 15]
[2 LYNX ]	[(GENERAL HUNT ONLY)]	
...		
Units 12 and 20(E)	Nov. 1-Mar. 15 (General hunt only)	Nov. 1-Mar. 15
2 lynx		
...		
Remainder of Unit 20, and Unit 25(C)	<b><u>Nov. 1 – Feb. 28</u></b> [DEC. 1-JAN. 31] (General hunt only)	<b><u>Nov. 1 – Feb. 28</u></b> [DEC. 1-JAN. 31]
2 lynx		

**ISSUE:** At the March 2005 Board of Game meeting, the board granted the department discretionary authority to align lynx hunting seasons with lynx trapping seasons in the units managed under the lynx harvest tracking strategy. In order to align seasons, the framework seasons in several of those units must be extended.

The department uses its emergency order authority to establish trapping seasons each year, and intends to use the same authority to align hunting seasons with trapping seasons. In years of lynx abundance the seasons would remain long. As the lynx population declines the seasons would be shortened to reduce harvest.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Hunting and trapping seasons will continue to differ in the same areas, and opportunity will be lost.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, the flexibility to adjust season dates will provide maximum opportunity for both hunters and trappers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters who wish to have longer lynx seasons.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status Quo.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-06W-G-023)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 2 - 5 AAC XXX. Permit to take foxes for the protection and enhancement of migratory birds.** Require a permit to take foxes for the protection and enhancement of migratory birds as follows:

(a) The department may issue a permit for the taking of foxes for the purposes of protection or enhancing nesting migratory birds. Issuance of a permit must be supported by a plan of operations that includes an adequate justification of fox removal, including sufficient positive benefits to migratory birds, such as protection of threatened or endangered species, restoration of secure breeding areas, and enhancement of diminished nesting colonies.

(b) A permit under this section must include: (1) name of permittee and authorized subpermittees; (2) the species and number of foxes to be taken; (3) methods and means that may be employed; (4) duration of the permit; (5) location of the permitted activities; (6) disposition of the foxes that are taken; and (7) reporting requirements.

**ISSUE:** Currently, prescriptive control of foxes to protect and enhance other wildlife species, specifically migratory birds, must be authorized either as a specific program by the board or under a scientific/education permit issued under 5 AAC 92.033. In routine cases where fox removal or reduction is warranted to protect migratory birds, detailed review and scrutiny by the board may not be warranted, and the activity may not meet the definition of research or education. Some simple effective mechanism is needed to authorize localized or temporary control of foxes as a wildlife management activity.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Projects that involve the control of foxes to benefit migratory birds, even if local and short-term would either have to be approved individually by the board or meet the standards of a research project. We do not believe that the board's time would be well spent reviewing routine management operations. Most of the activities envisioned under this permit would not meet the criteria of scientific research.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The proposed permit program will allow implementation of projects that directly enhance the survival and productivity of migratory birds. Examples would include removal of foxes from the Aleutian Islands to restore the abundance of seabirds and Aleutian geese; prescribed fox removal/reduction to enhance growth of Pacific brant colonies (currently diminished) on the Y-K Delta or North Slope; and preventing fox predation on the threatened spectacled and Stellar's eider nesting areas.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Management biologists and wildlife administrators will benefit immediately from a permit program that authorizes routine fox management through a straightforward and simple process. The public will ultimately benefit from enhanced migratory bird populations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one is expected to suffer if this proposal is adopted.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** (1) The application of a scientific permit is not appropriate and could be disingenuous; (2) board approval of each project is inefficient and unnecessary for routine management actions; (3) liberalization of public hunting and trapping regulations largely would not effectively and precisely target predating foxes at the best prescribed times and places.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-06W-G-030)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 3 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. Statewide archery hunts.** Create a regulation as follows:

A statewide archery moose season shall run from October 10 through October 20. Qualified hunters choosing archery season will not be eligible to hunt the regular moose season.

**ISSUE:** To approve a statewide archery moose season October 10-20 and omit the early season archery hunt August 10-17. Temperatures prove too hot for care of meat in August.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The number of bow hunters grows steadily, forcing other communities to travel great lengths to units becoming overcrowded. Statewide would be beneficial to all.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, October temperatures assure less meat spoilage.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Archery hunters statewide and others who may be interested in expanded outdoor opportunities.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Nobody would suffer, adding equal opportunity is fair to all.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Jerry Fletcher (HQ-06W-G-020)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 4 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. Sealing of mountain goat horns.** Create a new regulation as follows:

A person may not possess, transport or export from the state any horns of a mountain goat unless the horns have been sealed by a department representative within 30 days of harvest.

**ISSUE:** Establish a sealing requirement for mountain goat horns.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Potential overharvest of goats due to inaccurate reporting of sex and age.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Provides accurate harvest data for better management decisions.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** People who like to hunt and view mountain goats.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Wayne Woods

(HQ-06W-G-017)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 5 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. Sealing of mountain goat horns.** Create a new regulation as follows:

All hunters who are successful in harvesting a mountain goat shall deliver the horns to a department representative for sealing within five days of the kill in units where the goats are managed on a registration system and within 30 days of the kill in units where they are managed on a drawing system.

**ISSUE:** Hunters should be required to bring in the horns of mountain goats to a department representative for verification of sex and age of all harvested mountain goats.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Inaccurate reporting on harvest reports, especially in the case of hunters harvesting female goats, can have a large detrimental impact on the healthy long-term management of mountain goat populations.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal will eliminate the inaccurate reporting of the harvesting of female mountain goats and provide for more accurate harvest data to use in managing mountain goat populations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All hunters and users of the resource because the populations will be more accurately managed.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Unethical hunters and registered guides who would misreport the harvest of a female goat (which counts as two goats off the registration quotas) as that of a male goat (which is counted as one goat off the registration quota) would suffer. Registered guides have a great deal of incentive to keep registration hunts open for as long as possible, so the misreporting of the taking of females will leave more goats available for the harvest quotas. Department representatives will also have an increase in their workload in order to seal the mountain goat horns.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Make the taking of female goats illegal but this would increase the abandonment of many harvested female goats which would be further detrimental to the goat populations.

**PROPOSED BY:** Dennis M. Zadra

(HQ-06W-G-012)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 6 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. Policy for introduction of new species.** Create a new regulation as follows:

When a new species is introduced in any region of Alaska, once a harvestable surplus is reached, animals from that population would be available for a general, registration, drawing or permit hunt for eligible residents and nonresidents.

**ISSUE:** When general hunt license money used to transplant and/or introduce game species they are not being made available for harvest by those who foot the bill. Harvest is not being made available to the benefactors.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Those providing the funds do not benefit.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This encourages more funding for wildlife diversity in Alaska.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those who would like to hunt more abundant and diverse wildlife.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-06W-G-023)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 7 - 5 AAC 92.003. Hunter education and orientation requirements; 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures; 5 AAC 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures; 5 AAC 92.062. Priority for subsistence hunting; Tier II permits; and 5 AAC 92.130. Restriction to bag limit.**

Align minimum age requirements in all hunts statewide as follows:

**5 AAC 92.003. Hunter education and orientation requirements.** (a) Beginning August 1, 2002, a person born after January 1, 1986 that is

(1) required to have a hunting license must have successfully completed a certified hunter education course in order to hunt in Units 7, 13, 14, 15, and 20;

(2) not required to have a hunting license, and who has not successfully completed a certified hunter education course, must be under the direct immediate supervision of a licensed hunter **18** [16] years of age or older who has successfully completed a certified hunter education course in order to hunt in Units 7, 13, 14, 15, and 20.

(b) notwithstanding (a) of this section, a resident hunter who is 12 through 17 years of age at the start of the hunt, and has successfully completed a certified hunter education course, is allowed to hunt on behalf of an adult **(18 years of age or older) resident** [UNIT 13 TIER II] permit holder, under the direct immediate supervision of the permit holder, who is responsible for ensuring that all legal requirements are met.

...

**5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures.** (a) A person may not establish a black bear bait station to hunt black bear with the use of bait or scent

lures without first obtaining a permit from the department under this section. (b) A permit issued under this section is subject to the following provisions:

...

(3) a person must be at least **18** [16] years of age to be issued a permit;

**5 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:

...

(13) a permit applicant must be at least **12** [10] years old[, EXCEPT A TIER I SUBSISTENCE PERMIT APPLICANT MUST BE AT LEAST 12 YEARS OLD];

...

**5 AAC 92.062. Priority for subsistence hunting; Tier II permits.**

...

(c) An applicant for a Tier II subsistence hunting permit must be a resident at least 12 years old.

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

...

(e) A hunter who is under **12** [10] years of age may take big game only under the direct, immediate supervision of an adult who is at least 18 years of age, and is a licensed hunter. The supervising adult is responsible for ensuring that all legal requirements are met. The big game animal taken will count against the supervising adult's bag limit. This section does not relieve individuals from complying with big game tag requirements, but does require supervising adults to validate their harvest ticket, or permit, in accordance with 5 AAC 92.010, immediately following the taking of big game under this section.

...

**ISSUE:** As regulations have been adopted concerning younger hunters, different and conflicting ages have been adopted in various sections of the regulations. This proposal would align those ages consistently, without eliminating opportunities for young hunters. It will also provide additional opportunity by allowing younger hunters to hunt with the supervision of the adult permit holder under all permit hunts.

This proposal will:

- 1) Allow 12-17 year olds to hunt for permit holders in all permit hunts, not just Unit 13.
- 2) Allow hunters age 12 and up to apply for all permit hunts.
- 3) Allow 12 years and up to have their own bag limit in all big game hunts--less than 12 would be required to hunt under direct supervision, and the bag limit would be the adult's bag limit.
- 4) Define adult supervision consistently as 18 years of age or older.
- 5) Require bear baiters to be at least 18 years old before establishing their own bait station.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Minimum ages and supervision for specific types of hunting activity will be confusing.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Younger hunters.



**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Department of Fish and Game upon request by the board (HQ-06W-G-022)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 8 - 5 AAC 92.003(a)(2). Hunter education and orientation requirements.** Amend the regulation as follows:

(2) not required to have a hunting license and who has not successfully completed a certified hunter education course must be under the direct immediate supervision of a licensed hunter 16 years or older who has successfully completed a certified education course **or any licensed hunter who was “grandfathered” in before this regulation** in order to hunt in Units 7, 13, 14, 15 and 20.

**ISSUE:** Long-time Alaskan hunters cannot take a young hunter out unless the youth has taken the hunter education course.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Hunters who were “grandfathered” in before this regulation will be required to take the course before taking younger hunters into the field. (anyone under 16).

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaskan hunters who are not required to have this course to hunt and their children.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one we can see.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee (SC-06W-G-003)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 9 - 5 AAC 92.004. Policy for off-road vehicle use for hunting and transporting game.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Delete 5 AAC 92.004(a)(4): chronic conflicts with other user groups leading to a decline in the quality of the outdoor experience.

**ISSUE:** The board should not be allowed to restrict off-road vehicle use during hunting season because of conflicts with other user groups.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** More and more restrictions over time.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Off-road vehicle users.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who like off-road restrictions.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** N/A.

**PROPOSED BY:** Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee (SC-06W-G-002)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets and reports.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Resident tag fee is not required prior to hunt. Fee to be paid when hide and skull are sealed.

**ISSUE:** Requiring pre-purchase of bear tag for residents limits harvest opportunities for moose or caribou hunters who accidentally see a bear.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued low bear harvests by residents.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** More harvest opportunity for bears should increase moose and caribou population.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bear, moose and caribou hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Bear, viewers and photographers.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Unit 25C change in tag regulations—other proposal.

**PROPOSED BY:** Central Advisory Committee (HQ-06W-G-015)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 11 - 5 AAC 92.010(f). Harvest tickets and reports.** Amend the regulation as follows:

(f) For deer, a person may not hunt deer, except in a permit hunt, unless the person has in possession a deer harvest ticket **and has obtained a harvest report**.

**ISSUE:** Require deer harvest report.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** No personal hunter accountability. Continued speculation on actual harvest.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Provides consistency for reporting in general hunts for ungulates. Gives direct harvest data to the department.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters and the department.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Surveys are voluntary only.

**PROPOSED BY:** Anchorage Advisory Committee

(SC-06W-G-019)

\*\*\*\*\*

*Note: This proposal was deferred from the Fall 2005 meeting.*

**PROPOSAL 12 - 5 AAC 92.011(a). Taking of game by proxy.** Amend the regulation as follows:

(a) A resident hunter (the proxy) holding a valid resident hunting license may take only moose, caribou, **muskoxen** and deer for another resident (the beneficiary) who is blind, physically disabled, or 65 years of age or older, as authorized by AS 16.05.405.

...

**ISSUE:** Much of the muskox harvest in Alaska is by subsistence Tier II and Tier I permit. Permit holders are often subsistence hunters responsible for feeding many people in their families and communities. In the event that a permit holder is elderly or becomes disabled, it is reasonable that they be allowed to designate a proxy to provide them and their dependents with muskox meat, just as they are able to do with caribou and moose.

Since 1998 when Tier II muskox hunting began on the Seward Peninsula there have been repeated requests for authorization of proxy hunting by permit holders who are physically disabled or 65 years old or older and the issue is brought up regularly at public meetings concerning muskox hunting on the Seward Peninsula. Proxy authorization for muskoxen will likely increase success rates in subsistence hunts and make it possible to achieve harvest quotas with the number of permits that are being issued.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Those depending on the permit winner to provide meat will continue to lose out and permits will continue to go unfilled in the event that a permit holder becomes disabled.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Elderly and disabled permit winners and their dependants who want to have a proxy hunt for them.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Seward Peninsula MuskOx Cooperators Group, Northern Norton Sound Advisory Committee, Northern Seward Peninsula Advisory Committee, Noatak-Kivalina Advisory Committee, Lower Kobuk Advisory Committee, and Kotzebue Sound Advisory Committee  
(HQ-06W-G-031)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 13 - 5 AAC 92.011. Taking of game by proxy.** Restrict number of beneficiaries a resident hunter (proxy) may hunt for in each regulatory year, as follows:

Limit the number of proxies one hunter can have in each regulatory year. One would be our preference.

**ISSUE:** Even with the restriction to only hunting for one proxy beneficiary at a time, the system is being abused by a few individuals who “solicit” proxies from facilities such as Pioneer Homes. The system needs to provide for those Alaskans (or their families) who will use the meat not just provide additional hunting and harvest. No hunter should be allowed to accumulate proxy authorities just so he or she can keep on hunting and harvesting.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The present proxy system will be abused by hunters harvesting for their own benefit rather than for the benefit of the proxy beneficiaries.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** A limit on proxies would not benefit many people except in areas where there is a need to hold down the total harvest. Then it would improve the quality for more Alaskan families.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaskans who want to be more productive hunting for their families.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** A few individuals who are abusing the loophole in the present regulation by getting, in some cases, more than a half dozen proxy permits.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Eliminating the proxy hunt, but there are Alaskans who get their meat by proxy hunters.

**PROPOSED BY:** Interior Airboaters Association (HQ-06W-G-019)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 92.011. Taking of game by proxy.** Modify the existing proxy regulation to limit to specific hunts as follows:

(a) A resident hunter (the proxy) holding a valid resident hunting license may take only moose, caribou, and deer for another resident (the beneficiary) who is blind, physically disabled, or 65 years of age or older, as authorized by AS 16.05.405. **Proxy hunting will be allowed for caribou and deer in areas where the bag limit is greater than one. Proxy hunting will be allowed for moose in cow hunts or any-bull hunts.**

...

(f) A proxy who takes game for a beneficiary shall, as soon as practicable, but not later than 30 days after taking game, personally deliver all parts of the game removed from the field to the beneficiary [WHO MUST SIGN THE PROXY AUTHORIZATION FORM UPON RECEIPT OF THE GAME].

...

**ISSUE:** The proxy program was established in statute in 1992, and regulations were adopted by the Board of Game in 1993. The program was established to allow a resident hunter (the proxy) holding a valid resident hunting license to take moose, caribou and deer for another resident (beneficiary) who is blind, disabled, or 65 years of age or older.

The number of proxy authorizations issued has increased dramatically in recent years and some people believe the program is being abused and no longer meeting regulatory intent. In many areas of the state where hunting has been restricted for a variety of reasons, the proxy authorization is being used as a chance at additional opportunity. In some situations, this may have allowed the restriction on bag limits to be circumvented. Staff workload has increased as the number of proxy hunting applications has grown geometrically. Proxy permits are the most complicated set of paperwork that the department issues.

Over 1,900 proxy permits were issued in regulatory year 2004. The result has been an essentially increasing number of hunters in the field. The actual number of hunters may be static, but many of those hunters now have two bag limits, and more of the total harvest is going to fewer hunters. This has become an allocation issue directly related to fairness and equal opportunity for hunters.

In cases where the board has restricted seasons and bag limits due to conservation concerns, proxy hunters are circumventing those restrictions. An example of this is the restriction where a hunter can obtain either a moose or caribou permit in the Fortymile area, but not both. With a proxy authorization, one hunter can hunt for both.

This proposal would limit proxy hunting to areas where the board has fewer conservation concerns. Proxy hunting would be limited to areas where there is already a multiple bag limit for deer and caribou. Moose is limited to a bag limit of one statewide, so proxy hunting for moose would be allowed only for cow hunts or any-bull hunts.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The use of proxies to circumvent bag limit restrictions will continue to grow.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All hunters, as everyone will be hunting the same bag limit in an area.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Some proxy hunters may have to change the location where they hunt to acquire food for a beneficiary.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Require trophy destruction of all animals taken while proxy hunting, limit program to second degree kindred, require separation of hunts-not hunting for proxy at same time as self.

**PROPOSED BY:** Board of Game and Department of Fish and Game (HQ-06W-G021)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 15 - 5 AAC 92.011. Taking of game by proxy.** Amend the regulation as follows:

No more than two proxies in possession of a hunter during the same season for the same species.

**ISSUE:** Unlimited proxy permits.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Some people are hunting too many proxies at once.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** It will eliminate the potential for abuse of a good program.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** No one is likely to benefit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one is likely to suffer.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ray Heuer (I-06W-G-009)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 16 - 5 AAC 92.019. Taking of big game for certain religious ceremonies.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Anyone hunting for a potlatch must have in their possession a copy of the potlatch permit and a valid harvest ticket or tickets. All potlatch hunters must be listed on the permit and must report hunting results within five days of taking game (see 5 AAC 92.072(c)(2)(E)) and return unfilled harvest tickets within 15 days of potlatch date.

**ISSUE:** There are moose being harvested under the provision of 5 AAC 92.019 that are not being reported.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The unreported harvesting of cows, calves and bulls along Rosie Creek Road, Bonanza Creek Road, Cache Creek Road and Chena Hot Springs Road is limiting the biologists access to accurate human harvest records. The moose population is being depleted at an undocumented rate.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal improves the quality of the resource by allowing biologists to accurately assess moose populations for the implementation of sustained yield principles.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All hunters in Unit 20B will benefit because moose populations will be more accurately recorded and managed.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will suffer, this proposal does not restrict hunting, it only calls for reporting harvests.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Closing all potlatch hunting in Unit 20B unless the potlatch was to be held within the game unit boundary. This would probably be considered unfair to nonresidents of Unit 20B.

**PROPOSED BY:** Virgil Davis (I-06W-G-001)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 92.019. Taking of big game for certain religious ceremonies.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Only one potlatch hunting permit will be issued to the family of the deceased. The family may choose and register up to five hunters. The potlatch permit should be administered the same as the provisions stated under 5 AAC 92.072(c)(1)(A) of the community subsistence harvest hunt area and permit.

**ISSUE:** There is more than one potlatch hunting permit being issued for a single potlatch.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** An excessive number of moose will be harvested for potlatches which will cause an accelerated decline in areas that are heavily targeted by potlatch hunters. These areas include Rosie Creek Road, Bonanza Creek Road, Cache Creek Road and Chena Hot Springs Road as noted in the department potlatch permit records.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This limitation is consistent with sustained yield principles which are critically important in the heavily populated game Unit 20B.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All residents in Unit 20B, Fairbanks North Star Borough will benefit. This limitation is consistent with sustained yield principles.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one should suffer.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Virgil Davis

(I-06W-G-002)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC 92.027. Permit for exporting big game trophies, 5 AAC 92.200. Purchase and sale of game, and 5 AAC 92.031. Permit for selling skins and trophies.** Amend these regulations as follows:

Buying, selling, bartering, advertising, or otherwise offering for sale or barter a big game trophy, including any trophy made from any part of a big game animal is allowed under use of game provided that it has been legally harvested.

**ISSUE:** Under present law, Alaskan hunters are not allowed to sell their own big game trophies. If for whatever reason a hunter would like to sell a trophy that theoretically belongs to the hunter, it is against the law. If a hunter wanted to give a trophy away, it is unlawful to be reimbursed for the taxidermy or tanning fees. The State of Alaska has two public auctions to generate funds for its coffers by selling confiscated wildlife most of which are classified as “trophies.” The state can sell them but John Q public cannot. Time and time again this proposal has come before the board. Time and time again the proposal is rejected primarily due to Fish and Wildlife Protection adamantly insisting that this is a conservation issue with negative impacts to our wildlife resource. Our committee does not agree with this opinion. We would like the board to thoughtfully consider these facts:

- A. All legally taken and sealed fur bearing animals can be sold including wolf and wolverine that have a dual classification of both furbearers and big game.
- B. Presently certain hides and capes of big game animals such as caribou, Dall sheep, moose, muskox and mountain goat can be sold.
- C. Presently legally taken horns and antlers plus shed horn and antlers can be sold provided that they are detached from their natural point of separation from the skull.

Have any of these legal sales caused negative impacts to wildlife? Has it caused increased violations? In our opinion, legalizing the sale of “trophies” such as mounted game heads, bear rugs, bear hides, life-size mounts is not going to have any more impact on wildlife than what is legal to sell now. Making it legal to sell a trophy is not going to cause any more poaching than there currently exists. These trophies, mounted or not, will not have a significant enough value to cause a problem.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Legal sale of wildlife can actually help to benefit wildlife. Wildlife is not realizing this full potential.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Any person who may choose to sell a trophy. Individuals who otherwise would not be able to acquire an Alaskan trophy, such as folks who cannot afford a guided hunt, handicapped people who are not physically able to hunt for themselves, business owners wanting to promote their products through visual wildlife displays that in turn promote hunting by exposing and equipping thousands of new people to the sport of hunting which in turn pays for wildlife personnel, conservation, habitat and a host of other positive benefits to wildlife. Ungulates that have predators reduced in their areas as a result of hunter incentive due to the economic value of an animal that otherwise is a liability to them (requirement to salvage hides).

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Wildlife officers and individuals who have a mind set that giving wildlife a value causes their destruction. They will only temporarily suffer until the law is in effect long enough to prove them wrong. Anti-hunters who hold the belief that no animal should be used to benefit mankind.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Prohibiting the sale of bear claws was considered but rejected as long as the animal is legally taken it should not cause any problems. If bear claws are that valuable, a big problem would exist right now regardless of the law.

**PROPOSED BY:** Upper Tanana Advisory Committee (I-06W-G-010)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 92.031. Permit for selling skins and trophies, 5 AAC 92.200. Purchase and sale of game, and 5 AAC 92.027. Permit for exporting big game trophies.** Amend these regulations as follows:

Legally obtained game trophies may be sold by resident hunters.

**ISSUE:** It is illegal for Alaska citizens to sell trophy legally obtained. Trophies taken by out of state residents are commonly sold out of state.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Alaska citizens will still be penalized for being Alaskans and some trophies will be wasted.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, more trophies will be utilized.



**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Anyone who wishes to sell a trophy. Those who take trophy game who wish to sell the trophies.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-06W-G-021)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 20 - 5 AAC 92.029. Permit for possessing live game.** Amend the regulation as follows:

The species, African Serval, may be possessed only if the person holds a possession/educational permit issued by the department. The animal may not be released into the wild.

**ISSUE:** The problem of not being allowed to have ownership of an African Serval. This wonderful animal is allowed in most states. Some states allow them with a special educational permit.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There would be many adults in retirement and nursing homes, children in schools, children in hospitals plus the handicapped who would not be allowed to touch and experience this wonderful animal in person and learn about their history.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** I believe bringing the African Serval to the state would be a definite improvement, especially the educational experiences for the children and elderly.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The children and elderly that would be able to have a close encounter with a Serval. Responsible potential pet owners who will be able to share their love of cats of every size and breed. It has been proven that dogs and cats that have been allowed to visit hospitals, nursing homes and schools have a great interaction with the animals and have shown to improve a persons well-being.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** I do not believe any human or animal would suffer if this solution were adopted, with the Serval in the house and an enclosed outside pen, be spayed/neutered and declawed front and back. Vaccination for rabies and all other vaccines as indicated in the regulation could be stipulated.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** When I heard that I was next in line for an African Serval kitten I was so excited and started making plans to bring my kitten home and building the outdoor enclosure. My granddaughter and I were going to go together down to Montana to pick it up. Then I found out they were not allowed in Alaska yet and we were broken hearted. Now my solution is to get a permit so I can bring this wonderful cat into my home and share with the children and adults that otherwise would not be able to have the chance to actually touch one.

**PROPOSED BY:** Theresa Bauer (HQ-06W-G-007)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 21 - 5 AAC 92.031. Permit for selling skins and trophies.** Amend the regulation as follows:

In units or subunits where the board has determined that black bear populations need to be reduced, the department will issue permits allowing hunters and trappers to sell the skin with claws attached and the skull of black bears. Permits allowing trapping of black bear will also be issued.

**ISSUE:** The inability to achieve harvest objectives required to reduce black bear populations in areas where the board has determined that black bear predation/populations need to be reduced in order for depressed prey populations to recover.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Identified prey populations will not recover.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, products produced for sale will have to be properly salvaged.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bear hunters, consumers, moose and caribou hunters, moose calf viewers and photographers, and trappers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Mt. Yenlo Advisory Committee (HQ-06W-G-003)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 92.031. Permit for selling skins and trophies and 5 AAC 92.200. Purchase and sale of game.** Amend these regulations as follows:

In areas where the department has determined that black bear populations are to be reduced to aide in the recovery of depressed ungulate populations, the sale of black bear hides and skulls will be allowed.

**ISSUE:** Underharvest of black bears in areas where the department has determined black bear populations need to be reduced.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Black bear populations will not be reduced and prey populations will not recover.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, salvage for sale will require better handling.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bear hunters, moose and caribou hunters, and moose calf viewers and photographers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Mt. Yenlo Advisory Committee

(HQ-06W-G-005)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC 92.031. Permit for selling skins and trophies.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Public sale of brown bear (grizzly) hides raw or processed will be legal.

**ISSUE:** To allow the sale of brown bear hides and skulls to the general public—no permits needed.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Not very many bears will be taken due to the high cost of processing the hides.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** It will allow the person to recover some of the costs.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunter, trapper and the general public.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Daniel Green

(SC-06W-G-014)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC 92.031. Permit for selling skins and trophies.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Public sale of black bear hides, raw or processed, is legal without a permit.

**ISSUE:** Allow the sale of black bear hides and skulls to the general public. No permits needed, just tagging.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Not very many bears will be taken due to the high cost of processing the hides.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** It will allow the person to recover some of the cost.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters, trappers and the general public.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Daniel Green

(SC-06W-G-015)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC 92.031. Permit for selling skins and trophies and 5 AAC 92.200. Purchase and sale of game.** Amend these regulations as follows:

Black bear hides and skulls may be sold legally.

**ISSUE:** Black bear hides are going to waste where there is an abundance of black bear.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Black bear hides will continue to be wasted.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, induces complete utilization of the resource.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Black bear hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-06W-G-022)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC 92.031. Permit for selling skins and trophies.** Shorten unclaimed period before sale as follows:

Change from one year wait after mount completion to six months after completion.

**ISSUE:** It takes too long to get permission to sell an unwanted trophy. Having to wait one year after completion is a financial burden on the taxidermist.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** With the number of unwanted mounts growing, the financial burden of the taxidermist continues to increase.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Does not affect the resource.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All taxidermists that do business in the State of Alaska.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The people who no longer want or cannot afford their taxidermy bill.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Russell Knight (SC-06W-G-027)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 27 - 5 AAC 92.050(a)(9). Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.**  
The following conditions and procedures for permit issuance apply to each permit hunt:

...  
(9) an applicant for a “certified bowhunters only” permit hunt must have successfully completed a department approved bowhunter education course prior to submitting a permit application; **an**

**applicant for a “certified muzzleloader hunter only” permit hunt must have successfully completed a department approved muzzleloader certification course prior to submitting a permit application.**

**ISSUE:** There has been increased interest and awareness of muzzleloading hunting in Alaska, especially with a recent increase of “muzzleloader only” hunts.

Change should be considered for the following reasons:

- The new requirement would match the current “archery only” hunts.
- Ensure that only serious applicants that intend to hunt would be applying for these “muzzleloader only” permits, since it would take some effort, time, and money on their part to become certified.
- The department would have a higher percentage of muzzleloader hunt winners actually going into the field, since they would already be certified to hunt upon notification.
- This would reduce the complaints we get from other muzzleloader hunters that currently know permits are not being used, due to the current application process.

The department is requesting a two-year delay in implementation to allow advance notice to appear in department publications. Public notice would be listed in Spring of 2006 and 2007 supplements and become mandatory for the Spring 2008 application period. This would provide the interested hunters advance notice and adequate time to obtain certification. This also gives the department staff another year to increase muzzleloader instructor numbers and essential course equipment to meet the anticipated increase in classes and students.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Everyone will continue to be able to apply for restricted hunts and then attempt to obtain certification.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** There will be no change. Muzzleloader hunters will still be required to be certified before hunting.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters who plan ahead and obtain the certification prior to the application period.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Hunters who do not plan ahead and do not obtain certification, making them ineligible to apply for these hunts. .

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-06W-G-027)

\*\*\*\*\*

*Note: This proposal was deferred from the June 2005 meeting.*

**PROPOSAL 28 - 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-06W-G-033)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system.** Amend the regulation as follows:

- (a) Dependence = **40** [60]
  - (1) Length of use of game population by individual **30** [50]
  - (2) Length of use of game population by household **10** [10, but calculated using a different figure]
  
- (b) Access to alternate resources = **60** [40]
  - (1) Delete this section
  - (2) Availability of food locally **15** [30]
  - (3) Cost of gasoline **15** [10]
  - (4) Distance traveled to obtain food from applicant residence to closest available grocery store 15**
  - (5) Distance traveled to obtain gasoline from applicant residence to closest available gas station 15**

**ISSUE:** The people most dependent on the animals are not able to get permits due to the way the point system currently operates. This is particularly a problem for young people.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The people most dependent on subsistence resources will continue to be prevented from obtaining Tier II permits.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The people most dependent on subsistence resources that are harvested under Tier II permits.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People with good access to alternative resources who are less dependent on subsistence resources.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Several variations of point changes were considered.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ahtna Tene Nene' Subsistence Committee (HQ-06W-G-009)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system.** Amend this regulation as follows:

Adopt Tier II point system changes proposed in the Nelchina proposals.

**ISSUE:** Inequity in relative importance of Tier II point system.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Permits issued under Tier II hunts will continue to be inequitable in their distribution.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Subsistence users more dependent on the resource.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Subsistence users not as dependent on the resource.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Numerous, too complex of an issue.

**PROPOSED BY:** Tanana Chiefs Conference (SC-06W-G-007)  
\*\*\*\*\*

*Note: This proposal was deferred from the Fall 2005 meeting and amended by the board to apply to all of Unit 22.*

**PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 92.080(4). Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Allow hunters the ability to hunt and harvest wolves on motorized vehicles including ATV, snowmobile and boat.

**ISSUE:** Unlawful harvest of wolf by motorized vehicle.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued increase in wolf population in central Unit 22A.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Hopefully increasing wolf harvest will aid the effort to increase moose populations in central Unit 22A.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Wolf hunters and future moose users.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Southern Norton Sound Advisory Committee (HQ-06W-G-032)  
\*\*\*\*\*



**PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 92.110. Control of predation by wolves and 5 AAC 92.115. Control of predation by bears.** Amend these regulations as follows:

Allow the pursuit of wolves and/or bears by snowmachine within intensive management predator control boundaries.

**ISSUE:** Pursuit by snowmachine is excluded at the present time, for example, in the Fortymile Caribou Herd protection area, and should be allowed to enable hunters to assist in removing wolves and/or bears from within the control areas.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Hunters will not have as much flexibility in hunting predators during the regular hunting seasons, especially where snowmachine pursuit is not allowed by existing regulation over large areas, i.e., multiple game management units, regions or even statewide.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Since this would only be valid in predator control areas as part of the removal plan, the improvement to survival of the stated species, usually moose or caribou calves, is removing additional predators.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters who have the opportunity to harvest a wolf or bear and all Alaskans through the success of the predator control implementation plan.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None, it makes sense to harvest the predators as efficiently and as quickly as possible.

**PROPOSED BY:** Fairbanks Advisory Committee (I-06W-G-004)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 92.115. Control of predation by bears.** Amend the regulation as follows:

In game management units or subunits where the board has determined that a reduction in black bear populations are necessary to help in the recovery of depressed ungulate populations, the following will occur if black bear harvest objectives are not met for three consecutive years following the board's decision to reduce black bear populations:

- 1) During the spring board meeting the department (utilizing expertise provided by local residents) will present options available to the board to increase harvests to achieve the harvest objectives.
- 2) Until harvest objectives are met the department will be required to update progress and provide options for increased harvest at every spring board meeting.

**ISSUE:** The inability to achieve harvest objectives in areas where the department has decided to reduce black bear populations to aide in the recovery of ungulate populations.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Objectives will be set, but objectives will not be met and problems will never be solved.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The board will benefit as they may become more informed of the current status of goals and options to achieve them.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Include brown bears—rejected—the board can add as amendment if desired.

**PROPOSED BY:** Mt. Yenlo Advisory Committee (HQ-06W-G-002)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 34 - 5 AAC 92.170(e). Sealing of marten, lynx, beaver, otter, wolf, and wolverine.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Trappers will be allowed to ship fur to fur buyers in Alaska for sealing.

**ISSUE:** Currently, fur is shipped to fur buyers in Alaska for sealing. Even though these fur buyers are authorized fur sealers of the department this act is illegal without first filling out a temporary sealing form and shipping it with the fur. In many rural areas, fur sealers and temporary sealing forms are not available. Allowing fur buyers to receive and seal fur as if the trapper was present would make sales of fur more convenient. The intent of sealing is to record the location, sex, and age of harvested animals for management of furbearer populations. A fur buyer is capable of transposing this information to a sealing certificate by written or phone communication with the trapper.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The sealing of fur sent to fur buyers from trappers without other options will continue to be illegal without good reason.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trappers and fur buyers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** A simplified temporary sealing form printed in the back of the trapping regulations.

**PROPOSED BY:** Bill Wivoda (HQ-06W-G-034)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 92.170. Sealing of marten, lynx, beaver, otter, wolf, and wolverine.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Sealing requirements for all trapped animals will be replaced by the requirement for trappers to submit a season harvest card stating species and game unit of harvest.

**ISSUE:** Remove sealing requirements for all trapped animals and require a trapper to submit a season harvest card giving species and place (game unit).

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Massive amount of time and money wasted by staff sealing for animals when data could be taken by mail-in harvest card.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Will improve the management of game funds.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The department by increasing information gathered while reducing funds expended. Trappers by making reporting easier.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-06W-G-020)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC 92.171. Sealing of Dall sheep horns.** Modify the regulation concerning sealing of sheep horns as follows:

A person may not possess, transport, or export from the state, the horns of a Dall sheep ram taken in any hunt where there is a horn configuration bag limit, unless the horns have been sealed by a department representative within 30 days after the taking, or a lesser time if designated by the department.  
(See list of options below.)

**ISSUE:** This regulation was passed in 2004 in response to public proposals concerned about the take of illegal sheep. After two years of data gathering, data have shown that 30-35 percent of the sheep taken statewide are less than full curl. Most of the sheep less than full curl are still legal because they are over eight years old.

The number of illegal sheep that have been presented over the last two hunting seasons is less than 1 percent of the total harvest. Almost all of the illegal sheep were taken by nonresident guided hunters.

The department is continuing discussions on how to modify the program and will present further options at the January meeting. Examples include requirements to:

- affix a permanent marker on sealed sheep,
- seal sheep that are harvested only in specific game management units,
- limit sealing to nonresident hunters,
- allow sealing only in certain offices versus the current program where sheep may be sealed anywhere in the state.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Status quo. All hunters will be required to seal sheep taken.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All hunters who take sheep.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** If changes are made to the current regulation, different groups of sheep hunters may be affected.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** See Issue statement.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-06W-G-028)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Statewide, either the meat or the hide of a black bear must be salvaged.

**ISSUE:** Unnecessary salvage of unwanted black bear hides when harvesting bears for meat.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** An unnecessary burden of salvaging bear hides when harvesting bears for meat will continue.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Black bear meat hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The department will have to rely on the hunter to identify sex of animal when sealing skull.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Have hunter salvage the evidence of sex for biologist to inspect.

**PROPOSED BY:** Mt. Yenlo Advisory Committee (HQ-06W-G-004)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 38 - 5 AAC 92.230. Feeding of game.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Include bald eagles to the list of six species that may not be intentionally fed.

**ISSUE:** Clearly, to curtail burgeoning eagle populations and additional people establishing more eagle feeding sites, this activity needs to be made unlawful, as is the case for most large predators. Feeding eagles could be prohibited under 5 AAC 92.230 by adding bald eagle to the list of six species that may not be intentionally fed. Under special circumstances, such as a research project, a permit issued and monitored by the department and/or federal officials could allow local feeding. Feeding bald eagles, apex predators, especially in residential areas (in Homer, Eagle River, Sitka, and other coastal communities) is resulting in increasing depredation on small pets and poultry as more eagles lose their wariness of humans. In turn, additional nuisance eagles are causing neighborhood conflicts, and more eagles are being shot. Growing numbers of eagles are harassing

and preying upon a small, declining Sandhill Crane population in the Homer area, and heavy predation is reported on waterfowl, lessening hunting opportunities. Eagle feeding sites also attract ravens, crows, and other scavengers, which increase the probability of disease transmission. In Kachemak Bay the mean number of eagles counted in winter prior to feeding on the Homer Spit was only five, but it averaged 130 with a peak count of 650 since feeding began in 1979.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If eagle feeding remains legal, their populations will continue to increase in more areas, and feeding will proliferate in additional subdivisions, resulting in increasing animosity towards eagles. Electrocution and shooting of eagles will escalate along with the likelihood of avian diseases. Additional people who now erroneously believe feeding eagles is illegal will discover that it is permissible, and therefore more people will begin doing it.

In addition, the escalating number of eagles in the Homer area poses a threat to aircraft, particularly the major winter feeding operation (500 pounds per day) on the Homer Spit according to the wildlife hazard management plan for the Homer airport and the extensive “Wildlife Hazard Assessment of the Homer Airport...” prepared by the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Wildlife Services. A commuter aircraft collided with an eagle in September 2002.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, making eagle feeding unlawful would ultimately disperse and reduce local numbers of eagles, thereby benefiting waterfowl hunting, viewing, and photography. Sandhill Cranes and other species, such as some seabirds and waterfowl, excessively disturbed and preyed on by eagles also would benefit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** People suffering losses of small dogs, other small pets, and poultry, the vast majority of people who enjoy watching and photographing Sandhill Cranes not harassed or killed by eagles, particularly in the Kachemak Bay region; and waterfowl hunters who would have less competition from an overabundance of eagles. Also, in the long run eagles themselves will benefit because they will be less likely to be shot, electrocuted, hit by cars or aircraft, poisoned, or contract diseases.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Relatively few individuals who place fish scraps and other meat near their homes or elsewhere to watch and photograph eagles and other commensals. Some bed and breakfast establishments, lodges, and photo tour operators who amuse tourists with artificial concentrations of feeding eagles. Businesses that sell herring and other fish to tourists and photographers to toss to eagles.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Requesting the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to recommend amending the Bald Eagle Act nationwide to ban eagle feeding would be a difficult process that would take years. Localized eagle feeding in Alaska could easily be stopped by the board and would be encouraged by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Promulgating local municipal and/or borough regulations to outlaw eagle feeding would not be consistent or practical since the problem is too geographically widespread. Also, local governments like the Kenai Peninsula Borough lack enforcement authority.

**PROPOSED BY:** Edgar Bailey (HQ-06W-G-001)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 39 - 5 AAC 92.230. Feeding of game.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Add bald eagles to the already existing “do not feed” regulation.

**ISSUE:** The intentional feeding “baiting” of eagles by the general public. There is currently no regulation prohibiting the intentional feeding of eagles. Those who engage in this behavior have no consideration of the unintended consequences of such behavior. Eagles should be added to the list of species which are unlawful to feed to reduce the numbers of this apex predator around populated areas.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** This is a public safety issue. Intentional feeding costs the members of the community.

- A. Fed eagles are a danger to airports, as documented by the FAA in its Wildlife Hazard Assessment report from Homer.
- B. They also are a danger around construction and in populated areas. A news report from Homer documents an incident of a construction worker being hit in the head by an eagle fighting over fed fish. Also, a fed eagle crashed through a plate glass window in Ketchikan.
- C. They create a safety hazard in harbors. Eagles, attracted to harbor areas with food, perch on VHF antennas on boats destroying the ability of sailors to call for help in emergency situations, as documented by the Homer Coast Guard Auxiliary. The Coast Guard reports that fed eagles do major damage to the electronic towers on their boats, knocking off antennas and leaving huge claw marks and much excrement on their boats.
- D. The feeding of eagles taxes the resources of communities by increasing cost of patrolling airports to keep eagles away from runways. An incident in Petersburg between an eagle and an ERA flight did \$250,000 in damage to the airplane. Eagle collisions and near misses also have occurred in Homer.
- E. There is a cost of handling injured birds, such as the cost of removing an eagle from a microwave antenna in Homer, cost in time for vets to handle injured birds; and cost to the insurance industry to repair damages done by eagles to boat electronics and to repair claw marks on vehicles.
- F. Electrocution of eagles on power lines is a major concern for electric companies. In Kodiak eagles fighting over fish scraps were getting electrocuted, so a way had to be devised to prevent electrocutions. Electrocutions sometimes cause power outages. Feeding and attracting eagles to towns increases this probability. USFWS records show that hundreds of eagles have been killed by electrocutions or collisions with power lines.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, more ducks and other waterfowl will be available to hunters rather than being taken by hordes of eagles attracted by feeding.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Virtually all Alaskans will benefit in terms of safety in harbors and at airports across Alaska. Eagles are generally migratory and are kept around towns by people who like to see large numbers of eagles around their homes and harbors. Towns cannot alter their airports and their approach patterns from residential areas.

The seafood industry will benefit because of the reduction of eagles around the plants. Some ill-advised people like to feed the eagles that gather around areas where fish are being processed.

Communities will benefit because of the reduced costs of keeping eagles out of the airport areas and the reduced costs of rescuing eagles. Our electric co-ops will benefit as there will be fewer eagles

perched on electric lines. Kodiak paid more than \$250 per pole to prevent eagle electrocutions with plastic insulators and perch guards. Electrocutions can cause a power outage. This regulation would reduce that danger.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who like to feed, watch and photograph eagles.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** It is the state's job to control excessive predators artificially congregated by feeding.

**PROPOSED BY:** Susan Clardy (HQ-06W-G-006)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 40 - 5 AAC 92.230. Feeding of game.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Add the bald eagle to the list of species prohibited to feed.

**ISSUE:** Prohibiting feeding protects people who are adversely affected by this activity as a public nuisance by allowing State Wildlife Troopers to stop intentional feeding of bald eagles. This is not a significant burden for the state to enforce. Although USFWS manages the bald eagle under the federal 1940 Bald and Golden Eagle Act, it has failed legally to address Alaska's serious issue of feeding/baiting bald eagles. Alaska is a large state and has limited accessibility and no one group can assess and manage non-game species.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** This will continue to be a public safety issue and a public nuisance as people will intentionally feed bald eagles around cities, airports, fish processors, construction sites, and public use areas, such as harbors, beaches and local neighborhoods where "backyard feeders" may attract other animals. Bald eagle feeding allows people to artificially increase bald eagle populations in local areas such as Kachemak Bay, a designated state critical habitat area. No studies to assess the negative effects on prey species, pets, and poultry have been made. The State of Alaska constitution states that all animals in the state are held in a public trust to be managed for all residents, not just a few.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Protects valuable wildlife resources, especially waterfowl, as well as habitat areas from people who bait and feed eagles. Cessation of eagle feeding and consequently concentrating large numbers of eagles would likely benefit waterfowl hunters, especially those seeking sea ducks. Large unnatural congregations of hundreds of eagles likely have an influence on the survival of local prey species. Huge concentrations of eagles also may aid the spread of avian diseases.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bald eagles lured by the promise of an easy meal are often attracted by feeders to areas that contain the leading causes of eagle mortality; power lines, antennas, cell phone towers, boats and busy traffic. Bald eagles made to dive or fight for fish scraps are at risk of injury or death.

Local habitats that cannot support a large artificial congregation of a top predator and any animal or bird that is prey to the eagles that resides in this habitat will benefit.

Hunting, observing, and photographing small game is a popular activity for many Alaskans as well as an increasing number of nonresidents. This could diminish in areas of large concentrations of fed eagles.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** A very small group of people who have made bald eagle feeding/baiting a cottage industry as a matter of opportunity and do not depend on this activity as a means of support.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** USFWS to address the unintentional gap in their laws that protect eagles in regards to humans feeding them. This would take too long. However, the activity of intentionally feeding and baiting bald eagles, as practiced by both residents and nonresidents, is currently an issue in the state. All the bald eagles that reside in the State of Alaska deserve to be recognized as a valuable resident wildlife resource and therefore should have a state law to protect them.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Eagle Watch Network (HQ-06W-G-010)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 41 - 5 AAC 92.230. Feeding of game.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Allow the department to act preemptively to avoid possible problem conditions resulting from the feeding of wildlife that would result in the animals becoming conditioned to human food, pet food or garbage.

**ISSUE:** We are concerned about the intentional and/or negligent feeding of wildlife that results in an animal becoming conditioned to human food, pet food or garbage. It too often happens that these animals become a nuisance or threat and get killed. It appears to us that language in the existing regulation should allow authorities to intervene in situations where problems have not yet occurred but are inevitable, but we have been told that that is not the case. Apparently, enforcement of this regulation can occur only after a problem occurs. Consequently, we would like to strengthen this regulation to allow authorities to act preemptively, allowing them to fine individuals who are inviting problems with moose, bear, wolf, coyote, fox and wolverine, particularly in areas of the state that have a history of these problems.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If enforcement authorities are not able to head off obvious problems, conflicts with wildlife because of food and garbage will persist. This will not only lead to a waste of wildlife, but wasted time for authorities who could be doing more work more beneficial to wildlife and users of wildlife.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Definitely, it will reduce the waste of wildlife and make better use of time and other resources that would otherwise be expended by authorities that have to deal with these problems.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Moose, bear, wolf, coyote, fox, and wolverine and all those who live in or visit areas where these species occur in Alaska.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one that we can imagine.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo which is not as effective as it could be.



**PROPOSED BY:** Kachemak Bay Conservation Society

(HQ-06W-G-011)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 42 - 5 AAC 92.230. Feeding of game.** Amend the regulation as follows:

...pet food livestock feed (i.e. grains) and hay, birdseed from April through November, or garbage in a manner that attracts these animals to protect their beehives, fowl, and small livestock persons must take adequate precautions, such as electric fences or bear proof containers (proven bear deterrents; not taking adequate precautions will constitute a violation of this regulation).

**ISSUE:** To clarify and increase enforceability of 5 AAC 92.230.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will be continued defense of life/property bear deaths and there will continue to be conflict of bear and human encounters in subdivisions and neighborhoods if this regulation is not improved.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Increased safety in neighborhoods for everyone, safer conditions for domestic animals, and fewer human-bear conflicts will result. There likely will be fewer defense of life/property bear deaths.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Some will say they cannot afford to take adequate preventative measures. However, low cost or free electric fencing is available.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Doing nothing. I rejected this because the status quo is not working. As more people move into bear country, more conflicts will result unless people are educated and required to take preventative measures.

**PROPOSED BY:** Roberta Highland

(HQ-06W-G-013)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 92.230. Feeding of game.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Add bald eagle to the list of species that may not be intentionally fed. A section could be added to allow permits under the department or federal purview for special situations, i.e., rehabilitation or research.

**ISSUE:** Intentional feeding of wild bald eagles.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Homer has had a long-term eagle feeding operation on the spit, a very controversial issue locally. In the past this was the only known feeding station in Homer. As many as 650 eagles have been counted at one time on the spit. Historically, before feeding there were only one to five eagles on the spit, according to Christmas bird counts. We are now seeing outside photographers purchasing herring bait and throwing it to eagles on populated beaches where people walk with their children and dogs. Some dangerous practices have been witnessed, such as a child walking up to an eagle and eagles diving in close proximity to beach

walkers. With the increasing numbers of people feeding eagles, there is a high probability of serious incident involving injury to people and other animals, including eagles themselves.

Eagle feeding is increasing in Homer subdivisions and neighborhoods, and according to some becoming a problem in other areas of the state. The reported conflicts include injury and death to small pets, poultry, Sandhill Cranes, waterfowl, and livestock calves. Another potential problem is attracting bears and other predators into peoples' yards during the summer months when the majority of people have removed their birdfeeders. There is a proven safety factor involving aircraft and birds, particularly with large birds like eagles and other birds like crows, ravens, and gulls attracted to eagle feeding stations around airports.

In addition, a long-time resident reported historically there was one eagle nest every five miles along the Kachemak Bay shoreline. This has now increased to approximately one every mile or so. This increased density of eagles is logically having an affect on prey species, such as waterfowl.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** By prohibiting eagle feeding, the overabundant numbers of eagles would be reduced, thereby likely increasing the number of waterfowl available for hunting and wildlife viewing.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Pet and poultry owners and people who enjoy hunting or viewing waterfowl and other species impacted by too many eagles would benefit. People who travel on airplanes will benefit from increased airport safety. People in areas where feeding of eagles has been occurring would not have to worry about conflicts with bears and other predators brought into their areas by the feeding. People walking beaches on the end of the spit will not have to worry about eagle conflicts. Eagles themselves will be less likely to be injured or killed if not brought into close proximity with humans in such large concentrations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Photographers, including those from outside the state.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None at this time.

**PROPOSED BY:** Roberta Highland

(HQ-06W-G-014)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 92.230. Feeding of game.** Prohibit feeding wild birds in areas where bears are attracted to bird feeding stations, prohibit leaving unsecured hay in areas where moose are attracted and become a problem and prohibit use of commercial animal food for winter feed as follows:

A person may not intentionally feed a moose (except under terms of a permit issued by the department), **deer, elk,** bear, wolf, coyote, fox, or wolverine, or negligently leave human food, **domestic animal pet or artificial, commercially produced livestock** food, **including hay, bird seed,** or garbage in a manner that **may** attract[S] these animals. **In situations identified by ADF&G or ABWE as having attractant problems, a person must dispose of or secure these attractants immediately.** However, this prohibition does not apply to use of bait for trapping fur bearers or hunting black bears under 5 AAC 84 - 5 AAC 92.

**ISSUE:** Bears are attracted to foods provided by humans, and human food-conditioned bears may become a problem, particularly in urban areas. Bird seed and other foods provided for wild

birds, squirrels, and other wildlife are nutritious and sought after by bears who have learned to eat it. In Anchorage, many callers who reported black bears in their yards (2002-2004) identified bird feeders as one of the attractants. Bird feeders are also a major bear attractant in Juneau and Homer. Far fewer people feed squirrels and other small mammals; however, peanuts, bread, and other “squirrel” foods will also attract bears, and a person who allows bears to eat from a bird feeder could claim that he or she was feeding squirrels as a defense.

Unsecured hay attracts moose in some parts of the state. Moose have been shot in defense of life or property (DLP) where other means are available to keep them from eating hay. This is generally not a problem in rural areas; however, it is a problem in residential areas. In some areas, well meaning people buy commercially produced pellets for deer and elk to provide winter feed. These artificial and commercially produced foods may contain rendered animal parts, increasing the possibility of disease introduction.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** People will continue to feed wild birds, squirrels, and other small mammals, inadvertently attracting bears. People will continue to store hay in a manner that attracts moose. People will continue to feed deer and elk with artificial foods, increasing the chance of disease introduction.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Animals will not be taken unnecessarily under DLP provisions.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** People who do not want bears in their neighborhood. People who do not want moose killed DLP unnecessarily. People who don’t want wildlife diseases introduced to the state.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who want to feed birds and other wildlife in areas and seasons when bears are attracted to human-provided foods.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Adding “wild bird seed” and “livestock feed” to the list of items a person may not negligently leave in a manner that attracts moose, bears, and other species listed. We believe these foods should be prohibited only in areas and seasons where they are known to be a problem.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-06W-G-026)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 45 - 5 AAC 92.450. Description of game management units.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Unit 19E describes the Holitna watershed in its entirety.

**ISSUE:** The Holitna watershed at present is divided into two separate subunits, Unit 19A and Unit 19B. It shares boundaries with five different and diverse river systems. These other rivers and their user groups do not always share the same biological and/or regulatory needs.

Regulation and management tools are not always able to adequately address the needs of the Holitna since regulations and management tools must serve all the rivers in these large subunits.

This watershed needs its own separate subunit, to be managed as a whole watershed so its particular needs can be addressed.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The watershed will continue to be managed and regulated with the five other river systems that do not share the same hunting pressures, management problems or user groups. The Holitna River system is the large subsistence moose hunting area in this country and the users of the other rivers in the subunits do not always share the same concerns and/or problems thus compromises are made that sometimes have adverse effects for proper management on this river.

Present management needs or problems on the Holitna watershed do not necessarily fit those needs of the Aniak, Stony, Oskawalik, Holokuk and George rivers but since they share the same subunits, regulations and management tools must be tailored to fit all the different rivers.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal if adopted would help managers regulate and rebuild the game populations which have been sharing regulations with the other five river systems but have different pressures and populations. The quality of the resource of this drainage will improve if this watershed can be managed as a whole entity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Most user groups who access this river, biologists and game managers and future generations who will benefit from increased populations. The user groups of the other systems which now share the Holitna regulations and management will also benefit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Not known.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Critical habitat and game refuge status is one of the other tools looked at for the Holitna watershed but this will be addressed at a different forum. This river was once considered by the federal government as a wild and scenic river because of its unique nature.

**PROPOSED BY:** Grant Fairbanks (HQ-06W-G-008)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 46 - 5 AAC 92.450(9). Description of game management units.** Amend this regulation as follows:

Unit 9B consists of the Kvichak River Drainage except those lands drained by the Kvichak River/Bay between the Alagnak River drainage and the Naknek River drainage.

Unit 9C consists of the Alagnak (Branch) River drainage, the Naknek River drainage, lands drained by the Kvichak River/Bay between the Alagnak River drainage and the Naknek River drainage, and all land and water within Katmai National Park and Preserve.

**ISSUE:** During the 2004 regulatory year caribou hunters challenged the game management unit definition of Unit 9C in an attempt to harvest caribou under the seasons and bag limits of Unit 9B. The drainages of Coffee Creek and Graveyard Creek have historically been recognized as part of Unit 9C by the State of Alaska in spite of the fact that this portion of Unit 9C drains into the Kvichak River and Kvichak Bay.

The Northern Alaska Peninsula Caribou Herd frequents this portion of Unit 9C. Due to the status of this herd, there were no state or federal hunting permits issued in 2005. If caribou hunters exploit the discrepancy in the unit boundary definition, the Northern Alaska Peninsula Caribou Herd may be subject to the liberal seasons and bag limits in Unit 9B that were established for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.

Maintaining the current game management boundaries is fundamental to the management of the caribou herds that occupy this portion of Unit 9 and is consistent with past actions of the board regarding caribou hunting regulations in this area.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** As caribou hunting opportunities in Unit 9 become increasingly limited, unit boundaries will be challenged.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters that comply with the departments interpretation of the subunit boundary.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Hunters that want to take advantage of the lack of clarity to harvest additional caribou.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-06W-G-029)  
\*\*\*\*\*

*Note: Identical proposals were received by the submitters below. They are reproduced here as one proposal for publishing purposes.*

**PROPOSAL 47 - 5 AAC 92.450(17)(B). Description of game management units.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Extend the north boundary of Unit 17C to the north of Lake Kulik straight across.

**ISSUE:** Game management Unit 17C for moose hunting. The number of moose are declining due to increasing effort by nonresident hunters. They have easy access by airplanes. Residents hunt by boat in summer seasons.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Unit 17C moose numbers will continue to decline.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** There will be more breeding area for Unit 17C.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Unit 17C resident moose hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Former Unit 17B nonresident moose hunters.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** If the board does not consider this, let nonresidents hunt by boat, not airplanes.

**PROPOSED BY:** Aleknagik Traditional Council and Gusty R. Chythlook, Sr. (SW-06W-G-001)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 48 - 5 AAC 92.450(21). Description of game management units.** Change Game Management Unit 21B so that it includes all of the Nowitna River Drainage as follows:

Game Management Unit 21 consists of drainages into the Yukon River upstream from Paimut to but not including the Tozitna River drainage on the north bank, and to but not including the Tanana River drainage on the south bank, and excluding the Koyukuk River drainage upstream from the Dulbi River drainage;

(A) Unit 21(A) consists of the Innoko River drainage upstream from and including the Iditarod River drainage[, AND THE NOWITNA RIVER DRAINAGE UPSTREAM FROM THE LITTLE MUD RIVER];

(B) Unit 21(B) consists of the Yukon River drainage upstream from Ruby and east of the Ruby-Poorman Road, downstream from and excluding the Tozitna River and Tanana River drainages[, AND EXCLUDING THE NOWITNA RIVER DRAINAGE UPSTREAM FROM THE LITTLE MUD RIVER], and excluding the Melozitna River Drainage upstream from Grayling Creek;

**ISSUE:** The Nowitna River is currently split between Units 21A and 21B. The upper portion of the drainage above the Little Mud River is in Unit 21A, and the lower river is in Unit 21B. Department management activities along the river are also split, with the upper river managed by the McGrath area office and the lower river managed by the Galena area office. Wildlife population management issues are similar along the entire river and department access is easiest from Galena. Placing the entire Nowitna River in Unit 21B will enable simpler, more efficient management of the entire river from the Galena area office.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Management of the Nowitna River will continue to be more complicated and costly than necessary.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, management will be simpler and more efficient.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The public and the department will benefit from more efficient management of resources.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will likely suffer.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Take no action

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-06W-G-024)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 49 - 5 AAC 92.450(24). Description of game management units.** Divide Game Management Unit 24 into four subunits as follows:

...

Game Management Unit 24 consists of the Koyukuk River drainage upstream from but not including the Dulbi River drainage;

**(A) Unit 24(A) consists of the Middle Fork of the Koyukuk River drainage upstream from but not including the Harriet Creek and North Fork Koyukuk River drainages, the South Fork of the Koyukuk River drainage upstream from Squaw Creek, the Jim River Drainage, the Fish Creek drainage upstream from and including the Bonanza Creek drainage, to the 1,410 ft. peak of the hydrologic divide with the northern fork of the Kanuti Chalatna River at N66° 33.303' W151° 03.637' and following the unnamed northern fork of the Kanuti Chalatna Creek to the confluence of the southern fork of the Kanuti Chalatna River at N66° 27.090' W151° 23.841', 4.2 miles SSW (194 degrees true) of Clawanmenka Lake and following the unnamed southern fork of the Kanuti Chalatna Creek to the hydrologic divide with the Kanuti River drainage at N66° 19.789' W151° 10.102', 3.0 miles ENE (79 degrees true) from the 2,055 ft. peak on that divide, and the Kanuti River drainage upstream from the confluence of an unnamed creek at N66° 13.050' W151° 05.864', 0.9 miles SSE (155 degrees true) of a 1,980 ft. peak on that divide, and following that unnamed creek to the Unit 24 boundary on the hydrologic divide to the Ray River drainage at N66° 03.827' W150° 49.988' at the 2,920 ft. peak of that divide;**

**(B) Unit 24(B) consists of the Koyukuk River Drainage upstream from Dog Island to the Subunit 24(A) boundary;**

**(C) Unit 24(C) consists of the Hogatza River Drainage, the Koyukuk River Drainage upstream from Batza River on the north side of the Koyukuk River and upstream from and including the Indian River Drainage on the south side of the Koyukuk River to the Subunit 24(B) boundary;**

**(D) Unit 24(D) consists of the remainder of Unit 24;**

**ISSUE:** Unit 24 is over 26,000 mi<sup>2</sup> and contains a broad range of habitats, wildlife densities, land ownership patterns, and human use. It is difficult to simply and efficiently manage wildlife populations because the unit is not currently divided into subunits that reflect these differences. For example, moose have declined substantially over the past ten years in northern Unit 24, which may require regulatory actions that are best dealt with through subunit boundaries compared with the southern portion of the unit that has maintained a high density. Also, caribou herds in the unit have vastly different population sizes, ranges and human use. Small herds in southern Unit 24 require conservative regulations; while liberal regulations are possible for the Western Arctic Caribou Herd when it moves into the northern part of the unit. Hunter demand along the Dalton Highway is high for both moose and caribou. Subdividing Unit 24 into smaller geographic areas will allow the department to address these and other wildlife management needs in a simpler, more efficient manner.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Regulations in Unit 24 will remain more complex and difficult to understand than is necessary.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Management programs may be more effective, resulting in additional hunter harvest and opportunity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** People who would like to see the regulations simplified will benefit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who are accustomed to or prefer the historical game management unit boundaries and associated regulations will suffer.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Subdivide the unit into different configurations.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-06W-G-025)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 50 - 5 AAC 92.990(12). Definitions.** Amend this regulation as follows:

You may not take brown (grizzly) bear cubs or sows accompanied by cubs. Cub bear means a brown (grizzly) or black bear (including the cinnamon and blue phases) in its first year of life.

**ISSUE:** High number of brown (grizzly) bears in Unit 13. Would like to align the definition of brown (grizzly) cubs with definition of black bear cubs.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continuing high brown bear populations in Unit 13 with high moose calf and caribou calf predation.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters because of moose and caribou population increases. Bear hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** With a potentially increased bear harvest non-consumptive users may be marginally impacted.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Bear baiting, bounties, legalizing sale of bear hides and parts, same day airborne hunting, legalizing snow machine hunting. None of these solutions were agreeable with all our members.

**PROPOSED BY:** Paxson Advisory Committee (SC-06W-G-004)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 92.990(12). Definitions.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Redefine cub bear to mean a brown (grizzly) or black bear (including the cinnamon and blue phases) in its first year of life.

**ISSUE:** Redefining the definition of brown (grizzly) cubs to match black bear cubs making only cubs of the year and their sows protected.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Legal bears will continue to be passed because of the difficulty in judging yearlings and two year olds. Cubs of the year are easy to determine.



**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, by protecting fewer bear family groups, more bears will be harvested and ungulate calf survival will improve.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bear, moose, caribou and sheep hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who oppose additional brown bear hunting.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Limit this proposal to predator management areas.

**PROPOSED BY:** Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee (SC-06W-G-008)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 52 - 5 AAC 92.990(21). Definitions.** Amend the regulation to include the following:

Add brown bear (grizzly) to the list of furbearers.

**ISSUE:** Amend and add the following brown bear (grizzly).

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Adding brown bear (grizzly) to furbearers will allow trapping to take place.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trappers and moose.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Daniel Green (SC-06W-G-012)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 53 - 5 AAC 92.990(21). Definitions.** Amend the regulation to include the following:

Add black bear to the list of furbearers.

**ISSUE:** Amend and add the following—black bear.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Adding black bear to furbearer will allow trapping of black bear to take place.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trappers and moose.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Daniel Green

(SC-06W-G-013)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 92.990(45). Definitions.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Definition of second degree of kindred to include: uncle, aunt, niece and nephew.

**ISSUE:** Definition of second degree of kindred.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Less family hunts.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Some families who are close.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Beulah N. Johnson

(HQ-06W-G-016)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 92.990 Definitions.** Define full curl as follows:

1. A full curl ram is a ram with at least a portion (tip or flare) of which one horn has grown even with the start of the eye socket.
2. A ram with the complete lamb tip (first year) of at least one horn has been broken off.
3. A ram at least seven years old as determined by counting annual horn rings and segments.

**ISSUE:** The current definition of a full curl ram as it is being administrated (stick test) by the Department of Fish and Game in their sealing program is not proper. The broken or broomed horn portion of the regulation has always been vague and must be changed so everyone (hunter, protection officer, biologist and any other department personnel) know a true definition of broken.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The number of legal rams will continue to decline. Marginal harvested sheep will be left in the field. What is happening with the current definition (because sheep horns spiral instead of circle) over half of the ram population will never be legal and die.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** It doesn't change the quality of resource harvest much, but does allow for some additional impressive rams to be harvested that currently die of old age and starvation.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All sheep hunters, including meat, trophy, resident and non-resident alike. With current rules and methods of determining legal rams the state will lose many nonresident hunters who can go elsewhere to hunt sheep.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Lowering the legal ram size to  $\frac{3}{4}$  curl as it was in the past. I however believe the reason behind the full curl rule has merit and with these changes meets the management goals.

**PROPOSED BY:** Roger D. Morris (SC-06W-G-026)

\*\*\*\*\*

(This page is intentionally left blank.)