

**PROPOSAL 1 -5 AAC 92.009. Obstruction or hindrance of lawful hunting or trapping.**

Amend the regulation as follows:

Provide a section in the regulation to prohibit any action that will publicly tarnish the reputation of a hunter, or the business of a guide participating in legal hunting activities.

5 AAC 92.009. Obstruction or hindrance of lawful hunting or trapping. **(1)** A person may not intentionally obstruct or hinder a bait station permittee’s feasibility of taking black bear by using the station without the permittee’s written permission.

**(2) A person may not intentionally conduct an activity that may obstruct, hinder, or alter the experience of another person’s lawful hunting, fishing, trapping, viewing of fish and game, or interfere with a guide’s ability to book clients.**

**ISSUE:** Special interest group’s actions to vilify law abiding hunters and hunters in general.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Incidents will increase where hunters are chastised for practices have been legal and considered ethical for many years.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCT PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, the experience of a hunt will be greatly improved if you don’t have to look over your shoulder to see if you are going to be on the news.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those with an anti-hunting agenda.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Seasons, bag limits, and license fees for viewing and filming of wildlife as to eliminate conflicts with hunters.

**PROPOSED BY:** Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-08W-G-010)

*Note: The Department of Law advises that elements of the crime of interfering with hunting and trapping are in statute and the Board of Game does not have the authority to make this change.*

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

- Shane Oyster PC12
- Joseph Taylor PC37
- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Fairbanks AC3
- Central Kuskokwim w/Am AC10
- Middle Yukon AC12
- GASH AC13
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

- Ahtna Inc. PC46
- Kenai/Soldotna AC6
- Copper Basin AC7
- Koyukuk River AC11
- Matanuska Valley AC16

- Defenders of Wildlife PC11
- Daniel Zatz PC15
- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17

**PROPOSAL 1 CONTINUED**  
**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Richard Hahn PC31  
Arthur Greenwalt PC32  
John Tracy PC42

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 2 - 5 AAC 92.068. Permit conditions for hunting black bear with dogs; and 92.085(5)(B). Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions.** Eliminate the permit requirement for hunting black bear with dogs as follows.

Repeal **5 AAC 92.068. Permit conditions for hunting black bear with dogs** (a) and (d), but retain the following:

**(i) Once a black bear is treed, cornered, or otherwise restrained, it must be either harvested or allowed to go free. If the bear is allowed to go free, the dogs must be leashed and restrained from further pursuit of the bear.**

**(ii) A hunter may not release the dogs to hunt black bear within one mile of an occupied dwelling.**

**92.085 (5)(B). Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions:**

...

(5) with the aid or use of a dog, except that

...

(B) [A DOG] **dogs** may be used to hunt black bear. [BY A PERMIT ISSUED AT THE DISCRETION OF THE DEPARTMENT; THE DEPARTMENT MAY ISSUE A NONTRANSFERABLE PERMIT TO AN INDIVIDUAL WHO QUALIFIES UNDER THE PERMIT CONDITIONS ESTABLISHED BY THE DEPARTMENT IN 5 AAC 92.068.]

**ISSUE:** The very few hound hunters in the state are required to apply for a permit that most people at the front desk do not even know exists much less where to find the form. A couple simple rules regarding the hunting of bears with dogs should allow for an enjoyable hunt without excessive conflict.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** An unnecessary permit will continue to be required discouraging some from participating in a very effective and traditional hunting method.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, hunting bears over dogs is the most selective method of hunting bears.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Anchorage Advisory Committee

(SC-08W-G-007)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Wayne Kubat PC47

Delta AC2

Central Kuskokwim AC10

Matanuska Valley AC16

Jenny Pursell PC30

Defenders of Wildlife PC11

**PROPOSAL 2 CONTINUED.**

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17  
Richard Hahn PC31  
Arthur Greenwalt PC32  
Nathan Sperry PC53  
Fairbanks AC3  
Copper Basin AC7  
Koyukuk River AC11  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

---

**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 3 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures.** Allow hunting of bears over registered bait stations the same day one has flown.

**(11) A person may hunt at a permitted bait station the same day he/she has been airborne provided they are at least 300 feet from the aircraft.**

**ISSUE:** Wasting an entire hunting day when flying provides no real advantage to the bait hunter.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Time will continue to be wasted.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The quality of the hunt will be improved.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bait hunters who fly in.

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-08W-G-005)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Alaska Bowhunters Association PC73
- Fairbanks w/Am AC3
- Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5
- Central Kuskokwim AC10
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15
- Matanuska Valley AC16

**OPPOSE**

- Nina Faust PC25
- Marylee Hayes PC3
- Jeff Sperry PC5
- Defenders of Wildlife PC11
- Luke Gilson PC14
- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Linda Feiler PC18
- Nan Weed PC19
- Iris and Gus Roberts PC20
- Jeff Sloss PC21
- Gerald Brookman PC23
- Mossy Kilcher PC24
- Seth Kantner PC26
- Rudy Wittshirk PC28
- Charlotte and Robert Sartor PC29
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Richard Hahn PC31
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32
- William Cox PC33
- Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36
- Michael McKinnon PC48
- Nathan Sperry PC53
- John Strassenburgh PC56

**PROPOSAL 3 CONTINUED.**

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Marybeth Holleman PC61  
Rick Steiner PC63  
Deanna Geary PC68  
Form Fax 117 Signatories PC86  
Copper Basin AC7

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 4 - 5 AAC 92.036. Permit for taking a child hunting.** Eliminate the permit requirement for taking a child hunting.

A permit would not be required to take a child hunting.

**ISSUE:** Requiring a permit to take a child hunting.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Requiring a permit to take a child hunting would discourage parent/family from taking a child hunting. Cost of permits, stipulations, etc. - need more information.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Child, parent/family

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Rosalie Sepp (sc-08W-G-018)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Allen Avinger PC8  
Joseph Taylor PC37

**OPPOSE**

Fairbanks AC3  
Denali AC9  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15  
Matanuska Valley AC16

Jenny Pursell PC30  
Richard Hahn PC31  
Arthur Greenwalt PC32

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 5 – 5 AAC 92.037. Permits for falconry.** This proposal would simplify falconry regulations by: 1.) removing capture permit requirements for taking American and arctic peregrine falcons, 2.) eliminating all numerical quotas associated with the take of any subspecies of peregrine falcon, 3.) relaxing statewide restrictions applied to the take of passage peregrine falcons, and 4) clarifying notification and reporting to the department by falconers taking birds.

**5 AAC 92.037. PERMITS FOR FALCONRY.** (a) A permit jointly issued by the department and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service is required for taking, transporting, or possessing a raptor for falconry or for practicing falconry in this state. The permit will be issued under standards, procedures, and conditions set out in the Falconry Standards section of the Alaska Falconry Manual No. [7] **8**, dated July 1, [2004] **2008**; that section of the falconry manual is hereby adopted by reference. Only a bird defined in this section as a raptor may be taken, held, or possessed for falconry.

...

(e) **Before taking** [THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURES AND CONDITIONS APPLY TO THE APPLICATION FOR AND ISSUANCE OF AMERICAN PEREGRINE FALCON AND ARCTIC PEREGRINE FALCON CAPTURE PERMITS (CAPTURE PERMITS) AND TO THE TAKING OF] American or arctic peregrine falcons for the practice of falconry.:

(1) a[N APPLICANT] **permittee** [, WHO] must possess either a) an Alaska master class falconry permit or b) an Alaska general class falconry permit with more than two years of experience in the practice of falconry at the general class level [, SHALL SUBMIT A COMPLETED APPLICATION ON A FORM PROVIDED BY THE DEPARTMENT];.

[(2) A PERSON MAY NOT SUBMIT MORE THAN ONE APPLICATION NOR RECEIVE MORE THAN ONE CAPTURE PERMIT DURING A CALENDAR YEAR;

(3) THE TOTAL NUMBER OF CAPTURE PERMITS ISSUED ANNUALLY BY THE DEPARTMENT WILL NOT EXCEED SIX, AND THE TOTAL NUMBER OF CAPTURE PERMITS ISSUED ANNUALLY BY THE DEPARTMENT FOR THE SAGAVANIRKTOK AND TANANA RIVERS WILL NOT EXCEED THREE FOR EACH AREA. CAPTURE PERMITS WILL BE ISSUED TO ALASKA GENERAL CLASS FALCONRY PERMITTEES WITH MORE THAN TWO YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN THE PRACTICE OF FALCONRY AT THE GENERAL CLASS LEVEL ONLY IF SURPLUS CAPTURE PERMITS ARE AVAILABLE AFTER ISSUING CAPTURE PERMITS TO ALASKA MASTER CLASS FALCONRY PERMITTEES;

(4) IF THE NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS RECEIVED BY THE DEPARTMENT EXCEEDS THE NUMBER OF CAPTURE PERMITS AVAILABLE, THE CAPTURE PERMITS WILL BE ISSUED ON A LOTTERY BASIS USING THE FOLLOWING RANKING CRITERIA: A) FIRST RANK – MASTER FALCONERS WITH NO PREVIOUS YEAR CAPTURE PERMIT, B) SECOND RANK – MASTER FALCONERS WITH CAPTURE PERMIT IN PREVIOUS YEAR, C) THIRD RANK – QUALIFIED GENERAL CLASS FALCONERS WITH NO PREVIOUS YEAR CAPTURE PERMIT, D) FOURTH RANK - QUALIFIED GENERAL CLASS FALCONERS WITH CAPTURE PERMIT IN PREVIOUS YEAR;

(5) FOR THE SAGAVANIRKTOK AND TANANA RIVERS, A CAPTURE PERMIT WILL BE ISSUED FOR EACH OF THE FIRST THREE APPLICATIONS DRAWN

**PROPOSAL 5 CONTINUED.**

UNDER (4) OF THIS SUBSECTION THAT SPECIFIES A PREFERENCE FOR TAKING A PEREGRINE FALCON FROM ONE OF THOSE AREAS;

(6) IF A PERMIT DRAWING IS OVERSUBSCRIBED AND A SURPLUS CAPTURE PERMIT BECOMES AVAILABLE, IT WILL BE ISSUED AS PROVIDED IN (4) AND (5) OF THIS SUBSECTION;

(7) A CAPTURE PERMIT IS NONTRANSFERABLE AND AN AMERICAN OR ARCTIC PEREGRINE FALCON MAY BE TAKEN ONLY BY THE PERSON NAMED ON THE CAPTURE PERMIT;]

[(8)] **(2)** a permittee

(A) shall notify the department's Fairbanks regional office at least five days before taking an American or arctic peregrine falcon and identify the intended area and time of take;

(B) shall, within five days after taking an American or arctic peregrine falcon, inform the department's Fairbanks regional office and the permittee's regional falconry representative of the date of taking, the location of the nest site, and the number of young in the nest;

(C) shall, within five days after taking an American or arctic peregrine falcon, inform the department's Fairbanks regional office of the location of all other American or arctic peregrine falcon nests visited, the number of young in each nest, and other information requested by the department; and

(D) shall, within five days after taking an American or arctic peregrine falcon, turn in to the permittee's regional falconry representative any leg band retrieved from an arctic peregrine falcon removed from a nest.

...

**Alaska Falconry Manual No. 7, July 1, 2004**

...

6. Falconry permits are issued for apprentice, general, and master class falconers.

...

b. General class permits are issued under the following conditions:

...

(4) A permittee may take, transport, or possess only the following species: American kestrel, merlin, northern goshawk, sharp-shinned hawk, red-tailed or Harlan's hawk, gyrfalcon, captive-bred peregrine falcon, great horned owl, and hybrid raptor. A permittee with more than two years of experience in the practice of falconry at the general class level may also take, transport, or possess a Peale's peregrine falcon, American peregrine falcon [(CAPTURE PERMIT

**PROPOSAL 5 CONTINUED.**

REQUIRED)] and arctic peregrine falcon [(CAPTURE PERMIT REQUIRED)];  
and

...

c. Master class permits are issued under the following conditions:

...

(3) A permittee may take, transport, or possess only the following species: American kestrel, merlin, northern goshawk, sharp-shinned hawk, red-tailed or Harlan's hawk, gyrfalcon, Peale's peregrine falcon, American peregrine falcon [(CAPTURE PERMIT REQUIRED)], arctic peregrine falcon [(CAPTURE PERMIT REQUIRED)], golden eagle (federal regulations contain additional provisions and restrictions for golden eagles), great horned owl, and hybrid raptor ;

...

14. An eyas may be taken only from May 26 through August 5. A passage bird, adult American kestrel, or adult great horned owl may be taken only from August 15 through November 30. Except for American kestrels and great horned owls, a raptor that is over one year of age may not be taken. An eyas may be taken only by general or master class falconer; no more than two eyases may be taken during the specified period[, EXCEPT FOR AMERICAN PEREGRINE FALCON AND ARCTIC PEREGRINE FALCON ONLY ONE EYAS MAY BE TAKEN]; and, at least one nestling must be left in any nest from which a bird is removed. [FOR THE TAKING OF PEREGRINE FALCONS THE SPECIAL PROVISIONS APPLY:

A. AMERICAN PEREGRINE FALCON AND ARCTIC PEREGRINE FALCON  
CAPTURE PERMIT REQUIREMENTS:

THE DEPARTMENT MAY ISSUE A SINGLE NONTRANSFERABLE PERMIT (CAPTURE PERMIT) TO TAKE AN AMERICAN PEREGRINE FALCON OR ARCTIC PEREGRINE FALCON ONLY TO ALASKA FALCONERS WHO QUALIFY UNDER PERMIT APPLICATION PROCEDURES ESTABLISHED IN 5 AAC 92.037. THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURES AND CONDITIONS APPLY TO THE APPLICATION FOR AND ISSUANCE OF AMERICAN PEREGRINE FALCON AND ARCTIC PEREGRINE FALCON CAPTURE PERMITS (CAPTURE PERMITS) AND TO THE TAKING OF AMERICAN OR ARCTIC PEREGRINE FALCONS FOR THE PRACTICE OF FALCONRY:

(1) AN APPLICANT, WHO MUST POSSESS EITHER A) AN ALASKA MASTER CLASS FALCONRY PERMIT OR B) AN ALASKA GENERAL CLASS FALCONRY PERMIT WITH MORE THAN TWO YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN THE PRACTICE OF FALCONRY AT THE GENERAL CLASS LEVEL, SHALL SUBMIT A COMPLETED APPLICATION ON A FORM PROVIDED BY THE DEPARTMENT;

**PROPOSAL 5 CONTINUED.**

- (2) A PERSON MAY NOT SUBMIT MORE THAN ONE APPLICATION NOR RECEIVE MORE THAN ONE CAPTURE PERMIT DURING A CALENDAR YEAR;
- (3) THE TOTAL NUMBER OF CAPTURE PERMITS ISSUED ANNUALLY BY THE DEPARTMENT WILL NOT EXCEED SIX, AND THE TOTAL NUMBER OF CAPTURE PERMITS ISSUED ANNUALLY BY THE DEPARTMENT FOR THE SAGAVANIRK TOK AND TANANA RIVERS WILL NOT EXCEED THREE FOR EACH AREA. CAPTURE PERMITS WILL BE ISSUED TO ALASKA GENERAL CLASS FALCONRY PERMITTEES WITH MORE THAN TWO YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN THE PRACTICE OF FALCONRY AT THE GENERAL CLASS LEVEL ONLY IF SURPLUS CAPTURE PERMITS ARE AVAILABLE AFTER ISSUING CAPTURE PERMITS TO ALASKA MASTER CLASS FALCONRY PERMITTEES;
- (4) IF THE NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS RECEIVED BY THE DEPARTMENT EXCEEDS THE NUMBER OF CAPTURE PERMITS AVAILABLE, THE CAPTURE PERMITS WILL BE ISSUED ON A LOTTERY BASIS USING THE FOLLOWING RANKING CRITERIA: A) FIRST RANK – MASTER FALCONERS WITH NO PREVIOUS YEAR CAPTURE PERMIT, B) SECOND RANK – MASTER FALCONERS WITH CAPTURE PERMIT IN PREVIOUS YEAR, C) THIRD RANK – QUALIFIED GENERAL CLASS FALCONERS WITH NO PREVIOUS YEAR CAPTURE PERMIT, D) FOURTH RANK - QUALIFIED GENERAL CLASS FALCONERS WITH CAPTURE PERMIT IN PREVIOUS YEAR;
- (5) FOR THE SAGAVANIRK TOK AND TANANA RIVERS, A CAPTURE PERMIT WILL BE ISSUED FOR EACH OF THE FIRST THREE APPLICATIONS DRAWN UNDER (4) OF THIS SUBSECTION THAT SPECIFIES A PREFERENCE FOR TAKING A PEREGRINE FALCON FROM ONE OF THOSE AREAS;
- (6) IF A PERMIT DRAWING IS OVERSUBSCRIBED AND A SURPLUS CAPTURE PERMIT BECOMES AVAILABLE, IT WILL BE ISSUED AS PROVIDED IN (4) AND (5) OF THIS SUBSECTION;
- (7) A CAPTURE PERMIT IS NONTRANSFERABLE AND AN AMERICAN OR ARCTIC PEREGRINE FALCON MAY BE TAKEN ONLY BY THE PERSON NAMED ON THE CAPTURE PERMIT;
- (8) A CAPTURE PERMITTEE MAY NOT TAKE MORE THAN ONE EYAS AMERICAN OR ARCTIC PEREGRINE FALCON IN COMBINATION FROM THE WILD PER YEAR;
- (9) ARCTIC PEREGRINE FALCONS MAY BE TAKEN ONLY IN GAME MANAGEMENT UNITS 22, 23, AND 26, EXCLUDING A CORRIDOR EXTENDING ONE-HALF MILE ON EITHER SIDE OF THE COLVILLE RIVER, BEGINNING AT THE MOUTH OF THE ETIVLUK RIVER AND EXTENDING DOWNSTREAM TO OCEAN POINT, WHICH IS CLOSED TO HARVEST; AND

**PROPOSAL 5 CONTINUED.**

(10) AMERICAN PEREGRINE FALCONS MAY BE TAKEN ONLY IN GAME MANAGEMENT UNITS 12, 18-21, 24 AND 25, EXCLUDING A CORRIDOR EXTENDING ONE-HALF MILE ON EITHER SIDE OF THE YUKON RIVER, BEGINNING AT THE ALASKA/CANADA BORDER AND EXTENDING DOWNSTREAM TO CIRCLE, ALASKA, WHICH IS CLOSED TO HARVEST; AND

(11) ONLY EYASES MAY BE TAKEN.]

[B. PEALE'S PEREGRINE FALCON TAKING REQUIREMENTS:

(1) AN ALASKA MASTER CLASS PERMITTEE, AND AN ALASKA GENERAL CLASS PERMITTEE WITH MORE THAN TWO YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN THE PRACTICE OF FALCONRY AT THE GENERAL CLASS LEVEL MAY TAKE PEALE'S PEREGRINE FALCONS;

(2) PEALE'S PEREGRINE FALCON MAY BE TAKEN ONLY IN GAME MANAGEMENT UNITS 1-10 AND 15; AND

(3) ONLY EYASES MAY BE TAKEN.]

15. Before taking a raptor from the wild, a permittee shall **provide notification of the intended area and time of take to** [NOTIFY] the department employee who is designated as the regional falconry representative **in the intended area of take** and shall notify **the same information to** the department office nearest the location where the raptor will be taken. Within five days after taking a raptor, the permittee shall notify the [DEPARTMENT] **the department regional falconry representative in the area of take**, shall submit copies of federal form 3-186A (Migratory Bird Acquisition/Disposition Report) to both the department and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, shall provide to the [DEPARTMENT] **the department regional falconry representative in the area of take** the specific location of capture, and shall submit other information related to the taking, as required by the department.

a. Special notification requirements for the taking of American peregrine falcons and arctic peregrine falcons are listed below. A permittee:

(1) SHALL NOTIFY THE DEPARTMENT'S FAIRBANKS REGIONAL OFFICE AT LEAST FIVE DAYS BEFORE TAKING AN AMERICAN OR ARCTIC PEREGRINE FALCON AND IDENTIFY THE INTENDED AREA AND TIME OF TAKE; NO MORE THAN 3 ARCTIC PEREGRINE FALCONS MAY BE TAKEN FROM THE SAGAVANIRKTOK RIVER AND NO MORE THAN 3 AMERICAN PEREGRINE FALCONS MAY BE TAKEN FROM THE TANANA RIVER;]

(1) **shall notify the department's Fairbanks regional office at least five days before taking an American or arctic peregrine falcon and identify the intended area and time of take;**

(2) **shall, within five days after taking an American or arctic peregrine falcon, inform the department's Fairbanks regional office and the permittee's regional falconry representative of the date of taking, the location of the nest site, and the number of young in the nest;**

## **PROPOSAL 5 CONTINUED.**

- (3) shall, within five days after taking an American or arctic peregrine falcon, inform the department's Fairbanks regional office of the location of all other American or arctic peregrine falcon nests visited, the number of young in each nest, and other information requested by the department; and**
- (4) shall, within five days after taking an American or arctic peregrine falcon, turn in to the permittee's regional falconry representative any leg band retrieved from an American or arctic peregrine falcon removed from a nest.**

**ISSUE:** Historical and projected take of peregrine falcons for falconry in Alaska are low and have resulted in no discernable impacts on wild populations since the take was authorized (*pealei* in 1984 *anatum* and *tundrius* in 1996; see below for subspecies information). Widespread population recovery of peregrine falcons, increased numbers and productivity of breeding pairs, and low rates of take by falconers make peregrine falcon capture permit restrictions unnecessary. Alaska is a participant state in the joint Federal/State falconry program and liberalization of regulations promulgated at the Federal level also support relaxing State regulations requiring capture permits.

Present regulations governing the take of peregrine falcons for falconry in Alaska are far more restrictive than for other raptors used in falconry and are not supported by the ongoing population recovery and abundance of peregrines in Alaska. Previously, two migratory subspecies, American peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*) and arctic peregrine falcon (*F. p. tundrius*), experienced reduced populations and were listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Once removed from the ESA list falconry take was limited by special capture permits to prevent overharvest while allowing for full recovery. A third non-migratory subspecies, Peale's peregrine falcon (*F. p. pealei*), did not experience population declines and falconry take was limited by a falconer's experience in handling birds and not by special capture permits. Since American and arctic peregrine populations have largely recovered and are not at risk from the low level of harvest exhibited by qualified Alaska falconers, we recommend that all three subspecies of peregrine falcons taken for falconry purposes be governed solely by an experience-based standard. To achieve this standard, the proposed regulation maintains the requirement that peregrine falcons may be taken only by experienced falconers, those permittees with Master Class permits or General Class permits with 2 or more years of experience.

Eliminating peregrine falcon capture permits will ease the administrative burden related to the falconry program offered by the State. Sometimes in the past, successful capture permit recipients have opted not to take peregrines at the last minute, leaving insufficient time for waitlisted applicants to be notified of available permits. The new system without capture permits will improve this situation. Even though capture permits are being eliminated, collection of harvest information will not be compromised as mandated in 5 AAC 92.037 (as proposed) and the Alaska Falconry Manual. Specific requirements for licensed falconers will be maintained for peregrine falcons, including prior notification to the department, coordination with designated falconry representatives, specific species allowed for class of falconry permit, and post-take reporting. Also, revised language clarifying reporting requirement for the take of peregrine falcons is now included in the Alaska Falconry Manual.

Closed areas and harvest quotas for American peregrine falcons (Upper Yukon River and Tanana River, respectively) and for arctic peregrine falcons (Colville River and Sagavanirktok River, respectively) are being removed from the administrative requirements contained in the Alaska Falconry Manual because annual take of these species is very low and not expected to approach the

**PROPOSAL 5 CONTINUED.**

harvestable surplus in each area. Previously, closed areas were used to preclude falconry harvest in the 'population index' areas associated with monitoring the recovery of depleted populations (e.g., Colville River). Now, populations are largely recovered and applying a modest harvest rate (5-10%) in any specific area suggests that harvestable surpluses are well above the number of peregrine falcons taken by falconers (approximately 5 birds annually). The department expects little harvest from areas such as the Colville River given its remoteness and the ease of access to peregrines closer to Alaska's road and river systems.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** When persons permitted to take peregrines choose, on short notice, not to take advantage of their permits, their unused permits may not be transferable to other qualified applicants and permitted take will not be fulfilled. Unsuccessful applicants will have to wait an additional year for the opportunity to take a peregrine.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** There will be not change to the resource harvested, but there will be elimination of additional permitting and paperwork while maintaining oversight of harvest.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Licensed falconers and those who enjoy watching trained raptors pursue wild quarry.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those opposed to the any changes to the administrative procedures for taking peregrine falcons by appropriately licensed Alaska falconers.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08S-G- 081)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Dr. James Ingram PC58
- Delta AC2
- Fairbanks AC3
- Kenai/Soldotna AC6
- Cooper Landing AC8
- Matanuska Valley AC16

**OPPOSE**

Denali AC9

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

*The Board of Game accepted this proposal as an agenda change request.*

**PROPOSAL 6 - 5 AAC 92.031. Permit for selling skins and trophies; and 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.** The proposal would require hunters to obtain a control permit in order to sell bear hides and skulls, or to take black bear same-day-airborne over bait. These activities would still be legal under control regulations instead of general hunting regulations. The language shown in capital letters would be found under the specific predation control implementation areas where it is allowed.

**5 AAC 92.031 PERMIT FOR SELLING SKINS AND TROPHIES.**

...

[(C) FOR BLACK BEARS TAKEN IN ACTIVE PREDATOR CONTROL AREAS, THE DEPARTMENT WILL ISSUE PERMITS ALLOWING HUNTERS TO SELL UNTANNED HIDES (WITH CLAWS ATTACHED) AND SKULLS, AFTER SEALING AS REQUIRED IN 5 AAC 92.165.

(D) FOR BROWN BEARS TAKEN IN ACTIVE BROWN BEAR PREDATOR CONTROL AREAS, THE DEPARTMENT WILL ISSUE PERMITS ALLOWING HUNTERS TO SELL UNTANNED HIDES (WITH CLAWS ATTACHED) AND SKULLS, AFTER SEALING AS REQUIRED IN 5 AAC 92.165.

(E) IN THIS SECTION, "ACTIVE" MEANS THAT PREDATOR CONTROL PERMITS HAVE BEEN ISSUED FOR THE REFERENCED PREDATOR CONTROL AREA DURING THE CURRENT YEAR.]

**5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.** The following methods and means of taking big game are prohibited in addition to the prohibitions in 5 AAC 92.080.

(8) a person who has been airborne may not take or assist in taking a big game animal until after 3:00 a.m. following the day in which the flying occurred; however, this paragraph does not apply to

...

[(F) TAKING BLACK BEARS WITH THE USE OF BAIT OR SCENT LURES IN AN ACTIVE PREDATOR CONTROL AREA IDENTIFIED IN 5 AAC 92.125, UNDER A PERMIT ISSUED BY THE DEPARTMENT, IF THE HUNTER IS AT LEAST 300 FEET FROM THE AIRPLANE AT THE TIME OF TAKING; IN THIS SUBPARAGRAPH, "ACTIVE" MEANS THAT PREDATOR CONTROL PERMITS HAVE BEEN ISSUED FOR THE REFERENCED PREDATOR CONTROL AREA DURING THE CURRENT YEAR.]

**ISSUE:** Implementation of liberalized hunting regulations for bears within areas designated for wolf control. There is public confusion concerning what is allowed under general hunting regulations versus what is allowed under control regulations with a control permit. In the case of same day airborne take of black bear, this has resulted in different layers of regulations within the same areas.

These regulations will be removed from general hunting and only be allowed in specific areas under terms of a control permit.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The public will be confused by liberalizations applied only to specific areas.

**PROPOSAL 6 CONTINUED.**

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The public will have a better understanding of methods allowed under general hunting versus liberalized methods used in control areas for management of predator populations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Hunters who wish to opportunistically take black bears and sell the hide, unless they obtain a control permit.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08W-G-079)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Tanana Chiefs Conference PC16

Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36

Ahtna Inc. PC46

Nathan Sperry w/Am PC53

Delta AC2

Fairbanks AC3

Central Kuskokwim AC10

Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

Matanuska Valley AC16

Middle Yukon AC12

Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17

Jenny Pursell PC30

Richard Hahn PC31

Arthur Greenwalt PC32

Wayne Kubat PC47

Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5

Denali AC9

GASH AC13

**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 7 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bears with the use of bait or scent lures:** Change the current permit requirements to allow a guide to place and remove a client's bait station.

“A registered guide may register, place and remove a contracted client's bait station in any legal area, within the guide's guide use area, that the client would otherwise be allowed to register a bait station. When registering a client's bait station a registered guide shall present for review, a copy of his guide use area authorization letter, a signed copy of the guide client and shall present a copy of the client's hunting license and big game tag record. Once a guide registers a client's bait station, the guide is equally responsible for all other bait station requirements.”

**ISSUE:** Registered guides should be allowed to do their job and prepare a bait site on behalf of their client. This means a registered guide should be able to register a client's bait station (in any area the client would be able to register a bait station) for the client when the guide presents a copy of the client contract, a copy of the client's hunting license and big game tag. And the guide should be allowed to establish and prepare the bait site for the client prior to their arrival and remove the bait after the client departure. The chain of who is responsible for placement and clean up and who has baited the site is known, recorded and unbroken.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Under the current system, the client (typically a nonresident, or local working person who doesn't have time to place, monitor and pull the bait) can only establish a bait site upon their arrival to a remote camp. It may or may not go active before their departure. Either way, the effort is underutilized at best and logistically costly with little benefit. A guide is only allowed two bait sites under his own personal permit. This is in itself unduly restrictive for no biological reason. In fact, it is bad biology/management. It is well documented, after the McGrath research, that black bears are the main predator on new born moose calves particularly in the interior. It is well documented that the majority of black bear meat is salvaged for human consumption even after it is no longer a requirement to do so. Guides and their clients will be forced to continue to take bears at fewer baits thereby increasing localized harvest with less selection available.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. By allowing the guide to spread out hunting pressure, it increases the available selection (bigger bears and more male bears) and decreases the likelihood of a higher localized harvest at fewer baits.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The moose calves will benefit. The black bear hunters and their guides will benefit. The bear eating and moose hunting public will benefit. The state will benefit from the use of a better game management tool, and the increase in license and tag sales. It will also decrease the chances of violations since the guide is generally more knowledgeable of the baiting and hunting regulations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. Assuming the client will place a bait station anyway; no new sites will be established. Any additional paperwork (the Department of Fish and Game reviewing guide/client contract, client's license and tag and the guide's name) will be negligible. And most of the guided bear hunting over bait tends to take place far enough away from the general public that they won't be overly affected.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** “Allow guides to register more than two bait stations/guide license based on the number of booked/contracted clients.” This accomplishes the same goal for the most part, but, it has been repeatedly opposed/denied by the board because it is perceived as construing additional benefits/rights/opportunity to guides not available to the

**PROPOSAL 7 CONTINUED.**

general public. In my proposal, the primary benefit flows to the contracted client, while placing addition responsibility on the guide. I also considered placing a requirement that the contracted client must be accompanied at their own bait by the guide or the guide’s assistant guide. I rejected this because the resident hunter considering hiring the guide to perform the logistical work would be less likely and or prevented from utilizing the guides services because he would have to be guided and pay the considerable additional expense when he may not need to be guided or want to be guided.

**PROPOSED BY:** Don Duncan

I-08W-G-002

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Central AC1
- Fairbanks AC3
- Copper Basin AC7
- Central Kuskokwim AC10
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15
- Matanuska Valley AC16

- Jeff Sperry PC5
- Defenders of Wildlife PC11
- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Richard Hahn PC31
- Ahtna Inc. PC46
- Nathan Sperry PC53
- Carl Kinney PC77
- Delta AC2
- Denali AC9
- GASH AC13

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 8 -5 AAC 92.050 Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.** Allow only one bison permit per person every ten years, statewide.

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

...  
(4) permit issuance:

...  
**(H) A person may not apply for a bison permit anywhere in Alaska for ten years after drawing a bison permit.**

**ISSUE:** People drawing multiple bison permits for a very limited resource while thousands of others go without for decades. Also, there are a number of permits that are not utilized each year. This would encourage participation if they draw because they will not be able to apply for ten years even if they do not kill a bison.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Some people will continue to be “lucky” and get multiple tags while the majority will contribute their \$10 annually to the drawing with no results.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCT PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, the applicants will take the process more seriously and not put in for a hunt they are not going to be able to hunt. The hunters will take the hunt more seriously and not “burn” a tag that could have went to someone else.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those wishing to draw a bison tag in their lifetime.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who get lucky in the drawings.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** One bison per lifetime, rejected because populations and regulations change. If larger herds are someday established people may like to get another.

**PROPOSED BY:** Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-08W-G-008)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**  
Brett Nelson PC4  
Jeff Sperry w/Am PC5  
Allen Avinger PC8  
Dean Lippold PC 34  
Ahtna Inc. PC46  
Wayne Kubat PC47  
Nathan Sperry w/Am PC53  
Fairbanks w/Am AC3  
Copper Basin AC7  
Denali AC9  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15  
Matanuska Valley AC16

**OPPOSE**  
Shane Oyster PC12  
Joseph Taylor PC37  
Timothy Christopherson PC38  
Carl Kinney PC77  
Delta AC2

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 9 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures; and Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits for big game.** Create nonresident drawing hunts for all big game and allocate a percentage of harvest to nonresidents.

For all big game hunted by nonresident hunters in the state of Alaska, I propose new regulations that would take an average number of animals harvested every year, for the past ten years and only offer between 10 and 40 percent of that average, in tags. Example: When sheep populations are low, only give out 10% of that average and when numbers are high, give out 40% of that average. Furthermore, only make those tags available through a drawing system, with a minimal fee to apply. In units where multiple animals of the same species are allowed to be harvested by nonresidents, those numbers should be reduced to only one tag.

**ISSUE:** This proposal is to address the overall decline in the quantity and the quality of big game animals throughout the entire state of Alaska. With more and more restrictions being imposed on resident hunters, the free-for-all, unlimited tag system for nonresidents needs to be abolished and a statewide drawing system for nonresidents be adopted. By requiring nonresident hunters to apply under a drawing system, it would give the Board of Game the power of managing game numbers in Alaska without having to restrict resident hunters' access to a natural resource. Simply: when game numbers are low, restrict the amount of tags given to nonresidents and when numbers are high, issue more tags to non-residents. If there is a question of raising money, Alaska should raise tag fees for nonresidents and make them comparable to other western states, which would offset the lower amount of tags being given to nonresidents. Example: sheep tags in most western states average between \$1,000 and \$3,000, whereas Alaska only charges nonresidents \$425 for a sheep tag.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?**

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** By implementing new regulations on nonresident hunters and reducing the amount of animals that can be harvested, it would enable big game populations to rejuvenate without having to restrict resident hunters. Doing so would raise the quality and quantity of the animals as well as produce more quality animals for those non-residents who are drawing tags.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?**

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Coby Thomas (HQ-08S-G-001)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Brett Nelson w/Am PC4
- Jeff Sperry PC5
- Dean Lippold PC 34
- Joseph Taylor PC37
- Timothy Christopherson PC38
- Nathan Sperry w/Am PC53
- Perry Schneider w/Am PC70
- Roland Fein PC71
- Carl Kinney PC77
- Delta AC2
- Kenai/Soldotna AC6

**OPPOSE**

**PROPOSAL 9 CONTINUED.**

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Fairbanks AC3

Seward AC14

Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36

Ahtna Inc. PC46

Wayne Kubat PC47

Kelly Vern PC57

Brian West PC72

Central AC1

Copper Basin AC7

Denali AC9

Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

Matanuska Valley AC16

---

**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures:** Amend this regulation as follows:

Make all registration hunts available at all Department of Fish and Game offices statewide or via the internet on the department's website.

**ISSUE:** Unequal access to game resources, financial and time hardship for non-local hunters to procure a registration permit.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued regulation of users and not uses to the disadvantage of non-local hunters.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All Alaska resident hunters

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those trying to keep game resources for their local use.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No other options considered

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Kenai Peninsula Chapter of Safari Club International (HQ-08W-G-006)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Brett Nelson PC4
- Jeff Sperry PC5
- Tanana Chiefs Conference PC16
- Joseph Taylor PC37
- Timothy Christopherson PC38
- Steven Hohensee PC69
- Brian West PC72
- Fairbanks AC3
- Matanuska Valley AC16

- USFWS - Subsistence Management PC41
- Seward AC14

**OPPOSE**

- Ahtna Inc. PC46
- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Delta AC2

- Defenders of Wildlife PC11
- Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36
- Kelly Vern PC57
- Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5
- Copper Basin AC7
- Cooper Landing AC8
- Denali AC9
- Central Kuskokwim AC10
- Koyukuk River AC11
- Middle Yukon AC12
- GASH AC13
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 11 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures:**

Modify the statewide drawing permit regulations to reflect the following:

Establish a limited draw permit alternate list for each hunt choice for Dall sheep, mountain goat, brown/grizzly bear and moose hunts.

If a successful application cancels limited draw permit use after the required confirmations date, the unallocated permit would be filled by an alternate list that represents the unsuccessful drawing applicants in the order that they were selected in the drawing. If a permit is not utilized through the alternate list it becomes available on an over the counter, first come first serve basis.

Permittees are required to contact the Department of Fish and Game at least 45 days prior to a season to confirm their intent to hunt by telephone. Hunters who fail to contact the department will forfeit their permits.

**ISSUE:** Each year there are individuals who win prized, limited drawing permits for and Alaska big game animal hunt and for whatever reasons, are not able to use the permit. This is a missed opportunity for an unsuccessful individual who wants to and could utilize this prized limited drawing permit.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will be continuance of opportunities for users who want and can utilize a limited draw permit for that hunt choice. Also, in many areas commercial service operators, and community businesses that supply business related support to permit holders of these permits hunts, lose out on significant income that would have been made if the permit was used.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. It allows an increased opportunity for unsuccessful applicants. Plus, it helps rural and remote businesses have an opportunity to get this potential income source. Additionally, in many cases some or all the meat is donated to individuals in the local bush communities. It also helps game managers better manage a game population in a permit area.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Applicants who didn't draw a limited draw permit who wanted to.

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Not aware of any other solutions.

**PROPOSED BY:** Don Schwandt (HQ-08W-G-021)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Steven Hohensee PC69
- Brian West PC72
- Denali AC9

- Kenai/Soldotna AC6
- Seward AC14

**OPPOSE**

- Jeff Sperry PC5
- Tony Russ PC10
- Joseph Taylor PC37
- Timothy Christopherson PC38

**PROPOSAL 11 CONTINUED.**

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Howard Beito PC44  
Ahtna Inc. PC46  
Nathan Sperry PC53  
Tom Lamal PC74  
Carl Kinney PC77  
Delta AC2  
Fairbanks AC3  
Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15  
Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 12 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.**

Modify the applicable limited permit regulations to provide drawing choice restrictions as follows:

Any person who applies for any of the following Alaska big game animals (sheep, mountain goat and brown/grizzly bear) is prohibited from applying for any limited draw permits for all the other big game species in the state of Alaska for that year.

**ISSUE:** A provision needs to be put in place to help spread out the demand on drawing permit species hunt choices. Each year many people put in for all available drawing permits and in a lot of cases, have no intentions of using the permit if drawn or they might draw too many permits and don't have the time or can't afford to go on a hunt using the prized draw permit. Many permits are not used each year by permit winners that other hunters really want and would use. This creates a few problems: It prevents all hunters having an increased opportunity at getting a prized draw permit which they really want because someone put in for it who really didn't want it. It effects the game management of a species and creates more of a work load because the Department of Fish and Game has to use registration permit hunts which are labor intensive to oversee to prevent an over harvest.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will be a huge, lost opportunity for hunters who really want a permit for an area of species. Hunters will apply for permits they really don't intend to use. Game managers will have to expend needless additional work load managing a species or draw area.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, it will spread out the limited draw permit choice demand and allow for an increased opportunity for all people who really want to win a permit in an area for a give species.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All applicants

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Don Schwandt

(HQ-08W-G-022)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Perry Schneider w/Am PC70

Kenai/Soldotna AC6

Seward AC14

Jeff Sperry PC5  
Tony Russ PC10  
Shane Oyster PC12  
Jenny Pursell PC30  
Richard Hahn PC31  
Joseph Taylor PC37  
Timothy Christopherson PC38  
Ahtna Inc. PC46  
Wayne Kubat PC47  
Nathan Sperry PC53  
Steven Hohensee PC69  
Brian West PC72

**PROPOSAL 12 CONTINUED.**

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Bowhunters Association PC73  
Carl Kinney PC77  
Delta AC2  
Fairbanks AC3  
Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5  
Copper Basin AC7  
Denali AC9  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15  
Matanuska Valley AC16

---

**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 13 - 5 AAC 92.050(7). Required permit hunt conditions and procedures:** Amend this regulation as follows:

Repeal 5 AAC 92.050(7) which requires filling out the permit within a certain time period. Filling out the harvest report is sufficient for reporting purposes.

**ISSUE:** The problem is the state law that requires immediate validation of the permit by cutting out the month and day while out in the field.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Law abiding people are cited for not validating the permit in the field.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal does not improve the quality of the resource being harvested.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Subsistence users will benefit if 5 AAC 92.050 is repealed. The absurdity of requiring validation of both harvest tickets and permits is most evident when a law abiding subsistence user goes through great lengths to harvest an animal and then becomes cited in the field for not immediately validating the ticket or permit. This law appears to harass subsistence users and remunerate law enforcement activities when no other violation can be found by them.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Not sure who will suffer

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Repeal 92.010 which requires filling out the harvest report in the field, but it does not fall under the statewide agenda for this meeting.

**PROPOSED BY:** Kawerak, Incorporated

(HQ-08W-G-027)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Tanana Chiefs Conference PC16  
Copper Basin w/Am AC7

**OPPOSE**

Jeff Sperry PC5  
Tony Russ PC10  
Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17  
Jenny Pursell PC30  
Richard Hahn PC31  
Arthur Greenwalt PC32  
Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36  
USFWS - Subsistence Management PC41  
Ahtna Inc. PC46  
Nathan Sperry PC53  
Brian West PC72  
Carl Kinney PC77  
Denali AC9  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15  
Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Every year you apply for a certain hunt or area, your chances increase instead of decrease.

**ISSUE:** Changing the state's drawing system to a preference points system.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?**

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, more people will put in if they know their chances are improved.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everybody

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** New Applicants

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Tom Rench (HQ-08W-G-085)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

- Brett Nelson PC4
- Alaska Bowhunters Association PC73
- Carl Kinney PC77
- Middle Nenana AC4
- Copper Basin AC7
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15
- Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36
- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Fairbanks AC3
- Kenai/Soldotna AC6
- Denali AC9
- Seward AC14

- Jeff Sperry PC5
- Shane Oyster PC12
- Timothy Christopherson PC38
- Ahtna Inc. PC46
- Nathan Sperry PC53
- Brian West PC72
- Delta AC2

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 15 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.**

Amend the permit drawing regulations as follows:

Add to existing statewide regulations for drawing permits: “Anyone drawing a limited drawing permit for specific Alaska big game species is prohibited from hunting in any other hunt for that species for that year in the state of Alaska.”

**ISSUE:** A provision needs to be put in place that if a person draws a limited draw permit for a specific species then that is the only area and time they can hunt for that species for the hunting year. This will help keep permit winners from migrating into general hunting areas where non-permit winners have to hunt in. This will make applicants ensure they want to hunt a permit area before submitting. Many hunters submit for drawing permits for extra hunt area options versus an area they really want to hunt. Also, by putting this type of provision in place it will spread out user pressure, reduce stress on a limited resource and help game managers have better data to manage game populations.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Many hunters submit for draw permits that they really don’t want which takes away opportunities from those that do. Without this type of provision there will continue to be mass migration of hunters going from unit to unit looking for game each year which takes away from all users’ outdoor experience. There will continue to be lost opportunity by hunters who truly wanted a permit for that species in that area and time frame. Additionally, it adds to the problem for the Department of Fish and Game to manage game populations because of the inconsistent harvest take or spikes in hunting pressure of an area.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, it will greatly reduce the stress off of general season open area game populations by hunters that hunt both a unit general season area and their limited draw permit area or vice verse. It will also help immensely improve the overall outdoor experience of all users by spreading our the number of users in an area.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All user groups, especially those who didn’t draw a limited draw permit and non-hunter users who are doing activities in a general season area during a species hunting season.

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** none

**PROPOSED BY:** Don Schwandt

(HQ-08W-G-030)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

- Brett Nelson PC4
- Tanana Chiefs Conference PC16
- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Richard Hahn PC31
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32
- Dean Lippold PC 34
- Kelly Vern PC57
- Steven Hohensee PC69
- Alaska Bowhunters Association PC73
- Wesley Walker PC78

**PROPOSAL 15 CONTINUED.**

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Wayne Kubat PC47  
Fairbanks AC3  
Seward AC14

Jeff Sperry PC5  
Shane Oyster PC12  
Joseph Taylor PC37  
Timothy Christopherson PC38  
USFWS - Subsistence Management PC41  
Ahtna Inc. PC46  
Brian West PC72  
Carl Kinney PC77  
Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5  
Copper Basin AC7  
Denali AC9  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15  
Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_  
**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 16 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.** Amend the regulations to provide a preference point system for drawing hunts.

Establish a preference point system as follows for all drawing hunts in Alaska as follows:  
Each year a hunter applies for a big game drawing hunt and is not drawn, the hunter accrues a point for that species of game. Once drawn, a hunter's point total returns to 0 for the next year's applications for that species. If a hunter stops applying for a species' drawing hunts, his/her points are retained in the permit drawing system for the life of the system. If they again apply, they will still have their previous point total to add to. There is no ceiling to the number of points an applicant can accrue. Points accrue per species, not per hunt. Points cannot be bought in years an applicant does not want to hunt. Military personnel who draw a permit and then are called to active duty out of the state will be awarded a permit for the same hunt number in the year they return. 75% of the permits of any one hunt will be drawn from a pool of those applicants who have the highest point totals. The remaining 25% of the permits will be drawn from all the remaining applicants, including those that did not draw one of the 75% during the first draw. Party permit applicants will be assigned an average of the two applicants point total for the drawing.

This system would still be partially random, but the point system would help even out the distribution of highly coveted permits among applicants. It would be a "fairer" way to award permits. Since points will be accumulated per species, this system will improve the odds of drawing the low odds hunts. The obvious reason for this result is because applicants with a history of applying are put into the 75% pool have a better chance of drawing. The less obvious way this system will improve the odds is by taking applicants out of the high-point pool when they draw a permit for a higher odds hunt for the same species. They then lose their point total and further improve the chances of the remaining applicants in the low odds hunt in succeeding years.

**ISSUE:** No point system is used to select big game drawing permit winners. As a result, applying for drawing permits is like gambling, and some people always lose, so they seldom or never draw permits long after the odds predict they should have. Establishing a preference point system will bring hunters and the Department of Fish and Game (department) back together so we are more like one group working towards common goal

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Drawing permits will continue to be awarded on a random basis every year. Some applicants will be awarded permits at a much higher rate than others – because it is random. Some applicants will receive fewer permits than the odds would predict, and in some cases – no permits after a long history of applying. Applicants will continue to become disheartened with the process, claim preference for winners, drop out entirely from the process, and this will cause a continuing loss of support for the department a continuing dissent among hunters, and overall, further divide the hunting community.

Although random is "fair" when gambling is the subject, most hunters would rather not gamble with their hunting opportunities. We would much rather have some sort of preference system that evens out the distribution of drawing permits among repeat applicants.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Resident and nonresident hunters who continually apply for drawing hunts but do not draw permits or draw permits at a much lower rate than the odds predict. Department personnel and Board of Game members benefit because they will not have to explain to

**PROPOSAL 16 CONTINUED.**

so many hunters why they are “never” drawn for permits since the permits will be awarded more uniformly across the applicant pool.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The handful of hunters who would have beaten the odds year after year and actually drawn more permits than gambling odds would have predicted.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1.) Leave the drawing system as is and ignore the problems (listed above) that continue to divide hunters and alienate them from the department and award coveted permits to some individuals year after year, and none to others who apply just as often. Status quo is more and more contentious each year, at a time when the community of hunters and the department need to become more cohesive, and not more divided. 2.) Use a point system where applicants’ names are put into drawings as many times as they have points, and have one drawing per hunt from this large pool. This would not even out the distribution of permits as well as the 75%/25% method. 3.) Use a point system where applicants are put into drawings as many times as the square of the points they have accumulated, and have one drawing per hunt from this very large pool. This would not even out the distribution of permits as well as the 75%/25% method.

**PROPOSED BY:** Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-08W-G-003)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Tony Russ PC10
- Kelly Vern PC57
- Alaska Bowhunters Association PC73
- Carl Kinney PC77
- Upper Tanana 40 Mile w/Am AC5
- Copper Basin AC7
- Denali AC9
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road w/Am AC15
- Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36
- Ahtna Inc. PC46
- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Wesley Walker PC78
- Fairbanks AC3
- Kenai/Soldotna AC6
- Seward AC14

**OPPOSE**

- Jeff Sperry PC5
- Shane Oyster PC12
- Timothy Christopherson PC38
- Nathan Sperry PC53
- Steven Hohensee PC69
- Brian West PC72
- Delta AC2
- Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.**

Establish a “preference points” system for drawing permits similar to other western states.

(a)(4)(A) the department shall issue registration permits in the order applications are received, and drawing permits on a lottery basis **weighted toward the applicant’s accumulated number of preference points.**

- (i) **points will be accumulated exponentially on an annual basis. Example: (resident applicant will receive 2 pts. 1<sup>st</sup> year, 4 pts 2<sup>nd</sup> year, 8 pts. 3<sup>rd</sup> year, 16 pts 4<sup>th</sup> year, etc.)**
- (ii) **residents will receive two points the first year per hunt (three hunts per species).**
  - a. **annual preference points will be awarded for each hunt for the cost of the application fee with or without entering the lottery.**
- (iii) **nonresidents may receive one point the first year per hunt (three hunts per species).**
  - a. **The appropriate tag fees must be paid prior to entering the drawings for each species and this fee will be applied to the applicants tag if successful.**
  - b. **One half of the tag fee will be refunded if the applicant is unsuccessful and one half will be retained by the department as an “application fee” for this species.**
  - c. **Annual preference points will be awarded for the cost of the application fee if the applicant wishes to not participate in the drawing.**
- (iv) **applicants will be assigned a separate lottery number for each point accumulated.**
- (v) **applicants must purchase an annual hunting license to purchase points.**
- (vi) **applicants may accumulate points for hunts they are ineligible to hunt by purchasing points without entering the drawing (four years following the harvest of a bear in a one bear every four years area).**
- (vii) **applicants points will be returned to zero if:**
  - a. **a hunting license is not purchased in any single year.**
  - b. **they fail to apply for a permit for three years.**
  - c. **they fail to file a harvest report if required.**
  - d. **they are convicted of any wildlife violation.**
- (viii) **there will be no “guaranteed” tags after a specific point total.**
- (ix) **Award x bonus point/points for applicants that have completed an approved hunter education course.**

**ISSUE:** An antiquated drawing tag system that leaves people wishing to hunt a specific hunt for an unknown number of years or decades. This system will still leave the drawing up to chance but those that have contributed hundreds or thousands of dollars over the years applying for tags will get some reward for their efforts.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Status Quo.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The drawing tag system will reward those that have been attempting to hunt a specific hunt for years without successfully drawing a tag.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The Department of Fish and Game will see increased revenue due to people applying and buying licenses every year so they do not lose their points and nonresidents that pay half of the tag fee even if they are not drawn for a tag. The program should more than pay for itself. Those that have spent the time and money to apply for permits over the

**PROPOSAL 17 CONTINUED.**

years will have a better chance. Residents will have and improved chance in those areas without allocated tags.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Nonresidents will have increased costs and decreased chance of drawing in areas without allocated tags. Those that are not will to apply or buy a license every year. Wildlife violators. Those who do not file their harvest reports.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** There are many similar systems in place in other states that work well.

**PROPOSED BY:** Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-08W-G-006)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Brett Nelson PC4
- Kelly Vern PC57
- Alaska Bowhunters Association PC73
- Carl Kinney PC77
- Upper Tanana 40 Mile w/Am AC5
- Denali AC9

- Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36
- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Wesley Walker PC78
- Fairbanks AC3
- Seward AC14
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

**OPPOSE**

- Jeff Sperry PC5
- Shane Oyster PC12
- Timothy Christopherson PC38
- Ahtna Inc. PC46
- Nathan Sperry PC53
- Steven Hohensee PC69
- Brian West PC72

-----

**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC 92.050 (a)(4). Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.**

Create a preference point system for the drawing permit system.

**ISSUE:** Adopt a preference point system for the drawing permit system.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Low drawing permit win success is discouraging many hunters.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All applicants.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** N/A

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Carl A. Kinney

(HQ-08W-G-036)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Kelly Vern PC57

Alaska Bowhunters Association PC73

Carl Kinney PC77

Fairbanks AC3

Upper Tanana 40 Mile w/Am AC5

Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36

Wayne Kubat PC47

Wesley Walker PC78

Seward AC14

Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

Jeff Sperry PC5

Shane Oyster PC12

Timothy Christopherson PC38

Ahtna Inc. PC46

Nathan Sperry PC53

Steven Hohensee PC69

Brian West PC72

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.** Amend the regulation as follows:

If an applicant applies for the same drawing hunt (\*such as 8 yrs) in a row, and has not been drawn, he/she automatically receives a tag. (\*The Board of Game determines the length of time based on the number of applicants).

**ISSUE:** I would like to see drawing hunt applications receive priority ratings. People who have applied year after year for the same drawing hunt, but have not been drawn, should receive a higher priority to be drawn. After a period of years (example 8 years) if that applicant hasn't been drawn, he/she will receive a tag.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** People like me will continue to grumble and wonder if the drawing process is fair. Some people get drawn more often than others. Are they really just luckier?

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** It does not.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Unlucky people will benefit by being rewarded with a tag if they apply long enough.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will suffer. Lucky people will continue to be lucky and continue to be drawn more often then the rest of us.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Discontinue the "party hunt" application process. This limits number of tags available.

**PROPOSED BY:** Dale Nelson (HQ-08W-G-037)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**  
Kelly Vern PC57  
Alaska Bowhunters Association PC73  
Upper Tanana 40 Mile w/Am AC5  
Kenai/Soldotna AC6

Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36  
Wayne Kubat PC47  
Fairbanks AC3  
Seward AC14  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

**OPPOSE**  
Delta AC2  
Matanuska Valley AC16

Jeff Sperry PC5  
Shane Oyster PC12  
Timothy Christopherson PC38  
Ahtna Inc. PC46  
Nathan Sperry PC53  
Steven Hohensee PC69  
Brian West PC72  
Carl Kinney PC77

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 20 – 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.**

Establish a bonus/preference point system for drawing permits.

**5 AAC 92.050 (a)(4) Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.**

...

(4) permit issuance:

(A) the department shall issue registration permits in the order applications are received, and drawing permits on a lottery basis; **the department may issue drawing permits on a point system, as follows:**

There are a variety of options available, with numerous states implementing any number of combinations. Example requirements and ideas include:

- Points are species specific versus hunt specific.
- All drawing hunts are included versus popular hunts only.
- All permits issued by points versus a percentage of permits allocated to use for points.
- Points are specific to hunt versus specific to hunter—i.e., hunter can use all her/his points for one hunt.
- Points are accumulated only when the applicant is not drawn or chooses the “bonus point only” option vs. points are accumulated only when actually applying for permit.
- Points are scored and accumulated by a variety of formulas — one point per year versus points squared per year.
- Points are all lost when an applicant is drawn for a hunt.
- Points are all lost when an applicant fails to apply for that species for 2 consecutive years.
- Applicants will be required to be part of the department’s “Customer ID” system.

**ISSUE:** When hunting is open under a general hunting regulation, every hunter has an opportunity to hunt that species every year. When hunting is regulated by random drawing permit, many hunters do not get a chance to hunt that species on a regular basis, or get to hunt in certain areas ever. Some hunters never draw; some seem to draw regularly. For sheep hunts in 2005–06, the chance of drawing in each of the state’s 33 drawing hunts ranged from <1% to 27%; the most coveted areas having the lowest chance of drawing success. For bison hunts in 2006–07, the chance of drawing in each of the state’s 3 drawing hunts ranged from <1% to 2%.

Several western states have implemented preference or bonus points systems for issuing drawing permits to ensure that hunters have some increased opportunity to draw a permit the longer they have been applying. These systems are complex and highly variable, and in some cases, have met with limited success. In popular hunts, the odds of drawing a permit is so small that point systems change the odds of being drawn very little.

There are legislative and administrative considerations in implementation of this type of system. Depending on approach, the legislature or department would have to establish a user-pay fee system if extra charges are to be implemented to offset program costs. Currently the department has no system of permanently identifying hunters and anglers from one year to the next, so the department would have to develop such a system. The division would have to develop policies for the type of system adopted, and consider many possible scenarios, including how to deal with points accumulated if the hunt is modified or closed.

This proposal was requested by the Board of Game and the department will provide a presentation to the Board at the meeting in January 2008, and intends to establish a committee to develop specific recommendations for the future.

**PROPOSAL 20 CONTINUED.**

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Longevity in applying will carry no weight in drawings. First time applicants will have just as much opportunity to draw as others who have regularly applied for drawing hunts for several years.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** There will be no change to the quality of the resource.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Drawing hunt applicants who regularly apply for drawing hunts. Hunters would have increasing opportunity to draw each consecutive year. Hunters could continue to build points in years when they can not hunt.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Young hunters with fewer years applying for permits. Older hunters might suffer if they are never able to accumulate enough preference points to be drawn. Drawing hunt applicants who prefer everyone be treated equally in a random drawing. People who can not afford to apply for as many hunts.

Applicants who fail to maintain their electronic paperwork and standing in the preference point system may suffer. Applicants can suffer if a hunt area is changed and the drawing pool is also changed as a result.

Gains in the probability for drawing a permit for a hunt like Delta bison will continue to be very small because many hunters will enter the preference point system and their expectations for successfully drawing will continue to not be met. Other states with preference points for highly coveted hunts have pointed out the problem that the odds of being successful for these hunts do not appreciably increase.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Limit hunters to a once per lifetime permit in popular hunts, bonus point systems; preference point systems.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game, at the request of the Board of Game.  
(HQ-08W-G-75)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Brett Nelson PC4
- Kelly Vern PC57
- Steven Hohensee PC69
- Alaska Bowhunters Association PC73
- Carl Kinney PC77
- Upper Tanana 40 Mile w/Am AC5
- Cooper Landing w/Am AC8
- Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36
- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Fairbanks AC3
- Seward AC14
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

**OPPOSE**

- Jeff Sperry PC5
- Shane Oyster PC12
- Joseph Taylor PC37
- Timothy Christopherson PC38

**PROPOSAL 5 CONTINUED.**

Ahtna Inc. PC46  
Nathan Sperry PC53  
Brian West PC72  
Delta AC2

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 21 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.** Amend the permit hunt regulations as follows:

Place all permit drawings mid-winter, with sheep and goat.

**ISSUE:** The spring permit drawing date prevents hunters from planning a hunt and obtaining transport to the field (e.g. air charter services are already booked by sheep hunters.)

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Non-residents will have first shot at services and residents will continue to find that, after winning a permit drawing, all transport services are pre-scheduled, and have limited options for the hunt.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaskan residents who wish to plan and execute a safe hunting experience

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The permit system could be over-loaded by having all forms processes mid winter

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** David J.F. Pelto (HQ-08W-G-039)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Wayne Kubat PC47  
Steven Hohensee PC69  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

Timothy Christopherson PC38  
Fairbanks AC3  
Kenai/Soldotna AC6

**OPPOSE**

Tony Russ PC10  
Shane Oyster PC12  
Ahtna Inc. PC46  
Delta AC2

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.** Modify the draw permit party application regulations to allow up to four individuals per application.

Up to four hunters desiring to hunt together can submit as a party. Drawing permit party applications are good for up to four individuals per application.

**ISSUE:** The current party drawing permit application restrictions of two only per application prevents groups of friends and families from hunting together who want to hunt together in a drawing permit area.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will continue to be a missed opportunity to have families and close friends to share an Alaskan outdoor experience. Additionally, there will be lost opportunity for mentorship opportunities by larger families for young up coming hunters in a high quality hunting area.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, it will allow groups of friends or families to be able to apply and hunt together.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All applicants

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** none

**PROPOSED BY:** Don Schwandt (HQ-08W-G-065)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Fairbanks AC3

**OPPOSE**

- Jeff Sperry PC5
- Shane Oyster PC12
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Richard Hahn PC31
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32
- Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36
- Timothy Christopherson PC38
- Ahtna Inc. PC46
- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Nathan Sperry PC53
- Kelly Vern PC57
- Carl Kinney PC77
- Delta AC2
- Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5
- Koyukuk River AC11
- Middle Yukon AC12
- GASH AC13

---

**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.** Modify the limited permit regulations as follows:

The deadline for applications for the Alaska winter drawing permit supplement is February 10.

**ISSUE:** The winter drawing cycle is too early. The November 1 to December 6 window is difficult for outfitters to work with their hunters to get submitted for the winter supplement draws. During this time many outfitters are still conducting hunts and it is the prime hunting time for lower 48 hunting seasons, so many hunters are in the field hunting. The old drawing cycle for the winter supplement big game animals used to be in May which is too late and November has proven overtime to be too early.

A better window would be the January/February time frame when the major sporting shows are taking place in the lower 48. This way an outfitter/guide could get people to comment for the draws right there at the show and have them submit. Additionally, many Alaskan residents are still out doing hunts in November and it is a burden to some of them as well.

If the drawing deadline was moved to/near February, it would still allow permit winners to have more than enough time to prepare and plan for their hunt. For that matter, all drawing permits could be standardized to this time frame for both the winter and spring drawing.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will continue to be missed opportunities for hunters to submit for draws and the missed economical benefits the state of Alaska gets by having nonresident hunters come to Alaska to hunt that win permits.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, provides a better time frame for all to be able to submit for draws.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Don Schwandt (HQ-08W-G-066)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Wayne Kubat PC47  
Kelly Vern PC57  
Steven Hohensee PC69  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15  
Fairbanks AC3

**OPPOSE**

Brett Nelson PC4  
Jeff Sperry PC5  
Tony Russ PC10  
Dean Lippold PC 34  
Timothy Christopherson PC38  
Ahtna Inc. PC46  
Nathan Sperry PC53  
Carl Kinney PC77  
Delta AC2  
Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5  
Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.** Offer all moose drawing permit hunts during the same drawing period as follows:

The Department of Fish and Game (department) has had discussion about the need to combine all drawing hunts (all species) or all fall drawing hunts to one drawing period. The board should encourage the department to make a determination on this matter in time for implementation in 2009.

- A single draw period would greatly reduce the burden on department (budget and staffing).
- The most appropriate draw period may not be either of the current draw periods.

**ISSUE:** Two different drawing permit periods for the same species – moose. Units 21, 22 and 24 moose are offered during the winter draw period while moose in Units 1, 3, 6, 7, 14, 15, 20, 23, 25, and 26 are offered during the spring drawing period.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Hunters, their guides and outfitters will continue to not be able to select drawing hunts by preference. An inappropriate and unproportionate number of drawing applications will continue to be submitted for moose during the winter draw period. Continued excessive submissions during the spring drawing period by hunters not fully understanding the three entry rule. Continued hunter confusion and disillusionment with Alaska’s drawing permit system.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The proposal would allow for guide outfitters to better plan for and implement hunts, entering hunters at a desired level of participation, in their preferred guide use areas, thereby improving the quality of the hunt product offered. All hunters would be able to choose moose hunts by preference. Improved drawing result satisfaction should reduce the number of unused (wasted) permits. Less confusion about the process should reduce rejected applications.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Resident and nonresident hunters, guides/outfitters, transporters, the Department of Fish and Game.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1. Move Unit 23 moose to the winter drawing period. This solves the situation in that unit only and does not solve issues statewide or within the entire drawing permit process. 2. Move Units 21 and 24 moose to the spring drawing period. This solves the situation in those units only and does not solve issues statewide or within the entire drawing permit process.

**PROPOSED BY:** Joe Schuster (HQ-08W-G-069)  
\*\*\*\*\*

<b>FAVOR</b>		<b>OPPOSE</b>
Wayne Kubat PC47	Fairbanks AC3	
Kelly Vern PC57	GASH AC13	
Steven Hohensee PC69		
Koyukuk River AC11		Ahtna Inc. PC46
Matanuska Valley AC16		Delta AC2

**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC 92.069. Special provisions for moose drawing permit hunts; 5 AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep drawing permit hunts; and 92.XXX. Special provisions for other big game animals.** Amend the regulations to provide the following:

All drawing hunts in Alaska will have a minimum of ninety percent of the permits going to residents of the State of Alaska. Provisions will apply in case insufficient residents apply.

**ISSUE:** Alaskans should come first. Not enough drawing permits are being allocated for Alaska resident hunters.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** As more and more hunting areas/populations are managed with drawing hunts, and many of these permits go to nonresidents, there will be fewer and fewer hunting opportunities for resident hunters of the State of Alaska. With diminishing hunting opportunities, more resident hunters will stop hunting and more will stop taking their children hunting, which will reduce hunter recruitment. This not only reduces license fees from residents, it reduces support for game management from local hunters.

There will also be continued growth in the resentment toward nonresidents who many Alaskans feel “take our game.” This resentment manifests itself in the growing number of complaints of field confrontations between guided nonresident hunters, their guides, and resident hunters. This hurts the guiding industry, hunters as a whole, law enforcement, game management, and Alaska’s reputation as a tourist destination.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Resident hunters of the State of Alaska, the reputation of Alaska guides, Alaska wildlife management personnel, and the reputation of Alaska as a hunting destination.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Nonresident hunters, nonresident Alaska guides, Alaska resident guides, and the State of Alaska, which will lose income from fewer nonresident hunting fees and the additional monies they spend.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No nonresident drawing permits. This is not a desirable outcome; we want a healthy, but limited, guiding industry in Alaska, plus we want nonresidents to hunt Alaska on a limited basis just like we want to be able to hunt other states on a limited basis.

**PROPOSED BY:** Matanuska Valley AC (SC-08W-G-002)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Brett Nelson w/Am PC4
- Jeff Sperry w/Am PC5
- Tony Russ PC10
- Shane Oyster PC12
- Tanana Chiefs Conference PC16
- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Richard Hahn PC31
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32
- Dean Lipplold PC 34

**OPPOSE**

**PROPOSAL 25 CONTINUED.**

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Timothy Christopherson PC38  
Howard Beito PC44  
Stuart Pechek PC49  
Nathan Sperry w/Am PC53  
R. Miller PC54  
Steven Hohensee PC69  
Perry Schneider PC70  
Tom Lamal PC74  
Carl Kinney PC77  
Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5  
Matanuska Valley AC16

Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36  
Ahtna Inc. PC46  
Wayne Kubat PC47  
Kelly Vern PC57  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.** Amend the regulations as follows:

Discretionary permits should be allowed to be attained no more than three working days before the hunt. Be able to register on-line, or be mailed in with the proper post mark, or at the local designated building. The closing date should be one day prior to the opening of the hunt, unless all the permits have not been issued out.

**ISSUE:** The discriminating access to the registration of discretionary permits. Many discretionary hunt permits are set up to discourage non-local users to apply (A loophole to rural preference) by way of starting the registration sometimes more than 30 days before the hunt, or close the registration as much as 12 days before the hunt starts. Permits are issued at a place, or places that give the most access and the least amount of inconvenience to the local resident, or allow the use of their common post office to be mailed. All this to make sure the local user has the best opportunity to receive the permit, than any other resident. This is not at all the intent of 5 AAC 92.052, nor can I believe the Board of Game would misuse their authority under AS 16.05.255(9).

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The Board of Game will continue to no allow fair and equal access to the registration dates (AS 16.05.255 (9)). This will continue to have the very appearance of “rural preference.” Also, would this be concern for discrimination? The area biologist for Kodiak has stated that goat permits (RG 471-479) are for the use of locals. This is why the registration stops 12 days before the hunt starts.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** No, but it does address improving the quality among state residents.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaskan consumptive users.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Area biologists, and the board, trying to look like the good guys when it comes to the management of game in rural Alaska.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Allen Barrette (I-08W-G-007)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

- Jeff Sperry PC5
- Tony Russ PC10
- Tanana Chiefs Conference PC16
- Timothy Christopherson PC38
- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Steven Hohensee PC69
- Fairbanks AC3
- Matanuska Valley AC16

Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

- Tanana Chiefs Conference PC16
- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Richard Hahn PC31
- USFWS - Subsistence Management PC41

**PROPOSAL 26 CONTINUED.**

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Ahtna Inc. PC46  
Cooper Landing AC8  
Central Kuskokwim AC10  
Koyukuk River AC11  
Middle Yukon AC12  
GASH AC13

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 27 - 5 AAC 92.050 Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.** Establish a preference point system for musk ox drawing permits.

Drawing permit applicants are given the option of paying a fee for applying to a point saver hunt number for bison, in addition to the regular application fee. Upon paying the fee and submitting the application the hunter is placed into a category of hunters with preference points. Each year a hunter applies for the same bison hunt through this process, the hunter is awarded a preference point and maintains these preference points into the following year if a permit is not awarded. If the applicant fails to submit an application in any year the points are removed from the system. The preference point drawing is allocated 75% of permits first, and the remaining 25% will be drawn randomly from a pool of all applicants. If the database is available, it may be considered to assign points retroactively to jump start the first year. Permits are randomly awarded to those within the highest preference point group first and on to the next lower preference point group if necessary, and so on.

**ISSUE:** There are many hunters who have been submitting applications for Alaska’s bison hunts for decades without success. Some of these veteran hunters are dying without the opportunity to hunt bison in Alaska, and countless others are giving up submitting applications. In 2004, the Board of Game failed to take action on a proposal requesting a point system for drawing permit hunts. Within its discussion the board stated “younger hunters or new applicants may be discouraged from participating knowing their odds are even less.” In reality what has happened by maintaining a status-quo, is veteran hunters from Alaska are giving up hope that they can ever hunt bison and are quitting the application process.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The feeling of discouragement surrounding the bison hunt application process is pervasive in the hunting community of Alaska. Unfortunately, along with this comes a feeling of mistrust toward those who manage the resource. This discontent is being passed on to the next generation of hunters. Status-quo in the drawing permit process for bison bolsters this discontent. A new point system for bison drawing permits would invigorate a positive relation between hunters and managers and give those who helped shape Alaska’s great hunting legacy over the last decades a more equitable chance at a hunt.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** A more positive atmosphere will be produced between hunters and game managers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The hunters who historically submit applications to the bison drawing permit process year in and year out.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** First year applicants.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Restricting the hunt to Alaskan residents was also considered a solution, but was rejected as it removes this great hunt from the reach of even more hunters.

**PROPOSED BY:** Seldovia Advisory Committee (SC-08W-G-012)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**  
Carl Kinney PC77

Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36  
Fairbanks AC3

**OPPOSE**  
Jeff Sperry PC5  
Timothy Christopherson PC38

**PROPOSAL 27 CONTINUED.**  
**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Ahtna Inc. PC46  
Nathan Sperry PC53  
Steven Hohensee PC69

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 28 - 5 AAC 92.069. Special provisions for moose drawing permit hunts for nonresidents; 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep drawing permit hunts for nonresidents; and 92.008. Harvest guideline levels:** Amend the regulations as follows:

Place restrictions on the harvest quota for the guiding industry. Limitations would include the number of guides allowed to work in the subunits and the number of animals that they can harvest.

**ISSUE:** The growing community of guiding services is causing a dramatic increase in harvest numbers in many areas of the state. The guiding industry is not regulated in the number of animals it is allowed to take. The non-guided hunting community can not compete with the guiding industry and is losing opportunities as a result of the increased competition for the animals.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The Alaska Department of Fish and Game will have to implement more restrictions on hunting regulations to limit animal harvest. Many of the open areas will be considered for a drawing permit.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All non-guided hunters will benefit from this proposal.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The guiding industry will have limitations to the areas they can work on the number of animals they can harvest.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Carl A. Kinney (HQ-08W-G-033)

*Note: The Department of Law advises that the Board of Game has no authority to regulate the number of guides.*

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR** **OPPOSE**

- Shane Oyster PC12
- Dean Lippold PC 34
- Howard Beito PC44
- Vern Fiehler w/Am PC51
- R. Miller PC54
- Roland Fein PC71
- Brian West PC72
- Tom Lamal PC74
- Carl Kinney w/Am PC77

- Fairbanks AC3
- Cooper Landing AC8
- Matanuska Valley AC16
- Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36
- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Kelly Vern PC57

**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 92.069. Special provisions for moose drawing permit hunts; 5 AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep drawing permit hunts; and 92.XXX. Special provisions for other big game animals.** Amend the regulations for resident and nonresident permit allocations as follows:

Set allocated numbers for resident and nonresident permits to be issued for all species.

**ISSUE:** Allocate the number of drawing permits that are going to be for Alaska residents and non-residents for all species.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Resident hunter permit win success is decreasing in many of the drawing hunt areas due to the increase in nonresident applicants.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaskan residents will benefit by knowing there is a limit to the number of permits that are going to nonresident hunters

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The guiding industry will possibly see a decrease in the number of clients that are successful in winning drawing permits.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Carl A. Kinney (HQ-08W-G-035)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Shane Oyster PC12

Timothy Christopherson PC38

Howard Beito PC44

R. Miller PC54

Greg Turner PC64

Steven Hohensee PC69

Perry Schneider PC70

Tom Lamal PC74

Carl Kinney PC77

Kenai/Soldotna AC6

Jeff Sperry PC5

Fairbanks AC3

Cooper Landing AC8

Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36

Wayne Kubat PC47

Kelly Vern PC57

Delta AC2

Matanuska Valley AC16

**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. Special hunts for disabled veterans.** Create a new regulation for specialty hunts as follows:

Establish special hunts for each big game species on all military and some national and state lands. Permit fees can be charged to cover any administrative or other costs.

**ISSUE:** "Other Disability Provisions." There are many disabled Veterans who are not wheel chair bound, however physically can't climb mountains or walk great distances. (I.e. veterans rated 100%, and as you know more and more troops coming back are missing appendages or an eye yet not in wheel chairs.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Veterans and wounded troops can't hunt/fish in the state known world round for its hunting and fishing. This should be changed to help the disabled/wounded veterans adapt easier into normal life.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, I believe so if managed properly. This can be a herd management/predator control resource and balance populations to facilitate all species health of herd.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All resident 100% disabled Veterans and our returning active duty wounded heroes.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** All environmentalists that do not understand the necessity of hunting/fishing to manage wildlife.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Bruce D. Frady

(HQ-08W-G-056)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Allen Avinger PC8  
Wayne Kubat PC47  
Delta AC2  
Central Kuskokwim w/Am AC10

Fairbanks AC3  
Matanuska Valley AC16

**OPPOSE**

Jeff Sperry PC5  
Dean Lippold PC 34  
Nathan Sperry PC53  
Brian West PC72  
Cooper Landing AC8

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_  
**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 92.085(13). Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions.**

Repeal the following paragraph under 92.085.

(13) [THE USE OF ANY OFF-ROAD-VEHICLE OVER 1,500 POUNDS, OR ANY AIRCRAFT, FOR MOOSE AND CARIBOU HUNTING UNDER A SUBSISTENCE PERMIT IN UNIT 13, INCLUDING THE TRANSPORTATION OF MOOSE AND CARIBOU HUNTERS, HUNTING GEAR, OR PARTS OF BIG GAME; HOWEVER, THIS PROVISION DOES NOT PROHIBIT MOTORIZED ACCESS, OR TRANSPORTATION OF GEAR OR GAME, ON THE PARKS HIGHWAY, DENALI HIGHWAY, OR RICHARDSON HIGHWAY.]

**ISSUE:** Access restrictions on Tier II hunts in Unit 13 should be removed so that hunters may be distributed throughout the region. This regulation was put in place when we were discussing a special subsistence area and trying to better define subsistence. That never happened, so we should put the regulation back to what it was originally. Concentrating hunters close to the road system is never a good idea.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** We will continue to harvest close to the road system only, driving the herd away from opportunity for other subsistence hunts.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, harvesting animals throughout the herd is always better than taking out all the animals in a specific area.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone, by decreasing pressure in limited areas.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Anyone who disagrees with airplanes and buggies being used for subsistence hunting.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Create a nonsubsistence area under Alaska Statute 16.05.258(c).

**PROPOSED BY:** Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee (SC-08W-G-013)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**  
Tanana Chiefs Conference PC16  
Wayne Kubat PC47  
Nick and Karen Steen PC75  
Carl Kinney PC77  
Fairbanks AC3  
Copper Basin AC7  
Denali AC9  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

Cooper Landing AC8

**OPPOSE**  
Brett Nelson PC4  
Jeff Sperry PC5  
Allen Avinger PC8  
Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17  
Jenny Pursell PC30  
Richard Hahn PC31

Arthur Greenwalt PC32  
Nathan Sperry PC53  
Brian West PC72

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 92.070(a)(1). Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system.**

Amend this regulation as follows:

92.070(a)(1) should be changed to add on the end... **“unless a permit applicant has been issued a permit in the last five years at which point the most they can score on this question is 1/2 of the maximum points available”**

**ISSUE:** Tier II permits being awarded to a small percentage of hunters who apply every year, though all Alaskans are subsistence users under state law and should receive the same opportunity. For example; Tier II hunt TC566 consistently receives thousands more applications every year than permits are awarded. The only two criteria left to distinguish between who receives Tier II permits and who doesn't are “mainstay of livelihood” and “the ability to obtain food if this use is restricted”, 16.05.258(b)(4) (B) (i) and (ii). The current Tier II scoring point system doesn't accommodate all Alaskans who qualify for Tier II permits equally.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Permits will continue to be a longevity bonus program and others will keep giving up on the process knowing they will never be able to get a permit.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The other applicants who qualify as subsistence users under 16.05.258(b)(4)(B) that don't receive a Tier II permit currently.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Current permit winners as this will force a rotation in Tier II permits with other Alaskans who also qualify as subsistence user under state law.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Create a non-subsistence Area under Alaska Statute 16.05.258(c). This was rejected by the Joint Boards October 8, 2007.

**PROPOSED BY:** Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee (SC-08W-G-014)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Wayne Kubat PC47  
Matanuska Valley AC16

Timothy Christopherson PC38  
USFWS - Subsistence Management PC41  
Fairbanks AC3  
Cooper Landing AC8  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

**OPPOSE**

Tanana Chiefs Conference PC16  
Brian West PC72  
Copper Basin AC7  
Central Kuskokwim AC10

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system.** This proposal addresses the point system and measures for indicators pertaining to the relative availability of alternative sources of game and customary and direct dependence on the game population.

**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 85 points. It is measured by the following indicators and points.

...

(b) The "ability of a subsistence user to obtain food if subsistence use is restricted or eliminated" may provide up to [55] **XX** points. It is measured by the following indicators and points:

...

**(5) the relative availability of alternative sources of game to the applicant's household, which may provide up to YY points, as measured by the formula Score = YY(I/J), in which "I/J" is the percent of the applicant's household's wild big game that came from the Tier II population over the past five years, in which "I" stands for the amount of big game harvested by hunters from the applicant's household from the Tier II population and "J" stands for the amount of game harvested by hunters from the applicant's household from within the state; "I/J" may be a percent up to but not exceeding G/H, in which "G" stands for the amount of game harvested from the Tier II game population within the past five years and "H" stands for the amount of game harvested by Alaska resident hunters from all reasonably accessible game hunts, except drawing hunts, in subunits within MM miles of the applicant's location within the past five years. The value for "G" for locations greater than MM miles from the Tier II hunt area is 0. Before January 1, 2012, the provisions of this paragraph do not apply to Units 22 and 23 musk oxen hunts.**

**ISSUE:** This proposal is being submitted to allow the public and Board to consider reestablishing a Tier II question to measure alternative sources of game. In the Supreme Court decision of *State of Alaska, Department of Fish and Game v. Manning*, the court stated that the Board could constitutionally measure access to alternative game resources, and the court provided guidance on how to construct a regulation that would pass constitutional scrutiny. By measuring the indicator for the alternative sources of game resources and allocating points to this indicator, the Board may also consider the points allocated to the other indicators used for measuring "customary and direct dependence on the game population" in 92.070(a) and the "ability of a subsistence user to obtain food if subsistence use is restricted or eliminated" in 92.070(b). Several additional options for changes to the present Tier II questions and point system are provided below for consideration when addressing the point system for measuring alternative game resources.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued dissatisfaction by some of the hunting public regarding the Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system in some areas of the state.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** This will depend upon the scoring determined by the board for each indicator comprising the point system. (See additional options 1 through 4, below.)

## **PROPOSAL 33 CONTINUED.**

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** This will depend upon the scoring determined by the board for each indicator comprising the point system. (See additional options 1 through 4, below.)

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The following options for other changes to the present Tier II questions and point system are listed here for further discussion and consideration by the board as they address the alternative sources of game indicator. Any combination of the following options noted below, along with the option presented above, can be considered by the board for addressing the subsistence hunting permit point system in total. The complex nature of this proposal and subsequent scoring makes it difficult to predict the outcome of any changes because of the multiple questions involved in scoring, and because the applicant pool and number of permits issued vary by year.

1.) Consider changing the allocation of points between questions that measure Factor A, “customary and direct dependence for human consumption as a mainstay of livelihood” (5 AAC 92.070(a)) and Factor B, “the ability of a subsistence user to obtain food if subsistence use is restricted or eliminated” (5 AAC 92.070(b)). Currently, the potential maximum number of points awarded for Factor A (85 points) is 61% of the total potential points an applicant may receive (140 points). The potential maximum number of points awarded for Factor B (55) points is 39% of the total potential points. For example, increasing the number of points and the percentage of total points awarded for Factor B would award higher scores to applicants with lower cash incomes and applicants who purchase food and gasoline in areas where costs are highest. This may also result in younger people living in areas with higher costs of living and fewer job opportunities receiving higher scores on their applications than applicants with longer histories of use of the Tier II game population who shop and work in areas with lower costs and higher paying jobs.

2.) Consider adjusting the number of years required in Factor A for an applicant to achieve the total number of points allocated for “the number of years in which the applicant has hunted on or eaten from the game population” (5 AAC 92.070(a)(1)) and “the number of years in which a member of the applicant’s household has hunted on or eaten from the game population” (5 AAC 92.070(a)(2)). Presently, applicants achieve the maximum number of points at 50 years. For example, if the number of years were reduced, applicants with a shorter history of use would achieve the maximum number of points in a shorter period of time and receive the same score on these questions as applicants with much longer histories of use. Presently, applicants with 50 years of use of the Tier II population receive 60 points for these two questions (receiving 1 point per year for question 1 and 0.2 points per year for question 2), while applicants with 30 years of use receive 36 points. In a case where the maximum number of years were changed to 30, both would receive the same score of 60 points (receiving 1.66 points per year up to 50 points for question 1 and 0.33 points per year up to a maximum of 10 for question 2. This change could result in more applicants receiving the same score for these questions, thereby placing more emphasis on questions that measure Factor B.

3.) Regarding measuring Factor B, “the ability of a subsistence user to obtain food if subsistence use is restricted or eliminated” (5 AAC 92.070(b)), consider adjusting the total points awarded for the relative cost of food at the location where most of the applicant’s household’s store-bought food was purchased. For example, if the total points for this question were increased, this change could result in some applicants with higher food costs, but fewer years of use of the Tier II game population receiving higher scores than applicants with relatively low food costs but more years of use.

**PROPOSAL 33 CONTINUED.**

4.) Regarding measuring Factor B, “the ability of a subsistence user to obtain food if subsistence use is restricted or eliminated” (5 AAC 92.070(b)), also consider adjusting the total points awarded for the relative cost of gasoline at the location where most of the applicant’s household’s gasoline was purchased. For example, if the total points for this question were increased, this change could result in some applicants with higher gasoline costs, who face higher costs to access alternative game resources, but fewer years of use of the Tier II game population, receiving higher scores than applicants with relatively low gasoline costs, and hence more access to alternative game resources, but more years of use.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08W-G-59)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR** **OPPOSE**

Tanana Chiefs Conference PC16

Central Kuskokwim AC10

Matanuska Valley w/Am AC16

USFWS - Subsistence Management PC41

Cooper Landing AC8

Timothy Christopherson PC38

Ahtna Inc. PC46

Brian West PC72

Delta AC2

Fairbanks AC3

Kenai/Soldotna AC6

Copper Basin AC7

Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 34 - 5 AAC 92.052(5). Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures.**

Amend this regulation as follows:

Delete “antler destruction” or just say that it’s not eligible as a trophy animal for Unit 13E.

**ISSUE:** The regulation that bothers some hunters is cracking antlers. Why? I see to prevent trophy hunters from coming and hunting for trophy animals, but why not just state in the rules that you cannot enter in any Tier II animal into any kind of contest?

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Loss of hunting due to hardships on families.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** It takes the emphasis off the antlers and puts it back on the meat where it belongs.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters of moose meat who have to drive several hundred miles to the nearest Department of Fish and Game office.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one – the current law benefits no one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Make all hunting groups take their antlers to the department to be fair to all groups.

**PROPOSED BY:** Windy Gore

(HQ-08W-G-064)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Ahtna Inc. PC46

Fairbanks AC3

Copper Basin AC7

Denali AC9

Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

Kenai/Soldotna AC6

Cooper Landing AC8

Jeff Sperry PC5

Allen Avinger PC8

Richard Hahn PC31

Steven Hohensee PC69

Delta AC2

Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

The Board of Game considered this proposal during the Spring 2007 regional meeting and voted to defer it to the Statewide meeting.

**PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 92.171. Sealing of Dall sheep horns.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Cease the sealing of Dall sheep horns for the units in the southcentral and southwest regions.

**ISSUE:** Misguided sheep sealing requirement.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The department will continue to waste money and man hours on an unnecessary requirement.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The department in no longer wasting money.

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Chapter of FNAWS and Anchorage Advisory Committee (HQ-08W-G-083)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

R. Miller w/Am PC54  
Fairbanks AC3  
Upper Tanana 40 Mile w/Am AC5

Tony Russ PC10

**OPPOSE**

Jeff Sperry PC5  
Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17  
Richard Hahn PC31  
Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36  
Howard Beito PC44  
Ahtna Inc. PC46  
Wayne Kubat PC47  
Nathan Sperry PC53  
Alaska Backcountry Hunters and Anglers PC62  
Tom Lamal PC74  
Carl Kinney PC77  
Copper Basin AC7  
Denali AC9  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15  
Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC 92.062. Priority for subsistence hunting; Tier II permits.** Amend the regulation as follows:

An individual should be able to hunt in the unit that the individual physically resides in.

**ISSUE:** Being able to hunt in the area you live in. Subsistence hunting of indigenous foods that are local to your area for the consumption of food that supplements your other food choices is right to those who live in that area. People have been adapting to their surroundings since time immemorial and learning to hunt in new ways as they are discovered or handed down. Just as we learn to eat new foods over time, it is the over time that is so important to many of use because you just can't take away someone's right to hunt something they've hunted and eaten their whole life and their parents and grandparents did before them. It is nutritionally unhealthy to do that to someone. We have an elder here who doesn't get a caribou permit sometimes, he doesn't have a family who can provide for him, he has always gotten his own caribou, how can he do this without a permit? He's 88 years young and still rides a four-wheeler; he physically needs his caribou meat. What is wrong with this Tier II system? Of course, people are going to buy food at the store, and learn to survive in a changing world but why do we have to take things away rather than let them adapt naturally? This man did not move to the city for a high paying job when he could have years ago because he chose to live in rural Alaska where he can enjoy eating as naturally and traditionally as he can in this fast-changing world, and he chooses to knowing he will live a less-than convenient life. The people that live in rural Alaska should have priority because they've chosen to stay and live a harder life, one that doesn't always come with modern conveniences. It costs more for everything. And when a person in rural Alaska does improve their life over time, they certainly shouldn't be punished for it by saying they can no longer hunt and gather what they've worked so hard for. It is this lifestyle they've taught their children and one that their children may never know because they are discriminated against because the children can't get the rights to hunt when they're old enough. These children are the lifeblood of the future of our rural communities, without them we won't be able to pass on our traditions and culture and language. Therefore, I believe hunting the unit you live in is the best alternative for the Tier II point system, that a person should get the majority of their points for living and hunting in the unit. It is about choices.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Loss of language, tradition and culture

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, less chance for wanton and waste due to long travel times, hot meat, boned meat wrapped in tarps, dirty etc.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** People who truly use the environment around them and teach their family about it.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one, everyone can still hunt where they live.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Marie Gore

(HQ-08W-G-060)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32
- Ahtna Inc. PC46
- Delta AC2
- Denali AC9

**PROPOSAL 36 CONTINUED.**

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Cooper Landing AC8

Jeff Sperry PC5  
Allen Avinger PC8  
Tony Russ PC10  
Timothy Christopherson PC38  
Nathan Sperry PC53  
Brian West PC72  
Fairbanks AC3  
Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.** Repeal this regulation as follows:

Repeal 92.085(13) in its entirety

**ISSUE:** Currently, the law prohibits, “The use of any off-road-vehicle over 1,500 pounds, or any aircraft, for moose and caribou hunting under a subsistence permit in Unit 13...”

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Restricting use of these modes of transportation concentrates subsistence hunting along the road system or the portions of the unit accessible by boat or light all terrain vehicles (ATVs). The implied purpose of this restriction, along with an income ceiling thrown out by the courts, was to remove an “unfair” advantage held by hunters who could afford more expensive means of transportation thus giving the “true subsistence user” a better chance to harvest subsistence animals. Instead, this law: Increases competition along the road system; drives game away from the road system because of increased hunting activity; decreases the satisfaction for the hunter who is confined to a smaller area competing with more people for a limited resource; increases degradation to the land (aircraft leave no footprint and off road vehicles (ORVs) tend to stick to the defined trails while light ATVs know no bounds, doing more damage to the terrain; confines the harvest to a small portion of the population, and unnecessarily eliminates a traditional use of many remote hunting areas. The net effect is opposite of the original intention and detrimental to the land and resource.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. It will disperse the hunting pressure throughout GMU 13, allowing for the harvest of a true cross section of the caribou population, not just those animals living near the highway corridors.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters who in the past have used ORVs or aircraft to hunt will again be able to access remote areas. Hunters who traditionally use other methods will benefit from reduced competition and less wear and tear on trails and terrain. The resources will benefit from a less concentrated harvest that does not decimate local populations. Travelers who like to view wildlife along the road system will benefit when the local animals are not harvested so heavily.

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** We considered purchasing an ATV to hunt with the herd (of hunters) and rejected that thought because of the cost. Also, I considered purchasing a snow machine and hunting in the winter, but the season was closed by emergency order and will likely be so in the future.

**PROPOSED BY:** Nick and Karen Steen

(HQ-08W-G-067)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Stuart Pechek PC49
- Tom Lamal PC74
- Nick and Karen Steen PC75
- Carl Kinney PC77
- Delta AC2
- Fairbanks AC3
- Denali AC9

**OPPOSE**

**PROPOSAL 37 CONTINUED.**

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Central Kuskokwim AC10

Cooper Landing AC8  
Matanuska Valley AC16

Jeff Sperry PC5  
Allen Avinger PC8  
Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17  
Jenny Pursell PC30  
Richard Hahn PC31  
Arthur Greenwalt PC32  
Nathan Sperry PC53

---

**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 38 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.** Amend this regulation as follows:

Make the hunt access more equitable by putting planes back in as an allowable transport.

**ISSUE:** The inequities established in the most recent Tier II regulations for Nelchina caribou and moose hunting by restricting motorized access but not totally eliminating it.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Those hunters who don't choose to use ORVs to hunt are not being allowed access. By cutting out planes but allowing small ORVs, this could lead to an increase in number of hunters who use ORVs and put added pressure on already degraded habitat. ORVs are causing enormous damage to habitat. Each year more acreage is damaged irreparably by ORVs which affects the animals' life/food supply. Hunters using aircraft don't have the same impact on habitat or animals.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** If planes are reinstated as an acceptable form of transport, the habitat will be better protected and the hunt will be more equal situation between animal and human – at least with the hunters who use choose plane as transport.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** If planes are allowed again, then those hunters who choose to use planes but not 4-wheelers will be allowed access again.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will suffer as a result of this solution.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** I considered suggesting that all motorized access be eliminated. This would level the playing field advantage among all hunters and be of benefit to the resource – habitat and the animals. I decided this proposal would not be taken seriously.

**PROPOSED BY:** Judith L. Anderegg (HQ-08W-G-049)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Steven Hohensee PC69
- Nick and Karen Steen PC75
- Carl Kinney PC77
- Delta AC2
- Fairbanks AC3
- Denali AC9

**OPPOSE**

- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Richard Hahn PC31
- Nathan Sperry PC53
- Brian West PC72

- Cooper Landing AC8
- Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 39 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.** Amend this regulation as follows:

From August 1 through September 30, you may not hunt big game or assist someone in the taking of big game until 3:00 AM of the day following the day in which you have ridden a motorized land vehicle off of an established trail above the normal high-water mark any stream.

**ISSUE:** Riders (hunters?) on motorized land vehicles are causing destruction of habitat, environmental degradation, impaired scenic values of the land, deterioration of quality hunting experiences, harassment of other hunters and game animals, unsportsmanlike conduct, and complicating the Department of Fish and Game’s management of large game on a sustained yield basis. These negative effects of unrestricted motorized land vehicles have already resulted in many states limiting their use for recreational purposes.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Motorized land vehicle operators (hunters?) will continue to increase their presence with subsequent loss of habitat and increased environmental degradation through the destructive nature of unrestricted trails across Alaska’s fragile landscape. They will also continue to increase competition among hunters often resulting in unsportsmanlike conduct, harassment, even herding of game animals thereby lowering the overall quality of a hunting experience and complicating the management of the game resource on a sustained yield basis.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This will certainly reduce the amount of motorized land vehicular activity that results in habitat and environmental degradation. It also will reduce the “running and gunning” actions of some riders, thereby reducing hunter and game harassment, as well as improving the quality of the hunt for the real hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All Alaskans who oppose the widespread destructive and unsightly nature of motorized land vehicle trails carved into the pristine landscape; plus all ethical hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Motorized land vehicle operators (runners and gunners) who indiscriminately scar the countryside with trails under the guise of hunting. They, being too lazy to walk, prefer to ride up to game animals and shoot them. These shooters may also interfere with other hunters by riding in to intercept game animals that other hunters are stalking on foot. Such over-competitiveness actually constitutes harassment.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Restrict motorized land vehicles to designated trails – rejected because this would be costly and time consuming to accomplish. Prohibit hunting the same day that one has ridden a motorized land vehicle – this would reduce some of the negative impact, but would still allow habitat and environmental degradation. Ban motorized land vehicle use for hunting big game - rejected because many hunters ride theirs responsibly.

**PROPOSED BY:** Delta Junction Fish and Game Advisory Committee (I-08W-G-011)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Brett Nelson PC4  
Jeff Sperry PC5  
Defenders of Wildlife PC11  
Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17  
Jenny Pursell PC30

**OPPOSE**

**PROPOSAL 39 CONTINUED.**

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Arthur Greenwalt PC32  
Dean Lippold PC 34  
Nathan Sperry PC53  
Steven Hohensee PC69  
Delta AC2  
Middle Yukon AC12

Koyukuk River AC11

Arthur Greenwalt PC32  
Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36  
Wayne Kubat PC47  
Gary Hess PC76  
Carl Kinney PC77  
Central AC1  
Fairbanks AC3  
Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5  
Copper Basin AC7  
Cooper Landing AC8  
Denali AC9  
Central Kuskokwim AC10  
GASH AC13  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15  
Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 40 -5 AAC 92.260. Taking cub bears and female bears with cubs prohibited.**

Amend the regulation to allow the taking of sows and cubs as follows.

No person may not take a cub bear or a female bear accompanied by a cub bear **except in intensive predator management areas and those areas where the annual limit is three or greater.**

**ISSUE:** Killing a majority of boars has been shown to only increase bear populations.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** High bear density areas will continue to be unmanageable through hunting.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCT PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The quality and quantity of ungulate species in these areas will be improved. This will also take some of the pressure off of large boars that feed on cubs.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those that think cubs are cuddly.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Allow taking of sows and cubs statewide. Rejected because this is a valuable management tool to protect vulnerable populations.

**PROPOSED BY:** Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-08W-G-009)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Delta AC2
- Fairbanks AC3
- Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5
- Central Kuskokwim AC10
- Matanuska Valley AC16

- Charlotte and Robert Sartor PC29
- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Middle Yukon AC12

**OPPOSE**

- Marylee Hayes PC3
- Defenders of Wildlife PC11
- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Linda Feiler PC18
- Nan Weed PC19
- Iris and Gus Roberts PC20
- Jeff Sloss PC21
- Gerald Brookman PC23
- Mossy Kilcher PC24
- Nina Faust PC25
- Seth Kantner PC26
- Rudy Wittshirk PC28
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Richard Hahn PC31
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32
- William Cox PC33
- Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36
- Ahtna Inc. PC46

**PROPOSAL 40 CONTINUED.**

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Michael McKinnon PC48  
John Strassenburgh PC56  
Marybeth Holleman PC61  
Alaska Backcountry Hunters and Anglers PC62  
Rick Steiner PC63  
Deanna Geary PC68  
Brian West PC72  
Form Fax 117 Signatories PC86  
Copper Basin AC7  
Denali AC9  
Koyukuk River AC11  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

---

**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_  
**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 41 - 5 AAC 92.090. Unlawful methods of taking fur animals; 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers, exceptions; 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game, exceptions; 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions; and 98.XXX. Areas of jurisdiction for taking predators in intensive management areas.** Amend the regulations for methods, seasons, and bag limits for taking predators in intensive management areas as follows:

1. Establish a new section under 5 AAC 98.0XXX as follows: For the purposes of implementing AS 16.05.255(e), removing den disturbance prohibitions for the taking of wolves in areas with positive intensive management findings requires approval by a majority of the active Advisory Committees with jurisdiction located in, or the majority of whose members reside in the affected unit or subunit. For the purpose of this section an “active advisory committee” is a committee that holds a meeting and acts on the proposal.

2. In areas with a positive intensive management finding within 5 AAC 92.108 where habitat is not a limiting factor and moose or caribou populations are either not achieving or maintaining population or harvest objectives; or the population’s harvestable surplus is not maintaining amounts necessary for subsistence:

- a. Delete, or create exception for, restrictions to disturbing or destroying dens for wolves.
- b. Extend wolf season closure date to May 31,
- c. From April 1 through May 31 increase bag limit to 10 per day.
- d. Delete, or create exemption for, prohibition of taking a sow with cubs.

**ISSUE:** Reinstatement of a historical activity that helped promote and maintain more productive moose or caribou populations that are highly important as basic subsistence food sources in Alaska. An activity that was eliminated due to application of imposed societal standards for “sportsmanship” or “fair chase”; and for which purpose has been prevented in more recent decades based on philosophical or existential value/belief systems imported from the lower 48 states. That these practices were conducted for generations without any substantial, long-lasting or irreversible effects to predator populations is testimony to their ecological integrity, as well as substantiating assertions by Alaska’s indigenous peoples that their traditional harvest activities were/are essentially a part of the evolved ecosystem(s).

It has been noted in several different public forums and testimony from rural Alaska residents over the years that “denning”, as labeled by western society, was a known generational practice in areas of rural Alaska that some families considered to be their responsibility. Pelts of young obtained through this method were also utilized in the making of handicraft or utilitarian items. In some villages, certain young men were charged with carrying this out (along with other more “distasteful, shocking or indiscriminate” methods and means such as spring baiting) to keep wolf numbers at lower levels. As stated by one elder, “we know that when the wolves increase too much, its time to prepare for starvation”; and from another, “when the moose and caribou are gone – the country dies”.

We are now faced with another ballot initiative focused on pre-emption and prevention of the state’s ability to conduct cost effective aerial predator management activities, which may pass or fail based on emotional rhetoric rather than the science that has been incorporated in the few programs currently active. In addition, the threat of congressional interference has recently manifested as well, with the California congressman’s introduction of legislation to neuter state’s wildlife management rights recognized in the Federal Airborne Hunting Act; that is directly aimed at Alaska’s predator management programs.

**PROPOSAL 41 CONTINUED.**

Whether or not the unfortunate event that either of these “ballot box biology” interferences actually occurs, alternatives should be available to supplement or replace the functional wildlife management purpose, limitations and aspects affected.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The constitutional principles of resource management for sustained yield, common use, and equal application to all those similarly situated (among others), becomes even more of a shameful mockery than it already is due primarily to the limited application or complete lack of active management activities in this arena for most of the state over the last 15 years.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. History, local knowledge and the best scientific information available have shown that maintaining lower predator numbers is highly conducive to achieving and maintaining healthy and abundant ungulate populations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those who utilize these resources as a basic food source. Individuals or organizations (recreational or business oriented) who enjoy or have an interest in seeing abundant wildlife throughout the state.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Individuals or organizations who have personal, philosophical or speculative aversions to maintenance of predator/prey ratios as a viable or acceptable management tool to enhance human harvest needs.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** We considered requesting allowance for some directed level of spring baits, but rejected due to the indiscriminate mortality associated, rather than being able to focus or maintain application to the target species.

**PROPOSED BY:** Orutsararmiut Native Council – Greg Roczicka (HQ-08W-G-058)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Tanana Chiefs Conference PC16
- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Fairbanks AC3
- Central Kuskokwim AC10
- Matanuska Valley AC16

- Charlotte and Robert Sartor PC29
- Middle Yukon AC12

**OPPOSE**

- Marylee Hayes PC3
- Defenders of Wildlife PC11
- Luke Gilson PC14
- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Linda Feiler PC18
- Nan Weed PC19
- Iris and Gus Roberts PC20
- Jeff Sloss PC21
- Andra Silgailis PC22
- Gerald Brookman PC23
- Mossy Kilcher PC24
- Nina Faust PC25

**PROPOSAL 41 CONTINUED.**

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Seth Kantner PC26  
Rudy Wittshirk PC28  
Jenny Pursell PC30  
Arthur Greenwalt PC32  
William Cox PC33  
Martha Siebe PC35  
Marybeth Holleman PC61  
Alaska Backcountry Hunters and Anglers PC62  
Rick Steiner PC63  
Deanna Geary PC68  
Form Fax 117 Signatories PC86  
Copper Basin AC7  
Denali AC9  
Koyukuk River AC11  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

---

**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 42 - 5 AAC 92.080 Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions; and 92.085 Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions:** Allow the taking of wolves with bait:

“...except that wolves may be taken over or with the use of bait, scent or other attractants such as electronic calls.”

**ISSUE:** The ever growing wolf numbers and the needless restrictions in taking them. The board should amend the regulations to allow hunting wolves over bait. Baiting is a proven method and is a much less controversial method than airborne hunting. In fact, it is more effective than airborne hunting in many areas during the early fall and late winter. Trapping, run and gun, and airborne hunting aren't getting the job done in many areas of the state and are more controversial while baiting tool is not allowed.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The board and the state will continue to get beat up on the most controversial and costly methods and sometimes least effective methods of airborne hunting and same day airborne hunting. The board must start considering and utilizing any and all methods of managing wolf numbers. Wolf hunters especially paying wolf hunters (guided clients) will continue to consider and go to Canada, which has figured out that baiting wolves is an effective management tool, plus, it brings money (hunters) in, helps manage wolves, and it is less controversial.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** No. But it will increase the quantity of wolves harvested.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All wolf hunters will have an added tool to use and the consequences will be positive for moose, caribou and sheep hunters along with the state's reputation.

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** I rejected a companion proposal of opening wolf season August 1, anywhere statewide; that the current season opens August 10. I rejected including a badly needed season adjustment because the board cycle is not right for changing the wolf seasons. I also considered adding a clause that allows baiting wolves only when brown or grizzly bear season is not open in the area/unit/sub unit. I rejected this for several reasons. It implies and assumes that hunters cannot be trusted not to take a bear over a wolf bait. I found this argument insulting to the hunting public in general and a sorry excuse for not utilizing a legitimate method and management tool.

**PROPOSED BY:** Don Duncan

I-08W-G-001

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

- Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36
- Tony Russ PC10
- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Central AC1
- Delta AC2
- Fairbanks AC3
- Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5
- Central Kuskokwim AC10
- Middle Yukon AC12
- GASH AC13

**PROPOSAL 42 CONTINUED.**

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Matanuska Valley AC16

- Marylee Hayes PC3
- Defenders of Wildlife PC11
- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Linda Feiler PC18
- Nan Weed PC19
- Iris and Gus Roberts PC20
- Jeff Sloss PC21
- Andra Silgailis PC22
- Gerald Brookman PC23
- Mossy Kilcher PC24
- Nina Faust PC25
- Seth Kantner PC26
- Rudy Wittshirk PC28
- Charlotte and Robert Sartor PC29
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Richard Hahn PC31
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32
- William Cox PC33
- Martha Siebe PC35
- Michael McKinnon PC48
- John Strassenburgh PC56
- Marybeth Holleman PC61
- Rick Steiner PC63
- Deanna Geary PC68
- Form Fax 117 Signatories PC86
- Koyukuk River AC11
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_  
**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 92.080 Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions; and 92.085 Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions:** Amend the regulations as follows:

**“except that black bear may be hunted over a registered bait, during the legal baiting period, the same day airborne provided you are ..... And you are hunting in Units 11-13 and Units 19-25.”**

**ISSUE:** Allowing hunting black bear at a bait site on the same day airborne. Currently it is not allowed except in “liberalized areas.” This is a needless restriction. It should be allowed to encourage hunting more remote locations to benefit moose calf survival rates. Airborne baiters should be encouraged, not discouraged. The airborne resident weekend hunter is losing Friday nights needlessly. And the fly in guided hunter and guide are losing a night. And it drives up costs needlessly when it is tough enough for interior guides to compete for black bear hunters.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The state will continue to cost the airborne hunter time and money and thereby discouraging hunters from setting up bait stations in more remote and less utilized areas where the moose calves are more likely to need their help.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. By encouraging same day airborne hunting over bait, the state spreading the hunting pressure to underutilized areas, thereby increasing available selection (larger moose killing bears taken and more boars taken.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters utilizing a plane to reach a hunting location,

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** I considered adding on the end “....and units 19-25 provided it is one (or two) hours after landing.” I rejected as needless because the hunter would be a fool to buzz the bait, even if they could see it or the bears, then land and hunt. Either the bears will be there when the hunter is there, or they won’t.

**PROPOSED BY:** Don Duncan

(I-08W-G-003)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Stuart Pechek PC49
- Fairbanks AC3
- Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5
- Central Kuskokwim AC10
- Middle Yukon AC12
- GASH AC13
- Matanuska Valley AC16

**OPPOSE**

- Jeff Sperry PC5
- Defenders of Wildlife PC11
- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Richard Hahn PC31
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32
- Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36
- Carl Kinney PC77
- Cooper Landing AC8
- Denali AC9
- Koyukuk River AC11

-----

**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions:** Amend the regulations to prohibit shooting on or into private property as follows:

**5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions:** The following methods of taking game are prohibited:

...

**(14) By shooting on or into private property that has been posted against hunting by the owner.**

Amend page 15 of the regulations book as follows:

You may not take game by: **Shooting on or into private property that has been posted against hunting by the owner.**

**ISSUE:** Some unethical hunter will fire into or on posted private property. This is highly dangerous and disrespectful practice. The game regulations do not address this. If this practice could be prosecuted as a game violation it would give property owners a much stronger protection than simple trespass affords.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Property may be damaged, resident landowners may be injured or killed, and resident landowners will continue to lose the peace and security of their homes during every open season.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Private landowners

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No ethical hunter is going to suffer from having to show proper regard for the safety and peace of mind of private landowners. Writing the regulation in the above way will in no way restrict anyone from hunting on public lands, or on private lands that the owner does not choose to post.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** There are no other reasonable solutions

**PROPOSED BY:** Gregory J. Garrels, Linda J. Patton, M. Jane Hocking, (HQ-08W-G-09)  
Dennis Ray, Walter R Floyd, Linda Mullen, Roger and JoAnne Havens, Roger Hamms,

*Note: The Department of Law advises that the Board is not authorized to adopt regulations limiting means and methods based primarily on a public safety rationale. The Board's regulations must be for the purposes of conserving or developing Alaska's game resources.*

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Ahtna Inc. PC46  
G.J. Garrels PC83

Walter Soroka PC85  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

**OPPOSE**

Richard Hahn PC31  
R.K. Butts PC84  
Fairbanks AC3  
Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 45 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game, exceptions.** : Amend the regulations to prohibit shooting within any right of way or easement near private property as follows:

**5 AAC 92.080 Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions.** The following methods of taking game are prohibited:

- (1) By shooting from, on, or across a highway, **or within any right of way or easement that adjoins or passes through private property that has been posted against hunting or trespass by the owner.**

Amend page 15 of the regulations book as follows:

You may not take game by:

Shooting from on or across the drivable surface of any constructed road or highway, **or within any right of way or easement that adjoins or passes through private property that has been posted against hunting or trespass by the owner.**

**ISSUE:** Road hunters are firing weapons on rights of way that pass through or along posted private property. Bullets and pellets do not stop at the edge of the right of way. Neither does the noise from the report of the weapon. Hunters are hearing from the Departments of Fish and Game and Transportation that this is acceptable. In doing so, the state is creating not only a hazard to landowners but denying them the peace of their own homes.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Property may be damaged, resident landowners may be injured or killed, and resident landowners will continue to lose the peace and security of their homes during every open season.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Private landowners

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No ethical hunter is going to suffer from having to show proper regard for the safety and peace of mind of private landowners. Writing the regulation in the above way will in no way restrict anyone from hunting a right of way along public lands, or along private lands that the owner does not choose to post.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** There are no other reasonable solutions

**PROPOSED BY:** Gregory J. Garrels, Roger Hamms, JoAnne and Roger Havens, (HQ-08W-G-050) Walter R Floyd, M. Jane Hocking, Linda Mullen, and Jeanette Ray.

*Note: The Department of Law advises that the Board is not authorized to adopt regulations limiting means and methods based primarily on a public safety rationale. The Board's regulations must be for the purposes of conserving or developing Alaska's game resources.*

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

G.J. Garrels PC83

**OPPOSE**

Ahtna Inc. PC46

R.K. Butts PC84

Fairbanks AC3

Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

Matanuska Valley AC16

**PROPOSAL 45 CONTINUED.**  
**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 46 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions:** Amend the regulations to prohibit hunting near a highway as follows:

Amend existing regulation by making it unlawful to shoot within 50 feet of road or highway in Units 14 and 15.

**ISSUE:** Eliminate the practice of “road hunting” and discourage shooting from or across road or highway.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Unethical hunting will continue and increase as will shooting on, from and across roads and highways, (especially game birds attracted to road gravel).

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** 1.) Encourage ethical hunting. 2.) Promote safety 3.) Reduce the illegal take of game from roadway (especially ruffed spruce grouse).

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All responsible hunters, home owners, property owners, public in general. Facilitate enforcement of existing regulations prohibiting shooting from roadways.

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Walter Soroka

(HQ-08W-G-071)

*Note: The Department of Law advises that the Board is not authorized to adopt regulations limiting means and methods based primarily on a public safety rationale. The Board’s regulations must be for the purposes of conserving or developing Alaska’s game resources.*

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Walter Soroka PC85

**OPPOSE**

R.K. Butts PC84  
Fairbanks AC3  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15  
Matanuska Valley AC16

**PROPOSAL 47 - 5 AAC 92.085(8). Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions:** Allow same day airborne taking of predators:

During the period of November 15 through March 15 (or October 15-April 15) hunters using aircraft for access shall be allowed to harvest wolf, wolverine, lynx, fox, coyote, and bear same day airborne, provided that aircraft is at least ¼ mile away.

**ISSUE:** Not allowing same day airborne for predators such as wolf, wolverine, and bear in winter months.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued low pressure on predators due to extreme hardship of camping out over night in winter weather.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone who hunts ungulates and predators.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one except land trappers, if even that in this vast state.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** N/A

**PROPOSED BY:** Martin Recknagel (HQ-08W-G-005)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Central AC1
- Fairbanks w/Am AC3
- Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5
- Central Kuskokwim AC10

Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36

**OPPOSE**

- Defenders of Wildlife PC11
- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32
- Ahtna Inc. PC46
- Denali AC9
- Koyukuk River AC11
- Middle Yukon AC12
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 48 - 5 AAC 92.085(1). Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions:** Amend the regulation as follows:

Allow the use of muzzle-loading smoothbore shotguns in restricted hunts.

**ISSUE:** The regulations addressing legal big game muzzle loading firearms specify the word “rifle.” This eliminates the entire class of firearms known as smoothbores, or shotguns. By substituting the words “long gun” for the word “rifle” in regulation, muzzle loading shotguns will become legal hunting tools, along with rifles, for big game.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** An entire class of firearms suitable for big game hunting is excluded from legal status by using the word “rifle” rather than “long gun.” Many historical muzzle loading firearms were smoothbores and were used with great effectiveness in harvesting big game animals. Ballistically, muzzle loading smoothbores are nearly equivalent to modern shotguns. Certain current weapon-restricted areas in Alaska allow/mandate the use of modern shotguns to hunt big game. Because of wording choice in regulation, this same ability is denied traditional muzzle loading smoothbore hunters using firearms nearly equivalent to their modern counterparts.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those who would like to legally hunt big game using a muzzle loading smoothbore long gun.

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No one.

**PROPOSED BY:** Howard Delo

(HQ-08W-G-007)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Allen Avinger PC8
- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Steven Hohensee PC69
- George Thompson PC82
- Delta AC2

- Fairbanks AC3
- Kenai/Soldotna AC6

- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Richard Hahn PC31

**OPPOSE**

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 49 - - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions:** Amend this regulation as follows:

Hunters in “muzzle loader only” hunts must use round ball (spherical only). Conical or elongated bullets are not allowed.

**ISSUE:** Most muzzle loader only hunts in Alaska are designated on the premise that muzzle loaders don’t shoot as far as center fire rifles and are therefore safer in more populated areas such as Anchorage Hillside, Fort Richardson, Fairbanks suburbs and the Kodiak road system. The perception is true only when shooting round balls. Conical or elongated bullets have a trajectory equal to many center fire rifles.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Muzzle loader hunters will lose their muzzle loader only hunts.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Anyone who wants muzzle loader only hunts to continue

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Short term – Those who only have equipment or knowledge for conical shooting. Long Term – all muzzle loader hunters will benefit because the hunts will remain.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Fred Moore (HQ-08W-G-008)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Allen Avinger PC8  
Steven Hohensee PC69  
Delta AC2

**OPPOSE**

Carl Kinney PC77  
George Thompson PC82  
R.K. Butts PC84  
Fairbanks AC3  
Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_  
**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

*The Board of Game accepted this proposal as an agenda change request.*

**PROPOSAL 50 – 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions; and 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions.** Define a legal muzzleloader for hunting in Alaska, clarify legal muzzleloader requirements for big game hunting, and clarify legal muzzleloader requirements in a restricted muzzleloader-only hunt.

**5 AAC 92.990. Definitions.**

**() “muzzleloader” means any firearm where firing components are loaded into the muzzle end of the firearm.**

**5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.** The following methods and means of taking big game are prohibited in addition to the prohibitions in 5 AAC 92.080.

(1) with the use of a firearm other than a shotgun, muzzle-loading rifle, or rifle or pistol using a center-firing cartridge, except that

...

(B) the use of a **muzzleloader** [MUZZLE-LOADING RIFLE] is prohibited unless the firearm is **a shoulder mounted long gun, 45 caliber or larger, with a barrel that is either rifled or smoothbore, and discharges a single projectile;** and

(C) the use of a **muzzleloader** [MUZZLE-LOADING RIFLE] equipped with a scope, **or a muzzleloader using smokeless powder as a charger,** during any permitted, registered, or special season hunt for **muzzleloaders** [MUZZLE-LOADING RIFLE] only, is prohibited;.

**ISSUE:** No standard definition of a muzzleloader for use in hunting all game, big game, or big game in restricted hunts. This proposal defines a standard muzzleloader legal for use in hunting all game, sets muzzleloader standards for hunting big game, and standards for muzzleloaders used in restricted weapons hunts.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Current wording in the regulation book has no definition and as a result there is no consistency in the wording used in the various hunt descriptions. This allows for unrestricted interpretation as to what is legal.

Example:

Kodiak 8	“Muzzleloader only”
14C	“Muzzle-loading blackpowder rifle”
20A	“Muzzle-loading firearms”
20B	“Muzzleloader”

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The wildlife resource should benefit in reduced wounding loss rates resulting from individuals who were using substandard muzzleloaders or projectiles.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those hunting with muzzleloaders in Alaska will have a consistent definition, particularly for big game.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who may have been using substandard muzzleloaders (pistols) or projectiles to hunt big game in Alaska will no longer be able to do so. Individuals that may have been using smokeless powder in their muzzleloaders to achieve higher velocities may

**PROPOSAL 50 CONTINUED.**

suffer. Higher bullet velocities increase hunter success because hunters can shoot further. Increased hunter success results in less hunting opportunity.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08W-G-078)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Allen Avinger PC8  
Carl Kinney PC77  
George Thompson w/Am PC82  
Fairbanks w/Am AC3

Kenai/Soldotna AC6

**OPPOSE**

R.K. Butts PC84

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_  
**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

*The Board of Game considered this proposal during the Spring 2007 regional meeting and voted to defer it to the Statewide meeting.*

**PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.** Amend the regulation as follow:

The use of electronic calls for moose is prohibited for the southcentral and southwestern region units.

**ISSUE:** The use of electronic moose calls.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Increased harvest of moose. Disturbance of breeding interaction between moose. Conflict between hunter increases.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, more moose for real hunters will be available.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Moose, moose hunters who look for moose.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Lazy hunters who leave call running all night. If you cannot use electronic calls for ducks, how do we justify using them for struggling moose populations.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No.

**PROPOSED BY:** Joseph J. Hanes (HQ-08W-G-082)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

- Defenders of Wildlife PC11
- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32
- Ahtna Inc. PC46
- Steven Hohensee PC69
- Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5
- Kenai/Soldotna AC6
- Cooper Landing AC8
- Denali AC9

Wayne Kubat PC47

- Jeff Sperry PC5
- Curt Geoffrion PC80
- Fairbanks AC3
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 52 -5 AAC 92.080 Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions.** Amend the regulation to allow the use of lights to recover wounded big game animals.

**5 AAC 92.080 Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions.** The following methods of taking game are prohibited:

...

(7) with the aid of a pit, fire, artificial light, laser sight, electronically enhanced night vision scope, radio communication, cellular or satellite telephone, artificial salt lick, explosive, expanding gas arrow, bomb, smoke, chemical (excluding scent lures), or a conventional steel trap with an inside jaw spread over nine inches, except that:

- (A) a rangefinders may be used;
- (B) a killer style trap with a jaw spread of less than 13 inches may be used;
- (C) for the purpose of taking furbearers under a trapping license during an open season November 1 - March 31 in Units 7 and 9 - 26, artificial light may be used; and
- (D) a tracking dog handler with one leashed dog may use artificial light to aid in tracking and dispatching a wounded big game animal;
- (E) An artificial light may be used to track, recover, and dispatch a wounded animal.**

**ISSUE:** It is currently unlawful to use an artificial light to help in the recovery of a wounded big game animal. This causes the loss and suffering of valuable big game animals that cannot be tracked until morning. Any rain or snow overnight may result in the animal being lost. Large animals such as moose, if left in the field, retain enough body heat after death to cause meat spoilage overnight in warmer weather if not immediately recovered. Many people already use lights to recover wounded animals and are breaking the law. These people are “doing the right thing” in making every effort to dispatch a wounded animal as quickly as possible.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Animals will continue to suffer and meat will be wasted through loss and spoilage. Otherwise law abiding people will be criminalized trying to adhere to their ethical obligation to dispatch wounded game quickly and humanely.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCT PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Absolutely; animals will be dispatched more quickly limiting suffering. The quality of meat will be vastly improved if an animal can be recovered and butchered in a timely manner.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone that cares about the suffering of animals and waste of food.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No One

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Also allow use of any electronic device for tracking and dispatching game.

**PROPOSED BY:** Aaron Bloomquist (SC-08W-G-017)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Todd Fritze PC1
- Ahtna Inc. PC46
- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Steven Hohensee PC69
- Alaska Bowhunters Association PC73
- Delta AC2

**OPPOSE**

**PROPOSAL 52 CONTINUED.**  
**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

Denali AC9

Fairbanks AC3  
Kenai/Soldotna AC6  
Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_  
**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 53 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.** Amend this regulation as follows:

Use the same restrictions applied to aircraft and/or no use of motorized vehicle or watercraft the day of the hunt.

**ISSUE:** Illegal use of motorized vehicles in pursuit of game.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Destruction of habitat, breaking fair chase laws or ethics and unlimited trails.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Less destruction of habitat, more game available, abiding by fair chase principles.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All real hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Amateur hunters, those not truly concerned about ethical hunting or future habitat and game.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Ken Rowland

(HQ-08W-G-087)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Allen Avinger PC8

Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17

Jenny Pursell PC30

Richard Hahn PC31

Arthur Greenwalt PC32

Steven Hohensee PC69

Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36

Wayne Kubat PC47

Carl Kinney PC77

Curt Geoffrion PC80

Central AC1

Fairbanks AC3

Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5

Denali AC9

Central Kuskokwim AC10

Koyukuk River AC11

GASH AC13

Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

*The Board of Game accepted this proposal as an Agenda Change Request by the Department of Fish and Game.*

**PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 92.210 Game as animal food or bait; and 92.230. Feeding of game.**  
The proposal would clarify what is legal to use as bait under hunting regulations.

**5 AAC 92.230. Feeding of game.** Except under the terms of a permit issued by the department, a person may not intentionally feed a moose, deer, elk, bear, wolf, coyote, fox, wolverine, or deleterious exotic wildlife, or negligently leave human food, animal food, or garbage in a manner that attracts these animals. However, this prohibition does not apply to use of bait for trapping furbearers or deleterious exotic wildlife, or hunting black bears **under 5 AAC 92.044, or hunting** wolf, fox, or wolverine **with bait defined under 5 AAC 92.210 and other regulations** under 5 AAC 84 – 5 AAC 92.

**5 AAC 92.210 Game as animal food or bait.** A person may not use game as food for a dog or furbearer, or as bait, except for the following:

- (1) the hide, skin, viscera, head, or bones of game legally taken or killed by a motorized vehicle, after salvage as required under 5 AAC 92.220;
- (2) parts of legally taken animals that are not required to be salvaged as edible meat, if the parts are moved from the kill site;
- (3) the skinned carcass of a bear, furbearer, or fur animal, after salvage as required under 5 AAC 92.220;
- (4) small game; however, the breast meat of small game birds may not be used as animal food or bait;
- (5) unclassified game;
- (6) deleterious exotic wildlife;
- (7) game that died of natural causes, if the game is not moved from the location where it was found; for purposes of this paragraph, "natural causes" does not include death caused by a human;
- (8) game furnished by the state, as authorized by a permit under 5 AAC 92.040.

**ISSUE:** Conflicting regulations, and the generic definition of bait. At a recent board meeting, the use of bait for hunting purposes was addressed. This resulted in confusion concerning what is legal to use as bait for hunting and what is illegal if intentionally fed to a game animal.

Bait is described as any material excluding scent lures, that is placed to attract an animal by its sense of smell or taste.

In practice, this conflict in regulations could result in a ticket for someone feeding an animal in one location when the same food could be used to entice an animal to a hunter in another location. This proposal clarifies the intent of the Board by clearly defining parts of game that are allowed for baiting purposes under hunting regulations.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** People will continue to receive mixed messages concerning feeding of game.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, troopers and staff will be able to enforce the regulations and animals will not become food conditioned.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The general public will not receive mixed messages concerning feeding of animals.

**PROPOSAL 54 CONTINUED.**

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Hunters who attempt to use illegal bait for hunting purposes.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08W-G-080)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Delta AC2
- Fairbanks AC3
- Kenai/Soldotna AC6
- Denali AC9
- Matanuska Valley AC16

**OPPOSE**

Todd Fritze PC1

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_  
**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.** Amend this regulation to provide one of the following:

1. Remove the regulation.
2. Reduce the distance to a shorter distance than ¼ mile, (suggest 300 feet)
3. Reduce the time from remainder of the regulatory trapping year to 30 days after reporting the incidental take.
4. Allow trapping for mink, marten, beaver, otter, muskrat, weasel, squirrel, marmot, within the ¼ mile.

**ISSUE:** The requirement to move traps ¼ mile away from an animal taken incidentally is much too far. This creates a ½ mile zone around the carcass where no traps may be set. It prohibits trapping for a species not normally attracted to a carcass. It eliminates the ability to trap at a long established trap site because of a nearby incidental catch carcass.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** It creates a ½ mile “No Trapping Zone”. Missed opportunities to trap for other species that would not be attracted to the carcass for the remainder of the regulatory trapping year.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All trappers.

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

1. Require trapper to completely remove the incidentally caught animal carcass, this is not practical.
2. If reported allow 300 feet/30 days.
3. If not reported ¼ mile/remainder of regulatory year.

**PROPOSED BY:** Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee (SC-08W-G-015)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Jeff Sperry PC5
- Alaska Frontier Trappers Association PC55
- Michael Knapp PC66
- Steven Hohensee PC69
- Fairbanks AC3
- Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5
- Copper Basin AC7
- Central Kuskokwim w/Am AC10
- Koyukuk River AC11
- Middle Yukon AC12
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road w/Am AC15
- Matanuska Valley w/Am AC16

- Kenai/Soldotna AC6
- GASH AC13

**OPPOSE**

- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Richard Hahn PC31
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32
- Delta AC2
- Denali AC9

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.**

Require identification tags on traps and snare:

Traps and snares should have a tag with name and address of trapper.

**ISSUE:** Trappers consistently catch dogs which give all trappers a black eye, which often times, the trappers were trapping close to houses or in inappropriate places.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Public attitude toward trapping will continue to deteriorate.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** It would make trappers consider where trap are set

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?**

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Statewide – remote areas do not need this regulation

**PROPOSED BY:** William Shuster

(HQ-08W-G-026)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Jeff Sperry w/Am PC5
- Defenders of Wildlife PC11
- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Richard Hahn PC31
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32

**OPPOSE**

- Todd Fritze PC1
- Ahtna Inc. PC46
- Alaska Frontier Trappers Association PC55
- Michael Knapp PC66
- Curt Geoffrion PC80
- Central AC1
- Fairbanks AC3
- Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5
- Copper Basin AC7
- Denali AC9
- Central Kuskokwim AC10
- Koyukuk River AC11
- Middle Yukon AC12
- GASH AC13
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 57 - 5 AAC 92.095(12). Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.**

Amend the regulation as follows:

Rewrite the regulation to:

- A. Reduce the distance to a shorter distance than a ¼ mile, (suggest 300 feet)
- B. Reduce the time from remainder of regulatory trapping year to 30 days after reporting the incidental take.
- C. Allow trapping for mink, marten, beaver, weasel, otter, muskrat, squirrel, marmot, within the ¼ mile.

**ISSUE:** The requirement to move traps ¼ mile away from an animal taken incidentally is too far. This creates a ¼ mile zone around the carcass where no traps may be set. It prohibits trapping for species not normally attracted to a carcass. It eliminates the ability to trap at a long established trap site because of a nearby incidental catch carcass.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Creates a ½ mile “No Trapping Zone”. Missed opportunities to trap for other species that would not be attracted to the carcass for the remainder of the regulatory trapping year.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All trappers

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1. Require trapper to completely remove the incidentally caught animal carcass; this is not practical. 2. If reported, allow 300 feet/30 days. 3. If not reported, ¼ mile/remainder of regulatory year.

**PROPOSED BY:** Lee Underwood (HQ-08W-G-029)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Alaska Frontier Trappers Association PC55
- Michael Knapp PC66
- Steven Hohensee PC69
- Fairbanks AC3
- Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5
- Koyukuk River AC11
- Middle Yukon AC12
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road w/Am AC15
- Kenai/Soldotna AC6
- GASH AC13

**OPPOSE**

- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32
- Delta AC2
- Copper Basin AC7
- Denali AC9
- Central Kuskokwim AC10
- Matanuska Valley AC16

**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 58 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.** Modify the trapping requirements as follows:

Implement statewide requirements for permanent metal identification tags on traps and every three day checking, as it is required in Units 1-5, 12, and 20E.

**ISSUE:** Unattended traps and snares – no trapper identification on traps and snares.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Traps left unattended, fur damage, public and law enforcement problems identifying illegal trapping and pets caught by traps and snares set near homes, more bad public relations against trapping.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, less fur damage – less time in traps for possible release of non targeted animals, better public relations selling furs caught by responsible trappers, less negative response from anti trapping people, less chance of trapped animals escaping injured

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The fur industry, the responsible trappers, the targeted species, the law enforcement, and the public.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The careless unethical trapper.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** This is such a simple proposal that would help so much.

**PROPOSED BY:** Kevin Bopp (HQ-08W-G-038)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Richard Hahn PC31
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32

Kenai/Soldotna AC6

**OPPOSE**

- Todd Fritze PC1
- Cory Larson PC6
- Ahtna Inc. PC46
- Alaska Frontier Trappers Association PC55
- Michael Knapp PC66
- Carl Kinney PC77
- Wesley Walker PC78
- Curt Geoffrion PC80
- Central AC1
- Fairbanks AC3
- Middle Nenana AC4
- Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5
- Denali AC9
- Central Kuskokwim AC10
- Koyukuk River AC11
- Middle Yukon AC12
- GASH AC13
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15
- Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 59 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.** Amend this regulation as follows:

In Chugach State Park, the use of the following traps are prohibited:

- a) Steel foothold (leghold) traps with jaw spreads exceeding 5 ¼ inches as measured across the outside diameter or maximum width of the set jaws at the widest point.
- b) Steel neck snares with cables exceeding 1/16 inch in diameter.
- c) Conibear-type lethal traps with striker bar spreads or widths exceeding 7 inches, as measured across the minimum outside width of the set bars at their narrowest openings.
- d) All other trapping devices not named above (for example, foot snares, deadfalls, spring-activated neck snares) are prohibited.

**ISSUE:** Limits are needed on the types and sizes of traps allowed in Chugach State Park (Unit 14C).

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If trap sizes and types are not limited, an excessive number of wolverines, wolves, domestic dogs, and other large animals (including non-target species) will be caught in traps.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The use of smaller traps will help ensure that wolverines are harvested in limited numbers, if at all, in this area close to Anchorage where wildlife viewing opportunities are important and are protected by statute.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The general public, including dog owners, year-round wildlife viewing enthusiasts, individuals concerned with loss of high-value viewable species.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Trappers desiring to harvest medium to large-sized wolverines in the park.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Andrew Josephson

(HQ-08W-G-052)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

- Marylee Hayes PC3
- Defenders of Wildlife PC11
- Luke Gilson PC14
- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Linda Feiler PC18
- Nan Weed PC19
- Iris and Gus Roberts PC20
- Jeff Sloss PC21
- Andra Silgailis PC22
- Gerald Brookman PC23
- Nina Faust PC25
- Charlotte and Robert Sartor PC29
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Richard Hahn PC31
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32
- William Cox PC33

**PROPOSAL 59 CONTINUED.**

**FAVOR**

Martha Siebe PC35  
Kneeland Taylor PC39  
Michael McKinnon PC48  
John Strassenburgh PC56  
Marybeth Holleman PC61  
Rick Steiner PC63  
Deanna Geary PC68  
Form Fax 117 Signatories PC86

**OPPOSE**

Todd Fritze PC1  
Jeff Sperry PC5  
Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36  
Alaska Frontier Trappers Association PC55  
Michael Knapp PC66  
Michael Knapp PC66  
Carl Kinney PC77  
Curt Geoffrion PC80  
Fairbanks AC3  
Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5  
Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 60 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.** Amend this regulation as follows:

In Unit 14C within Chugach State Park, trapping is prohibited within 5 miles of any road.

**ISSUE:** A buffer zone for trapping near roads and trailheads is needed in Chugach State Park (Unit 14C), to ensure that the trapping pressure on rarely-seen furbearers such as wolverines is low, and to provide for public safety.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** With traps set close to trailheads and roads, there is a greater chance that humans will be accidentally injured by traps and that domestic dogs will be caught in traps. Also, furbearers such as wolverines are not very numerous in the park, and may be subject to over harvest. Having a buffer zone near roads would reduce these risks.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The general public, including dog owners, year-round wildlife viewing enthusiasts, individuals concerned with loss of high-value viewable species.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who would like easy access to trapping in the Park.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** N/A

**PROPOSED BY:** Tom Banks (HQ-08W-G-053)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

- Marylee Hayes PC3
- Defenders of Wildlife PC11
- Luke Gilson PC14
- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Linda Feiler PC18
- Nan Weed PC19
- Iris and Gus Roberts PC20
- Jeff Sloss PC21
- Gerald Brookman PC23
- Nina Faust PC25
- Charlotte and Robert Sartor PC29
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Richard Hahn PC31
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32
- William Cox PC33
- Martha Siebe PC35
- Kneeland Taylor PC39
- Michael McKinnon PC48
- John Strassenburgh PC56
- Marybeth Holleman PC61
- Rick Steiner PC63
- Form Fax 117 Signatories PC86
- Delta AC2

Jeff Sperry PC5  
Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36

**PROPOSAL 60 CONTINUED.**

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Nathan Sperry PC53  
Alaska Frontier Trappers Association PC55  
Michael Knapp PC66  
Carl Kinney PC77  
Fairbanks AC3  
Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5  
Kenai/Soldotna AC6  
Copper Basin AC7  
Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 61 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.** Amend these regulations as follows:

No trapping allowed within one quarter mile of the Parks, Glenn, and Richardson highways; further, no trapping within one mile of a residence on the Parks, Glenn, and Richardson highways.

**ISSUE:** The safety of homeowners and their relatives and their pets and other people who recreate along the Parks, Glenn, and Richardson highways. The negative impacts that result from the conflicts between the trapping community and users of the lands along the aforementioned highways and bring definition to the terms “ethical and responsible” that should govern the behavior of the trapping community.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The safety of homeowners and their relatives and their pets and other people who recreate along the Parks, Glenn, and Richardson highways will continue to be compromised. The trapping community will continue to suffer from the conflict between their profession and other users of the resources along the aforementioned highways.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The safety of homeowner their relatives and others who recreate along the Parks, Glenn, and Richardson highways will benefit. Trappers and the trapping community will benefit from having clear and concise language regarding their trapping activity rather than relying on ambiguous terms such as “responsible” or “ethical” to govern their behavior.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Trappers who trap along the Parks, Glenn, and Richardson highways will be required to cease trapping within one mile of a residence along the aforementioned highways and one quarter mile from the Parks, Glenn, and Richardson highways

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Contact trappers whose traps are approximate to residences and along the Parks, Glenn, and Richardson highways. Unable to identify the ownership of traps.

**PROPOSED BY:** Richard Brewer (SC-08W-G-016)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Defenders of Wildlife PC11
- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32
- Richard Brewer PC43
- Delta AC2

**OPPOSE**

- Todd Fritze PC1
- Jeff Sperry PC5
- Cory Larson PC6
- Ahtna Inc. PC46
- Alaska Frontier Trappers Association PC55
- Michael Knapp PC66
- Carl Kinney PC77
- Wesley Walker PC78
- Fairbanks AC3

**PROPOSAL 61 CONTINUED.**

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5  
Kenai/Soldotna AC6  
Copper Basin AC7  
Denali AC9  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 62 - 5 AAC 92.150(b). Evidence of sex and identity.** Eliminate the requirement for attached portions of external sex organs when taking big game animals that are restricted to one sex.

Game meat taken in any hunt limited to one sex must always be accompanied in the field by either the skull plate of the animal, or evidence of sex.

**ISSUE:** Meat Spoilage due to unnecessary requirement to keep evidence of sex attached to prime meat.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Hunters will continue to struggle field dressing game with genitalia attached. Continued confusion about when evidence of sex is required and when it is not. Numerous citations to otherwise law abiding hunters who either negligently remove genitalia or misunderstand the current regulations. Do sheep need sex attached? Does completely boned out meat require sex attached? Attached to what? What about hunts open to both sexes? What about hunts with antler restrictions that require the skull plates to accompany the meat? Good hindquarter meat will continue to be wasted or degraded through unnecessary contact with urine and feces.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. The quality of meat will be greatly improved. Leaving evidence of sex requires contact between urine and/or feces and edible meat. Rutting animals pose even more danger of spoilage. Bull moose are commonly found to have "staph" infections during late season fall periods, and just a few drops leaking from an attached genital or hair from this area is enough to deposit 5-100 bacterial organisms onto the inside of a hind quarter. We now know that bacteria multiplies under normal conditions (above 55 degrees Fahrenheit) at a rate of doubling every 20 minutes. Evidence of sex should be removed completely to prevent exponential game meat loss by the last day in the field. When a hind quarter gets removed with evidence of sex, the bladder or penile sheath is cut and a few drops of urine are inevitably deposited onto the hind quarter. At that moment, even if only five organisms lay attached to the meat, in one hour, those five organisms have divided and multiplied to become 40 organisms. It takes only about 100 organisms to cause illness in humans with bacteria such as staphylococcus and E. Coli.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All those who appreciate well cared for game meat. All hunters who strive to avoid any spoilage or contamination of their family's food supply.

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Evidence of sex could be detached but still transported with the meat. Rejected because most contamination occurs when the penis sheath is cut, spilling urine on the exposed meat. The current regulation is outdated. If an enforcement officer believes the meat is not from the same animal as the skull plate, DNA evidence can quickly and efficiently be gathered to either match the skull plate with the meat or simply to verify that the meat contained the correct x and y chromosome(s) for the hunt in question. The existing regulation has not prevented illegal kills, and the new proposed regulation would not create any loopholes for those who might kill the wrong animal. Leaving the current regulation in place would continue to cause the spoilage of thousands of pounds of game meat, while also making game law violators out of hundreds of ethical hunters each year who kill a legal animal but simply lose the genitalia somewhere in the field dressing or transportation process.

**PROPOSAL 62 CONTINUED.**

Another option is not even require the skull plate in hunts that do not have an antler restriction. An enforcement officer can simply take a sample of the meat and use the most basic DNA test for an x and y chromosome to determine the sex of the animal killed if there is probable cause to believe an illegal animal was killed.

**PROPOSED BY:** Fairbanks Advisory Committee (I-08W-G-004)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Ahtna Inc. PC46
- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Steven Hohensee PC69
- Alaska Bowhunters Association PC73
- Delta AC2
- Fairbanks AC3
- Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5
- Koyukuk River AC11
- GASH AC13

**OPPOSE**

- Jeff Sperry PC5
- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32
- Nathan Sperry PC53
- Kelly Vern PC57
- Central AC1
- Kenai/Soldotna AC6
- Denali AC9
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 63 -5 AAC 92.150. Evidence of sex and identity.** Repeal section (b) requiring sex attached to meat.

...

[(B) IF THE TAKING OF A BIG GAME ANIMAL, EXCEPT SHEEP, IS RESTRICTED TO ONE SEX, A PERSON MAY NOT POSSESS OR TRANSPORT THE CARCASS OF AN ANIMAL UNLESS SUFFICIENT PORTIONS OF THE EXTERNAL SEX ORGANS REMAIN ATTACHED TO INDICATE CONCLUSIVELY THE SEX OF THE ANIMAL, EXCEPT THAT ANTLERS ARE CONSIDERED PROOF OF SEX FOR A DEER IF THE ANTLERS ARE NATURALLY ATTACHED TO AN ENTIRE CARCASS, WITH OR WITHOUT THE VISCERA; HOWEVER, THIS SECTION DOES NOT APPLY TO THE CARCASS OF A BIG GAME ANIMAL THAT HAS BEEN CUT AND PLACED IN STORAGE OR OTHERWISE PREPARED FOR CONSUMPTION UPON ARRIVAL AT THE LOCATION WHERE IT IS TO BE CONSUMED.]

**ISSUE:** A disgusting requirement to leave sex organs attached to your food has become outdated and is no longer needed. With advancement in DNA technology a suspect can be required to provide a sample for testing. The current law punishes the vast majority of hunters that are honest. It is very easy to accidentally remove the organ from the meat in the butchering process.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued fines for those that unintentionally remove the parts. Continued dirty parts attached to clean meat.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCT PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This is one of very few proposals that can say that the product will absolutely be improved.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those who eat game meat.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The troopers will not have to spend more money to prove that someone has taken an illegal animal because if the parts are missing they already have to prove the wrong sex was taken by some other method. The troopers will suffer the loss of revenue from fines generated by “parts not attached” tickets.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-08W-G-011)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Ahtna Inc. PC46
- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Steven Hohensee PC69
- Alaska Bowhunters Association PC73
- Fairbanks AC3
- Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5
- Kenai/Soldotna AC6
- Koyukuk River AC11
- GASH AC13

**OPPOSE**

- Jeff Sperry PC5
- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32
- Kelly Vern PC57
- Central AC1
- Denali AC9
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

-----

**FINAL ACTION:** Carries \_\_\_\_\_ Fails \_\_\_\_\_ Tabled \_\_\_\_\_ No Action \_\_\_\_\_ See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

ABSENT \_\_\_\_\_ ABSTAIN \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 64 - 5 AAC 92.150. Evidence of sex and identity.** Amend the regulation as follows:

The new regulation should read “an intentionally altered horn is not considered a spike fork antler”.

**ISSUE:** The new regulation referring to a damaged, broken, or altered antler, as written, now puts an undue burden on the subsistence hunter to identify small chips, breaks or velvet breaks done by the animal in the field.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Hunters in the field who legitimately harvest a moose that has a broken antler that can not be seen in the field are having their animals taken away and receiving fines. Some hunters after killing a moose with a broken antler may just walk away.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The hunter who shoots a naturally altered horn on a moose

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The hunter who mechanically, intentionally, alters a horn.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Upper Lynn Canal Fish and Game Advisory Committee

(HQ-08W-G-073)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Jenny Pursell PC30

Wayne Kubat PC47

Gary Hess PC76

Kenai/Soldotna AC6

Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

Fairbanks AC3

Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 65 - 5 AAC 92.150(c). Evidence of sex and identity.** Amend this regulation as follows:

In Units 1-5, any damaged, broken, or altered horn broken by any mechanical, or intentional means does not make the moose legal if the other antler does not satisfy the legal points requirement.

**ISSUE:** The section of the regulations that reads “in Units 1 -5, any damaged, broken, or altered horn does not make a moose legal if the other antler does not satisfy the legal points requirement.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The spike fork part of the regulations would become a moot point. With some of the weird horn configurations that we have in the Chilkat Valley, a hunter would be afraid to shoot any moose that was spike or fork if it had another configuration on the other side.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The hunter who shoots a naturally altered horn on a moose

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The hunter who mechanically, intentionally, alters a horn.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Upper Lynn Canal Fish and Game Advisory Committee

(HQ-08W-G-074)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Gary Hess PC76  
Kenai/Soldotna AC6

Fairbanks AC3  
Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 66 - 5 AAC 92.150. Evidence of sex and identity.** Eliminate antler restrictions for elder hunters as follows:

Where horn or antler restrictions on the harvest of big game exist, such restrictions do not apply to resident hunters who are 70 years of age or older. These elder hunters may take any bull or any ram as appropriate. No proxy hunting is allowed under these provisions. The elder must shoot the animal themselves under these provisions. The elder may have assistance from someone else with butchering and transporting the animal once it has been harvested.

**ISSUE:** Providing elders a meaningful opportunity to harvest their own subsistence foods. For them, the trophy value of an animal is irrelevant. What they want is to be able to put food on the table.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Elders will have a more difficult time harvesting big game for subsistence purposes.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** No. It would neither improve nor decrease the resource quality.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Individuals age 70 and older

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. Harvest under the proposed provisions is anticipated to be very limited, however; those harvests that do take place will be of great significance to those involved.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** An increased age limit, but the subsistence resource commission felt that too high a limit would not provide a meaningful opportunity to elder hunters.

**PROPOSED BY:** Wrangell-St Elias National Park Subsistence Resource Commission  
(SC-08W-G-004)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Allen Avinger PC8
- Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36
- Ahtna Inc. PC46
- Gary Hess PC76
- Delta AC2
- Copper Basin w/Am AC7
- Denali AC9
- Central Kuskokwim AC10
- USFWS - Subsistence Management PC41

**OPPOSE**

- Jeff Sperry PC5
- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32
- Nathan Sperry PC53
- Fairbanks AC3
- Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

*The Board of Game accepted this proposal as an agenda change request.*

**PROPOSAL 67 - 5 AAC 92.990 Definitions.** Clarify the definition of a brow tine.

(8) "brow tine" means a tine emerging from the first branch or brow palm on the main beam of a moose antler [AND PROJECTING FORWARD]; the brow palm is separated from the main palm by a wide bay; a tine originating in or after this bay is not a brow tine;

**ISSUE:** Further clarification of antler configurations. A moose "tine" or "point" means any antler projection that is at least one inch long, and that is longer than it is wide, measured one inch or more from the tip. In some cases, a projection that meets the definition of a tine can be found on the brow palm, but is not projecting forward. This would clarify that such a tine does count as a brow tine.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Hunters will continue to be confused by tines that are located on the brow palm but point in an unusual direction.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters who shoot what they thought was a legal animal based on brow tines.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Hunters who only shoot moose with brow tines projecting forward.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08W-G-077)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Jenny Pursell PC30
- Ahtna Inc. PC46
- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Fairbanks AC3
- Kenai/Soldotna AC6
- Denali AC9
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15
- Matanuska Valley AC16

**OPPOSE**

Delta AC2

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 68 - 5 AAC 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit; and 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep:** Amend the statewide regulations for Dall sheep bag limits to reflect the following:

If you harvest a Dall sheep in any Unit either by harvest ticket or by a limited draw permit, “It is one legal male sheep every 4 regulatory years.”

**ISSUE:** It is well known and recognizable that the sheep populations are critically low and currently decreasing across many areas in the state of Alaska. Additionally, there is a significant increasing high demand of this stressed resource by users each year. The pressure needs to be limited and spread out: One legal male sheep or larger every 4 regulatory years regulation needs to be adopted and implemented statewide just like the regulations that are currently in place for the Tok sheep draw area (DS102), and for Units 8 and 9 brown bear. This will give unsuccessful hunters in increased opportunity to hunt Dall sheep in a high quality manner when they do. Dall Sheep aren’t a maximum quantity harvest animal, but a high quality outdoor hunting experience for a once in a life time hunt.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The already very low sheep numbers will continue to decline from over harvesting. Additionally, hunting quality experience will continue to degrade. This will cause even greater conflicts then there already are amongst all user groups of this limited resource. Every year with more sheep hunters in the field the conflicts between users is getting worse and worse.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Having this requirement in place will help relieve stress off this resource and greatly improve the experiences in the field of all user groups.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All users groups, the Department of Fish and Game, and the State Troopers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who want to hunt sheep every year without regard to current sheep population conditions.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Don Schwandt

(HQ-08W-G-031)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

- Brett Nelson PC4
- Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17
- Richard Hahn PC31
- Arthur Greenwalt PC32
- Wayne Kubat PC47
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15
- Timothy Christopherson PC38

**OPPOSE**

- Jeff Sperry PC5
- Cory Larson PC6
- Steve Bethune PC7
- Scott Lubber PC9
- Shane Oyster PC12
- Tony Russ PC10

**PROPOSAL 68 CONTINUED.**

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Howard Beito PC44  
Vern Fiehler PC51  
Ladd Nolin PC52  
R. Miller PC54  
Greg Turner PC64  
Steven Hohensee PC69  
Perry Schneider PC70  
Tom Lamal PC74  
Carl Kinney PC77  
Delta AC2  
Fairbanks AC3  
Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5  
Kenai/Soldotna AC6  
Copper Basin AC7  
Koyukuk River AC11  
Middle Yukon AC12  
GASH AC13  
Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 69** - 5 AAC 5 AAC 92.130(e). **Restrictions to bag limit.** Amend this regulation as follows:

Children 8 years of age to 10 years of age have the option to obtain their own harvest tag or to hunt on their parents' harvest tags in all units.

**ISSUE:** Reduce age for children to obtain their own harvest tags from 10 years old to 8 years old.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Loss of potential hunting opportunities for the younger generation.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Encourages more hunting opportunities for families.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone.

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The current solution is more restrictive and limits parents with multiple young children under 10.

**PROPOSED BY:** Patrick Jones

(HQ-08W-G-004)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5  
Central Kuskokwim AC10

Jeff Sperry PC5  
Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17  
Jenny Pursell PC30  
Fairbanks AC3  
Denali AC9  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 70 - 5 AAC 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit.** Modify the black bear bag limit as follows:

You may harvest the limit of black bear per any unit or subunit as described in the hunting regulations up to a total statewide limit of ten bears.

**ISSUE:** Shooting-harvesting a black bear in one unit or geographical area that goes against the number you can shoot in another unit. Example: The department biologist in Lake Iliamna, Unit 9, believes there is enough black bear so that a resident could harvest three per year. The department biologist in Prince William Sound, Unit 6, believes there is only enough bear for one per year. These are two completely different geographical and biological areas, unless you think black bear swim back and forth across Cook Inlet, which I have never heard of in my 39 years of living here. The department’s own brochure “Bear Facts”, reads black bear- more than 50,000. According to the department’s harvest summary 2000-2005, the average black bear harvest is only 2500 per year. Also, it is a known fact grizzly help keep black bear populations in check. Now with more liberal seasons and bag limits on grizzly bears, the black bear population is only going to increase and they can kill a moose calf just as a quickly as a grizzly.

With black bear population of over 50,000, harvest at only 2,500, it makes absolutely no sense to have such restrictions on black bear harvest numbers. Black bears have to be sealed so there is very accurate harvest data per year, per unit and sub unit statewide, which would control over harvest in anyone area. The bag limit on black bear on page 14 of the 2006-2007 hunting regulation book, is more like something an anti-hunter would make up and not a sportsman-hunter. I have absolutely no intention of going out and shooting 30 black bear, but I would like to hunt and harvest black bear in different areas of the state in the same year when the opportunity arises.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued population increase moose calf predation. Continued hindrance to hunters wanting to hunt black bear in several different units.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The thinning of an over populated specie always helps the species.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bear hunters, moose calves, city dwellers with bear problems.

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** David L. Lazer (HQ-08W-G-0086)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**  
Wayne Kubat PC47

**OPPOSE**  
  
Jeff Sperry PC5  
Defenders of Wildlife PC11  
Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17  
Jenny Pursell PC30  
Richard Hahn PC31  
Arthur Greenwalt PC32  
R. Miller PC54  
Tom Lamal PC74  
Fairbanks AC3  
Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5

**PROPOSAL 70 CONTINUED.**  
**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Copper Basin AC7  
Denali AC9  
Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15  
Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 71 - 5 AAC 92.135. Transfer of Possession.** Amend this regulation as follows:

Add the provision that states once game or game parts has/have reached the “domicile” of the harvester or to the “domicile” of the receiver and it is out of the “field” the transfer of possession will cease.

**ISSUE:** The "transfer of possession" never has an end time to the regulation. Also, it does not address the state or condition the game or game parts are in.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Without having one it puts Alaskan citizens at risk of receiving wildlife volition. Also for places of business that provide services such as taxidermists, meat processors, expeditors, the post office, UPS and other freight companies, and the Department of Fish and Game (department) when the regulation states “ game or parts of game..” and does not specify the condition, this also leaves to interpretation of the regulation. Examples: I see the department give game hides, antlers, and horns to auctions, no transfers of possessions. Then the auctions sell the department's goods, plus all the fur the trappers consigned. All have no transfer of possession. According to 5 AAC 92.135, whenever you give or receive game or game parts one must exist. What about game or game parts shipped thought the post office? What about skin sewers, horn and antler carvers, and their customers?

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** No. But it does address the way a regulation is written. It is not the way it was intended, nor enforced the way it reads, but can be.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaskan citizens. Because we never know when a peace officer will enforce the letter of the regulation.

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Allen F. Barrette (I-08W-G-006)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR** **OPPOSE**

- Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36
- Ahtna Inc. PC46
- Delta AC2
- Fairbanks AC3
- Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5
- Denali AC9
- Middle Yukon AC12

Wayne Kubat PC47

- Koyukuk River AC11
- Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15
- Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 72 - 5 AAC 92.140. Unlawful possession or transportation of game.** Amend this regulation as follows:

Repeal 1500 lb vehicle restriction in Unit 13E.

**ISSUE:** I am a local to Cantwell, Alaska and have been hunting and Fishing for all my life. My knowledge of our subsistence practices has been handed down from my parents, grandparents and many other members of my family. We depend upon our local resources for our self-sufficiency and we have been fine tuning the way we get our resources for a long time. When the spear was first made everyone switched to that instead of using rocks to kill. The same thing happened when the bow and arrow was made. Now we have trucks and snow machines and off road vehicles (ORVs) to hunt with and our use of them is now being restricted. I have gone through and read all the new subsistence laws and I do not see the reasoning behind many of the changes. One change in particular is the 1500 lb. limit on ORVs used for hunting. Since subsistence is all about the food you can get off an animal for your self-sufficiency, you would think that meat preservation would be the most important thing you do with your tag. With this new law hunters are now forced to use 4 and 6-wheelers to haul out meat. Whereas before we could use our buggies to haul as much meat as you can put in them in one load, cleanly and safely. Now hunters have to make many trips on a 4-wheeler, risking rollovers and our meat to spoilage; from being wrapped up in tarps and not being allowed to breathe. Additionally, taking the meat out of the tarp would mean the meat gets covered in mud, dust and water.

Another problem with this law is that before our whole family could fit in one truck, along with our gear, and still have space for our meat. Now we have to buy \$20,000 worth of 4-wheelers just to keep our family values and traditions strong by taking everybody out hunting. It's bad enough that none of the young kids can draw a tag for caribou or moose, but now they cannot even watch whoever has a tag, hunt. At first I thought well this law won't be too much of a problem, whoever will be hunting will just ride in on a four-wheeler, and the truck will take their gear in. However that does not work, because trucks cannot transport any piece of hunting gear. This year we drew a TM300 moose tag and did not even use it because of the reasons listed above.

Thank you for your time in reading this proposal. I hope the board will take all this into consideration when it comes time for writing the game laws for next year. Please remember that the decisions you make effect the preservation of Native Alaskan culture.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Families and extended families can't hunt and share traditions together.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, 100 fold, it will enable families to be out in the field and protects the harvest.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All who hunt this way, a subsistence hunter who hunts for the nutritional value of the meat and the continued practice of something their family have always done.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will suffer because the current law only discriminates against the "subsistence" hunter.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Make it a 1500 lb. rule for every hunting unit and group in Alaska – would that be fun? Isn't an airplane over 1500 lb.?

**PROPOSED BY:** Bruce J. Gore

(HQ-08W-G-061)

**PROPOSAL 72 CONTINUED.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Wayne Kubat PC47  
Carl Kinney PC77  
Delta AC2  
Fairbanks AC3  
Denali AC9

**OPPOSE**

Cooper Landing AC8  
Matanuska Valley AC16

Jeff Sperry PC5  
Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17  
Jenny Pursell PC30  
Richard Hahn PC31  
Arthur Greenwalt PC32  
Nathan Sperry PC53

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_  
**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 73 - 5 AAC 92.140. Unlawful possession or transportation of game.** Amend this regulation as follows:

Delete the 1500 lb. vehicle restriction in Unit 13E because it is discriminatory to one hunting group.

**ISSUE:** The restrictions that are on the Tier II hunt are somewhat ridiculous. The new laws make it harder to go out and retrieve meat for our families. The new law about letting only vehicles that weigh less than 1500 pounds carry out Tier II animals is not right.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** My family has been practicing subsistence hunting for generations and now cannot. I am writing to express my frustration regarding current Tier II subsistence requirements.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The meat is harder to get out of the field in a timely manner resulting in waste, dirty meat, and loss of meat.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** I am a freshman at Cantwell School. I am a subsistence hunter residing in Tier II hunting unit, 13E. My family and all those who hunt responsibly.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. The solution makes it the same for all hunting groups.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Restrict all hunting groups.

**PROPOSED BY:** Windy Gore (HQ-08W-G-063)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Wayne Kubat PC47  
Carl Kinney PC77  
Fairbanks AC3  
Denali AC9

Cooper Landing AC8  
Matanuska Valley AC16

**OPPOSE**

Jeff Sperry PC5  
Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17  
Jenny Pursell PC30  
Richard Hahn PC31  
Arthur Greenwalt PC32

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_  
**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

*The Board of Game considered this proposal during the Spring 2007 regional meeting and voted to defer it to the Statewide meeting.*

**PROPOSAL 74 - 5 AAC 92.171. Sealing of Dall sheep horns.** Amend the regulation as follows:

Cease the sealing of Dall sheep horns for the units in the southcentral and southwest regions.

**ISSUE:** Misguided sheep sealing requirement.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The department will continue to waste money and man hours on an unnecessary requirement.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The department in no longer wasting money.

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Chapter of FNAWS and Anchorage Advisory Committee (HQ-08W-G-083)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Wayne Heimer PC50  
R. Miller w/Am PC54  
Kelly Vern PC57  
Delta AC2  
Fairbanks AC3

Tony Russ PC10

**OPPOSE**

Jeff Sperry PC5  
Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17  
Jenny Pursell PC30  
Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC36  
Howard Beito PC44  
Wayne Kubat PC47  
Nathan Sperry PC53  
Alaska Backcountry Hunters and Anglers PC62  
Steven Hohensee PC69  
Tom Lamal PC74  
Carl Kinney PC77  
Denali AC9  
Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 75 - 5AAC 92.135(a) Transfer of possession.** Amend the regulation as follows:

**5 AAC 92.135. Transfer of possession.** (a) A person who gives or receives game or a part of game shall **immediately** furnish, upon demand by a peace officer **of the State of Alaska**, a [signed] statement **signed by both parties** describing the following: the names and addresses of each person who gave or received the game, when and where the game was taken, [and] what game or part of game was transferred **and the hunting license number of the person who took the game. This statement is unnecessary if the person who took the game accompanies the person possessing the game.**

(b) Upon receipt of game or a part of game, the recipient shall then be responsible to salvage the edible meat for human consumption.

(c) A person giving, shipping, or receiving game or parts of game shall allow inspection of that game or parts of game upon request from a peace officer of the state or a federal fish and wildlife agent.

**ISSUE:** The current language in 5AAC 92.135(a) is unclear on when the transfer of possession statement is required to be written and if both the hunter and the person who had the game transferred to him has to have a transfer statement in possession. Current language also gives the hunter or the transferee the ability to compose the transfer statement at the time it is requested by the peace officer. Wildlife enforcement troopers who use the transfer of possession requirement as an enforcement tool to detect significant illegal activities such as “the taking of an over limit, taking a sub-legal or a wrong sex animal, hunting same-day airborne, and wanton waste” will benefit. Requiring the transfer statement to be written at the actual time the transfer occurs locks the participants into a set of events that are present at the time of transfer. Current regulation allows the statement to be written at the time a contact is made with an enforcement officer and only then locks the participants into a story that fits the circumstances that benefit the situation.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued hunter confusion about when the transfer statement must be written. Waiting to write the transfer statement when contacted by law enforcement and then crafting the statement to cover an illegal activity.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters will have clear direction that the transfer of possession statement has to be completed at the time the transfer occurs. Enforcement officers have a more effective tool to evaluate a legal hunt or to uncover a possible violation, when the transfer of possession statement is completed at the time of trophy or meat transfer.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Division of Wildlife Troopers

(HQ-08W-G-048)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Jeff Sperry PC5  
Tony Russ PC10  
Nathan Sperry PC53  
Delta AC2  
Fairbanks AC3  
Denali AC9

**OPPOSE**

**PROPOSAL 75 CONTINUED.**

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road AC15

Tanana Chiefs Conference PC16  
Ahtna Inc. PC46  
Wayne Kubat PC47  
Kelly Vern PC57  
Alaska Bowhunters Association PC73  
Central AC1  
Upper Tanana 40 Mile AC5  
Copper Basin AC7  
Koyukuk River AC11  
Middle Yukon AC12  
GASH AC13  
Matanuska Valley AC16

---

**FINAL ACTION:** Carries    Fails    Tabled    No Action    See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL 76- 5 AAC 92.410. Taking Game in Defense of Life or Property.** Amend the regulation as follows:

....

(b) Game taken in defense of life or property is the property of the state.

A person taking such game shall immediately:

(1) salvage and surrender to the department the

(A) hide and skull of a bear, completely removed from the carcass, and including **all** attached claws;

(B) hide **and skull of fur animals or furbearers;**

(C) meat and **antlers or horns of ungulates;**

**(D) meat of all other game.**

(2) notify the department of the taking

(3) submit to the department a completed questionnaire concerning the circumstances of the taking within 15 days after the taking.

**ISSUE:** Animals taken in defense of life or property are the property of the state. This proposal reorganizes, clarifies and corrects omissions on what must be turned into the state. This amended language eliminates the ability of someone who kills wildlife in defense of life or property from being able to keep the hide, skull, horns or antlers, which might provide an incentive to take the animal in some cases.

Other than a reorganization of the current language in regulation, the proposal would result in the following changes:

1) require the salvage of the skull of black bear, wolf, wolverine, and coyote.

2) require the salvage of the hide and skull for beaver, fox, lynx, mink, weasel, muskrat, and otter.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Currently, someone who shoots a black bear under defense of life or property can keep the skull and meat of the bear. Animal skulls have value and should be turned over to the state.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those who take an animal, particularly a furbearer or ungulate under the rare circumstance when the take is for defense of life or property, will have to abide by consistent and transparent regulations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who take an animal under defense of life or property and thought they could keep certain animal parts.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish & Game

(HQ-08W-G-76)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Jeff Sperry PC5

Defenders of Wildlife PC11

Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC17

Linda Feiler PC18

Nan Weed PC19

Iris and Gus Roberts PC20

Jeff Sloss PC21

Gerald Brookman PC23

**PROPOSAL 76 CONTINUED.**

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Nina Faust PC25  
Charlotte and Robert Sartor PC29  
Jenny Pursell PC30  
Richard Hahn PC31  
Arthur Greenwalt PC32  
William Cox PC33  
Tony Russ PC10  
Ahtna Inc. w/Am PC46  
Nathan Sperry PC53  
Tom Lamal PC74  
Delta AC2  
Cooper Landing AC8  
Denali AC9  
Matanuska Valley AC16

Central AC1  
Fairbanks AC3  
Central Kuskokwim AC10  
GASH AC13

---

**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_

*The Board of Game considered this proposal during the Fall 2007 regional meeting and voted to defer it to the Statewide meeting.*

**PROPOSAL 77 - 5 AAC 92.052(5). Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures.**  
Eliminate the trophy destruction requirement for musk ox as follows:

Remove the Trophy destruction requirement for Tier II and registration musk ox hunts in Unit 22.

**ISSUE:** Tier II and registration permit holders are required to destroy the trophy value of musk ox horns removed from the unit. This is a loss of potentially sale-ability of these horns and reduces the opportunity for subsistence hunters to gain from their kill in an otherwise legal manner. This trophy destruction is not required of the federal permit holders in Unit 22. This makes for a complicated enforcement process.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Tier II and registration permit holders will continue to be required to destroy the trophy value of musk ox horns removed from the Unit.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. It improves the quality of legally vendible musk ox horns. It opens new markets for legal Tier II and registration hunters if they should wish to sell their horns.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All Tier II and registration permit hunters who successfully hunt in Unit 22.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** There would be a small potential for increase in non-local hunters seeking a registration permit, thereby causing a slight increase in competition for animals.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** N/A

**PROPOSED BY:** Mike H. Quinn (HQ-08W-G-084)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Cooper Landing w/Am AC8  
Koyukuk River AC11

**OPPOSE**

USFWS - Subsistence Management PC41  
R. Miller PC54  
Tom Lamal PC74  
Matanuska Valley AC16

-----  
**FINAL ACTION:** Carries      Fails      Tabled      No Action      See Prop. # \_\_\_\_\_

**ABSENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN** \_\_\_\_\_