

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
Spring 2009 Proposal Book
Southcentral and Southwest Regions

Table of Contents

<u>PROPOSAL TOPICS</u>	<u>PAGE NUMBER</u>
Anchorage Area, Unit 14C	1-24
Cordova Area, Unit 6	24-33
Dillingham/King Salmon Area, Units 9 and 17	33-66
Glennallen Area, Units 11 and 13	66-104
Kenai/Homer Area, Units 7 and 15	104-132
Kodiak Area, Unit 8	132-138
Palmer Area, Unit 14A, 14B and 16	138-160
Region-wide/Multiple Units	160-181
Region I – Southeast Units	181-184
Region V – Arctic Units	184-193
Region III – Interior Units	193-215
Statewide	215-219

PROPOSAL 1- 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.

Expand seasons and bag limits for brown bear in Unit 14C as follows:

Unit 14(C)	Residents	Nonresidents
	[JAN. 1] <u>October 1</u> - May 31	[JAN. 1] <u>October 1</u> - May 31

Chugach State Park Management Area (general hunt only) 1 bear every regulatory year, by drawing permit only; up to 15 permits may be issued

Eagle River Management Area (General hunt only) 1 bear every regulatory year, by drawing permit only; up to xx permits may be issued

Eklutna Lake, Eagle River, and Chugach Park Management Area, (general hunt only) 1 bear every regulatory year by archery only (IBEP card required), by registration permit.

ISSUE: : Increasing bear attacks in Anchorage in recent years have prompted a discussion to increase brown bear hunting in Chugach State Park. Brown bear hunting was opened in the Chugach State Park in 2007 but no bears have been harvested. Very few bears have been harvested in the park in recent memory.

The addition of a fall hunt will allow a higher success rate. The addition of an archery hunt will allow for hunting in the Eklutna Lake Management area. It will also allow for a large number of participants with a very small harvest. Bears will have greatly increased hunting pressure without greatly increased harvest. Bears that are aggressive or habituated to humans will be taken, decreasing conflicts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Problems will continue, and hunting opportunity will be lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, there has been no harvest in years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bear hunters and Anchorage residents that would like to feel safe in their city.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Wildlife viewers who like to view habituated bears. Hikers that don't like to see hunters in the park.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A drawing hunt for archery hunters, rejected because the hunt will have a low success rate and limited interest.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-056)

PROPOSAL 2 - 5AAC 85.020(13). Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.

Add upper Eagle River drainage to the area where brown bears may be hunted with a drawing permit in the Chugach State Park Management Area in Unit 14C, and open a fall season.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(13)		

...

Unit 14(C), Chugach State
Park Management Area **and**
that portion of Eagle River drainage
above Icicle Creek drainage.

[JAN. 1—MAY 31]
Day after Labor Day
—May 31
(General hunt only)

[JAN. 1—MAY 31]
Day after Labor Day
—May 31

1 bear every regulatory year,
by drawing permit only; up to
15 permits may be issued.

- (2) the Eagle River Management Area:
(A) the area consists of the Eagle River drainage upstream from the Glenn Highway in Unit 14(C);
(B) the area is closed to hunting, except
...
(ii) black **and brown** bear hunting by permit; before hunting **a** [BLACK] bear, a person wishing to hunt must complete a hunter safety course for which a certification of completion is issued;
...
(5) the Chugach State Park Management Area:
...
(iv) brown bear hunting is open by drawing permit only from **the day after Labor Day** [JANUARY 1] through May 31[, FOR ONE BEAR ONLY];

ISSUE: Brown bear harvest in Unit 14C has historically been low (less than one bear a year), and, until 2007, hunting of brown bears was restricted to the remainder of 14C. In 2007, the Board of Game established a spring drawing permit hunt for brown bears within the Chugach State Park Management Area. No brown bears were harvested by 3 permittees in spring 2008. In addition to hunting mortality, from 1999-2008 0-7 (mean = 2.6) adult and sub-adult brown bears were reported shot in defense of life or property or killed by vehicles or trains annually in Unit 14C.

A DNA analysis of brown bears hairs collected in the Anchorage Bowl, including Fort Richardson and Elmendorf AFB, in 2005 and 2006 found a minimum of 35 brown bears. Brown bears are attracted to salmon streams in the study area from remote parts of Chugach State Park. However, based on the minimum count, the population of brown bears in Unit 14C may be higher than the previous estimate of 50-60 bears. While there is no objective evidence that bear numbers are increasing, the number of bear-human encounters are increasing, especially near the Anchorage and Eagle River metropolitan areas.

The Board authorized a registration black bear hunt in upper Eagle River drainage beginning in 2001. This has become a popular hunt, with as many as 135 registered hunters and 4-11 bears harvested annually (mean = 6.3), and we believe it has reduced the conflicts with bears in the Eagle River drainage. Presumably, a brown bear hunt will also reduce conflicts, either by reducing the bear population or, more likely, by removing bold or unwary brown bears that are more likely to visit developed areas outside the park. Upper Eagle River is sufficiently remote to reduce the risk of hunting, and especially wounding, bears in city parks and neighborhoods.

Extending the hunting season would allow for a fall brown bear hunt within the upper Eagle River drainage and the Chugach State Park Management Area. Currently, the season is January 1 – May 31, a period which allows hunters only 1–2 months to find a bear out of its den and during the period when these remote areas are not easily accessible due to snow conditions. However; some moose and sheep hunters report seeing many adult brown bears during hunting trips in the fall in Chugach State Park. Greater bear activity combined with easier access in the fall would likely increase hunter success. We anticipate issuing as many as 10 drawing permits for these hunts in 2009.

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

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Conflicts with brown bears near Anchorage will remain high, and brown bears will continue to be habituated to people, with more surprise encounters that sometimes result in human injuries or dead bears.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Brown bear hunters. People who live in or visit the Anchorage area or recreate in Chugach State Park who are concerned about the increasing number of human-bear encounters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to bear hunting or hunting in Chugach State Park.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Registration hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-99)

PROPOSAL 3 - - 5AAC 85.020(13). Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.

Open that portion of Eklutna Lake Management Area within Chugach State Park for brown bear hunting by bow and arrow only.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(13) ...		
<u>Unit 14(C), that portion of Eklutna Lake Management Area within Chugach State Park</u>	<u>Day after Labor Day —May 31 (General hunt only)</u>	<u>Day after Labor Day —May 31</u>
<u>1 bear every regulatory year, by drawing permit only, by bow and arrow only; up to 25 permits may be issued.</u>		

5 AAC 92.530. Management areas. The following management areas are subject to special restrictions
(4) the Eklutna Lake Management Area:

- ...
- (B) the area is closed to hunting, except that
 - ...
 - (iii) black bear may be taken by bow and arrow only, from the day after Labor Day through May 31, **a person wishing to hunt a black bear must complete a hunter safety course for which a certification of completion is issued;**
[FOR ONE BEAR ONLY];
 - ...
 - (v) **brown bear hunting is allowed by permit with bow and arrow only, from the day after Labor Day through May 31, a person wishing to hunt a brown bear must complete a hunter safety course for which a certification of completion is issued;**

ISSUE: The Unit 14C brown bear population may number more than 60 bears, based on a minimum count of brown bears frequenting portions of the Anchorage Bowl. Historically, less than 1 brown bear per year has been harvested in Unit 14C, although from 1999-2008 0-7 (mean = 2.6) adult and subadult brown bears were reported shot in defense of life or property or killed by vehicles or trains annually.

The Board established a spring brown bear drawing hunt in the Chugach State Park Management Area in 2007. In the first season, no bears were taken by the 3 permittees. Establishing an archery-only season in that portion of Eklutna Lake Management Area within Chugach State Park would allow for increased opportunity to sustainably harvest brown bears within Unit 14C. A previous agreement between the Division of State Parks, the Department of Fish and Game, and Eklutna, Inc.—which has in-holdings managed by State Parks inside the boundary of Chugach State Park—prohibits the use of firearms for hunting in the Eklutna Lake Management Area. The area is sufficiently remote to reduce conflicts generated by bear hunting in proximity to housing areas.

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

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to underuse a sustainable resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Brown bear hunters who use bow and arrows.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to bear hunting or hunting in parks.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Registration hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-100)

PROPOSAL 4 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Open a registration hunt in Unit 14C as follows:

The early bow season from August 16 to the 31 should be kept as is. The drawing hunts from September 1 to October. 15 should return to a registration hunt. This gives everybody that wants to seriously hunt mountain goats the opportunity to do so. This area has an abundance of goats. There appears to be very healthy population (I have hunted here for over 15 years).

ISSUE: In 2008, goat hunting in the Unit 14C Lake George area (hunts #859 and #869) were changed to a draw permit hunt, and it was a failure. There is an 18 goat limit for this area. There were two hunts with twenty permits issued for each; of forty permits there were only 4 goats taken. I guided to three of these. Obviously this hunt had a very low participation. There were 272 applications for the first hunt (hunt 859) and 326 for the second hunt (hunt 869). What we have now is a hunt that is hard to draw and the people that get drawn don't participate or are unsuccessful. Many people who want to hunt goats can't do so. At the current odds you get to hunt once every 13 to 16 years. There is a registration hunt November 1 to 15 that offers difficult conditions and very limited places to access the goats, putting all the hunt pressure on just a small part of the total area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Keeping the drawing format will result in lost opportunity to hunt mountain goats for many hunters that really desire to hunt them, while keeping the total harvest will below the goal.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Under my proposal, more goats will be harvested to reach the goal of 18 goat units (although

this may be adjusted if a survey is ever done). More people will have an opportunity to hunt for goats.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters that want an opportunity to hunt mountain goats will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Department of Fish and Game personnel who have to keep track of the registration hunt will be affected.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Splitting the Lake George unit into two registration areas to even out hunting pressure and harvest; Lake George East and Lake George West, divided at Lake George Glacier down river to the Knik Glacier. I rejected this because it is more work for the department. 2) Changing to a draw permit for nonresidents with ten permits total guide/client agreements required, and a registration hunt for residents and second degree of kindred nonresidents with a total of ten goat units available. A good alternative solution but more work involved for department personnel.

PROPOSED BY: Daniel Montgomery (SC-09S-G-62)

PROPOSAL 5 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Increase available moose tags in the Anchorage Management Area of 14C and increase the hunt area as allows.

Unit 14(C), that portion known as the Anchorage Management Area (General hunt only) 1 moose by drawing permit only, and by bow and arrow, shotgun, or muzzleloading black-powder rifle only; [UP TO] **between 20 and 50** permits [MAY] **will** be issued; **at least one of which will be an “any bull” tag** [A PERSON MAY NOT TAKE AN ANTLERED BULL UNLESS IT HAS A SPIKE-FORK ANTLER; THIS HUNT WILL BE HELD AT THE DEPARTMENT'S DISCRETION.] **Increase the hunt area to include Far North Bi-Centennial Park and the upper Rabbit Creek area. The Department will set seasons to minimize conflict with other users.**

Units and bag limits	Residents Open season
Unit 14C Anchorage Management area	Nov 1- Nov 30

ISSUE: This hunt has failed to progress into a meaningful management tool. The resource is not being managed for the maximum benefit of the people under sustained yield principles. There is a surplus of several hundred moose in the Anchorage bowl and very little has been done to address the situation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hundreds of excess moose will eventually starve to death during the next hard winter. Moose will continue to be forced onto roadway costing millions in vehicle damage and medical bills.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the majority of moose harvested in the Anchorage bowl are salvaged from road kills. Harvesting them under hunting situation will greatly improve the quality of meat salvaged.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those that like to eat moose meat, Anchorage drivers, property owners, pedestrians. The moose will also benefit if their numbers are reduced the remaining animals will be healthier and have an easier time living through a hard winter.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those that would like to see moose starve to death during the spring. People who like to view moose in their natural habitat of urban Anchorage. Anti-hunters. Tourists who

think it is cool to see a moose in town.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Open other moose hunts around the City of Anchorage. The time will come for other moose hunts in town. This is another step in a long process.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-046)

PROPOSAL 6 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish a November archery season in Unit 14C as follows:

Remainder of Unit 14(C)

1 moose per regulatory year,
only as follows:

1 bull with spike-fork
antlers or 50-inch

Residents

Day after Labor Day-
Sept. 30

Non Residents

Day after Labor Day-
Sept. 30

antlers or antlers
with 3 or more brow
tines on one side;

or

1 bull by bow and arrow only

Nov 1 – 10

Nov 1 – 10

ISSUE: Moose populations are still high in Unit14C. Archery hunting takes place in most south-central units in August. Meat care during hot August hunts has proven problematic, especially in remote walk- in areas. Holding a hunt in October would allow moose hunting during the rut, possibly resulting in over harvest. A November hunt will allow hunters to spread out on skis while avoiding the vulnerability of a rut hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nothing, the season will go on as it has.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS

PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by placing this season after the majority of the rut has ended, and most of the cows have already been bred, this would ensure the harvest would have little effect on overall moose populations. The hunt taking place when the weather is cooler would also benefit to the condition of the meat harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters who put in the time and efforts to become IBEP certified will benefit from the added opportunity and the better conditions for meat care

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, the added opportunity is open to anyone willing to get certified.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-051)

PROPOSAL 7 - 5 AAC 085.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorize the antlerless moose season in the Fort Richardson Management Area in Unit 14(C).

Resident

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

(12)

...

Unit 14(C), Fort Richardson Management Area	Day after Labor Day -Mar. 31 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Mar. 31
--	--	---------------------------------

1 moose per regulatory year by drawing permit, and by muzzleloading blackpowder rifle or bow and arrow only; up to 160 permits may be issued.

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. An early December 2006 census on Fort Richardson, Elmendorf Air Force Base, and upper Ship Creek yielded a population estimate of 435 moose with a bull:cow ratio of 45 bulls per 100 cows and a calf:cow ratio of 30 calves per 100 cows. At that time the population was slightly below the population objective of 500 moose; however, this population has a history of rapid increase during mild winters and may have rebounded to a level closer to the population objective by fall 2007. Ten antlerless permits were issued for the fall archery and muzzle-loader hunts and 55 either-sex permits for the late hunt, with a total of 125 permits issued for all Fort Richardson hunts. Harvests for 2005, 2006, and 2007 were 26 bulls and 17 cows, 24 bulls and 18 cows, and 24 bulls and 21 cows, respectively.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population is likely to exceed the carrying capacity of the habitat if antlerless hunts are not authorized.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Muzzleloaders and bow hunters who draw permits. Persons living near Fort Richardson who incur damage to their gardens and shrubs and motorists on the Glenn Highway and in east Anchorage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who oppose antlerless moose hunting, and archery or muzzleloader hunting or hunting in general.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Long-term, large-scale habitat enhancement is desirable but difficult because of costs and conflicts with military operations.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and U. S. Army, Fort Richardson (HQ-09S-G-116)

PROPOSAL 8 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorize the antlerless moose season in the Anchorage Management Area in Unit 14(C).

**Resident
Open Season**

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

(12)

...

Unit 14(C), that portion known as the Anchorage Management Area	Day after Labor Day -Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season
---	--	----------------

1 moose by drawing permit only, and by bow and arrow, shotgun, or **muzzleloader** [MUZZLELOADING BLACK-POWDER RIFLE] only; up to 50 permits may be issued; a person may not take an antlered bull unless it has a spike-fork antler; this hunt will be held at the department's discretion

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be re-authorized annually. During summer, an estimated 200-300 moose inhabit the Anchorage metropolitan area. This number increases to 700-1,000 moose during the winter. Many of these moose come from the upper Campbell Creek valley, which lies within Chugach State Park. One hundred sixty-one moose (41 bulls, 90 cows, 30 calves) were counted in fall 2001 and 117 moose (21 bulls, 79 cows, 17 calves) were counted in fall 2003. Most of these moose move into the metropolitan area during December or January, where high densities of moose cause severe over-browsing in some areas, and lead to increased incidences of collisions with motor vehicles and adverse conflicts with humans.

The Board of Game re-authorized this hunt in 2005, and it was held for the first time since 1983. Four antlerless permits were issued for the upper Campbell Creek drainage in 2006, 2007, and 2008. In consultation with Chugach State Park staff and the park advisory committee, an additional 4 antlerless permits were issued in McHugh Creek drainage in 2007 and 2008. Hunters took 4 cows in 2005, 3 cows in 2006, and 5 cows in 2007.

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

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

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Issuing more permits for the upper Campbell Creek hunt area. However, this area is heavily used by other recreationists and moose gut piles in the last 3 years have quickly

attracted brown bears. These bears are also killing moose in the same area during the hunting season; nevertheless, it would be wise to base a decision to issue more moose permits (aka gut piles) on more experience in this portion of Chugach State Park.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-117)

PROPOSAL 9 - 5 AAC 085.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorize the antlerless moose season in the Birchwood Management Area and the remainder of Unit 14(C).

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12) ...		
Unit 14(C), that portion known as the Birchwood Management Area	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30
1 moose by drawing permit, by bow and arrow only; up to 25 permits may be issued		
... Remainder of Unit 14(C)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits may be issued	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. Composition counts are not flown in the Birchwood Management Area. However, we believe that a small resident population of 10-15 moose as well as an equal number of animals from Fort Richardson frequent the area. Ten bull and 5 antlerless permits were issued in 2006 and 2007 and 10 bull permits in 2008. Archers took no moose in 2006 and 2008 and 1 bull in 2007 (i.e., total hunter success for the last 3 years was 3% for bulls and 0% for antlerless moose). Very little public land exists in this management area and most of it is city parkland closed to discharge of weapons. Large parcels of land owned by Eklutna Native Corporation could not be hunted by permittees because no access permits were issued, and this land is quickly turning into subdivisions. Despite the warning in the

permit supplement that cautions hunters about the private property and low success rates, hunters are increasingly frustrated when they obtain one of these permits and cannot find a place to hunt. The one large block of public land remaining in this hunt area is Beach Lake Park, where discharge of firearms and bows is not allowed by city park ordinance.

Composition counts are seldom flown in the remainder of Unit 14(C). One hundred thirty-nine cows were counted during the fall 2001 trend counts in Knik/Hunter and Peters Creek count areas. The moose populations in these areas appeared to be at or above carrying capacity; however, to manage the moose population conservatively, lacking recent trend data, the number of antlerless permits was reduced from 20 to 10 in 2007. Hunters in Knik/Hunter took 3 cows in 2006, and 2 cows, 1 antlerless bull in 2007, and 1 cow in 2008 (preliminary). Hunters in Peters Creek took 1 cow and 1 antlerless bull in 2006, and no moose in 2007 or 2008 (preliminary).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The opportunity to harvest antlerless moose will be lost, and urban moose-human conflicts will likely increase.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Persons who acquire permits for antlerless moose hunts.

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-118)

PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 085.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorize the antlerless moose hunt on Elmendorf Air Force Base in Unit 14(C)

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
...		
Unit 14(C), Elmendorf Air Force Base	Day after Labor Day -Mar. 31 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Mar. 31

1 moose by drawing permit, and by bow and arrow only; up to 25 permits may be issued.

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. Moose on Elmendorf Air Force Base are part of a resident wintering population that also occupies Fort Richardson. An early December 2006 census on Ft. Richardson, Elmendorf Air Force Base and upper Ship Creek yielded a population estimate of 452 moose. During September, up to 100-150 of these moose frequent lands managed by Elmendorf. A majority of these animals move to Fort Richardson during late fall and winter, many into areas where hunting is not allowed.

Because the density of hunters on Fort Richardson has reached maximum manageable levels, the Elmendorf hunt provides additional hunter opportunity and helps achieve desired harvest levels. Thirteen bull, 7 antlerless and 5 either-sex permits were issued in 2006-2008. During the 2006, 2007, and 2008 (preliminary) seasons, hunters took 7 bulls and 5 cows, 4 bulls and 7 cows, 4 bulls and 3 cows, respectively.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Habitat may be over-browsed, reducing carrying capacity in subsequent years, and road and train kills will increase. The overall Fort Richardson-Elmendorf Air Force Base moose population is thought to have been above carrying capacity during the severe 1994-1995 winter. Browse was over-utilized across extensive areas during the severe winters of 1989-1990, 1991-1992, and 1994-1995. If cows are not harvested, the population will increase and suffer major losses during a severe winter.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bowhunters who draw permits. Persons living on or near Elmendorf Air Force Base who incur damage to their gardens and shrubs, and motorists on Elmendorf and in north Anchorage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to antlerless moose hunting, bow and arrow hunting, or hunting in general.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Long-term, large-scale habitat enhancement is desirable, but difficult because of costs and conflicts with military operations.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and Elmendorf Air Force Base (HQ-09S-G-119)

PROPOSAL 11 - 5AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless portion of the any-moose drawing permit in the upper Ship Creek drainage in Unit 14(C).

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

ISSUE: Moose use the upper Ship Creek drainage throughout the year. However, the highest density appears to be in fall and early winter when rutting and post-rut concentrations occur. In most years, accumulated snow packs force most of the moose out of the upper Ship Creek drainage in December. The moose move to lower-

elevation wintering areas on Fort Richardson, Elmendorf AFB, and other portions of the Anchorage Bowl. An early December 2006 census on Fort Richardson, Elmendorf Air Force Base and upper Ship Creek yielded a population estimate of 452 moose with a bull:cow ratio of 45 bulls per 100 cows and a calf:cow ratio of 30 calves per 100 cows. Fifty either-sex permits were issued for upper Ship Creek drainage in 2006, 2007, and 2008. Hunters took 12 bulls and 3 cows in 2006, 9 bulls and 3 cows in 2007, and 6 bulls and 4 cows in 2008 (preliminary). An additional 17 bulls and 1 illegal cow were taken in an any-bull registration hunt after the drawing hunts in 2007.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive. An either-sex drawing moose hunt should allow greater harvests in an area with limited access.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters.

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None. A late-season registration hunt for any bull was held in 2007 and 2008 to harvest additional moose from upper Ship Creek drainage.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-120)

PROPOSAL 12 - 5 AAC 085.045(5). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Units 7 and 14(C).

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
<p>(5)</p> <p>...</p> <p>Unit 7, the Placer River drainages, and that portion of the Placer Creek (Bear Valley) drainage outside the Portage Glacier Closed Area, and that portion of Unit 14(C) within the Twentymile River drainage</p>		

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits for bulls will be issued in combination with nonresident hunts, and up to 70

Aug. 20 - Oct. 10
(General hunt only)

permits for antlerless moose will be issued

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits for bulls will be issued in combination with resident hunts

Aug. 20 - Oct. 10

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. A count in mid-November 2008 found 192 moose (40 bulls, 121 cows, 30 calves, 1 unknown). The moose population in this hunt area is strongly influenced by winters with unpredictably deep snow accumulations.

A population peak of 333 moose in 1990 exceeded the carrying capacity of the winter range, and an aerial survey completed 2 years later found that many of the moose had died or emigrated. Harvest quotas were reduced and fewer permits were issued in the late 1990s and early 2000s to allow the population to recover. More recently, a count in late November 2004 found 94 moose (27 bulls, 44 cows, 23 calves), half the previous year's count, which indicated heavy winter mortality or emigration. No antlerless permits were issued in 2006, 2007, and 2008 to allow the population to recover. We anticipate issuing antlerless permits in 2009, if winter 2008-09 mortality is low.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population will increase quickly over several mild winters and suffer major losses during a severe winter. Habitat may be over-browsed, reducing carrying capacity in subsequent years, and road and train kills will increase.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who obtain a drawing permit, wildlife viewers and motorists driving in the Portage area. Visitor use is high and viewing is an important activity in this area. Local moose hunters who are willing to harvest a moose in December.

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-115)

PROPOSAL 13 - AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep drawing permit hunts. Require a guide-client agreement for sheep in Unit 14C as follows.

Guide-client agreements shall be required for nonresidents to apply for any of the 14 C sheep draws.

ISSUE: Nonresident 14C sheep applicants do not have to have a signed guide-client agreement to apply.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Large booking agents and application services outside

of Alaska will control and dominate the draw.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, allows for guides to have a better opportunity for their clients to draw thus resulting in a better experience for everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nonresidents, residents, and guides.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The big booking agents and application services.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Lance Kronberger (HQ-09S-G-018)

PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Modify the permit distribution for nonresidents in Unit 14C as follows:

Limit nonresident hunters to 10 percent or less of the available permits for Unit 14C Dall Sheep.

ISSUE: Overharvest of trophy quality Dall Sheep rams in Unit 14C permit areas by guide assisted nonresident hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Reduced numbers of mature, trophy-sized rams available for the permit holders.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Limiting guided nonresident hunters should improve the number of mature rams for all permit holders to hunt, as guided nonresident hunters have a higher success rate than resident hunters. Recently, there has been an increase in nonresident hunters drawing Unit 14C Dall sheep, contributing to a high hunter success rate and removing all trophy quality rams from some permit areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All permit holders will benefit with improved quality rams available. A greater benefit will go to the resident hunters who will receive most of the permits to hunt the state they live in.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Alaska Department of Fish and Game will lose some nonresident license and tag fees that are used to fund their operation. Unit 14C big game guides will suffer from less nonresident hunters to provide their services to.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Reducing overall permit numbers for Unit 14C Dall sheep would reduce hunting opportunities for both resident and nonresident hunters.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee (HQ-09S-G-080)

PROPOSAL 15 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Eliminate the nonresident sheep hunt in Unit 14C as follows:

Unit 14C - closed to nonresidents for sheep hunting, residents only.

ISSUE: Hunting season and bag limits for Dall sheep in Unit 14C. Make all of Unit 14C a resident only hunt,

except for the Governor's tag.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaska residents will continue to lose out on this highly prized tag to nonresident hunters. This amounted to a total of 28 tags going to nonresidents in 2008.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? My proposal only addresses improving the chances/odds of Alaskan sheep hunters (4565 applicants in 2008 for 14C) who applied for the 201 ram only tags in Unit 14C.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The 4565 Alaskans who applied in 2008. This hunt area is one of only a few in the state where the average Alaskan can afford and have access to one of the most prized trophies in Alaska. It is within the road system, making it affordable to all Alaskans, including father/sons or daughters who hunt together. In 2008, 28 of those tags went to nonresidents. That was 16.75 percent of the 201 ram tags available in 2008. Most of Unit 14C falls within the boundary of Chugach State Park lands.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The guides whose clients draw a tag in this area. Having said that, the guides have access to more remote areas in the state in which to take their client's sheep hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A bonus preference system. I rejected the idea mainly due to the cost of running it, and the false hope of drawing a tag in five years when in reality it may take ten or more years.

PROPOSED BY: Frank Neumann (SC-09G-013)

PROPOSAL 16 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Limit nonresident sheep tags in Unit 14C as follows:

Option 1: Limit nonresident tags to one tag per hunt or 10% of tags issued, whichever is greater.

or

Option 2: Create separate drawing hunts for nonresidents and residents. Allocate not more than 10% for tags to nonresidents.

ISSUE: Nonresidents have been drawing an increased number of tags in Unit 14C. Guides have been submitting an increased number of nonresident applicants, increasing the percentage of non-residents drawn. In one hunt in 2008, all three hunters drawn were nonresidents. Some guides have even mentioned their frustrations with this system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaska residents will continue to receive a reduced number of coveted Unit 14C drawing tags.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, resident sheep hunters are less successful than nonresidents. This should allow more rams to survive to trophy quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Eliminate nonresident hunters.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee

(SC-09S-G-054)

PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Modify the permit allocation for Dall sheep in Unit 14C as follows:

I propose making approximately 5% to 25% of the permits, depending on the draw area, available to nonresidents. Permits could be allocated as follows, with nonresidents hunting with qualified residents of 2nd degree of kindred putting in with the resident draw:

- 14C Central: DS 123-1 permit total, available to anyone, resident or nonresident
- 14C Northeast: DS 124-3 resident; DS 125-3 resident; DS 126-3 resident} 1 nonresident total, August 10 – September 17.
- 14C E. Eklutna: DS 127-1 resident; DS 128-1 resident; DS 129-1 resident} 1 nonresident total, August 10 – September 17.
- 14C Northwest: DS 130-7 resident; 1 nonresident; DS 131-7 residents, 1 nonresident; DS 132-7 resident} 1 nonresident total, August 10 – September 17.
- 14C Upper Eagle River: DS 133-1 resident; DS 134-1 resident; DS 135-1 resident} 1 nonresident total, August 10 – September 17.
- 14C Southwest: DS 136-7 resident, 1 nonresident; DS 137-7 resident, 1 nonresident; DS 138-7 resident} 1 nonresident total, August 10 – September 17.
- 14C West Area Wide: DS 139-18 residents, 2 nonresident
- 14C West, Bow: DS 140-76 resident, 4 nonresident
- 14C W Eklutna, Bow only: DS 141-23 residents, 3 nonresident

With this formula, nonresidents get to participate in all hunt areas. The total allocations are: rifle hunts, 76 permits for residents, 11 for nonresidents (13% non-resident); bow hunts, 99 for residents, 6 for nonresidents (6% non-resident).

The past draw results for rifle hunts are broken down as follows:

- 2004 121 residents, 18 nonresidents (13% nonresident)
- 2005 119 residents, 9 nonresidents (7% nonresident)
- 2006 102 residents, 27 nonresidents (21% nonresident)
- 2007 65 residents, 31 nonresidents (32% nonresident)
- 2008 79 residents, 17 nonresidents (18% nonresident)

ISSUE: Too many sheep permits in Unit 14C are being drawn by nonresidents, resulting in over harvesting of rams area wide. In some hunts this year all of the permits are issued to nonresidents, as there is currently no upper limit on nonresident draws. Mature ram numbers are plunging, and hunt quality has been dramatically reduced in the last five years. There is no balance to how the permits are currently being drawn; guided nonresidents are getting too many permits in some areas and not enough in others. There are just too many permits being issued.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The hunt quality will continue to decline for everyone.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quality of the hunt will improve for all hunters by having fewer guided hunts in each area and overall. Lower guide pressure will allow more mature rams to survive, and result in less conflict for existing rams.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters will have a higher chance of drawing. Nonresident guided hunters would not have any conflicts with other guides because there won't be more than one non-resident participating in any rifle hunt except for DS139, the area wide hunt, which will have two.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There will be less guided hunters, forcing some guides to go elsewhere.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered a flat 10% of permits going to non-residents, but with the number of permits available it would be hard to determine numbers and non-residents wouldn't get to participate in all hunts.

PROPOSED BY: Daniel Montgomery (SC-09S-G-63)

PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. n areas of Unit 14C, change the horn restrictions as follows:

Change the legal description for legal sheep to read "full curl" for permit hunts DS140 and DS141.

ISSUE: The Department of Fish and Game is offering fewer sheep permits this year for Unit 14C. Fewer permit equals less hunting opportunities. Until the sheep population in Unit 14c shows signs of rebounding, I am asking that "any sheep" be changed to "full curl" for DS140 and DS141. (These are the two bow-hunting draw permits.)

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If hunting opportunities are being cut due to the lace of sheep in Unit 14C, it doesn't make sense to continue to allow the harvest of female sheep.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. By not harvesting female sheep, sheep population will rebound quicker.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All sheep hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Archery sheep hunters that want to harvest a female sheep.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Troy Vincent (SC-095-G-99)

PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Change the allocation of sheep permits for Unit 14C as follows:

Make all sheep hunting in Unit 14C resident only;
or
Establish that no more than 10% of the tags for Unit 14C are issued to nonresident sheep hunters with no tags guaranteed;
and/or
Make all the early (August 10-22) sheep permits for Unit 14C "resident" only.

ISSUE: Alaska has the cheapest sheep hunting in the United States and this has led to record numbers of guides putting their non-resident clients in for sheep permits. Alaskan residents are finding it hard to get drawn for these permits. In fact, last year in 14C, upper Eagle River DS134, all three tags went to non-resident hunters. This is not fair to all Alaskans.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Until limits are set on the Non-resident hunter, Alaskans will continue to find it hard to hunt in the State in which they live in. This is not fair and limits need to be established for all non-resident hunters. Non-resident sheep hunters are more successful then the resident hunters and this high success rate has a negative influence on the amount of permits that the department will

issue the following year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All resident sheep hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Non-resident sheep hunters and their guides.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Troy Vincent (SC-095-G-103)

PROPOSAL 20 - 5 AAC 92.550. Areas closed to trapping. Restrict trapping near trails in Unit 14C as follows:

No trapping one mile from established trails in Unit 14C.

ISSUE: Trapping on trails in Chugach State Park.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More dogs will be killed in traps.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Skiers and trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trappers would have to hike further.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Only moving back 90 feet from trail.

PROPOSED BY: Kathy Feathergill Calvin (HQ-09S-G-056)

PROPOSAL 21 - 5 AAC 92.550. Areas closed to trapping. Restrict trapping in Unit 14C as follows.

No trapping is allowed in the Chugach State Park any closer than one mile radius from the community boundaries.

ISSUE: Proximity of trapping to the communities of Bird Creek and Indian has led to several dog deaths. (According to the ranger there were more dogs trapped than wolverine). The main concern is that trapping is permitted adjacent to our properties. Our children are running through the woods and we are concerned that they may be hurt alongside our dogs. Allowing any kind of hunting/trapping right beside the community is an unnecessary endangerment of our community members, especially the children. I suggest that the legal trapping is moved to at least 1 mile from the community boundaries.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Our children could get hurt. Our dogs are already killed and injured.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone living in the communities affected by the current trapping regulations. The trappers would also benefit because the current situation will eventually lead to an anti-trapping movement. That could easily be prevented by keeping the community members and their pets safe.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. The trappers can easily walk/ski/snow machine one mile beyond the community borders.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Forbidding trapping in the park altogether. This would not be fair to the majority of conscientious trappers who make a point of not endangering children, dogs and others.

PROPOSED BY: Martina Steinmetz (HQ-09S-G-057)

PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping; and 92.550. Areas closed to trapping. Close lynx trapping in Unit 14C as follows:

Lynx would be added to the list of species that may not be trapped anywhere in Chugach State Park.

ISSUE: Trapping of lynx within Chugach State Park.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Trapping of lynx outside of the Eagle River, Anchorage, and Eklutna Management Areas continues, reducing wildlife viewing opportunities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The prohibition of lynx trapping in the park would improve wildlife viewing opportunities in the park.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Thousands of people who wish to see a lynx in its natural environment.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A very small number of trappers who wish to trap near a large metropolitan area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A ban on all trapping in Chugach State Park. It is unlikely to pass.

PROPOSED BY: Kneeland Taylor (HQ-09S-G-061)

Note: This proposal was deferred by the Board of Game from the Statewide, 2008 meeting. It was previously listed as Proposal 60.

PROPOSAL 23 - 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. Have a buffer zone near roads would reduce these risks.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE 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 the Park.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Tom Banks

(HQ-08-w-G-053)

PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC 92.550. Areas closed to trapping. Close wolverine trapping in Unit 14C as follows:

Prohibit trapping of wolverine within Chugach State Park (CSP). Add wolverine to the list provided on page 26 of current trapping regulations book.

ISSUE: Limited population of wolverine being over-trapped within Chugach State Park.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Viability of wolverine population in CSP will be in jeopardy (per CSP Strategic Plan: Natural and Cultural Resources Objective II – “Manage and monitor state parks' natural and cultural resources to limit user impacts and ensure the condition of the resource, natural viewshed and ecological communities remain intact and fully functioning to future generations”. Wildlife viewing opportunities limited due to reduction in this small population of wolverine. Safety concerns continue with limited restrictions enacted with new restrictions cited on page 4 of regulations book. The methods used to trap wolverines have posed substantial threat to public safety of park users, including their pet dogs. Chugach State Park receives nearly 1.3 million annual visits. Hikers and other outdoor enthusiasts are a significant user-group and are often accompanied by their pets.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, quality of wolverine population will be strengthened by taking this action. According to Department of Fish and Game records, wolverine are being trapped at a rate that prohibits growth and possibly maintenance of current limited population. This action will ebb in accordance with CSP mission to provide and support wildlife viewing opportunities within the park as stated in existing CSP Master Plan.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Park Visitors who value the resources within CSP for premier wildlife viewing and the wolverine population. This decision would simply adhere to the historical use of the park, be an appropriate response to the majority of public feedback, and support one of the park's greatest wild values - the presence of wolverines - which have been protected from trapping since 1973. Families and pet owners who have a concern about safety within the park.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Possibly the two trappers who have been taking wolverine from this area, and any others who are pursuing wolverine trapping within the park.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Prohibiting use of conibear traps within CSP - although effective, this will not provide as effective a means of managing the wolverine population as proposed action will provide.

PROPOSED BY: Gus Gustafson

(HQ-095-G-021)

PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC 92.550. Areas closed to trapping. Prohibit coyote and wolverine trapping in Chugach State Park as follows:

Rescind the current conibear trapping of wolverine and coyotes of the Indian Creek drainage and other parts of Chugach State Park in Unit 14C.

ISSUE: Conibear trapping in Chugach State Park

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More dogs will be trapped as well as non-targeted wild species

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? There is only a very small number of wolverine left in the park.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Much of the tourist industry and people hiking and skiing in Chugach State Park

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Barbara Winkley (HQ-095-G-034)

PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC 92.550. Areas closed to trapping. Prohibit trapping in Unit 14C as follows.

The new regulation would reverse the recent Board of Game's decision to allow wolverine trapping in Chugach State Park, and bar any trapping of wolverines in Chugach State Park.

ISSUE: Trapping of wolverines in Chugach State Park

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If this problem is not solved, both the wolverine population and the recreational users of Chugach State Park will continue to be at risk. After the Board of Game approved trapping of wolverine in Chugach State Park last year, at least six dogs were caught in the conibear traps while only two wolverines were caught within the park. The dogs caught in the traps were with their owners on recreational outings. The high numbers of pets caught in traps is a powerful detraction to the enjoyment of Chugach State Park by recreational users; and the low numbers of wolverines supports state biologists' assertions that the wolverine population that is not of a size to support harvesting.

In the Anchorage Municipality's 1973 survey of Anchorage residents, 93 percent said that recreation is "vital to them", and many said that the availability of recreational opportunities strongly influences their residence in Anchorage. Chugach State Park has been listed as one of "America's 10 best state parks" because of an excellent trail system that is used extensively in both winter and summer. A high percentage of Chugach State Park users recreate with their dogs, and the presence of baited traps is a constant source of stress and danger. The Chugach State Park homepage states: "We are dedicated to helping you safely enjoy your visit and most importantly, to ensure you have fun." Trapping in Alaska's most popular and well used state park removes the fun and safety for many residents who recreate with their companion animals.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Alaska State wildlife biologists in May of 2008 reported that wolverine populations are being harvested in numbers that threaten the population survival. According to their research, the annual harvest rate in the Anchorage area over the last two years has been three times the number thought to be sustainable. Continued high rates of harvest will threaten not only the total number of wolverines in the Anchorage area, but severely deplete the gene pool.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users of the Chugach State Park will benefit from this proposal. Users without pets will benefit from increased viewing opportunities of wolverine, which are described as a "symbol for wilderness" on the Alaska Department of Fish and Game website. Users with pets will be able to enjoy their outdoor recreation without the constant fear of losing their pet's life in a wolverine trap. Trappers in the Anchorage area will benefit from the protection that the state park provides to the wolverine population's overall numbers, health, and genetic diversity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Limitations of trap placement will not eliminate entrapment and death of companion animals nor will it protect the wolverine population numbers and genetic diversity.

PROPOSED BY: Keri Gardner

(HQ-09S-G-058)

PROPOSAL 27 - 5 AAC 92.550(3). Areas closed to trapping. Close wolverine trapping in the Chugach State Park Management Area in Unit 14C.

(3) Unit 14(C) (Anchorage Area):

...

(3) Unit 14(C) (Anchorage Area):

...

(C) that portion of Chugach State Park outside of the Eagle River, Anchorage, and Eklutna management areas is open to trapping under Unit 14(C) seasons and bag limits, except that trapping of wolf, **wolverine**, land otter, and beaver is not allowed; a person using traps or snares in the area must register with the Department of Natural Resources Chugach State Park area office and provide a trapper identification; all traps and snares in the area must be marked with the selected identification; the use of traps or snares is prohibited within

- (i) 50 yards of developed trails;
- (ii) one-quarter mile of trailheads, campgrounds, and other developed areas;
- (iii) one-quarter mile of the Seward Highway from milepost 90 to milepost 115;

(D) all land and water within the Anchorage Management Area as described in 5 AAC 92.530 (3);

...

ISSUE: The board allowed wolverine trapping in the Chugach State Park Management Area beginning in fall 2007. Until then, wolverines could be trapped in the “remainder of Unit 14C.” Although state regulations allow wolverine trapping on Fort Richardson and Elmendorf AFB, the military installations have never issued access permits for trapping wolverines. However, wolverines rarely use Elmendorf, the Anchorage Bowl, lower Eagle River valley, and most of Fort Richardson due to development and the Glenn Highway barrier. Thus, before 2007, Chugach State Park served as a refugia, maintaining the population despite a relatively high annual harvest in the “remainder of Unit 14C.”

Harvest has increased in recent years, with mean annual harvests of 2.8 from 1988-2005 increasing to 5.0 in the past two years (2006-07 and 2007-08). The proportion of females in the harvest has doubled in recent years, with 58% females reported in the past 5 years (2003-2007) compared to 29% females reported in the previous 15-year period (1988-2002). Notably, 8 of 10 wolverines harvested in 2006-07 and 2007-08 were females.

The Unit 14C wolverine population has been surveyed twice, in 1995 and 2008. These spring surveys found 18 and 22 wolverines, respectively, in the unit’s fall population (after adding the reported winter harvest). The annual sustainable harvest in southcentral Alaska is assumed to be about 7-8% of the fall wolverine population. The 2007-08 harvest of 4 wolverines was about 18% of the estimated population. Presumably, the Unit 14C wolverine population has been maintained by dispersal from neighboring GMUs; however, the recent high harvests and high proportion of females in the harvest suggest that the population is being overharvested.

When the Board allowed wolverine trapping in the Chugach State Park Management Area, they compensated for increasing the area open to trapping by shortening the season from 12 weeks (Nov. 10-Jan. 31) to 7 weeks (Dec. 15-Jan. 31). However, federal subsistence trappers have no bag limit and a much longer trapping season (Nov. 10-Feb. 28) for wolverines. Four wolverines were harvested in Unit 14C in 2007-08, 2 of them by a federal subsistence trapper. If the board closes wolverine trapping in the Chugach State Park Management Area, the trapping season should remain Dec. 10-Jan. 31 in Unit 14C to reduce annual harvests to a sustainable level.

The statute under which Chugach State Park is managed states that providing areas for viewing wildlife is an important purpose of the park. Extensive public comment to the Department of Natural Resources in the past two years indicates that wolverine viewing, although not common, is desired by the public. Significant public concern has also been expressed about allowing the type of traps commonly used to harvest wolverines in the park, in spite of recent regulatory changes to provide for trapping restrictions along trails and at trailheads.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wolverines will continue to be trapped in Chugach State Park.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who don't want wolverine trapping in Chugach State Park.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trappers who want to trap wolverine in Chugach State Park.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Shorten the federal subsistence trapping season to match the state season.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and Alaska Department of Natural Resources
(HQ-09S-G-101)

PROPOSAL 28 - 5 AAC 84.270(14). Furbearer trapping and 92.550(3)(C). Areas closed to trapping.
Close trapping for wolverine in Chugach State Park, Unit 14C as follows:

The new regulation would prohibit wolverine trapping in Chugach State Park. We would return to the pre-2007 decision that worked for the overwhelming majority of Alaskans who live near and recreate in Chugach State Park.

ISSUE: For 35 years, Chugach State Park was closed to wolverine trapping. Then, in 2007, the Board of Game decided to open Chugach State Park to wolverine trapping. This decision by the Board of Game went against the recommendations of Department of Fish and Game biologists who are concerned about viability of the wolverine population within the park. Additionally, the Chugach State Park Advisory Board weighed in against this measure and this decision continues to be highly unpopular with residents of the area. The proximity of Chugiak State Park to Alaska's largest city makes it a highly popular destination for winter recreationalists and therefore is an inappropriate location for wolverine trapping. The reinstatement of the ban on wolverine trapping would solve this problem.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The continuation of wolverine trapping will result in more pets being killed or maimed, and more threats to public safety including possible injury to humans while trying to extricate their dogs from these large and dangerous traps. Many residents will choose not to use the park due to safety concerns. If trapping is allowed to continue, it will likely deplete the park's wolverine population, dropping it below sustainable levels. As a direct result, the likelihood of visitor's to the park seeing a wolverine in the wild is reduced, thereby diminishing the experience for the wildlife viewing public.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the quality of the experience for the viewing public in the state park will be improved. By upholding the statutory purpose of the park (Alaska Statute 41.21.121) including recreation for people and the display of wildlife, the public can safely visit and recreate in their backyard park without the risk of their pets being trapped. The ban would guarantee the appropriate protection of the park's wolverine populations, in accordance with park rules and regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who visits Chugach State Park is likely to benefit with an increased opportunity to see a rare wolverine and the assurance of a safer experience.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The two or three trappers who use the park to trap wolverines unless they decide to trap outside of the park.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered proposing a ban on all trapping within Chugach State Park, and feel this is a compromise position.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Center for the Environment (SC-09S-G-032)

PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear; and 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit. Modify the bag limit for Unit 6D as follows:

Wounded bears shall count towards a hunter's bag limit for a regulatory year.

ISSUE: Unreported wounded loss/probable mortality of bears compounded by the wounding/killing of subsequent bear(s).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The mortality rate of bears will continue to increase as hunters can legally shoot/potentially kill multiple bears under current regulations.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Black bears in Prince William Sound are being harvested at an unsustainable rate. If every hunter is allowed to shoot just one bear, including bears not recovered, there will be more bears available for future harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Every ethical bear hunter in Prince William Sound.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unethical hunters who choose to shoot multiple bears.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Limiting sow harvest by way of registration permit with sows counting towards the next four years registration hunt bag limits for the hunter who harvests a sow. This is unworkable as there would be too much resistance from resident hunters who may choose to not distinguish between the sexes.

PROPOSED BY: Greg Jennen (HQ-095-G-005)

PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear. Modify the bag limit in Unit 6D as follows:

One bear every two regulatory years.

ISSUE: Black bear bag limit in Unit 6D

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Populations will decline drastically.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will lower the hunting pressure to a reasonable amount.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who want a future bear season open.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Possibly some commercial operators.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Black bear drawing tag. This would create too much paperwork for Fish and Game.

PROPOSED BY: Otto Kulm (SC-09S-G-082)

PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 085.015.(2) Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bears. Delay the opening of the fall black bear season in Unit 6(D) as follows.

Seasons and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(2)		
...		
Unit 6(D)	<u>SEPT. 10</u> – June 10 [SEPT. 1]	<u>SEPT. 10</u> – June 10 [SEPT. 1]
1 bear		
...		

ISSUE: Harvest in Unit 6D, Prince William Sound, exceeded 500 black bears during the 2007-08 season. Although we do not have a population estimate, an assessment of harvest density and potential bear density for each drainage in Unit 6D suggests a population of about 3,700 bears, which results in a harvest rate of about 14%. This rate is considered to be near maximum sustained yield for black bears. A breakdown of Unit 6D into geographic areas indicates harvest rates ranging from 10 to 20%, with highest rates occurring in northern and western Prince William Sound. Most of the recent harvest increase has occurred during the fall season, which has quadrupled since 2005. There are 2 problems with the increasing fall harvest: 1) the potential to increase harvest beyond sustainability, and 2) the high proportion of females killed in the fall, exceeding 40%. Nonresidents take 50% of the fall harvest compared to 38% during spring.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Black bear harvest may exceed a sustainable level.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Black bear hunters and viewers in Unit 6D.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters and guides who hunt in the fall will have a shorter season.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A fall registration hunt would help to control harvest. However, if harvest can be controlled by reducing the season length it is a management method that ensures a reliable hunting season that this less subject to emergency closure and is consistent over time.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-092)

PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 085.020.(5) Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bears. Extends brown bear season on Montague Island in Unit 6D and opens hunt to nonresidents.

Seasons and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(5)		
...		
Units 6(D), Montague Island	Oct. 15 – <u>Dec. 31</u> [NOV. 30] <u>Apr. 1 – May 25</u>	<u>Oct. 15 – Dec. 31</u> [NO OPEN SEASON] <u>Apr. 1 – May 25</u>
1 bear every 4 regulatory years by registration permit only		
...		

ISSUE: The brown bear population on Montague Island has continued to increase since a limited hunt was reopened in 2001. Under the current season and residency restrictions, annual harvest has averaged 2.1 bears. Increasing the season and allowing nonresidents to hunt would provide more opportunity to harvest a brown bear on Montague Island. Continuing the registration hunt will allow in-season management of the harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity for brown bears on Montague Island would be lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Hunters will have additional opportunity to take brown bears from an increasing population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters desiring to take brown bears on Montague Island.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to bear hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Just opening spring season for residents. Draw season for nonresidents.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-091)

PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Modify the Unit 6D brown bear registration hunt for Montague Island as follows:

Extend the brown bear season in Unit 6D (Montague Island) to May 25, concurrent with the remainder of Unit 6D. Allow nonresident hunting of brown bear on Montague Island, concurrent with the remainder of Unit 6D. Keep the hunt as a registration hunt for both residents and nonresidents.

ISSUE: I would like the Board of Game to extend the length of the brown bear season on Montague Island to May 25 and to allow nonresident harvest of brown bears.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Currently, brown bear hunting on Montague is resident only and conducted as a registration hunt. The quota of five bears has only been filled once in the last seven years and brown bear population is increasing at a rapid rate. The potential brown bear harvest is currently underutilized.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The fall hunt was closed on Montague Island in 1990 and the spring hunt was closed in 1994.

Department of Fish and Game track and den surveys showed a continued increase in the bear population and a fall resident only hunt was established in 2002 as a registration hunt. Since that time, the quota of five brown bears was only taken in one year. The brown bear harvest by residents is underutilized and the bear population continues to increase providing an opportunity for nonresident harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nonresident brown bear hunters and registered guides who would be allowed to participate in the registration hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Residents who do not like nonresident hunters, and persons opposed to hunting in general.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Dennis Zadra (SC-09S-G-021)

PROPOSAL 34 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Change the season for brown bear in Unit 6D as follows:

Change the season to October 1 - May 31

ISSUE: Lengthen the brown bear season in Unit 6D.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Harvest numbers will not be met.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, harvest numbers will be met annually.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All bear hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Go to a special extended season draw area, however, this is too limited.

PROPOSED BY: Otto Kulm (SC-09S-G-085)

PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 085.020.(5) Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bears. Extend the brown bear season in Units 6A, B, and C.

Seasons and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(5)		
...		
Units 6(A), 6(B), and 6(C)	Sept. 1 – <u>JUNE 10</u> [MAY 31] (General hunt only)	Sept. 1 – <u>JUNE 10</u> [MAY 31]
1 bear every regulatory year		

...

ISSUE: Brown bear predation on moose has contributed to reduced moose populations in Units 6(A) and 6(B). In Units 6(B) and 6(C), Copper River Delta, brown bears are one important nest predator on dusky Canada geese, which have been slowly declining because of poor production. Although it is unknown whether additional bear harvest would increase dusky goose productivity, managing predators is an important component of the Dusky Goose Management Plan in avoiding a listing of dusky geese under the Endangered Species Act. Brown bear populations in these areas are healthy and can withstand additional harvest

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose populations in Units 6(A) and 6(B) will probably remain below management objectives. Additional opportunity to take brown bears, especially for nonresidents, would not be realized.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Hunters will be able to hunt brown bears later in the spring.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters desiring to take more brown bear brown bears in Unit 6.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to late spring brown bear hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Adding one week to the spring brown bear season rather than ten days.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-090)

PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Amend the bag limit for goat in Unit 6D as follows:

One billy by permit; the taking of any nanny is prohibited.

ISSUE: Goat bag limit in Unit 6D to become billies only.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Populations will decline.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, populations would be able to sustain themselves.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All goat hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who do not know how to judge the sex.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A.

PROPOSED BY: Otto Kulm (SC-095-G-79)

PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC 84.270(5). Furbearer trapping; and 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Modify the hunting and trapping seasons for lynx in Unit 6 as follows:

Close the hunting season for lynx and open a lynx trapping season.

ISSUE: Unit 6 has a hunting season and a bag limit of two lynx, but there is no trapping season. This is not correct by statute. Subsistence has priority over sport hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unit 6 will be in violation of Alaska Statute 16.05.258.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Non-trappers

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Have no harvest of lynx, but this is not logical because the Department of Fish and Game has allowed some lynx to be harvested by hunting.

PROPOSED BY: Allen Barrette (INT-09S-G-005)

PROPOSAL 38 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the harvest quota for moose in Unit 6A as follows:

20 bulls may be taken on hunt RM160, in addition to 5 bulls on hunt DM160.

ISSUE: Separate the quotas between hunts DM160 and RM160 for Unit 6A nonresidents.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Possible lawsuits by nonresidents that have their draw tag cancelled by the resident registration quota.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; people will not be discouraged to apply for hunt DM160, thus generating more state income.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nonresident hunters and commercial operators.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Possibly up to five resident hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Make residents a drawing too. Local needs.

PROPOSED BY: Otto Kulm (SC-09S-G-083)

PROPOSAL 39 - 5 AAC 085.045.(4) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorizes the antlerless moose season in Unit 6(A).

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

(4)

Unit 6 (A), all drainages into the Gulf of Alaska from Cape Suckling to Palm Point

1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by registration permit only; up to 30 bulls may be taken; or

Sept. 1-Nov. 30
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 drawing permits may be issued

Sept. 1-Nov. 30
(General hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1- Nov. 30

Remainder of Unit 6(A)

1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or

Sept. 1- Nov. 30
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; up to 20 antlerless moose may be taken

Nov. 15-Dec. 31
(General hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or

Sept. 1- Nov. 30

1 antlerless moose by registration permit; up to 20 antlerless moose may be taken

Nov. 15-Dec. 31

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. We recommend continuation of the antlerless season to promote population stability. The desirable post-hunt population size in Unit 6(A) west of Cape Suckling is 300 to 350 moose. A census completed during January 2008 yielded a population estimate of 275 moose with 7% calves. The reported antlerless harvest was 4 during 2005 and the hunt was not open during 2006 through 2008.

The desirable post-hunt population size in Unit 6(A) east of Cape Suckling is 300 to 350 moose. A census completed during February 2008 yielded a population estimate of 230 moose with 7% calves. No antlerless hunts were held because of previous poor calf survival and population level below the management objective. However, if recruitment does improve, antlerless hunts may be needed to hold the moose population at objective levels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If antlerless hunts are eliminated in Unit 6(A), hunting opportunity will be needlessly lost.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Individuals who desire to hunt antlerless moose in Unit 6(A).

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-111)

PROPOSAL 40 - 5 AAC 085.045.(4) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorizes the antlerless moose season in Unit 6(C).

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

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. The population objective is 400 moose. A census completed during January 2008 yielded an estimate of 430 moose, 15% of which were calves. Because the available antlerless harvest quota in Unit 6(C) is currently harvested under a federal subsistence season administered by the U.S. Forest Service, we have not held the antlerless hunt since the 1999-2000 season. We recommend re-authorizing the state antlerless hunt in the event that the federal subsistence hunt is cancelled. If recruitment improves, continuation of the antlerless hunts will be necessary to hold the population at objective levels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity will be lost, and the population may exceed the objective, which is based on the availability of adequate habitat during severe winters.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters desiring to take a moose in Unit 6(C).

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-113)

PROPOSAL 41 - 5 AAC 085.045.(4) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorizes the

antlerless moose season in Unit 6(B).

Units and Bag Limit	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(4)		
...		
Unit 6(B)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 antlered moose by registration permit only; up to 30 antlered moose may be taken; or	Aug. 27- Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 drawing permits may be issued for antlerless moose;	Aug. 27- Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. Desirable post-hunt population size is 300-350. A survey completed during January 2008 indicated a population of 240 moose with 9% calves. Antlerless hunts have not been held during recent years because of continued poor calf survival and population level below the management objective. However, if the population increases to the desired level, antlerless hunts may be needed to hold the population at objective levels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the moose population in Unit 6(B) increases and a season is possible, antlerless hunts will provide additional hunting opportunity.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Individuals who desire to hunt antlerless moose in Unit 6(B).

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-112)

PROPOSAL 42 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Delay the brown bear hunting season in Unit 9C as follows:

Delay opening of the brown bear hunting season until October 15 rather than the current date of October 1 in the Katmai Preserve (UCUs 0703 and 0702) of Unit 9C.

ISSUE: A change in the brown bear season - delaying start of the hunt until October 15 in portion of Unit 9C (UCUs 0703 and 0702, the Katmai Preserve). Throughout September and October sport fishermen and bear-viewers heavily use the Katmai Preserve. Late in the fall spawning salmon are most plentiful on these shallow creeks and bears congregate there in large numbers. Brown bear hunting is an incompatible concurrent use

during this period. The reasons for incompatibility include 1) unsafe conditions for firing high powered rifles among recreational users, 2) killing and removing bears while viewers, photographers and anglers are watching.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Other recreationalists will be threatened or even injured by rifle-fire. The image of bear hunting, if not hunting in general, will be tarnished by concurrent uses. Imagine photographs published on the Internet of a bear fishing idly in a pristine Alaska stream in the proximity of a fisherman or a group of bear viewers, followed by the same bear's death by gunshot, trophy photographs of the proud hunter - skinning a headless, skinless human-like carcass lying on the tundra beside the stream.

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

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

PROPOSED BY: Ken and Chris Day (HQ-09 S-G-045)

PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Close brown bear hunting in a portion of Unit 9C as follows:

Funnel Creek, Moraine Creek, and Battle Creek drainages are closed to the sport hunting of brown bear from their headwaters to Kakaklek Lake.

ISSUE: We have been watching and photographing brown bears in this area during the same period since 1999. The first year we saw more than 40 bears in an eight-hour period. These were a mixture of females, sows with cubs, juveniles, and big boars. In subsequent years, we have seen fewer and fewer bears, particularly cubs and big boars. The summer of 2004, we saw approximately fifteen bears during a twelve hour period and had to walk a wide area to spot them. When we first started our trips to this area, the average number of bears taken was in the seven to eight per season. This level of harvest of brown bears per season reflects the historical take for this area long before the Katmai National Preserve was established. According to Alaska Department of Fish and Game harvest data for the 2003-04 season, 34 bears (27 males and 7 females) were taken in this area of Unit 9C. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game data does not include the bears that were wantonly killed and left to rot. Alaska Department of Fish and Game statistics for the most recent season are not yet available.

The authorized harvest of bears from Unit 9C was just increased when qualified local residents were authorized to take ten bears from the Preserve for subsistence harvest. The ten brown bear subsistence harvest by qualified local residents would be in addition to the current harvest of brown bear taken by sport hunting regulations. During a trip to the same area in July 2006, we saw approximately 20 bears, only one of which was a boar. In 2007, I made two trips to the unit and in 2008, on visit--all in the same time frame of late July-

early August and the overall number of bears observed were substantially fewer than seen before the harvest numbers from the unit soared.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This is an outstanding area for bear viewing and photography in a unit of the National Park System that is also open to sport and subsistence hunting. On our trips, we have met individuals and families from across the country and from other parts of the world that have come to see the Alaska brown bear in the natural setting. We can attest how exciting it is, even for an Alaskan, to see numbers of brown bears of all ages chasing salmon in these streams. We can only imagine the awesome thrill it must be for non-Alaskans. If the harvest is not drastically reduced, the brown bears will no longer provide the outstanding remarkable attraction for rainbow trout fishermen, photographers, and tourists who want to see brown bear in a natural Alaskan environment. We have recommended bear viewing trips to a number of our friends and family. If the quality of these trips continues to be diminished, we will be reluctant to continue to make trips to this area and will urge other people to spend their cash this way. The loss of tourist dollars to Homer and to Alaska will be significant. In the ten years that I have been visiting Unit 9C, I have spent approximately \$15,000 for local guides, lodging and food in Homer for two days. My money, as is money spent by tourists and Alaskans visiting Unit 9C stays in Alaska as we are using 100 percent local services.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Bears in this area have been exposed to people fishing for rainbow trout and to bear viewers and photographers in non-threatening situations for a substantial part of each summer. Some bears in Unit 9C come from areas on Cook Inlet where they also had been in close proximity to people in non-threatening situations. Harvesting a brown bear that is regularly exposed to humans is neither fair chase nor a quality Alaskan hunting experience. The quality of brown bear viewing will be greatly improved. It will also enhance the viewing in the McNeil Sanctuary since the bears move back and forth between these areas. As photographers and wildlife viewers, it is important to be able to see animals ranging from cubs to big adults of both sexes. The value of this extraordinarily high quality viewing area is hard to overestimate. If these three drainages are protected, they will provide increasing and renewable income for Alaskans and provide delight to an incalculable number of visitors.

Another incident showing the lack of fair chase with national and international publicity that accompanied the killing of a large sow accustomed to seeing fishermen and photographers as non threatening without any apparent effort by the sportsman other than getting out of their tents will increase pressure for the National Park Service, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Congress to close all of the Katmai Preserve to brown bear harvest. A review of sport hunting in units of the National Park System open to sport hunting authorized by ANILCA, and could lead to closing sport hunting in other preserves in Alaska as a direct result of brown bear harvesting in the Katmai Preserve.

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? As an alternative, we considered recommending that they annual harvest of brown bears be reduced to no more that seven to eight per year or about half of the 25 year average legal harvest of brown bear. This was rejected since the subsistence harvest of brown bears has been established at an annual level of ten bears. We considered other options including a drawing and temporary closure and rejected this option because the population level for brown bear in the area based on aerial counts

in Unit 9C by the NPS and Alaska Department of Fish and Game ranged from 189 in 2005 and 581 in 2007. The 25 average harvest from Unit 9C is 15.1 brown bear, since 2000 the

PROPOSED BY: Jules and Peg Tileston

(HQ-09S-G-055)

PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Modify this regulation to provide the following:

Remainder of Unit 9C: 1 bear every four years **by drawing permit only.**

ISSUE: The current regulation for Unit 9C for the area outside the Naknek River drainage establishes an October 1 to October 21 (odd years only) and May 10 - May 25 (even year only) season for brown bear hunting. Part of Unit 9C includes Katmai National Preserve and the Funnel, Moraine, and Battle Creek drainages. While hunting is permitted within national preserves under the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) of 1980, the act also directed that the National Park Service provide for "high concentrations of brown/grizzly bears and their denning areas" in Katmai National Park and Preserve. Bear viewing guides in this area have reported a decline in the number of bears observed by their clients.

Since the current regulation was expanded in 1999 to include a longer season, the number of brown bears harvested within Katmai National Preserve has steadily, and since 2003, significantly increased. Department of Fish and Game biologists, as recent as 2003, state that a sustainable harvest of brown bears in Katmai Preserve is "7 to 9 bears per calendar year (i.e. about 16 per open regulatory year)." In the 2003/2004 regulatory year, 42 bears were harvested in this area. In the 2005/2006 regulatory year, 35 bears were harvested. We have not seen the numbers yet for 2007/2008. This does not include bears taken for subsistence purposes, poached, or in defense of life and property. Because this is a trophy hunt, big male bears make up the majority of those harvested.

While there may be multiple factors causing the viewable number of bears to decline, we don't know for sure the full range of the causes. We do, however, know that as the harvest levels went up, the number of viewable bears declined. Our concern is the high probability that too many Katmai Preserve bears are being harvested to meet the congressional mandate in ANILCA of providing for "high concentrations" of brown bears. In addition, the impact of this harvest on the age distribution, as well as the overall populations numbers, is at odds with the National Park Organic Act and with direction in Chapter Four of the National Park Management Policies that, in part, directs the Park Service to "strive to understand, maintain, restore and protect the inherent integrity of the natural resources...". To support a sustainable bear harvest in Unit 9C that also meets the Park Service mandate, a reliable study needs to be done on both bear populations and why are fewer being observed?

The National Park Service and the state of Alaska need to collaborate to determine what level of harvest, if any, can occur in Katmai Preserve and still meet the federal mandate of "high concentrations" of brown bears. Once a harvest level is determined, we request that the department adopt a draw hunt to ensure that only the agreed upon harvest level is taken each year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be harvested levels of brown bear that conflict with the National Park Organic Act and other federal laws, including the mandate found in ANILCA to provide for "high concentrations" of brown bears. Not only will this continued violation of federal law exacerbate state/federal tensions over jurisdiction, but continued hunting at the current level will contribute to the depletion of brown bears in the greater McNeil /Katmai region - a decrease that has been observed and documented by the department at McNeil since 1998. Observations by bear viewing operators in the immediate area in Katmai Preserve have also documented a serious depletion in bear numbers.

At risk here is one of the world's premier brown bear viewing areas. Because of the lack of vegetation, this area provides a unique opportunity to observe brown bears in their natural habitat. These bears become

habituated to human observation and the result is bear viewing unlike anywhere else in the world. This is exemplified by the volume of people that utilize bear viewing guides each summer and pay significant money to observe these bears. The close proximity of these bears to Alaska's major population centers and the protected status of McNeil and Katmai bears have created a unique bear viewing opportunity that provides jobs and a good source of income to bear viewing guides living on the Kenai Peninsula, King Salmon, and Kodiak. One study commissioned by the University of Alaska's Institute for Social and Economic Research found that visitors to Alaska who include a brown bear viewing experience in their visit spend almost twice as much on their vacation as the average visitor and those persons coming to Alaska specifically to view brown bears spend more than 2.5 times as much. The study further documented that one operator in Homer directly generates almost 1.5 million in visitor spending.

This sustainable economic activity is at risk, as well as the educational and inspirational opportunities provided by this unique bear viewing experience.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It improves the quality of the bear viewing resource by reducing the overharvest of brown bears. This will also, eventually, improve the quality of the hunting in this area as only a few bears will be harvested each year and those bears will undoubtedly be trophy sized.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The bear population will increase. The National Park Service will benefit from being able to meet its Congressional mandate. The State of Alaska will benefit by being seen as partnering with the federal government on how to sustain a hunt in an area with a specific population directive from Congress. Those hunters that are eventually allowed back into this area will benefit from trophy size bears. Visitors and residents alike will benefit by the return to historic brown bear population numbers giving unsurpassed brown bear viewing experiences found nowhere else in the world. The opportunity to view bears at historic population levels will continue to be an economic benefit to gateway communities on the Kenai Peninsula, Anchorage, and Kodiak.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A small number of hunters will not be able to hunt bears in this area. There is some economic loss from air transport and guide services.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Stopping the hunt would not necessarily meet the mandate of ANILCA to provide for hunting opportunities in national preserves. Congress intended for hunting to occur, but only in a manner and fashion that does not conflict with the other purposes of national preserve units. In that context, stopping the hunt with no future opportunity for it to be resumed once population levels have rebuilt and a sustainable harvest number has been determined is not consistent with Congressional intent.

PROPOSED BY: Jim Stratton, National Parks Conservation Association (SC-09S-G-035)

PROPOSAL 45 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend this regulation for portions of Unit 9C as follows:

Remainder of Unit 9C: Both residents and nonresidents - **open season is May 10 to May 25 (even years only).**

ISSUE: The concern is that too many brown bears are being harvested in the Katmai Preserve. The hunt in this area needs to be shortened to drop the harvest numbers back into the range established by the Department of Fish and Game biologists and to meet the US congressional mandate in the *Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act* (ANILCA) of providing for "high concentrations" of brown bears.

The current regulation was expanded in 1999 to include a longer season. As a result, the number of brown bears harvested within Katmai National Preserve has steadily, and since 2003, significantly increased. In the 2003/2004 regulatory year, 34 bears were harvested, 41 if you include the seven that were "poached". In the

2005/2006 regulatory year, 35 bears were harvested. These numbers do not include bears taken in defense of life and property. Department of Fish and Game biologists in 20005 stated that a sustainable harvest of brown bears in Katmai Preserve is "7 to 9 bears per calendar year" (about 16 per open regulatory year).

Additionally, in 2008 adding to the already increased hunting pressure was the creation of a new federal subsistence hunt for the Katmai Preserve area, which allows for the taking of up to 10 brown bears per calendar year.

In looking at the harvest success rates over the past few hunts, dropping the fall hunt altogether and only providing for a May 10-May 25 hunt in even years only could be a way of reaching a harvest level that doesn't conflict with the federal mandate of "high concentrations."

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be high harvest levels of brown bear; the numbers and age diversity of bears will continue to decline. Conflicts could occur between the State of Alaska and the federal government over the National Park Service mandate to provide for "high concentrations" of brown bears. At risk are not only the brown bears in this area, but also part of a critical economic engine that generates revenue and jobs for the Kenai Peninsula, Alaska Peninsula, Kodiak, and Anchorage.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? We should see increases in the overall numbers and age diversity of the bears. Bear viewers will have a higher quality experience. It will also improve the quality of the hunting in this area as only a few bears will be harvested each year and those bears will undoubtedly be trophy sized.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The State of Alaska will benefit by being seen as cooperating with the federal government over how to sustain a hunt in an area with a specific population directive from Congress. The National Park Service will benefit from being able to meet its Congressional mandate. Visitors and residents alike will benefit by increased brown bear numbers, providing high quality bear viewing experiences. The opportunity to view bears will continue to be an economic benefit to gateway communities of the Kenai and Alaska Peninsulas, Kodiak, and Anchorage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? In the short term, a small number of hunters will not be able to hunt fall bears in this area. However, if no attempt is made to address the overharvest of bears, the long-term impact will be that all hunting in the Katmai Preserve could be closed. There is some economic loss from air transport and guide services.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close the area to hunting. A shorter season is a more reasonable approach.

PROPOSED BY: Dave Bachrach (SC-09S-G-073)

PROPOSAL 46 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Alter the season for brown bear in Unit 9D remainder as follows:

Brown bear season could be September 20th through October 15th for residents and nonresidents in Unit 9D. Season to start 10 days earlier in the fall on September 20th every other fall.

ISSUE: Over abundance of nuisance and problem bears in local communities.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More old bears. Bear danger increased for locals; less meat animals for local subsistence hunters/calf reduction.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Improve calf survival rate for moose and caribou.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local resident moose and caribou population will increase. Guides could take more hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Brown bear hunt every fall instead of every other fall. To much set up cost for guides to hunt every year.

PROPOSED BY: Nelson Lagoon Advisory Committee (SW-08-G-03)

PROPOSAL 47 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Open a brown bear hunting season for residents in Unit 9E as follows:

One brown bear every regulatory year. State of Alaska residents only.

ISSUE: Over population of brown bear in Unit 9E. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game estimates there is currently a brown bear population of 6,500 bears in Unit 9E. This is a three-fold increase in the number of bear in this game unit since the early 1980's. Of particular concern is that the population estimate of brown bear in this game unit is based on harvest data only. No hard population data is available.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The brown bear population in Unit 9E will continue to increase. Increased population has caused safety concerns among the residents of Unit 9E.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? A few resident big game guides but more importantly the residents of the communities located within Unit 9E.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Residents of Unit 9E.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee (SW-08-G-14)

PROPOSAL 48 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. Special provisions for Unit 10 brown bear permit hunts. Create a permit drawing system for brown bear in Unit 10, Unimak Island as follows:

The following caveats found in this proposal have been established in the Unit 8 Kodiak brown bear drawing allocation system and represent the best system in the United States for allocating access to a big game animal permit offered through a lottery. The proposed regulation change would create new language that would be added to the previously established permit drawing application for Unit 10 Unimak Island brown bear drawing.

Drawing permits for nonresident hunters, which include the following conditions:

- a. 40 percent of the permits allocated to nonresidents. (The ten year average.) Next of kin nonresidents would qualify in the resident allocation only.
- b. A signed and dated guide-client agreement must be on file in the area Department of Fish and Game office at time of drawing application deadline.
- c. The guide on the agreement must be registered in Unit 10 prior to the drawing application.
- d. A guide may not submit more nonresident guide-client agreements than there are permits available for

nonresidents in the drawing.

e. An alternate list will be established that represent the unsuccessful drawing applicants in the order that they were selected in the drawing.

ISSUE: I began hunting Unimak Island professionally in 1995 when I became one of two big game services providers permitted by the Izembek Refuge. Since that time, with 15 permits available yearly, I have had three of my nonresident clients draw tags in 13 years. I turned down one nonresident permit holder who intended to hunt with his own non-permitted guide as it violated my refuge permit guidelines. I have been contacted by and guided three residents who chose to hire a guide for Unimak at a much reduced rate. The other permits issued in the last 13 years have been utilized by the one other big game service provider; resident hunters; or have gone unutilized due to hunter cancellation. Historically residents have drawn slightly better than half of the 15 permits each year. I have a following of prospective bear clients that could have filled the other six bear tags each year if they could successfully get drawn. All but three of the nonresident drawing application winners have been clients of the other permitted guides on the refuge in the last 13 years. I have not had one client draw in the last 7 years.

If a more equitable drawing system is not implemented, the public's resource will continue to be monopolized by one commercial service provider which will impact options and services available to the public when the smaller operation is displaced completely. An unbalanced visitor and commercial operator perspective will ultimately result in the degradation of this premier wilderness area. This is further explained in section five.

The Board of Game (board) has addressed inequitable permit drawing systems in other areas of the state. The Board has implemented caveats to the drawings in Unit 8, Kodiak that could be identically applied in Unit 10, to rectify the problem on Unimak.

Resident access to these permits could be in jeopardy in subsequent years due to the media exposure generated by high profile booking agents, premier drawing application service officers, the two US Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) permitted guides offering services on the Izembek Refuge, Unimak Island and the speculating guides certified for Unit 10 that are flooding the drawing with applicants. The State of Alaska Governor's tag program also features a Unimak Island brown bear tag to be auctioned each year at a high profile venue such as the Boone and Crockett Club or the Federation of North American Wild Sheep convention. This problem will continue to grow.

Due to the lack of safeguards in the present allocation system for bear permits on Unimak Island, a number of permits have in the past and will in the future continue to go unused. In the past, speculating guides have entered their client's names into the drawing and held a winning permit hostage, until the Service permitted guide agreed to sign the state hunt record.

The Service gave two big game guide permits on Unimak and stated that they felt it was important and beneficial to have two businesses in operation. One of those businesses has lost its presence on the refuge. As a small business owner I am not willing to flood the drawing system which has been identified as a problem and dealt with by a board proposal on Kodiak. I am patiently waiting for resolution through this board system for the same corrective measures in Unit 10, Unimak Island.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? a.) The destiny of this highly sought after big game permit will be in the hands of the out of state booking agencies, premier drawing application service providers, and the guides that adhere to the big box marketing philosophy of flooding the drawing system to gain control of the access to a public recreational resource.

b.) The number of permits that could go unused, due to the lack of safeguards in the present system adversely impacts the harvest goals of the Service and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. If a successful applicant, either a hunter or anti-hunter, does not use the permit they have drawn, that permit has no chance of being hunted under the current system. c.) The guide that wants to have control of his own marketing, wants

the personal contact with his prospective clients, and doesn't want to flood drawings will suffer adverse consequences in his business and will be displaced by not turning his marketing over to big box drawing application services. His distinct and different service will not be available to the public due to years of his clients being out-numbered and unable to draw. An emergency exists for the displaced permitted guide and for the refuge who stated it was in their best interest and the public's best interest to have these two distinctly different permitted operators. The refuge can not allocate permit access, only the Board has that authority.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Unimak Island is a wild and remote wilderness destination. The Service has found that it is in the public's best interest to offer two different products to the recreational hunter needing the service of a commercial guide. One service provider is a small sole proprietor providing wilderness backpack sport hunting and adhering to traditional Boone and Crocket fair chase hunting ethics and techniques. The other guide service is a high profile partnership with a large permitted base camp with airplanes on the ground. The latter with its marketing techniques has taken all but three of the nonresident permits for the last 13 years. Hunters desiring these two different kinds of services will have an equal chance of drawing and Alaska resident applicants will have a better chance of being drawn due to their own percentage of the allocation if this proposal is implemented.

Hunters who hold the highest ethics of fair chase and have strong desire to protect wilderness areas are being "out-drawn" and losing their opportunity to experience Unimak Island. If the majority of visitors to the refuge have lower standards for a wilderness experience, this will ultimately change the refuge. For instance when I was first awarded my permit in 1995, planes were not allowed to land above the high tide line on Unimak Island. It was the other permit holder with his fleet of planes and "need" of a base camp with planes on the ground that implemented a change of policy on Unimak, which dramatically impacted the "wilderness" quality. An unbalanced visitor and commercial operator perspective will ultimately degrade this premier wilderness area.

With a system that requires: a). a guide-client agreement with a guide who is registered and committed in the Unit and b). who is restricted to submitting only as many guide-client agreements as there are permits available in the drawing; the nonresident hunters will benefit in multiple ways. First they will have more opportunity to interface with their actual guide rather than an out of state, multi-level, big box marketing agency. Second, their guide will be assured to have experience and knowledge of the area he is applying for as "prospecting" in the drawings by guides will be eliminated. Third, nonresident hunters who are submitted in the drawing will have better odds to draw a permit.

The small family-owned guide service provider offering a true wilderness experience is being squeezed out. The public's choice of products is being diminished. The USFWS has developed and implemented on federal refuges the system now in place for providing guiding services to the public. The Board needs to do what the Service can not do, and that is to allocate the bear permits in a fair and logical system that serves the public's best interest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups. The two guides that are permitted will be able to concentrate on the stewardship of the resources and their individual client relationships instead having to flood the drawing with anonymous names. Their marketing expenses will be decreased. The chance of drawing a permit for a nonresident applicant or resident applicant will be greater with the implementation of this proposal. The refuge's intention of having two viable guides on Unimak will be realized. Residents will be guaranteed a greater percentage allocation than the nonresident allocation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Big box booking agents, premier drawing application services and guides who compete by flooding drawings to gain an advantage. Speculating guides that bounce from area to area depending on where their hunters draw, and who try to cut last minute deals with private landowners and/or permitted guides on the refuge. During my permitted time on Unimak I have witnessed different guides submitting names for this drawing, and I am sure there are more that I am not privy to. The guides "prospecting" for a client, that have nothing invested in this guide use area are competing for permits. They

have nothing to lose if they don't draw, but when they do draw, they create conflicts and create pressure for the permitted guides to joint-venture with them, in violations of their refuge permits. These prospecting speculators will suffer, as they will not be able to operate in their usual and accustomed way.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered suggesting to the refuge staff that they divide Unimak in half and make two sole use guide use areas with two separate drawing areas. Also that there be a nonresident percentage allocation in each area and an alternate list be established. This solution doesn't seem realistic due to the considerable effort it would take for all the participants to come to a consensus on the boundaries. I also considered negotiating and agreement with the other guide permitted on the refuge to alternate seasons that we would submit names in the drawing. This is not a realistic solution due to the other guides desire to dominate the allocation by flooding the drawings with applicants, and the inability of either of us to predict how many other speculating guides are submitting names in the drawing. I considered doing nothing and letting the status quo prevail. If I don't fight for the solutions to these problems then I will continue to be displaced; the greater public interest that is served when the public has a choice between two different products will be diminished even further in the future. The Big Game Commercial Services Guide Board has already stated they will not and can not address permit allocation that is something the Board needs to do through its proposal process.

PROPOSED BY: Tim Booch (SC-09S-G-029)

PROPOSAL 49 - 5 AAC 92.125. Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans. Create a predation control plan in Unit 17B as follows:

Adopt a similar brown bear control permit program for Unit 17B that is now implemented for black bear, as of July 1, 2008 in Unit 16 (Control Permit ML202 and ML 212) and brown bear in Unit 19D (MB301) and Unit 20E (MB303).

Permits will be issued to take brown bears for the purposes of predation control in Unit 17B.

Permit Conditions

- Permits will be issued to take brown bears for the purposes of predation control in Unit 17B.
- Local licensed residents may obtain a bear control permit.
- The permit and valid resident Alaska Hunting licensing must be carried while participating in this control program.
- The permit is not transferable and applies only to brown bears.
- Cubs and females accompanied by cubs may not be taken; however there is no closed season and no limit to the number of brown bears taken by an individual permittee.
- All hides and skulls must be salvaged and sealed by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game within 30 days of take.
- After sealing, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game will issue permits allowing permittees to sell untanned hides (with claws attached) and skulls, or tanned hides (with claws attached) and skulls, as long as sale tag remains attached.
- Permittees are required to complete the mail-in report section of the permit. Mail-in reports must be received at the Dillingham, Alaska Department of Fish and Game office after completion of control activities. Failure to report on the permit is cause for denial of future control permits.
- Permits will be cancelled if necessary to prevent exceeding the desired predation control quota.

ISSUE: The brown bear population in Unit 17 has skyrocketed in the past few years. Sows with cubs, lots of adolescences, and large males, are seen everywhere. The increased numbers of bears are becoming a serious problem to the moose population which local residents rely upon for subsistence food.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? An increase in the number of brown bears is seen by locals in Unit 17B. This increased numbers of bears prey on moose and especially the moose calves. In Unit

17B the local residents are seeing very few moose calves or even moose calf tracks, but gravel bars, sloughs, and creeks are covered with bear tracks. If the brown bear population continues to increase and the problem is not solved very soon, the moose population could reach a critical point of no return.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will increase the numbers of brown bears harvested in a controlled manner, to insure a quality subsistence moose harvest for local residents in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All moose hunters would benefit from an increase number of moose that would otherwise be eaten by brown bears. If nothing is done soon, the moose population will decline due to the number of calves taken by brown bears.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer. The proposal has a safeguard that will cancel the brown bear control permits" to prevent exceeding the desired predation control quota.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No closed season on brown bear and no limit in Unit 17B. However, this would not have the safeguards to prevent exceeding the desired predation control quota that a control permit would have.

PROPOSED BY: Nushagak Advisory Committee (SW-08-G-01)

PROPOSAL 50 - 5 AAC 92.125. Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans. Implement predator management in Unit 17B and 17C as follows:

Adopt and implement a state-managed predator management plan in Unit 17B and 17C to reduce brown bear populations.

ISSUE: Very high and increasing numbers of brown bears in Unit 17B and 17C. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game has no population estimates on bears other than admitting that there is no shortage of them. Local opinion is that all agree and testify that bear populations have skyrocketed and has had an impact on moose calf recruitment and that they also prey on adult moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose populations will continue to decline or be in jeopardy. Moose in Unit 17B are below the intensive management (IM) objective threshold. Moose in Unit 17C currently are above the IM objective threshold. Moose in Unit 17C are currently above the IM objective but can very easily fall below if calf recruitment and/or if the moose population declines due to hunting pressure, mortality, old age, health, predation, etc.

Will the quality of the resource harvested be improved?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport and subsistence hunters in Unit 17.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Liberalizing bag limit and season. Rejected because we feel that it will not effectively increase harvest.

PROPOSED BY: Nushagak Advisory Committee (SW-08-G-12)

PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Change the season and bag limit for brown bear in Unit 17B as follow:

Set the brown bear harvest regulations back to the pre-Intensive Management rule that provided for 1 bear every four years in two seasons: September 20 to October 10 or May 10-25 for that portion of Unit 17B that is in Lake Clark National Preserve.

ISSUE: While the State of Alaska regulates hunting on lands managed by the National Park Service and designated by Congress as national preserves, it does so only in as far as that these state regulations do not conflict with park purposes, park regulations and management directives, and the legislative direction provided by Congress when Alaska's park units were created (36 CFR 13.40(d)). National preserves in Alaska are bound to the Organic Act as well as to ANILCA and they are managed under the same management policies as parks in the Lower 48. Direction in both ANILCA and the management policies make it clear that while harvesting wildlife in national preserves can occur, it cannot deplete healthy populations or unacceptably impact natural processes, natural distributions, densities, age-class distributions and behaviors, and harvest cannot be done for the purpose of increasing the numbers of harvested species (i.e. predator control). Unfortunately, the passage of the state of Alaska's Intensive Management statute in 1994 set the state on a course of conflict with these NPS directives.

The National Park Service Organic Act clearly states that the purpose of the national park system is to "...conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein." The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (ANILCA) gives as one of its primary purposes providing "... for the maintenance of sound populations of, and habitat for, wildlife species...(section 101(b))", and in providing for these wildlife species, the populations in national preserves are to remain "healthy (section 815 (1))." And each park's enabling language clearly supports wildlife protection as a primary park purpose (see ANILCA Section II).

There is specific direction in ANILCA that provides for hunting in national preserves and we are not contesting that right. ANILCA section 1313 states that "A National Preserve in Alaska shall be administered and managed as a unit of the National Park System in the same manner as a national park... except that the taking of fish and wildlife for sport purposes... shall be allowed in a national preserve under applicable State and Federal law and regulation." The key words here are "administered and managed as a unit of the National Park system in the same manner as a national Park.. under applicable State and Federal law and regulation". Management direction for all units of the national park system in Alaska is firmly grounded in the 1916 Organic Act as set forth in ANILCA Section 203.

Of particular concern to the request made in this proposal, the National Park Service Management Policies at 4.4.2, make it abundantly clear that the manipulation of wildlife populations is not allowed: "The Service does not engage in activities to reduce the numbers of native species for the purpose of increasing the numbers of harvested species (i.e., predator control), nor does the Service permit others to do so on lands managed by the National Park Service."

In this proposal, the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) is concerned only about the application of existing bear harvest regulations in those parts of Unit 17B that are located in Lake Clark National Preserve. As such our proposed regulation change only addresses national preserve lands and makes no comment, judgment or suggestion for how the state of Alaska manages wildlife on its own or other federal lands.

When the state's Intensive Management Act was passed, brown bear harvest in 17B was one bear every four years in two seasons: September 20 to October 10 or May 10-25. Subsequent changes to the state's brown bear regulations for this unit were made in Regulatory Year (RY) 1997 when the spring season was liberalized to start earlier on April 15 to May 25, RY 2001 when the season was again liberalized to a single season from September 20 to May 25, RY 2003 when the bag limit was increased to 1 bear/year and finally in RY 2005 when the start of the season was liberalized to start on September 10 to May 25.

It is unclear from reading the state's Bear Management Reports(BMRs) (2002-2004 and 2004 to 2006) how much the Department of Fish and Game and the Board of Game relied on the need to increase moose and /or caribou populations as the reason for liberalizing bear harvest in Unit 17. However, from reading the proposals that led to the two most recent changes (RY 2003 bag limit and RY 2005 season extension) it is clear that the purpose of the proposers was to reduce predation for the benefit of moose and caribou. These stated purposes for requesting the manipulation of brown bear populations to benefit moose for human

consumption are in direct conflict with the direction given to the National Park Service that such manipulation cannot occur on its lands.

The two BMRs are clear that predominantly nonresident hunting pressure is increasing and having an impact on the bear population with harvest levels double the department's population objective of sustaining an annual harvest of 50 bears composed of at least 50% males. When the bag limit was liberalized in 2003, the numbers started increasing with 97 harvested in 2002-2003, 100 harvested in 2003-2004, 85 harvested in 2004-2005, and 119 in 2005-2006. And all of this against a backdrop of not really knowing the base bear population - the 2004 - 2006 BMR states "No population size or density estimates have been made for the brown bear population in Unit 17."

The liberalization of the season in 2005 was also objected to by the National Park Service in its February 17, 2005 letter to the Board. Ignoring this NPS request to not change the bag limit conflicts with the spirit of cooperation and mutual decision making set forth in the Master Memorandum of Understanding between NPS and the State of Alaska.

Given we don't really know how many bears live in the area and the harvest has been double that listed in the BMR's population objective, we are concerned about the impact on the bear population in that portion of 17B that is in Lake Clark National Preserve. Our goal is to perpetuate population levels at or near pre-ANILCA levels as this was the population levels known to Congress when they recognized sport hunting and established part of Lake Clark as a national preserve. As such, we would ask that the season and bag limit restrictions that were in place in 1993 be reinstated to ensure that as more people learn about the hunting opportunities in Lake Clark National Preserve, we don't over harvest our brown bear populations below the Congressionally mandated "healthy" levels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? State regulations will continue to be in conflict with federal statutes and management policies, setting up an inevitable showdown between state and federal authority that will most likely end in court at a considerable cost of time and resources for both entities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Healthy brown bear populations, as directed by ANILCA would be ensured in Lake Clark National Preserves and there would be no risk of the state's Intensive Management statutes, as embodied in the current liberalized harvest regulations, causing a reduction in the wolf population to an unhealthy level, which could/would cause the Park Service to take action to close the area to hunting altogether.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All people who appreciate that a primary management goal of national preserves in Alaska is to sustain healthy populations of wildlife, including brown bears, and that hunting in national preserves should be managed to meet federal wildlife statutes, regulations and policies, not the state of Alaska's.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those that wrongly believe that the federal government does not have authority to manage wildlife living within the boundaries of national park system units.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Jim Stratton, National Parks Conservation Association (SC-09S-G-042)

PROPOSAL 52 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Extend the brown bear hunting season in Unit 17 as follows:

Brown bear season in Unit 17, **September 1 - May 25.**

ISSUE: Fall brown bear needs to be opened earlier. Season opening needs to be changed from September 10 to September 1 annually. Several factors developing over the last decade and a half lead to the needed change.

In the early to mid 1990s the opening date of September 20 was fine. The bears had left the fish on the rivers and were in the hills and out on the tundra eating berries. Since Unit 17 has always had a fair number of guides, there was a reluctance to open the season earlier for fear the number of guides would increase. This was probably a valid concern. However, the Mulchatna Caribou Herd was increasing and drawing attention to the area. The herd wintered and calved in the area. The calving took and kept a lot of bear predation pressure off the moose calves and moose prospered. As the Department of Fish and Game directed more and more caribou hunting pressure to the area in the fall and late in to the fall, brown bear began to change their habits. Planes were constantly in the air buzzing the tundra. This kept the bears in the brush during the day and turned them nocturnal. Eventually, by the year 2000, the bears had decided not to leave the river vegetative corridor and head for the tundra berries. They stayed on the rivers and changed their diet to high bush cranberries. In the past, during moose season, the bears had always made a transition from river corridor to tundra. Likewise, the moose, were entering the rut and transitioned from the outer edges of the river vegetative corridor towards the river. This choreographed transition no longer happens as it did. The caribou are no longer available for an alternative meat source. There has been an increase in the number of adult moose being killed in the fall by the bigger bears. The big moose killing bears did not get big by being stupid. By the time moose season opens now, September 10, the bigger bears are pretty much done with feeding on fish, they are going nocturnal and or feeding on high bush cranberries as they wander in the thick woods and brush along the river. You can't see them or effectively hunt them. The bears taken seem to be more smaller, younger bears and the big ones survive. Opening the season September 1 will allow hunters to have a few more hunting days when the bears are still feeding on fish where you stand a chance of getting one. It also opens up the important time of when moose may be killed and bears hunted on the gut pile. This is probably the most effective way of harvesting a large moose killing bear since the larger bears in the area will command the gut pile. Chances are good that a hunter will be charged when walking into a moose kill site. Depending on when and where a moose is killed, there will be a bear on the gut pile with in hours and almost always by 36 hours. If we do not open the brown bear season earlier and make preventative regulations now, we will eventually see a drop in moose populations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose populations in the area will eventually drop due to bear predation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Moose populations will increase or at least not decline while bear number will be held in check to some degree.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident and nonresident moose and brown bear hunters

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Opening brown bear season August 20th. There was a lot of support in the village for opening the bear season to coincide with the resident moose season so bears could be hunted over the gut piles. Area residents want the bear population reduced. No doubt. And it would be very effective in reducing bear numbers with a longer season, more gut piles and bears still on the fish with longer daylight hours. The question is whether it would be too effective and what condition would the hides be in? Opening the season August 25 may be good date. From what I have heard, there are a lot of bears shot at wounded or killed in the summer and left. Maybe as many as are killed in the fall. The Board of Game should also be aware that the Big Game Commercial Services Guide Board and the Department of Natural Resources are currently trying to establish exclusive guide use areas around the state. If the current plans are enacted by 2010, one guide will most likely not be able to keep up with current bear kill rate and to maintain a stable moose and bear populations in balance, area residents will have to take more bears.

PROPOSED BY: Don Duncan

(INT-09S-G-002)

PROPOSAL 53 - - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou.

Close the season for the Southern Peninsula Caribou Herd in Unit 9D.

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

(4)

Unit 9(D)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:
[1 BULL BY REGISTRATION
PERMIT ONLY]

No open season
[AUG. 10-SEPT. 30
NOV. 15-MAR. 31]

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season

ISSUE: The Southern Peninsula Caribou Herd in Unit 9D has declined from a recent peak in population size of 4,100 caribou in 2002. During the summer of 2008, the population size was estimated to be 700 caribou following the first year of intensive management. The population decline was primarily attributed to the low calf recruitment that occurred over the past 6 years (16, 8, 7, 6, 1, and 0.5 calves: 100 cows in the fall of 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007 respectively). Reduction of wolves on the caribou calving grounds appears to have halted the decline and begun a recovery.

A cooperative, interagency (the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) operational plan was adopted in March 2008 for the Southern Alaska Peninsula Caribou Herd. This plan sets the following population and management objectives:

- 1 Sustain a combined population size of 3,000–4,000 animals
- 2 Maintain a minimum fall bull:cow ratio of 35:100

Low calf recruitment over the past 6 years has been insufficient to offset adult mortality and has likely altered the population age structure sufficiently to prolong recovery of this herd. Survey results also indicates a reduced bull:cow ratio, which may compromise future productivity if the declining trend continues.

Based on current population parameters, there is no anticipated allowable harvest in the Southern Alaska Peninsula Caribou Herd. All hunting opportunity will be eliminated to allow the population to recover from the recent decline. A hunting season will be proposed when the population reaches objective levels.

If the population continues to decline, population recovery will be prolonged and future opportunity for caribou hunters in GMU 9D will be further compromised.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

If the population continues to decline, population recovery will be prolonged and conservation concerns will continue over a longer period.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, closing the hunting season is required for the conservation and recovery of the herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The season was already closed by emergency order in 2007. No permits were issued in 2008. No effect is anticipated. However, hunters will benefit when the herd does recover.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who desire to hunt a small caribou population to extirpation.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Continued management through emergency order by the department.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-094)

PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou.

Close resident and nonresident hunting for caribou on Unimak Island.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open season
(5)		
Unit 10. Unimak Island Only [1 CARIBOU]	<u>No open season</u> [AUG. 10-SEPT. 30 NOV. 15-MAR. 31]	<u>No open season</u> [SEPT. 1-SEPT. 30]

ISSUE: The population size and sex ratio of the Unimak Caribou Herd in Unit 10 has declined significantly as a result of poor calf recruitment (7, 6, and 6 calves: 100 cows in the fall of 2005, 2007, and 2008 respectively). During the fall composition surveys in 2008 biologists estimated the current sex ratio to be 9.3 bulls:100 cows and the fall calf ratio is 6.2 calves:100 cows. These results are similar to patterns observed in other caribou herds in Southwest Alaska and suggest that Unimak caribou has experienced a prolonged period of poor calf recruitment which has skewed the population age structure towards older age animal. Further declines in the sex ratio and population size should be expected.

Based on the composition data observed in the fall of 2008 and general observations reported by biologists and a hunting guide, it is reasonable to conclude that there is no harvestable surplus of caribou in the Unimak Caribou Herd and that any continued harvest will be detrimental to the future of this herd. All hunting opportunity must be eliminated to allow the population to recover.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

If the sex ratio and population size continue to decline, productivity of the population will be reduced and the growth potential of the herd may be compromised.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, closing the hunting season is required for the conservation and recovery of the herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who desire the long term conservation of this herd and a future sustainable population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-95)

PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 92.108. Identified big game prey populations and objectives.

Change the Intensive Management population and harvest objective for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.

Population	Finding	Population Objective	Harvest Objective
Caribou Herds			
....			
Mulchatna	Positive	<u>30,000-80,000</u> [100,000-150,000]	<u>2,400-8,000</u> [6,000-15,000]
....			

ISSUE: Intensive Management population and harvest objectives for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd were established in 2001 when the estimated herd size was 160,000 to 180,000 caribou. Herd size has declined dramatically since then. Surveys since 2001 suggest the large size attained by this herd (estimated at 200,000 caribou in 1996) likely contributed to conditions leading to reduced productivity and survival. Managing this herd at a lower, more realistic herd size is needed to avoid drastic population fluctuations which have characterized this herd in the past.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? An unrealistic and perhaps detrimental population objective for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd will remain in the regulations.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The caribou herd will be more productive.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Not applicable

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Not applicable

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Retain existing Intensive Management population and harvest objectives. Eliminate population objective entirely and use only harvest objectives for naturally fluctuating caribou herds.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-106)

PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou.
Change bag limit for portions of Units 17A & 17C.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
(12)		

Unit 17A, all drainages east of Right hand Point

RESIDENT HUNTERS:
[5] **1 caribou may be taken during the season to be announced by emergency or-**

(Season to be announced)

der]; HOWEVER, THE COMMISSIONER MAY CLOSE AND IMMEDIATELY REOPEN, BY EMERGENCY ORDER, A SEASON DURING WHICH THE BAG LIMIT IS LESS THAN 5 CARIBOU]

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season

Remainder of Unit 17(A)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

2 caribou; however , no more than 1 bull may be taken and no more than 1 caribou may be taken from Aug. 1 – Jan. 31

Aug. 1 – Mar. 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season

Unit 17(B), that portion in the Unit 17(B) nonresident closed area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

2 caribou; however , no more than 1 bull may be taken and no more than 1 caribou may be taken from Aug. 1 – Jan. 31

Aug. 1 – Mar. 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season

Remainder of Unit 17(B), and that portion of Unit 17(C) east of the Wood River and Wood River Lakes

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

2 caribou; however , no more than 1 bull may be taken and no more than 1 caribou may be taken from Aug. 1 – Jan. 31

Aug. 1 – Mar. 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

Sept 1 – Sept 15

Remainder of Unit 17(C)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

[5] **1 caribou may be taken during the season to be announced by emergency order**]; HOWEVER, THE COM-

(Season to be announced)

MISSIONER MAY CLOSE AND IMMEDIATELY REOPEN, BY EMERGENCY ORDER, A SEASON DURING WHICH THE BAG LIMIT IS LESS THAN 5 CARIBOU]

DIATELY REOPEN, BY EMERGENCY ORDER, A SEASON DURING WHICH THE BAG LIMIT IS LESS THAN 5 CARIBOU]

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season

...

ISSUE: Hunters reading the hunting regulation booklet find an area within the range of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd with a bag limit listed as 5 caribou, and anticipate they will be able to take 5 caribou in that area. This proposal would reduce the confusion in that area of GMUs 17A and 17C that are closed for the protection of the nearby Nushagak Peninsula Caribou Herd. This is an area where Mulchatna Caribou are rarely found. Bag limits throughout the rest of the range of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd have been reduced as the herd's numbers have changed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to be confused as to the bag limit for caribou in the area and what areas are open, and anticipate there is an area where they could take 5 caribou.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This will make the regulations less confusing for caribou hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, this reduced bag limit is more closely aligned with current regulations in the Mulchatna area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Keep present regulation.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-107)

PROPOSAL 57 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Close the nonresident hunting season for Mulchatna Caribou as follows.

Close Mulchatna Caribou hunting for nonresidents in Units 9, 17, 18, and 19.

ISSUE: The diminishing Mulchatna Caribou Herd and the low bull count of the herd.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Mulchatna Caribou Herd will continue to decline, especially the large bulls which are needed to father calves, which are below what is needed to be sustainable.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident Mulchatna Caribou Herd hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresidents looking for trophy bulls.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Closing the season for bulls to residents and nonresidents.

PROPOSED BY: Lake Iliamna Advisory Committee (SW-08-G-04)

PROPOSAL 58 - 5AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change the moose bag limit

during the winter season in Unit 9 to one antlered bull.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open season
(8)		
Unit 9(A)		
1 bull	Sept. 1-Sept. 15	Sept. 5-Sept. 15
Unit 9(B)		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull; <u>or</u>	Sept. 1-Sept. 15	
<u>1 antlered bull</u>	Dec. 15-Jan. 15	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side		Sept. 5-Sept. 15
Unit 9(C), that portion draining into the Naknek River		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull; <u>or</u>	Sept. 1-Sept. 15	
<u>1 antlered bull</u>	Dec. 1-Dec. 31	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side		Sept. 5-Sept. 15
Remainder of Unit 9(C)		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull; <u>or</u>	Sept. 1-Sept. 15	
<u>1 antlered bull</u>	Dec. 15-Jan. 15	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with 50-inch antlers		Sept. 5-Sept. 15

Unit 9B and require antler destruction as follows:

Moose season to open August 20 - September 15 from August 20 - September 5; the antlers have to be cut in half to destroy the trophy value.

ISSUE: The difficulty for residents to harvest moose during the fall season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Residents will continue to have low harvest levels

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local meat hunters

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lake Iliamna Advisory Committee (SW-08-G-05)

PROPOSAL 60 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Provide a registration hunt in Unit 17C as follows:

Open season for moose west and south of the Wood River for this registration hunt. Include all areas as the fall hunt except 50 feet off of the Aleknagik Road and within city limits.

Issue: Registration winter moose hunt December 1 to 31 (RM585).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Warm winters and climate changes do not freeze the Wood River in Unit 17C; most of the time it has been uncrossable. More and more the river doesn't freeze until later in the winter. So local residents cannot access open hunting grounds. Eliminate that cumbersome and costly process for villages west of the Wood River to request hunt extensions and/or to open a special hunt by emergency order. Open west and south of the Wood River to this resident winter hunt.

WHO WILL BENEFIT? All residents of Alaska, State of Alaska, Division of Boards Budget and Joint Boards members wouldn't have to meet to give villages do process.

WHO WILL SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Keep it as is. Climate change and global warming is impacting winter and freezing conditions and we need all options open to us.

PROPOSED BY: Frank Woods (SW-08-G-015)

PROPOSAL 61 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose; and 92. 069. Special provisions for moose drawing permit hunts. Change this moose drawing permit hunt in Unit 17B in one of three ways:

Option 1:

The RM587 registration permit requires nonresident moose hunters to sign up in person in Dillingham starting July 15th and remains open until all 75 permits are issued or the moose season ends. Up to 75 permits may be issued. Nonresident moose hunters are required to have a RM587 permit in the following areas. The Mulchatna River up to the Kaktuli River. The Nushagak River up to but not including Harris Creek. The Nuyukuk River up to but not including Arrow Creek. A guided nonresident may have the guide pick up the permit on his/her behalf when the guide presents a copy of the hunting contract and a copy of the hunters

license and big game tag.

or

Option 2:

Permit RM587 and the nonresident moose hunting permit area is deleted and no longer applicable required.

or

Option 3:

The same as option # 1, except the area affected by the permit remains unchanged.

ISSUE: The Unit 17B nonresident closed area known as RM587, a registration permit requirement to hunt with in two miles of the major drainages. We need to either eliminate the permit or modify the permit terms/conditions. This regulation prohibits nonresident moose hunting with in a two mile corridor of many of the rivers and creeks unless the nonresident hunters obtain a registration permit in person in Dillingham. The last day to sign up (August 31) and obtain the permit is five days, minimum, before the season opens. The cost of flying from anywhere to Dillingham prohibits coming in July or early August to get the permit. In 2008, hunters needed to be at the Department of Fish and Game by 5 pm on August 29 a full seven days before the moose season is open. RM587 has been underutilized every year since 2005 when RM587 was put in place. In short, the desired effect of RM587, which was to discourage nonresident moose hunters, has been too effective. The permit allows 75 permits to be issued. Except for 2006 when about 50 permits were issued, the average has been between 23 and 30 permits. In 2005 when the Board of Game created this permit, the board was misled as to how much resident, and particularly area resident, hunting actually takes place in the effected areas. The fact is that area residents do not use the permit area anywhere near as much as the board was led to believe. My camp is on the main Nushagak River. No boats can go by my camp and not be seen. My camp is the lowest down stream camp and is about nine miles upriver from Harris Creek where the village corporation land ends and state land begins. I have been counting boats. Since the permit, the average number of resident boats that go by my camp has averaged 0-5 boats season. The fact is that most boats (24 out of 29 parked in Koliganek, the nearest village) run props. Unless the water is high, most boats and operators running props cannot and will not get to where my camp is located. Harris Creek is not navigable with a prop except in extreme high water. The Klutuspak Creek is only navigable two miles from the mouth by even the best jet boat operator and the King Salmon River and Chichitnok Rivers are only navigable by jet boat. The Mulchatna River is generally not Navigable past the Kaktuli River by prop boat.

This regulation was a day late and a dollar short from the beginning. This area did see high numbers of nonresident moose hunters in the past. The spike in numbers directly correlated with a large number of transporters bringing nonresident moose and caribou hunters during they heyday of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd. Now that the Mulchatna Caribou Herd has been beat down to cows and small bulls at best and they don't come around until well after moose season, if at all; the transporters and their clients have moved elsewhere to cause problems. The attractiveness of nonresident moose and caribou combination hunt, guided or drop off, no longer exists. With the departure of the caribou and current caribou regulations; the threat of large numbers of nonresident moose hunters no longer exists. Now that transporters have moved on, the vast majority of nonresident moose hunters in the permit area have been guided hunters. Guides and their operations bore the brunt of this permit and have suffered greatly, while transporters just moved on. Guides have to pick a Guide Use Area and stick to it and typically they have long term permitted camps and they can not just pick up and move like a transporter. We guides have a vested interest in the area.

Guided hunters tend to be wealthier and have jobs that prevent them from spending the three weeks it takes to travel to Dillingham, get the permit in person, wait for the season to open, and then hunt 11 days and return home. Since the permit has been underutilized and the majority of hunters recently have been guided; and since guides are tied to the area with the Guide Use Area and camp permits, they should be able to obtain the permit on behalf of the clients. The permit registration timeline needs adjusting to allow for two factors. The registration permit should stay open until all permits are issued and the registration deadline should, at a minimum, remain open until September 1 when August 31st falls on a weekend.

The board should be aware that the original proposal made in 2005 asked that only the main rivers, the Nushagak to the Chichitnok, the Mulchatna to the Kaktuli and the Nuyukuk Rivers be included in a completely

closed area. No permits. A special committee was formed and out of that came two changes. 1) The 75 permits allowed condition along with the unreasonable deadline was created and 2) the corridor was extended and small creeks like the Klutuspak Creek, Harris Creek, and the entire King Salmon River drainage, Chichitnok River drainage and the Upper Mulchatna River drainage were added to the corridor. The effected area was quadrupled for the 75 permits. Increasing the area was a bad and unnecessary decision. The added areas simply are not or cannot be utilized by most, if not all, area resident hunters accessing the area by boat and particularly prop boat.

The board must be aware that the two mile corridor is really an effective whole drainage corridor. Almost all of the moose habitat in the drainages is with in the two mile corridor. The two mile corridor really covers a lot more than two miles.

The board must be aware that the Nushagak River from one mile above Harris Creek all the way to Dillingham, some 200 river miles, and the first 12 miles of the Nuyukuk River and the Lower Mulchatna River is all held by native corporations, and as such, is private land and that nonresidents have never had permission to hunt moose there. The RM587 nonresident moose permit areas are not critical to local resident moose hunting success. Most of the area residents have been taking moose below Harris Creek in recent years. Particularly after the gas prices jumped.

The board must be aware that the resident season opens August 20 for a registration hunt and September 1 for the resident general season in these areas. Resident hunters also have a 31 day winter moose hunting season. Opportunity abounds.

The board must be aware that the immediate effect of the RM587 permit shifted many guided and transported hunters into Tikchik State Park. That move required the state park to put limits on the number of camps allowed in certain lakes and rivers.

I have submitted two companion proposals. One will lengthen moose season two days and the other addresses the brown bear season dates and why they need to be modified. In short the moose season needs lengthening due to the later rut trends and the brown bear season needs to open sooner due to behavior and feeding patterns changing. It is important that the board view these proposals together to get the full picture so they can understand public comment better. I say this because area residents are not seeing and taking moose along the rivers in the permit area like they use to. They probably aren't because the bears are still along the river afraid and trained not to step out on the tundra where they can be seen or buzzed. The fact is, when the Mulchatna Caribou Herd was at its' highest population and every transporter with planes descended on the area for two months during the fall, the moose, brown bear and caribou changed their behavior and patterns. The caribou no longer come during August and September. The brown bears changed their feeding patterns. They stay off the tundra blue berries and instead rely on fish longer and on high bush cranberries along the river in the thick river vegetation/cover. They changed due to planes buzzing the area from sunrise to sunset. Consequently; the moose changed their patterns due to the brown bears staying close to the rivers on fish and high bush cranberries. Consequently the moose aren't by the river (like they use to be) where area residents concentrate their hunting pressure. The moose are there, just a ¼ mile in the woods. Aerial surveys support this fact. Even though area residents with years of experience hunting the area are complaining that all the moose are gone, it is not the case. Things have changed. It is not like it use to be. Now we need to make changes. My companion proposals address these issues.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The resource will continue to be under utilized. The guides with permits and camps in the area along the affected rivers will continue to suffer and be hampered by the current regulation. The state will continue to loose license and tag revenue from nonresident moose hunters. When nonresident moose hunters are driven out; they are not likely to be there to hunt brown bears or wolves. The RM587 permit will continue to be undersubscribed and the area as a whole under utilized.

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

IMPROVED? No

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All nonresident hunters and the guides that have jet boats and that do business in 17B along the rivers. Resident hunters will also benefit because the nonresident hunters will also hunt brown bear and wolves.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. The conflicts, as small as they were, are long gone.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Making the RM587 area a drawing permit area. I rejected because it would also hamper client recruitment needlessly. The Board should also be aware that the Big Game Commercial Services Guide Board and the Department of Natural Resources are currently working to establish exclusive guide use areas around the State. If the current plans are enacted by 2010, there will be a drastic reduction in the number of guides operating in the three guide use area that are in the RM587 permit area.

PROPOSED BY: Don Duncan (INT-09S-G-003)

PROPOSAL 62 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change boundary of winter registration hunt in Units 17B & 17C.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
(15)		
Unit 17A		
1 bull per regulatory year, only as follows:		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull by registration permit only; or	Aug. 25-Sept 20 (Subsistence hunt only)	
1 antlered bull by registration permit; during the period Dec. 1-Jan. 31, a season of up to 14 days may be announced by emergency order	Dec. 1-Jan. 31 (Subsistence hunt only) (To be announced)	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		No open season
[UNIT 17(B), THAT PORTION THAT INCLUDES ALL THE MULCHATNA RIVER DRAINAGE UPSTREAM FROM AND INCLUDING THE CHILCHITNA RIVER DRAINAGE		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 BULL BY REGISTRATION PERMIT ONLY; HOWEVER DURING THE PE-	[AUG. 20-SEPT 15]	

RIOD SEPT 1-SEPT 15, SPIKE-FORK BULLS AND BULLS WITH 50-INCH ANTLERS OR WITH 3 OR MORE BROW TINES ON ONE SIDE MAY BE TAKEN WITH A HARVEST TICKET

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 BULL WITH 50-INCH ANTLERS OR ANTLERS WITH 4 OR MORE BROW TINES ON ONE SIDE]

[SEPT 5-15]

Unit 17(B), that portion in the Unit 17(B) nonresident closed area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by registration permit only; however during the period Sept 1-Sept 15, spike-fork bulls and bulls with 50-inch antlers or with 3 or more brow tines on one side may be taken with a harvest ticket; or

Aug. 20-Sept 15

1 **antlered** bull by registration permit

Dec 1-Dec 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; by registration permit; up to 75 permits may be issued

Sept 5-Sept 15

Remainder of Unit 17(B)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by registration permit only; however during the period Sept 1-Sept 15, spike-fork bulls and bulls with 50-inch antlers or with 3 or more brow tines on one side may be taken with a harvest ticket; or

Aug. 20-Sept 15

1 **antlered** bull by registration permit

Dec 1-Dec 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept 5-Sept 15

Unit 17(C), [THAT PORTION THAT INCLUDES THE IOWITHLA DRAINAGE

AND SUNSHINE VALLEY AND ALL LAND WEST OF WOOD RIVER, SOUTH OF KILLIAN CREEK, NUNAVAUGALUK LAKE, AND THE SNAKE RIVER]

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by registration permit only; however during the period Sept 1-Sept 15, spike-fork bulls and bulls with 50-inch antlers or with 3 or more brow tines on one side may be taken with a harvest ticket; or

Aug. 20-Sept 15

No open season

1 **antlered** bull by registration permit

Dec 1-Dec 31

[UNIT 17(C), THAT PORTION WEST OF KILLIAN CREEK, NUNAVAUGALUK LAKE, AND THE SNAKE RIVER

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 BULL BY REGISTRATION PERMIT ONLY; HOWEVER DURING THE PERIOD SEPT 1-SEPT 15, SPIKE-FORK BULLS AND BULLS WITH 50-INCH ANTLERS OR WITH 3 OR MORE BROW TINES ON ONE SIDE MAY BE TAKEN WITH A HARVEST TICKET; OR

[AUG. 20-SEPT 15]
[(SUBSISTENCE HUNT ONLY)]

[NO OPEN SEASON]

1 ANTLERED BULL BY REGISTRATION PERMIT; DURING THE PERIOD DEC 1-JAN 31, A SEASON OF UP TO 14 DAYS MAY BE ANNOUNCED BY EMERGENCY ORDER

[DEC 1-JAN 31]
[(SUBSISTENCE HUNT ONLY)]
[(TO BE ANNOUNCED)]

REMAINDER OF UNIT 17(C) ONLY; HOWEVER DURING THE PERIOD SEPT 1-SEPT 15, SPIKE-FORK BULLS AND BULLS WITH 50-INCH ANTLERS OR WITH 3 OR MORE BROW TINES ON ONE SIDE MAY BE TAKEN WITH A HARVEST TICKET]

[AUG. 20-SEPT 15]
[DEC 1-DEC 31]

[NO OPEN SEASON]

...
ISSUE: Areas in western Unit 17C have remained closed during the winter registration hunt to provide for expansion of moose westward into unoccupied areas and provide protection for limited numbers. Moose have expanded into the western areas and numbers in the closed area have increased since this protection was instituted. Moose numbers in this portion of GMU 17C are now such that can provide additional hunting opportunity by a registration hunt in the winter.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity will be lost, and moose might

increase in these areas to a level detrimental to the habitat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters participating in the winter registration hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, since moose season regulations would be easier for the public to understand.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Keep present regulation.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and Nushagak Fish and Game Advisory Committee
(HQ-09S-G-105)

PROPOSAL 63 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Extend the season dates for moose in Unit 17 as follows:

Anywhere in Unit 17 where the moose season closes September 15, the date is now September 17 for residents and nonresidents.

ISSUE: Moose season closure dates in Unit 17. Currently moose season closes September 15. It needs to stay open until at least September 17. The problem is the moose rut has had a five year trend of getting later and later. During the last three years, the rut did not really start until the last two to three days of the season. This year mature bulls were killed September 15 with red antlers. I don't remember the last time we had a hard frost in August which we use to get. Lately the frost date has been more like September 17 or later. In the past, a September 15 closure date was smart and it was a needed. The bulls were storming into rut the last few days. Leaving the season open longer, would have led to over harvest. This is no longer true and has not been for some time. I would hate to say global warming, but the fact is; the weather patterns of the first half of September have shown a five or more year trend of being warmer and rainier. And the start of the rut has been noticeably later. In much of Unit 17, especially along the rivers, there are 3 ways to hunt. Run and gun with a boat (expensive and relies on luck and not very effective), sit and watch a spot or pond (boring and not very effective) or calling. In the thick river vegetative corridor, you must call and get answers to locate moose and get close enough to see and judge them. When the bulls are not answering calls or traveling as they do during the rut, hunters stand little chance. The season must be adjusted slightly to counter the current weather conditions and trends.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose hunters will continue to be hampered by poor hunting conditions and inactive bulls. An available resource will not be harvested.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? More mature bulls will be taken as opposed to younger bulls.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All moose hunters

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered proposing leaving the season open until September 20. There was plenty of support in the village though not unanimous. I rejected September 20 because I think that may make too much of a change and may risk over harvest. I preferred to propose a more conservative date and provide needed opportunity while not risking over harvest.

PROPOSED BY: Don Duncan (INT-09S-G-001)

PROPOSAL 64 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf. Change the season dates and bag limit for wolf in Unit 9 as follows:

Set the wolf harvest regulations back to the pre-Intensive Management rule that provided for 5 wolves annually in a season starting August 10 to April 30 for those portions of Unit 9B, C and E that are in Lake Clark, Katmai and Aniakchak National Preserve.

ISSUE: While the State of Alaska regulates hunting on lands managed by the National Park Service and designated by Congress as national preserves, it does so only in as far as that these state regulations do not conflict with park purposes, park regulations and management directives, and the legislative direction provided by Congress when Alaska's park units were created (36 CFR 13.40(d)). National preserves in Alaska are bound to the Organic Act as well as to ANILCA and they are managed under the same management policies as parks in the Lower 48. Direction in both ANILCA and the management policies make it clear that while harvesting wildlife in national preserves can occur, it cannot deplete healthy populations or unacceptably impact natural processes, natural distributions, densities, age-class distributions and behaviors, and harvest cannot be done for the purpose of increasing the numbers of harvested species (i.e. predator control). Unfortunately, the passage of the State of Alaska's Intensive Management statute in 1994 set the state on a course of conflict with these NPS directives.

The National Park Service Organic Act clearly states that the purpose of the national park system is to "...conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein." The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (ANILCA) gives as one of its primary purposes providing "... for the maintenance of sound populations of, and habitat for, wildlife species...(section 101(b))", and in providing for these wildlife species, the populations in national preserves are to remain "healthy (section 815 (1))." And each park's enabling language clearly supports wildlife protection as a primary park purpose (see ANILCA Section II).

There is specific direction in ANILCA that provides for hunting in national preserves and we are not contesting that right. ANILCA section 1313 states that "A National Preserve in Alaska shall be administered and managed as a unit of the National Park System in the same manner as a national park... except that the taking of fish and wildlife for sport purposes... shall be allowed in a national preserve under applicable state and federal law and regulation." The key words here are "administered and managed as a unit of the National Park system in the same manner as a national park.. under applicable state and federal law and regulation". Management direction for all units of the national park system in Alaska is firmly grounded in the 1916 Organic Act as set forth in ANILCA Section 203.

Of particular concern to the request made in this proposal, the National Park Service Management Policies at 4.4.2, make it abundantly clear that the manipulation of wildlife populations is not allowed: "The Service does not engage in activities to reduce the numbers of native species for the purpose of increasing the numbers of harvested species (i.e., predator control), nor does the Service permit others to do so on lands managed by the National Park Service."

In this proposal, the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) is concerned only about the application of existing wolf harvest regulations in those parts of Unit 9B, C and E that are located in these corresponding national preserves - Lake Clark, Katmai and Aniakchak. As such our proposed regulation change only addresses national preserve lands and makes no comment, judgment or suggestion for how the State of Alaska manages wildlife on its own or other federal lands.

When the state's Intensive Management Act was passed, wolf harvest in these Units were five wolves annually in a season from August 10 to April 30. Subsequent changes to the state's wolf regulations for this unit were made in regulatory year (RY) 2003 when the bag limit was increased to 10 wolves/day and in RY 2005 when the season was liberalized to extend through May 25.

With wolf populations estimated at 350 in Units 9 and 10, the excessively high bag limit of 10/day can only be

seen as an attempt to manipulate wolf populations to benefit moose and caribou, especially when the Wolf Management Report (WMR) indicates that little is known about wolves on the Alaska Peninsula. Manipulating wolf populations to benefit ungulates is further illuminated in the WMR's background discussion that focuses on the fluctuations in ungulate populations, a discussion that is consistent with looking at these wolves in light of the purpose of intensive management, the state's primary wildlife management regime.

Further indication of the wolf population manipulation purpose of these two liberalizing actions is the Department of Fish and Game's lack of support for the season change to May 25 citing, in part, that such action would not be successful at reducing predation on caribou. And any extension of hunting wolves into May, as set forth by the Board of Game, should only be used to benefit Implementation Areas. This season extension was also objected to by the National Park Service in its February 17, 2005 letter to the Board. In ignoring this request for not changing the season length, the Board of Game action conflicts with the spirit of cooperation and mutual decision making set forth in the Master Memorandum of Understanding between NPS and the State of Alaska.

And there is precedent for excluding NPS lands from Unit specific regulations. At the same Spring 2005 meeting where the season was liberalized to May 25, a regulation pertaining to the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for wolf hunting in Units 9C and E did exempt NPS lands.

While NPCA does recognize that the WMR also claims that recent harvest under these liberalized regulations has had little impact on the wolf population, the fact that they were adopted with the purpose of manipulating populations puts them at odds with federal regulations and, for that reason alone, they should be repealed.

This proposal seeks to restore the bag limit and season length for wolves in those parts of Unit 9 B, C and E that lie in national preserves to the RY 1993, pre-intensive management level of five wolves / year in an August 10 to April 30 season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? State regulations will continue to be in conflict with federal statutes and management policies, setting up an inevitable showdown between state and federal authority that will most likely end in court at a considerable cost of time and resources for both entities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Healthy wolf populations, as directed by ANILCA would be ensured in Lake Clark, Katmai and Aniakchak National Preserves and there would be no risk of the state's Intensive Management statues, as embodied in the current liberalized harvest regulations, causing a reduction in the wolf population to an unhealthy level, which could/would cause the Park Service to take action to close the area to hunting altogether.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All people who appreciate that a primary management goal of national preserves in Alaska is to sustain healthy populations of wildlife, including wolves, and that hunting in national preserves should be managed to meet federal wildlife statutes, regulations and policies, not the State of Alaska's.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those that wrongly believe that the federal government does not have authority to manage wildlife living within the boundaries of national park system units.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Jim Stratton, National Parks Conservation Association (SC-09S-G-036)

PROPOSAL 65 - 5 AAC 92.125. Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans. Expand predator control into Unit 9D and 9E as follows:

Direct the Department of Fish and Game to draft a predator control implementation plan for the Alaska Peninsula, Unit 9D and 9E.

ISSUE: Reduce the number of predators harvesting the caribou and moose calves in Unit 9D and 9E. The current population of caribou in Unit 9D and 9E are currently dangerously low and the bear and wolf populations have exploded in the last ten years. In addition, the moose population in these units are considered moderate to low density by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game management biologists.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The caribou and moose populations in Units 9D and 9E will continue to decline. The current population of caribou in these units is below allowable subsistence harvest levels.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, a reduction in the number of wolves and brown bear in Unit 9D and 9E will allow for improved caribou and moose calves survival rates.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Continued sustainability of our resident caribou and moose populations. All the residents of the communities located within Units 9D and 9E.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee (SW-08-G-13)

PROPOSAL 66 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf. Extend the wolf season and increase the bag limit in Unit 10 as follows:

Wolf hunting season: August 10 - May 25; daily limit - ten wolves.

ISSUE: There is a substantial decline in the caribou population on Unimak Island. Having hunted this area for the previous seven years I have witnessed a consistent decrease in calf recruitment to a present condition of almost no calf survival at all. Comparatively I have witnessed a steady increase on the wolf population. It has been apparent in the last few years that there is a large impact of the wolf population also impacting the adult bull population, evident by a large increase in both recent kills and adult caribou racks seen from the air from previous kills. It is not uncommon to see more wolves on a given flight than adult bulls or calves. An increase in the wolf harvest is critical to the survival of the Unimak caribou population. It is recommended that the season be adjusted to match the existing season and harvest limits in Unit 9. Thus extending the season to May 25 and the limit being ten daily.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The caribou population appears to have declined by at least 50 percent in the last year. Considering the current decline rate and wolf population, the herd could be decimated in a very short period of time. Although hunting typically does not produce a high kill rate on wolves, every small part will help the declining herd.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the harvest of wolves will help the recruitment of caribou calves, and relieve pressure on the rapidly declining caribou population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone with an interest in a stable or growing caribou population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Only those that are opposed to wolf management.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSAL 67 - Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf. Change the bag limit in Unit 17 as follows:

Set the wolf harvest regulations back to the pre-Intensive Management rule that provided for 5 wolves in a season starting August 10 to April 30 for that portion of Unit 17B that is in Lake Clark National Preserve.

ISSUE: While the State of Alaska regulates hunting on lands managed by the National Park Service and designated by Congress as national preserves, it does so only in as far as that these state regulations do not conflict with park purposes, park regulations and management directives, and the legislative direction provided by Congress when Alaska's park units were created (36 CFR 13.40(d). National preserves in Alaska are bound to the Organic Act as well as to ANILCA and they are managed under the same management policies as parks in the Lower 48. Direction in both ANILCA and the management policies make it clear that while harvesting wildlife in national preserves can occur, it cannot deplete healthy populations or unacceptably impact natural processes, natural distributions, densities, age-class distributions and behaviors, and harvest cannot be done for the purpose of increasing the numbers of harvested species (i.e. predator control). Unfortunately, the passage of the state of Alaska's Intensive Management statute in 1994 set the state on a course of conflict with these NPS directives.

The National Park Service Organic Act clearly states that the purpose of the national park system is to "...conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein." The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (ANILCA) gives as one of its primary purposes providing "... for the maintenance of sound populations of, and habitat for, wildlife species...(section 101(b))", and in providing for these wildlife species, the populations in national preserves are to remain "healthy (section 815 (1))." And each park's enabling language clearly supports wildlife protection as a primary park purpose (see ANILCA Section II).

There is specific direction in ANILCA that provides for hunting in national preserves and we are not contesting that right. ANILCA section 1313 states that "A National Preserve in Alaska shall be administered and managed as a unit of the National Park System in the same manner as a national park... except that the taking of fish and wildlife for sport purposes... shall be allowed in a national preserve under applicable State and Federal law and regulation." The key words here are "administered and managed as a unit of the National Park system in the same manner as a national Park.. under applicable State and Federal law and regulation". Management direction for all units of the national park system in Alaska is firmly grounded in the 1916 Organic Act as set forth in ANILCA Section 203.

Of particular concern to the request made in this proposal, the National Park Service Management Policies at 4.4.2, make it abundantly clear that the manipulation of wildlife populations is not allowed: "The Service does not engage in activities to reduce the numbers of native species for the purpose of increasing the numbers of harvested species (i.e., predator control), nor does the Service permit others to do so on lands managed by the National Park Service."

In this proposal, the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) is concerned only about the application of existing wolf harvest regulations in those parts of Unit 17B that are located in Lake Clark National Preserve. As such our proposed regulation change only addresses national preserve lands and makes no comment, judgment or suggestion for how the state of Alaska manages wildlife on its own or other federal lands.

When the state's Intensive Management Act was passed, wolf harvest in 17B was five wolves per season from August 10 to April 30. In Regulatory Year (RY) 2003, that bag limit was significantly increased to ten wolves per day. It is unclear from reading the state's Wolf Management Reports (1999-2002 and 2002 to 2005) how much the department and the Board of Game relied on the desire to increase moose and/or caribou populations as the reason for significantly liberalizing wolf harvest in Unit 17. However, we can think of no other reason

for such a significant increase in bag limit.

Furthermore, we are concerned that the management objectives for this region are setting the stage for a wholesale reduction in wolf population numbers, even though the latest WMR states that "No population estimation surveys for wolves have been conducted in this unit." The stated management objective is an annual harvest of at least 25 wolves. Given that harvesting 35% of the population is a standard used by the department in other units, that goal of 25 could be achieved with only a population of 80 wolves. Yet while no population surveys exist, the WMR does estimate the population in 2004 (the latest numbers available on the department website) at 280 to 320 wolves. Reducing this number to 80, which could be done with no change to the management objectives, would be significant and contrary to Park Service directives.

Should the state desire to do that on its own land, that's a state decision. NPCA is concerned about and objects to this kind of wholesale reduction in predator populations occurring on national preserve lands. As such, this proposal seeks to restore the bag limit for wolves on that part of Unit 17B that is in Lake Clark National Preserve to the pre-intensive management levels of 5 wolves per year from August 10 to April 30.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? State regulations will continue to be in conflict with federal statutes and management policies, setting up an inevitable showdown between state and federal authority that will most likely end in court at a considerable cost of time and resources for both entities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Healthy wolf r populations, as directed by ANILCA would be ensured in Lake Clark National Preserve and there would be no risk of the state's Intensive Management statues, as embodied in the current liberalized harvest regulations, causing a reduction in the wolf population to an unhealthy level, which could/would cause the Park Service to take action to close the area to hunting altogether.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All people who appreciate that a primary management goal of national preserves in Alaska is to sustain healthy populations of wildlife, including brown bears, and that hunting in national preserves should be managed to meet federal wildlife statutes, regulations and policies, not the State of Alaska's.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those that wrongly believe that the federal government does not have authority to manage wildlife living within the boundaries of national park system units.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Jim Stratton, National Parks Conservation Association (SC-09S-G-043)

PROPOSAL 68 - 5 AAC 92.125. Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans. Implement predator management in Unit 17B and 17C as follows:

Adopt and implement a state-managed predator management plan in Unit 17B and 17C to reduce the wolf populations.

ISSUE: Excessive numbers of wolves in Unit 17B and 17C. Predation by wolves on moose and their calves is affecting that ungulate's capacity for sustained yield.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose recruitment will continue to suffer because of predation. Moose in Unit 17B are below the intensive management (IM) objective threshold. The moose population in 17C currently is above the IM objective but can very easily fall below if calf recruitment and/or if the moose population declines due to hunting pressure, mortality, old age, health, predation, etcetera.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport and subsistence hunters in Unit 17.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Liberalizing bag limit and season. Rejected because we feel that it will not effectively increase harvest.

PROPOSED BY: Nushagak Advisory Committee (SW-08-G-11)

PROPOSAL 69 - 5 AAC 92.125. Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans. Implement a predation control area plan for Unit 9 and Unit 17 as follows:

Develop a predator management plan for Bristol Bay; Unit 9 and Unit 17.

ISSUE: The low populations of caribou and moose in the Bristol Bay Area

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Caribou and moose will continue to be low and in some areas, hunting is not allowed.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All who harvest caribou and moose in Units 9 and 17.

WHO WILL SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lake Iliamna Advisory Committee (SW-08-G-06)

PROPOSAL 70 - 5 AAC 85.065 (3) Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game.

Shorten the ptarmigan season in Unit 13B to end on Nov 30. Increase the winter season for Units 13A, B, and E to 10 per day.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(3)		
Ptarmigan (rock, willow and white-tailed)		
...		
Units 6D, 7, 11, <u>13A</u> , 13C, 13D, <u>13E</u> , and 14 - 16	Aug 10 – Mar 31	Aug 10 – Mar 31
10 per day, 20 in possession		
Unit [13A,] 13B, [13E]		
10 per day, 20 in possession	Aug. 10 – Nov 30	Ten per day

[5 PER DAY, 10 IN POSSESSION
HOWEVER, A SEASON MAY BE
ANNOUNCED DURING WHICH
THE BAG LIMIT IS UP TO
10 PER DAY, 20 IN POSSESSION]

[DEC 1 – MAR 31]

[FIVE PER DAY]

ISSUE: Ptarmigan numbers have declined dramatically in 13B. Rock ptarmigan used to be fairly abundant in the 1990s but have not been observed on spring survey routes for two years. Ptarmigan numbers appear higher in other parts of Unit 13, therefore returning the late winter bag limit to ten per day in 13A and 13E is expected to be sustainable. Spring harvests are considered to be additive mortality while fall harvests are not. Areas in southcentral Alaska with extensive winter harvest such as Hatcher Pass and the Caribou Hills have had similar declines while non-hunted areas such as Chugach State Park have not.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Willow ptarmigan numbers may remain low and rock ptarmigan will continue to be extremely low.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. If eliminating winter hunting mortality allows for a population increase, more birds will be available for fall hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Ptarmigan hunters who would like to see increased ptarmigan numbers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Ptarmigan hunters who only hunt in unit 13B during the winter from snowmachines or opportunistically along the Richardson Highway.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

- The bag limit was reduced to 5 per day from 1 Dec – 31 Mar with no discernable impact.
- Shortening the season to Feb 28 was considered, but research suggests that hunting mortality starts to be additive by early winter.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-097)

PROPOSAL 71 - 5 AAC 84.270(2). Furbearer trapping. Shorten the trapping season for coyote in Unit 13 as follows:

Trapping season for coyote in Unit 13: November 10 - March 31, no bag limit.

ISSUE: Coyote trapping October 15 - April 30.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A large by-catch of fox and lynx

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Coyote fur is better and it will stop incidental catch of fox and lynx.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Better fur and will stop by-catch of fox and lynx.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Copper Basin Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-014)

PROPOSAL 72 - 5 AAC 85.010. Hunting seasons and bag limits for bison. Modify the boundary for bison hunting in Unit 11 as follows:

East of the Copper River, south of the Klawasi River and west of a line from Mount Sanford to Mount Wrangell to Long Glacier, west of the Kotsina River.

ISSUE: Bison in Unit 11 - Copper River Northern Boundary (DI454).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bison north of the Nadina River will not be hunted.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This will open a larger area for bison hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bison hunters

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Copper Basin Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-015)

PROPOSAL 73 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear. Lengthen the black bear season in Unit 13E as follows:

Residents and Nonresidents: Extend black bear baiting to April 15 to June 30.

ISSUE: Difficulty in getting around until mid-June.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It will be difficult to get around until June.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The ability to harvest will improve.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Black bear baiters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Denali Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-71)

PROPOSAL 74 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear; and 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Extend the bear baiting season in Units 11 and 13 as follows:

Units 11 and 13 black bear baiting season - [APRIL 15- JUNE 15] **April 15-June 30.**

ISSUE: Units 11 and 13 have abundant black bear populations and climate similar to Interior Region Units. All interior units have bear baiting seasons that end June 30. Climate, bear populations, and hunter pressure are much more similar to interior units than the coastal areas with which they share June 15 baiting closures.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Baiting seasons in Units 11 and 13 will continue to be

needlessly short.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bear hunter and moose populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Leave Sub-unit 13D with the current closure due to higher hunter participation and more coastal climate. Rejected because 13D often receives deeper snow causing later den exits.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-053)

PROPOSAL 75 - 5 AAC 92.085(4). Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions; 92.115. Control of predation by bears; and 92.125(c). Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans. Modify the regulations to allow the issuance of permits as follows:

Permits will be issued to take grizzly/brown bear in Unit 13A, B, C, and E within the predator (wolf) control program area for the purposes of predation control. The permitted may choose to use bait to take brown bears. Basically the same verbiage as found in the 2007-2008 Alaska Bear and Wolf Control Supplement for Unit 19D black and brown bear control area.

92.085(4). Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions:

The following methods and means of taking big game are prohibited (4) with the use of bait for ungulates and **with the use of bait or scent lures for any bear**, except that black bears may be taken with the use of bait or scent lures as authorized by a permit issued under 5 AAC 92.044.

ISSUE: The problem I would like the board to address is the predation of prey species by grizzly/brown bears within the predator control management area within Unit 13. Currently, there are no effective control measures in place to allow sufficient harvest of grizzly bears in the predator control area in Unit 13. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game has allowed brown bear tag fee exemptions in Unit 13, and has allowed a one grizzly bear per regulatory year limit. However, the department has failed to successfully reduce the number of grizzly bears within the predator control management area despite these liberalized seasons, and bag limit, in direct contradiction to the department's own findings, based on studies and research conducted by biologists: "While no intensive bear management program has been implemented for Unit 13, brown bears have been identified as significant predators of moose calves." (Alaska Department of Fish and Game Predator Management in Alaska, November 2007). Generally speaking, hunters who are likely to harvest a grizzly bear in Unit 13 are out actively engaged in hunting bears, not other big game. More specifically, hunters engaged in hunting for a moose or caribou to put meat in the freezer are not as likely to harvest grizzly bear because if they are dealing with skinning and packing out a bear, they aren't hunting for the species they came out to get. Furthermore, the department has actively pursued and subsequently had approved the aerial wolf hunting as prescribed in Predator Management in Alaska (the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Nov 2007). However, the Board of Game has repeatedly denied proposals, as directed by Alaska the Department of Fish and Game, for increased harvest of grizzly bears, which is also prescribed by the predator control in Alaska, November 2007 document. These have been proposals to allow harvesting of brown bears by using bait. Why the disparity between wolves and bears in terms of management within the predator control management area? Unit 13 is the only unit with predator control regulations that isn't intensively managing the bear population. From 5 AAC 92.125(5)(E)(ii) *"habitat does not appear to be the primary limiting factor for moose populations now, and is not expected to limit moose populations at proposed objectives; although wolves and grizzly bears are significant sources of mortality for moose, wolf predation occurs year-round while grizzly bears prey primarily on calves in the spring; black bears in this area are an insignificant source of mortality; harvest of*

predators by humans is necessary to achieve moose management objectives;"

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Failure to adopt proposals that would increase the harvest of grizzly bears in the predator control management area will result in continued decline of moose and caribou populations as well as decline in overall herd health in Unit 13. "Alaska Constitution requires the management of fish and wildlife resources under the principle of sustained yield" (2007-2008 Alaska Bear and Wolf Control Supplement). "The state Intensive Management Law requires management of certain important ungulate herds to provide for a high human harvest". (2007-2008 Alaska Bear and Wolf Control Supplement.) The failure to adopt proposals that promote sustained yield and allow for high human harvest is contrary to and in violation of the laws of the State of Alaska. "

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This proposal would directly influence the number of moose and caribou calves killed each spring by brown bears. Thus there would, in time, be an overall increase of moose and caribou within Unit 13, which is the ultimate objective of the predator control. An additional consideration obviously is the overall health and population of brown bears. Clearly, the department would have to monitor harvest numbers of brown bears taken over bait to ensure over harvesting isn't occurring and close the season by emergency order if over harvesting became an issue.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Most directly, the hunters who engage in baiting of grizzly bears in the spring and or fall season will benefit from this proposal if adopted. This will provide those hunters with better and more frequent opportunities to selectively harvest brown bears. However, all hunters of moose and caribou within Unit 13 will benefit from the reduction in predator species preying upon moose and caribou.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The only possible group who would suffer from the adoption of this proposal is the big game guides who operate in the predator control management areas. However, most big game guides operate in more remote, fly-in camps that will largely be unaffected if this proposal is adopted.

The department employees have stated concern that the environmental/animal rights activist groups will propose and pass a ban on all baiting activities if the proposal to allow grizzly bear baiting is adopted. If environmental/animal rights groups wanted to propose and pass bans on baiting of black bears they would have done that already. The proposal has no ramifications on the management, applicable laws regulating harvest or method of harvest of black bears. Furthermore, predator control measures allowing baiting of brown bears in Units 19 and 20 have not resulted in bans of black bear baiting. Therefore the concerns of certain employees seem misguided and irrelevant. Also noted in the Predator Management in Alaska Paper, "Citizen values range from rejecting manipulation of wildlife populations for human benefits, to demanding management practices allowing hunters to harvest higher percentages of wildlife populations annually. Because of these opposing public values, predator control will always be controversial". I agree whole heartedly with this statement, however, as mentioned before the state constitution as well as state laws require, not suggest, but require the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the Board of Game to increase or maintain ungulate densities at high levels.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I have also considered allowing the harvest of sows with cubs and cubs as is allowed in Unit 16 but have rejected that because that alone will not increase the number of brown bears harvested. Even with allowing the harvest of sows and sows with cubs, there will be fewer opportunities to harvest them as compared to allowing grizzly bears to be taken over bait.

Other possible solutions include relocating bears to different geographic areas, however this will come with significant financial and logistical cost to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Additionally, bears have shown the tendency to return to their home range very quickly.

PROPOSED BY: Shawn Conway (SC-09S-G-033)

PROPOSAL 76 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear; and 92.132. Bag limit for brown bears. Increase the bag limit in Unit 13E as follows:

Increase the bag limit for brown bear to two every regulatory year in Unit 13E.

ISSUE: Try and cut down the taking of calf moose, caribou, and sheep lambs by grizzly bears.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bears will continue to prey on these young animals at their current rate and populations will decline.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Number of calf moose, caribou, and sheep lambs should increase if the number of grizzlies decrease.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose, sheep, caribou, and those that hunt them.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The grizzlies.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Denali Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-70)

PROPOSAL 77 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Change brown bear regulations for Unit 13C as follows:

Set the brown bear harvest regulations back to the pre-Intensive Management rule that provided for 1 bear every four years in a season starting September 1 to May 31 for that small portion of Unit 13C that is in Wrangell St. Elias National Preserve.

ISSUE: While the State of Alaska regulates hunting on lands managed by the National Park Service and designated by Congress as national preserves, it does so only in as far as that these state regulations do not conflict with park purposes, park regulations and management directives, and the legislative direction provided by Congress when Alaska’s park units were created (36 CFR 13.40(d). National preserves in Alaska are bound to the Organic Act as well as to ANILCA and they are managed under the same management policies as parks in the Lower 48. Direction in both ANILCA and the management policies make it clear that while harvesting wildlife in national preserves can occur, it cannot deplete healthy populations or unacceptably impact natural processes, natural distributions, densities, age-class distributions and behaviors, and harvest cannot be done for the purpose of increasing the numbers of harvested species (i.e. predator control). Unfortunately, the passage of the State of Alaska's Intensive Management statute in 1994 set the state on a course of conflict with these NPS directives.

The National Park Service Organic Act clearly states that the purpose of the national park system is to "...conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein." The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (ANILCA) gives as one of its primary purposes providing "... for the maintenance of sound populations of, and habitat for, wildlife species...(section 101(b))", and in providing for these wildlife species, the populations in national preserves are to remain "healthy (section 815 (1))." And each park's enabling language clearly supports wildlife protection as a primary park purpose (see ANILCA Section II).

There is specific direction in ANILCA that provides for hunting in national preserves and we are not contesting that right. ANILCA section 1313 states that "A National Preserve in Alaska shall be administered and managed as a unit of the National Park System in the same manner as a national park... except that the taking of fish and wildlife for sport purposes... shall be allowed in a national preserve under applicable state and federal law and regulation." The key words here are "administered and managed as a unit of the National Park system in the same manner as a national park.. under applicable state and federal law and regulation".

Management direction for all units of the national park system in Alaska is firmly grounded in the 1916 Organic Act as set forth in ANILCA Section 203.

Of particular concern to the request made in this proposal, the National Park Service Management Policies at 4.4.2, make it abundantly clear that the manipulation of wildlife populations is not allowed: "The Service does not engage in activities to reduce the numbers of native species for the purpose of increasing the numbers of harvested species (i.e., predator control), nor does the Service permit others to do so on lands managed by the National Park Service."

In this proposal, the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) is concerned only about the application of existing bear harvest regulations in those parts of Unit 13 C that are located in Wrangell St. Elias National Preserve. As such our proposed regulation change only addresses national preserve lands and makes no comment, judgment or suggestion for how the State of Alaska manages wildlife on its own or other federal lands.

When the state's Intensive Management Act was passed, brown bear harvest in 13C was one bear every four years from September 1 to May 31. Subsequent changes to the state's brown bear regulations for this unit were made in Regulatory Year (RY) 1995 when the bag limit was increased to one bear / year, RY 1996 when the season was liberalized to start earlier on August 10 to May 31, RY 1999 when the season was again liberalized to extend later from August 10 to June 15 and finally in RY 2003 the Board of Game did away with all season restrictions.

From reading the Brown Bear Management Report (BMR) for Unit 13, it is obvious that liberalizing hunting opportunities, beginning with the significant increase in bag limit in 1995 to the more recent change of no closed season, are focused entirely on growing more moose. The 2002 to 2004 BMR reports that "...brown bear numbers should be reduced to increase moose calf survival. In order to increase interest in hunting bears, the board has been liberalizing seasons ever since." In the 2004 to 2006 BMR, the unit's focus on moose and caribou for human consumption continues to be the driving management objective with statements like "...brown bear numbers should be reduced to increase moose calf survival."

These very clear statements directing the manipulation of brown bear populations to benefit moose and caribou are in direct conflict with the direction given to the National Park Service that such manipulation cannot occur on its lands. And the fact that national preserve lands are a small part of Unit 13C should not deter our desire to resolve this conflict. The part of Unit 13C in Wrangell St Elias is right near the highway and the UCU containing preserve lands sees a great deal of hunting activity. As such, this proposal seeks to restore the bag limit and season for brown bears on that small part of Unit 13C that is in Wrangell St. Elias National Preserve to the pre intensive management levels of 1 bear every four years from September 1 to May 31.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? State regulations will continue to be in conflict with federal statutes and management policies, setting up an inevitable showdown between state and federal authority that will most likely end in court at a considerable cost of time and resources for both entities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Healthy brown bear populations, as directed by ANILCA would be ensured in Wrangell St. Elias National Preserve and there would be no risk of the state's Intensive Management statutes, as embodied in the current liberalized harvest regulations, causing a reduction in the wolf population to an unhealthy level, which could/would cause the Park Service to take action to close the area to hunting altogether.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All people who appreciate that a primary management goal of national preserves in Alaska is to sustain healthy populations of wildlife, including brown bears, and that hunting in national preserves should be managed to meet federal wildlife statutes, regulations and policies, not the state of Alaska's.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those that wrongly believe that the federal government does not have

authority to manage wildlife living within the boundaries of national park system units.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Jim Stratton, National Parks Conservation Association (SC-09S-039)

PROPOSAL 78 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Change this regulation to provide the following brown bear hunt in Unit 11 as follows:

Establish a registration hunt for brown bears on Unit 11(Z) to ensure that the combined harvest of subsistence and sport hunted bears does not exceed the pre-ANILCA level of 16.

ISSUE: While the State of Alaska regulates hunting on lands managed by the National Park Service and designated by Congress as national preserves, it does so only in as far as that these state regulations do not conflict with park purposes, park regulations and management directives, and the legislative direction provided by Congress when Alaska's park units were created (36 CFR 13.40(d)). National preserves in Alaska are bound to the Organic Act as well as to ANILCA and they are managed under the same management policies as parks in the Lower 48. Direction in both ANILCA and the management policies make it clear that while harvesting wildlife in national preserves can occur, it cannot deplete healthy populations or unacceptably impact natural processes, natural distributions, densities, age-class distributions and behaviors, and harvest cannot be done for the purpose of increasing the numbers of harvested species (i.e. predator control). Unfortunately, the passage of the State of Alaska's Intensive Management statute in 1994 set the state on a course of conflict with these NPS directives.

The National Park Service Organic Act clearly states that the purpose of the national park system is to "...conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein." The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (ANILCA) gives as one of its primary purposes providing "... for the maintenance of sound populations of, and habitat for, wildlife species...(section 101(b))", and in providing for these wildlife species, the populations in national preserves are to remain "healthy (section 815 (1))." And each park's enabling language clearly supports wildlife protection as a primary park purpose (see ANILCA Section II).

There is specific direction in ANILCA that provides for hunting in national preserves and we are not contesting that right. ANILCA section 1313 states that "A National Preserve in Alaska shall be administered and managed as a unit of the National Park System in the same manner as a national park... except that the taking of fish and wildlife for sport purposes... shall be allowed in a national preserve under applicable state and federal law and regulation." The key words here are "administered and managed as a unit of the National Park system in the same manner as a national Park.. under applicable state and federal law and regulation". Management direction for all units of the national park system in Alaska is firmly grounded in the 1916 Organic Act as set forth in ANILCA Section 203.

In this proposal, the National Parks Conservation Association is concerned only about the application of existing brown bear harvest regulations in those parts of Unit 11(Z) that are located in Wrangell-St Elias national preserve. As such our proposed regulation change only addresses national preserve lands and makes no comment, judgment or suggestion for how the state of Alaska manages wildlife on its own or other federal lands.

When the state's Intensive Management Act was passed, brown bear harvest in 11(Z) was one bear every four years from September 1 to October 31 or April 25 to May 31. Subsequent changes to the state's brown bear regulations for this unit were made in Regulatory Year (RY) 2001 when the season was liberalized to August 10 to June 15 and in RY 2003 when the bag limit was increased to one bear/year.

While we don't find evidence that the changes in regulations for Unit 11(Z) are motivated by the desire to grow

more moose and caribou, as directed by the state's Intensive Management statute, and we recognize that the population is healthy, we are concerned that the increase in harvest level seen over the past eight years resulting from these liberalized seasons and bag limits is approaching the pre-ANILCA average annual harvest of 16 for years 1961 to 1978. This was the level of harvest known to Congress when they recognized sport hunting and established parts of Wrangell-St. Elias as a national preserve. As such, we would ask that this hunt be changed to a registration hunt to ensure that as more people learn about the hunting opportunities in Wrangell-St. Elias National Preserve, we don't exceed the pre-ANILCA harvest level of 16 bears.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Should the brown bear harvest exceed that of pre-ANILCA levels, state regulations could come into conflict with federal statutes and management policies, setting up an inevitable showdown between state and federal authority that will most likely end in court at a considerable cost of time and resources for both entities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Ensure a continued high quality brown bear hunt by keeping populations at a healthy level.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All people who appreciate that a primary management goal of national preserves in Alaska is to sustain healthy populations of wildlife, including wolves, and that hunting in national preserves should be managed to meet federal wildlife statutes, regulations and policies, not the state of Alaska's.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Jim Stratton, National Parks Conservation Association (SC-09S-G-037)

PROPOSAL 79 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear, and 92.132. Bag limit for brown bears. Increase the bag limit for brown bear in Unit 13 as follows.

Allow the harvest of two brown/grizzly bear every regulatory year for Unit 13. It will not count against the bag limit in anywhere else in the state.

ISSUE: Grizzly bear predation on moose calves.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unit 13 will continue to lose a large percentage of moose calves.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It should help increase the percentage of moose calves.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who take a bear in Unit 13 and still want to hunt other game management units.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Copper Basin Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-020)

PROPOSAL 80 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Modify the goat hunting area in Unit 13D as follows:

Add a remote portion of the Tonsina Controlled Use Area to goat hunt RG580. Include the area of Unit 13D south of the Uranatina River, east of a line running from the south fork of the Uranatina River through the pass

along the eastern most tributary on the north side of the Tiekel River to its confluence with the Tiekel.

ISSUE: This area of Unit 13D has had little if any harvest in the last ten years of goats under the current draw tag (DG719) although there is a healthy population. This area is very difficult to access. The terrain and weather is some of the worst in Alaska. This area is below Wood Canyon on the Copper River. The rest of the draw area is much easier to access by the Richardson Highway, airstrips in the Chugach Range, and Klutina Road and Lake. This area would be able to sustain a reasonable harvest.

At the 2007 spring Board of Game meeting, Proposal 95 was passed to add an area in southeastern Unit 13D to the RG580 goat hunt. This portion of the Tonsina "walk-in" area was amended out of the proposal by the board. The Department of Fish and Game mistakenly reported this area of the Tonsina Controlled Use Area as one of the areas highly utilized by DG719 goat hunters. In fact there had been only one goat taken in the area in the last 15 years.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Brave souls willing to navigate the Copper River south of Wood Canyon and climb thousands of vertical feet through dense alder jungle will continue to be neglected the opportunity to easily obtain a tag to hunt this under-utilized resource.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, some product is better than none, the resource will be harvested unlike the current situation where there is virtually no harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters willing to make an effort to hunt in this harsh environment will not have to draw a tag.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo - the worst option, the resource will continue to be untapped.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-045)

PROPOSAL 81 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Restrict the methods for taking caribou under a Tier II permit in Unit 13 as follows:

Unit 13 caribou, Tier II hunts - restrict bullet clips or magazines to five rounds.

ISSUE: Tier II caribou in Unit 13.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Caribou shot or wounded and not salvaged.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Fewer caribou will be wasted.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunter may take more time picking out caribou and not shooting more than one. All hunters and caribou will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who like rifles with large clips or magazine.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Copper Basin Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-016)

PROPOSAL 82 - 5 AAC 92.220(d)(4). Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. Eliminate the salvage requirement for the Tier II caribou hunt in Unit 13 as follows:

Delete the language that requires the salvage of the head, hide, heart, liver and kidneys.

ISSUE: The current regulation requiring salvage and removal of the head, hide, liver, kidneys and heart creates an additional and unnecessary burden on both successful hunters and troopers charged with enforcing this "nuisance" regulation that has no biological justification.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A) Troopers will continue to waste valuable time that could be spent investigating real violations. B) Many hunters will continue to break the law and ignore this "nuisance" regulation. C) Some hunters will lawfully dispose of these parts in landfills; others will unlawfully dump them along roads, rivers, neighborhoods, etc. Those who eat the organs will increase fat / cholesterol levels.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All successful hunters, all enforcement officers, public landfills that won't be filled with unnecessary garbage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Only those persons who mistakenly think that this type of "nuisance" regulation will discourage others from applying for a permit.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Make the regulation optional, rather than mandatory, by properly disposing of carcass/entrails away from public sight.

PROPOSED BY: Jerry Hepler & Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-09G-003)

PROPOSAL 83 - 5 AAC 92.220(d)(4). Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. Eliminate the salvage requirement for the hide, head and kidney taken in Unit 13 under a Tier II caribou permit as follows:

You must salvage all of the meat, front quarters, hindquarters and ribs plus heart and liver.

ISSUE: Salvage requirement on Tier II caribou hide and head and kidney should be voluntary.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hides and heads will be left all over our local communities and along our roads (and making bear problems by our homes).

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All subsistence hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Copper Basin Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-018)

PROPOSAL 84 - 5 AAC 92.072. Community subsistence harvest hunt area and permit conditions; and 92.074. Community subsistence harvest hunt areas. Modify these regulations to create a new community harvest as follows:

Authorize a community harvest permit for moose and caribou for the Ahtna Villages and other eligible communities. 5 AAC 92.072 and 92.074 provide authority for issuing community permits, but may need to be amended, or another regulations adopted, in order to issue the community harvest permit proposed below.

Fundamentals of Ahtna’s proposal for a community harvest permit for moose and caribou:

The Ahtna Tene Nene Customary and Traditional Use Committee would act as the administrator for a community subsistence harvest permit. A single Ahtna community permit would serve the tribal members for all eight Ahtna Villages; Gulkana, Cantwell, Chistochina, Gakona, Mentasta, Tazlina, Chitina, and Kluti Kaah. Ahtna would work with and through its village tribal governments to distribute caribou and moose harvest tickets to tribal hunters and to ensure that all hunters, families and communities have their needs met and are treated fairly and equally. Ahtna would work with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to ensure timely harvest reporting and otherwise fulfill the administrative requirements of the permit.

The Ahtna community permit would apply to tribal members enrolled in the Ahtna Village tribes. Other eligible communities could also apply for community harvest permits.

The Ahtna community permit for Unit 13 would not preclude harvest opportunities in other areas of Ahtna’s traditional moose and caribou hunting territory, which includes lands in Unit 11, 12, and 20.

The Ahtna community permit would include a harvest opportunity and reporting/harvest ticket system that would allow the taking of moose and caribou in numbers sufficient to satisfy the subsistence needs of the eight tribal communities, including customary and traditional subsistence sharing. The subsistence harvest amount for the community permit would be reviewed, and revised if necessary, every three to five years based on recommendations provided through a cooperative process between Ahtna and the department.

To the degree consistent with conservation, the permit would allow taking bull and cow caribou as is currently allowed for harvest from the Nelchina Herd. The permit would allow the taking of “any bull” moose to the extent consistent with conservation.

The community permit would authorize a moose season open from August 10 through September 20, and a second moose season from November 1 through January 31. The caribou season would be open from August 10 through September 20, and a second season from October 21 through March 31 (the same caribou season as in current regulation for Unit 13).

ISSUE: The Tier II and Tier I subsistence hunts for moose and caribou in Unit 13 have been a source of controversy and dissatisfaction since the *McDowell* decision and the adoption by the Joint Boards in 1990 of the “All Alaskans are subsistence users anywhere in the State” policy (Joint Board Policy Statement 90-18-JB). In recent years the Board of Game has struggled to define “real subsistence users” in an attempt to meet subsistence needs and allow the possibility of a registration hunt for general or sport hunters. The board has at times reached for harsh and restrictive measures, such as proposing that Unit 13 be classified as a non-subsistence use area or that Tier II criteria be reduced to a welfare program, and Ahtna subsistence users have often been forced to bear the burden. Moreover, the board’s various attempts have not furthered its goals or the goals of the various user groups. This proposal would authorize a community harvest permit that would be consistent with the Ahtna Villages customary and traditional uses of moose and caribou and provide for these communities’ subsistence needs. It would also allow other eligible communities an opportunity to obtain community harvest permits. It may also provide the Board some discretion to allow harvests of Unit 13 moose and caribou that are not subsistence hunts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The caribou hunt in Unit 13 will remain exclusively a Tier II hunt and the Unit 13 moose hunt will continue to be exclusively a subsistence hunt and may become exclusively a Tier II hunt. Under the board’s current regulatory framework for moose and caribou hunts in Unit 13, all Alaskans are subsistence users. That means, under Ahtna’s interpretation of the law and past board practice, that when the Board determines the amount necessary for subsistence (ANS), the entire harvestable

surplus of caribou and moose is allocated to the ANS. In the case of the Nelchina caribou hunt, a Tier II hunt is mandated because the ANS is not sufficient to satisfy all subsistence uses. The moose hunting regime for Unit 13 is scheduled for review during the Spring 2009 meeting, and the ANS for moose may be part of the board's review. A new ANS for moose could result in an exclusively Tier II hunt like the Nelchina caribou hunt, a combined Tier I and Tier II hunt, or some combination of a subsistence hunt and a general hunt for residents. In any event, unless the board adopts the proposed community harvest system, it is unlikely that the ANS for moose and caribou in Unit 13 will allow for any significant harvest outside of what is needed for subsistence uses. The proposed community harvest permit system would provide an opportunity for the board to more narrowly, and more accurately define subsistence uses consistent with its Customary and Traditional Use finding for moose and caribou in Unit 13. Customary and traditional uses are essentially community based. Providing for eligible communities' subsistence uses under a community harvest permit could thus result in an ANS that would be less than the total harvestable surplus of moose and caribou in Unit 13, thereby providing the opportunity for a registration or other general hunt.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? A permit incorporating vital community C and T patterns and uses will benefit the resource and the subsistence products produced because the taking, preparation and use will all be consistent with long held practices designed for efficiency and the well being of the community. Also, there will be no need for the Board to place unnecessary, burdensome and, in the case of antler destruction, wasteful regulations on subsistence users. The community permit will serve to better define "real" subsistence uses, and the need for artificial restrictions to separate out subsistence uses will no longer be necessary. Finally, if the community permits open up an opportunity for a registration or other hunt, the product of those hunts will also be improved as it will more accurately reflect the character and uses inherent in those hunts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? If adopted as proposed, the community permit will benefit subsistence based communities in Unit 13 as well as other users of the resources. Eligible communities will be allowed to harvest in a way consistent with their subsistence way of life and to take amounts necessary to meet the community members' subsistence needs. This will be a great improvement after years of diminishing subsistence harvest opportunities and subsistence regulations disruptive of customary and traditional use patterns. Other users will benefit if the community harvest permit system opens up other hunting opportunities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Other Ahtna proposals include revision of the Tier II scoring system, repealing the antler destruction (5 AAC 92.151) and Unit 13 Tier II area restriction (5 AAC 92.062(c)), and extending the Tier II August moose hunting season from August 10-September 20.

PROPOSED BY: Ahtna Tene Nene' Customary and Traditional Use Committee (HQ-09S-G-073)

PROPOSAL 85 - 5 AAC 92.151. Destruction of trophy value of game required in specific areas. Repeal this regulation.

Repeal 5 AAC 92.151, which requires subsistence hunters to destroy the trophy value of moose and caribou antlers when these subsistence resources are harvested in Unit 13.

ISSUE: Subsistence hunters in Unit 13 must destroy moose antlers and caribou antlers with seven or more points.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Subsistence hunters will continue to have to destroy caribou and moose antlers, which is burdensome and unnecessary. The destruction of these resources also forecloses opportunities to use full antlers and skulls for arts and handicrafts.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, subsistence hunters will be able to keep caribou and moose antlers and skulls intact.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence hunters in Unit 13 will have a better hunting experience. They will not have to waste precious time in the field or as otherwise required “splitting caribou and moose antlers or cutting one antler through the main beam”. Also, subsistence users who utilize caribou and moose antlers to make handicrafts will benefit by ending the wasteful requirement that antlers and skulls must be destroyed.

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Provide for community harvest permits for Unit 13 subsistence communities as proposed by Ahtna.

PROPOSED BY: Ahtna Tene Nene Customary and Traditional Use Committee (HQ-09S-G-074)

PROPOSAL 86 - 5 AAC 92.062(c). Priority for subsistence hunting; Tier II permits. Amend this regulation as follows:

Repeal 5 AAC 92.062(c) “An individual holding a Unit 13 Tier II Permit for moose or caribou is prohibited from hunting that species anywhere else in the state during that regulatory year”.

ISSUE: Subsistence hunters are prohibited from hunting in much of their customary and traditional hunting areas, some of which is very close to the villages where they live. Many Ahtna Villages, for example, selected and were conveyed ANCSA lands across the Copper River in Units 11 and 12, as well as in Units 20 and 13 because these lands are village member’s primary hunting grounds. Under this regulation, hunters from these villages who qualify and receive Tier II permits for moose and caribou in Unit 13 are forbidden from hunting on traditional hunting lands just across the river. If these hunters fail to harvest a moose in Unit 13, they are prohibited from meeting their subsistence needs by simply hunting in another unit close to their village.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unjust, ineffective and discriminatory prohibitions will continue to create hardships for many Unit 13 Tier II subsistence hunters. Tier II hunters are, pursuant to the state’s Tier II statute and criteria, the most in need and have the strongest customary and traditional patterns of use for moose. As such, Tier II hunters are entitled to a greater opportunity to harvest a moose for subsistence uses. Yet, this severe prohibition results in just the opposite. Tier II subsistence users are restricted in a way suffered by no other moose hunters in Alaska. Rather than an extended opportunity to harvest a moose, Tier II hunters are not even provided with a fair and equal harvest opportunity. The 150 Tier II permit holders for moose in Unit 13 have an opportunity to harvest any bull moose during an early season from August 15-31. Yet, using the recent 5-year average, only 51 of these 150 permit holders harvest a moose during the August Tier II season. The other 100 unsuccessful Tier II permit holders must then compete with thousands of hunters during the September 1- 20 Unit 13 season. In 2007, nearly 3700 hunters participated in the Unit 13 moose hunt, and only 16.7 percent of these hunters bagged a moose. Therefore, if a Tier II moose hunter is among the two-thirds of unsuccessful August Tier II season hunters, and among the 83 percent of unsuccessful September season hunters, his family and those he shares with will be forced to simply go without moose, even if moose are available just across the river in another Unit. No other hunter in Alaska is similarly restricted from hunting in different areas until they get the meat they need to fulfill their needs.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The Board of Game did not enact this regulation out of any concern for the quality of resources or for conservation. Instead it was a misguided attempt to make potential Tier II Unit 13 applicants choose between getting a Tier II permit and living with the area restriction, or foregoing a Tier II permit to retain the possibility of hunting in other Units until bagging a moose. The consequences of this choice, of course, falls far the heaviest on those who most need a moose to sustain their families and way of life. Tier II

hunters need all the opportunity possibly available to assure, to the degree possible, a successful harvest. The board should deal directly with the legal constraints and problems caused by its “all Alaskans are subsistence users anywhere in the state” policy, and repeal this failed “experiment.”

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Unit 13 Tier II permit holders who are not successful in harvesting a moose during the Tier II August season and the September season. Ahtna hunters will be able to hunt on traditional hunting grounds very close to their villages. Their families and all those who depend on them for sharing will benefit by restoring their right to engage in all open hunts until they fill their bag limit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer hardship.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Approval of the Community Harvest Permit proposal that is being submitted by Ahtna Tene Nene' Customary and Traditional Use Committee would take those participating under the community permit out from under this harsh restriction. In Ahtna's view, however, this prohibition violates Alaska law, and there is no just or legal rationale for the area restriction.

PROPOSED BY: Ahtna Tene Nene' Customary and Traditional Use Committee (HQ-09S-G-076)

PROPOSAL 87 - 5 AAC 92.070(a) and (b). Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system. Revise the regulation as follows:

Delete all references to a different scoring system for Unit 13, repealing scoring based on income, and repealing the zeroing out of an entire application based on a zero score for points potentially awarded under subsections (a) or (b).

1. 92.070(b)(2) delete [WHICH MAY PROVIDE UP TO 15 POINTS IN UNIT 13, AND UP TO 25 POINTS IN OTHER UNITS] and amend to read **which may provide up to 25 points.**
2. 92.070(b)(3) delete [WHICH MAY PROVIDE UP TO 20 POINTS IN UNIT 13, AND UP TO 30 POINTS IN OTHER UNITS] and amend to read **which may provide up to 30 points.**
3. 92.070(b)(4) has been declared invalid as currently written and implemented pursuant to the court's order of summary judgment, June 5, 2008, *Ahtna Tene Nene' v. Alaska Board of Game*, 3AN-07-8072 CI. It should be repealed in its entirety, and no income question should be included in the Tier II scoring system.
4. 92.070(c) delete [HOWEVER, FOR A SUBSISTENCE HUNT IN UNIT 13, UNLESS THE APPLICANTS' SCORE UNDER (A) OF THIS SECTION IS GREATER THAN 0, AND UNDER (B) OF THIS SECTION IS ALSO GREATER THAN 0, THE APPLICANT'S TOTAL SCORE IS ZERO.] This provision was also declared invalid pursuant to the court's order of summary judgment, June 5, 2008.

Consider the following changes in the Tier II scoring system to improve its ability to identify those truly dependent on subsistence resources to meet nutritional needs and to sustain a way of life.

1.) Change 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. Increasing the number of points and the percentage of total points awarded for Factor B would award higher scores to 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 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.

2.) Adjust 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.) Factor B, “the ability of a subsistence user to obtain food if subsistence use is restricted or eliminated” (5 AAC 92.070(b)), increase 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. 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.

4.) Factor B, “the ability of a subsistence user to obtain food if subsistence use is restricted or eliminated” (5 AAC 92.070(b)), also increase 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.

5) Consider revising the point allocation for 5 AAC 92.070(a)(3) to award less points for less days spent harvesting in the unit and more points for greater time spent harvesting in the unit. For example, 5 points are currently awarded for 1-6 days in the unit. Consider reducing that score to 1 point. Ten points are currently awarded for 7-27 days in the unit. Consider reducing the score for that time in the unit to 5 points. Then add points to the score for those who spend more time harvesting in the unit.

ISSUE: WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The problems with the court mandated invalidations and revisions, and the deletion of Unit 13 specific aspects of the regulation speak for themselves. As to the other suggestions for revising the scoring system, it will continue to function ineffectively unless revised.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Allocation decision only – question not really applicable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those most dependent on subsistence resources for their nutritional needs and way of life.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those whose scores may be less under a revised system than what they would score under the current scoring system.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There is no alternative solution to complying with the court’s

order. Nor is there any justifiable alternative to repealing all differences in scoring for Unit 13 Tier II applicants, to repealing entirely any scoring system based on income, or for repealing all zeroing out aspects to the scoring system. Subsistence uses are a way of life for Ahtna people, not a welfare system.

The community harvest permit proposal submitted by Ahtna is an alternative to otherwise amending the scoring system.

PROPOSED BY: Ahtna Tene Nene' Customary and Traditional Use Committee (HQ-09S-G-077)

PROPOSAL 88 - 5 AAC 92.070(4). Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system.

Modify the Tier II permit scoring point system for Unit 13 as follows:

Simply delete the financial income as a qualifying or non-qualifying factor in the point system for the Nelchina caribou Tier II hunt.

ISSUE: Any financial figure established as an income "ceiling" to determine eligibility to apply for a Nelchina Tier II caribou hunt will be arbitrary, unfair and discriminatory and subject to continuing court challenge.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Court challenges will continue. The current rural vs. non-rural controversy will be expanded to include "rich vs. poor" creating more controversy and division.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who will be eliminated or disqualified from eligibility, based on an income ceiling.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who would be under that magic financial ceiling income.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Adopt a sliding, graduated, income range, 0-5 points based on income such as, below \$20,000 (5 points); \$40,000 (4 points); \$60,000 (3 points); \$80,000 (2 points); \$100,000 (1 point).

PROPOSED BY: Jerry Hepler and Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-09G-004)

PROPOSAL 89 - 5 AAC 92.062. Priority for subsistence hunting; Tier II permits. Modify the scoring for Tier II caribou permits in Unit 13 as follows:

Total revamping of the questionnaire and weighting process for the TC566 permit, with more influence on current need than historic use. Greater emphasis should be given to the limited availability, lack of convenience, and the greater expense of securing other food, as well as an individual's ability to purchase it. Add "remote communities not listed" on community list and allow for place listing actual residence.

ISSUE: Unfairness of the process used to determine true subsistence. The hunting regulations indicate that the applicants are questioned on "their dependence on the game for their livelihood and availability of alternate resources." However, the current questioning and weighting process does not accurately identify individuals with subsistence needs. We live in a remote location - at Stephan Lake in Unit 13 with no way to get supplies except by flight service. Stephan Lake is not on a list of communities on Tier II application so we must list Talkeetna as residence community.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Tier II permits are awarded to individuals whose

resources are far greater than the concept of subsistence while those with less access to non-game resources are not selected.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No effect on quality of the game resource but will make a fairer hunter selection process.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Benefit individuals with true subsistence needs.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Bill and Judy Dyroff (HQ-09S-G-089)

PROPOSAL 90 - 5 AAC 92.070(4). Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system.

Modify the Tier II permit scoring point system for Unit 13 as follows:

Eliminate a single, fixed, "ceiling" creating an all or nothing figure. Create instead a sliding, graduated, 0-5 point system based on income as follows: 5 points (under \$20,000); 4 points (under \$40,000); 3 points (under \$60,000); 2 points (under \$80,000); 1 point (under \$100,000). This would be consistent with the other formula points, all awarded on a graduated, sliding scale.

ISSUE: Eliminate or modify the proposed income ceiling level qualifying or disqualifying potential permit applicants for the Nelchina Tier II caribou hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Court challenges will continue. The current rural vs. non-rural controversy will be expanded to include "rich vs. poor" creating more controversy and division.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, but it would bring more consistency and fairness to the system, if income has to be included in the qualification formula.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those with the lowest income.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those above \$100,000 and/or higher incomes, thus qualifying for less points.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Totally eliminate income as a qualifying factor. I don't reject that but apparently the Board of Game does.

PROPOSED BY: Jerry Hepler and Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-09G-005)

PROPOSAL 91 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. Change the salvage requirement for Unit 13 to provide the following:

Salvage requirements should be the same for all hunting units and groups regardless of race or otherwise. Salvage requirements should be all edible parts.

ISSUE: Requiring hunters to take everything from the animal out of the field. Many of the parts required to come out aren't edible such as the hide. The parts brought out contribute to trash waste and potential problems with bears, wolves, dogs, etc. foraging through city and town trash. This requirement is discriminatory because it only requires one hunting group to do it, the Tier II hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Cleaning and gutting animals will be done according to the law; what is traditionally done by the hunter will continue to be done.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunting groups and the relationship between hunters, fish and game and non-hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, it will improve.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Denali Advisory Committee (SC-095-G-72)

PROPOSAL 92 - 5 AAC 92.220(d)(3). Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. Eliminate the meat salvage requirement for moose in Unit 13 taken under a Tier II permit as follows:

You must salvage all of the meat of moose front quarter, hindquarter and rib.

ISSUE: Meat must remain on the bones of the front quarters, hindquarters and ribs until removed from the field.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The other Units (11, 12 and 14) do not have salvage meat on the bone requirements. This puts an unfair obligation on our local Unit 13 hunter.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who have to pack moose from the field.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Copper Basin Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-019)

PROPOSAL 93 - 5 AAC 92.220(d)(5). Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. Modify the salvage requirement for liver in Unit 13 taken under a Tier II moose permit as follows:

Make salvage of moose liver voluntary as by the 10th of September, they are soft and not fit to eat.

ISSUE: Salvage requirement on moose liver.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose livers taken after September 10th will be left all over our communities.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone and keeping the unwanted liver out of local dumpsters for the bears.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Copper Basin Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-017)

PROPOSAL 94 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Alter this regulation to provide the following:

Extend the TM300 Unit 13, Tier II moose season. The current season is from August 15-31. The proposal is to extend the season from August 10-September 20.

ISSUE: The low success rate for the TM300 hunt demonstrates that the season does not provide sufficient opportunity for those most in need of taking a moose, Tier II permit holders. Of the 150 TM300 permit holders, and according to the recent five year average, only 51 of 150 permit holders are successful in the TM300 season. Extending the season as proposed would also make it consistent with the season for the TC556 Nelchina caribou Tier II hunt in Unit 13. Currently the TM300 season opens on August 15, five days after the TC566 opening on August 15. There are Ahtna hunters who hold both TM300 and TC566 permits. Opening the TM300 and TC566 seasons on the same date would allow these subsistence hunters an opportunity to take a moose during the first five days of the caribou season when they are already out in the field hunting. It would increase their hunting efficiency and success, and bring down hunting costs in these times of great economic stress in rural Alaska.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The harvest opportunity for TM300 subsistence hunters will remain too short to allow many hunters an opportunity to harvest moose meat necessary to feed their families and those kin, elders and other with whom they share according to customary and traditional (C and T) practices. The Board of Game’s C and T findings for moose in Unit 13, as well as the studies conducted by the Division of Subsistence clearly demonstrate that the Ahtna C and T hunting season extended far beyond that allowed under current regulation, and that the legal moose season has consistently dwindled over the years pursuant to board actions. This pattern of ever more restrictive subsistence harvest opportunities has resulted in less harvested food and restricting a way of life tied into traditional hunting patterns.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The last time the Board of Game addressed a proposal to extend the TM300 season it declined to do so out of a concern that overlapping the TM300 any bull season with the spike fork 50 antler Tier I season (September 1-20) would reduce the hunter reported violations of the antler restricted harvest. In other words, the board made a value judgment, a mistaken one in Ahtna’s opinion, that it was more important to get a few more enforcement tips from hunters than to allow those subsistence users with the greatest need an extended harvest opportunity. The board concern about enforcement and hunter reporting can be addressed, for example, through the system of distributing different colored harvest ticket to Tier II hunters, and the requirement that tickets must be displayed on the moose after it is taken. Information about different colored harvest tickets can be effectively distributed to hunters by the Department of Fish and Game, thereby allowing knowledgeable hunters to identify and report hunters without TM300 tags taking moose outside the antler restriction.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? TM300 hunters, their families and those with whom they share.

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Provide for community harvest permit for Unit 13 subsistence hunters as proposed by Ahtna.

PROPOSED BY: Ahtna Tene Nene' Customary and Traditional Use Committee (HQ-09S-G-075)

PROPOSAL 95 - 5 AAC 85.045 (11) Hunting Seasons and Bag limits for moose. Because the estimated

harvestable surplus likely exceeds the amount needed for subsistence (ANS), eliminate the Tier II moose hunt, and add drawing permit hunts in remote portions of Units 13A, 13B, and 13C where moose populations are increasing due to predation management efforts. The department has identified additional moose available for harvest in portions of 13A, 13B, and 13C. These areas are described below for the board to consider additional opportunity.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
<p><u>Unit 13A, that portion east of Kosina Creek, south of the Susitna River, west of Tyone River and Tyone Creek, including the drainages of the Black River, Oshetna River, Little Oshetna River and Sanona Creek</u></p>		
<u>and</u>		
<p><u>Subunit 13B that portion east of the Susitna and Maclaren rivers, southwest of Dickey Lake to 62 51.460 -146 23.670 (NAD83), south of the ridgeline running east to the mouth of the Middle Fork Gulkana River, and west of the mainstem Gulkana River.</u></p>		
<u>and</u>		
<p><u>Subunit 13C that portion within the Chistochina River drainage.</u></p>		
<p>1 bull with spike fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or</p>	<p>Sept 1 – Sept 20 (General hunt only)</p>	<p>No open season</p>
<p>1 bull, by drawing permit only, up to 200 permits may be issued</p>	<p>Sept 1 – Sept 20 (General hunt only)</p>	<p>No open season</p>
<p><u>Remainder of Unit 13</u></p>		
<p>1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:</p>		

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

Sept 1 – Sept 20
(General hunt only)

No open season

ISSUE: At a July 2008 Board of Game meeting, the board expressed a desire to review the Amount Necessary for Subsistence (ANS). Presently, the harvestable surplus exceeds the ANS and the board has an obligation to increase opportunity for hunters to take additional animals. The 2008 moose surveys indicated that the bull to cow ratio is also above objectives. The department believes that the existing Spike Fork 50/ 4BT management strategy coupled with additional options is the likely start to developing a different moose harvest program than is presently in place.

GMU 13 is identified as an intensive management unit for moose. Active management programs to increase moose numbers occur in this unit. Under the intensive management law guidelines, moose harvests are to be liberalized when moose numbers increase in response to management actions. Also, moose management objectives for bulls and cows are designed to keep the population balanced with the habitat while maintaining the highest level of productivity. This proposal addresses both the intensive management mandate for increasing harvests and management concerns for keeping moose numbers consistent with available habitat in remote portions of Unit 13.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bull numbers will continue to increase in these remote upland areas where predator management has been successful, and bull numbers in these areas will be higher than objectives. Management guidelines call for 25-30 bulls/100 cows and this is met or exceeded in all areas proposed for permit hunts. Liberalized harvest regulations are necessary to increase the unit-wide moose harvest and meet intensive management harvest objectives, otherwise the resource will be underutilized.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? By allowing the harvest on small and medium bulls that are currently illegal under the SF/50"/4BT regulation, the population structure can be balanced, and overall herd quality increased. Also, bulls that are slow developers or never do grow large enough to be legal under the 50"/4BT regulation would be harvested. By focusing increased harvest opportunity in the areas with higher moose numbers, additional harvest will not impact other hunters' ability to harvest SF/50"/4BT bulls under the general harvest regulations. Considering the increases in moose are largely limited to remote alpine areas where predator management has been most effective, these proposed hunts would be the most effective way to increase moose harvest in a sustainable manner.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who draw a permit and those who are uncomfortable judging a 50" minimum legal antler spread. GMU13 is an intensive management area where additional harvests are mandated as they become biologically available.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

- Creating a slot-limit type bag limit for the drawing hunts, where the bag limit would be 1 bull with antlers larger than SF and less than 50" or 4BT. This would be very confusing for the hunting public.
- Maintain the Tier II hunt even though the number of moose available for harvest is above the Amounts Necessary for Subsistence. This was rejected because the department has an obligation to remove hunts from Tier II status whenever possible.
- Reduce number of brow tines to 3 in some areas where the population is higher and bull to cow ratios are above objectives.
- Open subsistence seasons several days earlier.
- Develop community harvest seasons with permit conditions.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-09S-G-096)

PROPOSAL 96 – 5AAC 99.010 Boards of fisheries and game subsistence procedures: By regulation, the Board of Game must identify game populations, or portions of game populations, that are customarily and traditionally taken or used by Alaska residents for subsistence. The Unit 13 moose population has been thus identified. Once a positive finding has been made, as it has in Unit 13, the board must determine the “amount necessary for subsistence” (ANS). That is “the amount of the harvestable portion that is reasonably necessary for subsistence uses.” In Unit 13, the ANS for moose was set at 600 in 1992. As weather, habitat, predation, human use and other circumstances affecting the situation change over time, it is sometimes necessary for the board to review periodically the ANS number. Additionally, the board must re-examine subsistence moose management in Unit 13 because of a court order.

ISSUE: At a July 2008 Board of Game meeting, the board expressed a desire to review the Amount Necessary for Subsistence (ANS). Presently the harvestable surplus exceeds the ANS and the board has an obligation to increase opportunity for hunters to take additional animals. Before any additional regulatory action can be taken with respect to moose hunting in Unit 13, the Board must consider whether the ANS of 600 moose is appropriate. Is the number too high, too low or just right? The purpose of this proposal is to seek public comment on what the ANS should be.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? GMU13 is an intensive management area where additional harvests are mandated as they become biologically available. Existing regulations may be out dated.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. A periodic review of the ANS is necessary to ensure that subsistence needs are being met.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those hunters who rely on GMU 13 to provide for their subsistence needs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None, all three options (ANS of 600 being too high, too low or just right) are presented for consideration.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-09S-G-138)

PROPOSAL 97 – 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish a nonresident season in Unit 13 as follows:

- Bull moose with antlers 36 inches or three brow tines.
- General season September 1 – September 20, resident hunters
- Nonresidents - same season, 50 inches or four brow tines.

ISSUE: Change the antler restriction for moose in Unit 13.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Will continue to harvest the large, breeding bulls.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All resident hunters; also nonresidents would be able to hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Tok Cutoff-Nabesna Road Advisory Committee

(SC-09S-G-087)

PROPOSAL 98 – 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the antler restriction for moose in Unit 13 as follows:

One bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers, or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on at least one side.

ISSUE: Overabundance of three brow tine bull moose in Unit 13. Bull to cow ratio seems too high. I've seen lots of three brow tine bulls over the last several years, but only one four brow tine bull. I believe the genetics are not there for many bulls to grow four brow tines.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Over-browse of available food sources and not meeting state mandated maximum sustained yield and use of game resources.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. More hunters will harvest a moose, (less over-browse) and protected bulls will still be available for breeding with a more favorable bull to cow ratio.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All regular season moose hunters in Unit 13.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Tier II season is before the regular harvest season.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? My second choice would be to lengthen the season to close on September 25th, not on September 20th, as is done now.

PROPOSED BY: Randall L. Kuehler (SC-09G-002)

PROPOSAL 99 – 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the Unit 13 moose hunt as follows:

Unit 13 moose: August 25 to September 15
Residents: 36 inch or 3 brow tines
Nonresidents: 50 inch or 4 brow tines
Only one moose per household allowed for residents and nonresidents

ISSUE: The taking of large breeding bulls by subsistence only hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Reduction of large breeding bulls and lost nonresident hunt revenue.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Should increase the total number of bulls taken while reducing the number of large breeding bulls taken and allow a nonresident hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Non-trophy meat hunters and nonresident hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People hunting bulls closer to the rut.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Thumper Williamson, Terry Spracklen, and Dave Stevenson (SC-09S-G-022)

PROPOSAL 100 – 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish and archery

season in Unit 13 as follows:

Unit 13 **Residents** **Nonresidents**

1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:

1 bull by Tier II subsistence hunting permit; (Subsistence hunt up to 150 permits may only be issued;)

Aug. 15 - Aug. 31 No open season.

or

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

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20 No open season.

or

One bull with spike fork antlers or 50-inch antlers with 4 or more brow tines on at least one side, by bow and arrow only

Nov. 1 – Nov.10 **Nov. 1 – Nov.10**

ISSUE: Moose populations are rebounding nicely in Unit 13. Archery hunting takes place in most Southcentral Units in August, the Unit 13 Tier II hunt would conflict with an August hunt. Meat care during hot August hunts has proven problematic, especially in remote areas. Holding a hunt in October would allow moose hunting during the rut, possibly resulting in over harvest. A November hunt will allow hunters to spread out on snow machines while avoiding the vulnerability of a rut hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nothing.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by placing this season after the majority of the rut has ended, and most of the cows have already been bred, this would ensure the harvest would have little effect on overall moose populations. The hunt taking place when the weather is cooler would also benefit to the condition of the meat harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters that put the time and efforts to become IBEP certified will benefit from the added opportunity and the better conditions for meat care.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, the opportunity is open to anyone that wants to get certified.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Different dates. Allow non-resident moose hunting during the general season. Any bull hunting.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-049)

PROPOSAL 101– 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Open a nonresident moose

hunt in Unit 13D as follows:

Nonresident general hunt or registration hunt: September 1 – 20; bull only, 50 inch or 3 brow tine requirement.

ISSUE: Re-authorize nonresident moose allocation in Unit 13D. This sub-unit moose population has consistently and should continue to allow for nonresident harvest opportunity. It is questionable that biologically, this area should have ever had nonresident allocation eliminated.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued loss of opportunity for nonresident hunters and professional guide service providers. Revenue generation for the state through license sales and Alaska businesses through goods and services.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Will help balance bull to cow ratio for better management and will assist in predator harvest by having additional hunters in the field.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The Department of Fish and Game, Division of Wildlife Conservation through license sales. Alaska goods and services businesses through sales and nonresident hunters who lost allocation without justification.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Drawing permit hunt, rejected for Department of Fish and Game burden concerns.

PROPOSED BY: The Alaska Professional Hunters Association (HQ-09S-G-066)

PROPOSAL 102 – 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Create a nonresident moose season in Unit 13D as follows.

Create a limited drawing for nonresident hunters.
August 10-September 20, with a 50 inch minimum.

ISSUE: Create an open season for nonresident moose Unit 13D.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Possible discrimination cases filed.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; nonresidents bring more money to the state.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nonresidents and some commercial operators.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Otto Kulm (SC-09S-G-080)

PROPOSAL 103 – 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Open a nonresident moose season in Unit 13 as follows:

Reinstate a nonresident moose hunting season in Unit 13 with a bag limit of 1 bull with 50 inches or 4-

browtines, season dates of September 8-17. The September 8-17 season dates will bring the nonresident season in line with the nonresident season dates in Unit 12, which will simplify the area regulations.

ISSUE: Increasing moose populations in Unit 13 can support an increased harvest. Implementing a nonresident moose hunting season will allow for increased hunting opportunity for all nonresidents and will give guides and transporters in Unit 13 additional hunting options for their clients.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose regulations in Unit 13 will remain unnecessarily restrictive and will limit opportunity for nonresident hunters and the associated guide and transport industries.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Allowing nonresident hunters to harvest moose will increase harvest opportunity and will provide additional business opportunity for the guides and transporters in the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who feel current regulations are unnecessarily restrictive and are interested in maximizing harvest opportunity for both residents and nonresidents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those individuals who wish to continue to limit the moose harvest in Unit 13 to Alaska residents only.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Advisory Committee (INT-09S-G-007)

PROPOSAL 104 – 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Amend the horn restriction for sheep in Unit 11 as follows:

(5)

	Resident Open season	Nonresident Open season
Unit 11 [1 RAM WITH 3/4 CURL HORN OR LARGER] <u>1 ram with full curl horn or larger</u>	Aug 10 - Sept 20	Aug 10-Sept 20

ISSUE: Sub-legal rams taken in walk-in areas in Units 7, 12-15, 20, 25 and 26 may be claimed as taken in Unit 11. Reports from the hunting public of infractions of this nature usually never make it to Wildlife Troopers. Sheep hunters are often solitary by nature and need only to make it to their car with an illegal sheep.

The 3/4 curl regulations attract a number of extra hunters to the unit looking for an easier hunt. Some of these hunters will not hunt Unit 11 if regulations are standardized, easing pressure on a low population. Sheep numbers (especially rams) in Unit 11 and surrounding units are at all-time lows due to many factors. Unit 11 hunts are the most liberal in the state. Retaining 3/4 curl regulations while creating drawing hunts in Units 13 and 14 is counter-intuitive.

According to the Department of Fish and Game, decreasing sheep numbers in the Wrangell Mountains in the last 15 years is mostly due to an increase in predators. Nearly all of Unit 11 sheep habitat is federal preserve lands with no potential of predator management and very little trapping pressure.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Criminals will continue to have an "easy out" if they get out of the field with a sub-full curl sheep. Sheep numbers in Unit 11 are likely to remain low with or without this regulation due to lack of management options, 3/4 curl regulations just compound the problem.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, most sheep that reach 3/4 curl will live to be full curl. Most sheep hunters would agree that a full curl ram is a higher quality product.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sheep hunters, sheep populations, and wildlife troopers will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Criminals and poachers will no longer have an excuse. Some hunters that believe 3/4 curl rams are easier to take. Hunters may have to wait two years for today's 3/4 curls to become legal.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Adding some 3/4 curl areas in other units - rejected due to dwindling sheep numbers. Drawing hunts - rejected, drawings have already eliminated sheep hunting for many.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-059)

PROPOSAL 105 – 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Modify the horn restriction in Unit 11 as follows:

In Unit 11, replace “3/4 curl” with “full curl”.

ISSUE: Allowing Unit 11 harvest of 3/4 rams, when all other units have full curl restriction.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? By allowing 3/4 curl rams to be harvested in Unit 11 this opens the door for illegal sheep hunting opportunities in the other units.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All sheep hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Troy Vincent (SC-095-G-100)

PROPOSAL 106 – 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Establish a Dall sheep hunt in Units 14A and 13D as follows:

Create a 50% additional resident and 10% nonresident tag allocation for IBEP qualified archery sheep hunters in both Units 14A and 13D. With the historic data from 14C archery hunts, we can create archery only tags with minimal net impact to the resource. These tags must be in addition to rifle tags and not reduce opportunity. The hunt could be conducted October 1-10 as to maintain low hunter density and preserve the quality of the experience.

ISSUE: Lack of bow-hunting opportunities in the newly created sheep zones in both Units 14A and 13D.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Opportunities will be lost in an area managed for maximum opportunity, for both resident and nonresident archers and Alaskan outfitters. Draw odds will continue to decrease without "spreading" opportunity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No - it creates opportunity with minimal impact to management objectives and the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Numerous archers hoping to hunt sheep in Units 14A and 13D. With additional nonresident archery tags outfitters could also increase bookings thus increasing state income.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No user group should suffer noticeable impact. The low participation and harvest experienced last season, coupled with difficult terrain, indicates the land and resources can tolerate the proposed increases.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo - needlessly withholds opportunity. Have hunt dates coincide with current hunt dates - this would increase hunters in the field and diminish opportunity/experience. Have hunt dates prior to existing season dates to allow archers an opportunity to hunt sheep before rifle hunters.

PROPOSED BY: Kyle Wait (SC-09S-G-044)

PROPOSAL 107 – 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Establish a new archery hunt as follows:

Establish an archery only draw for sheep in Unit 13D. We would like to see additional draw tags be available (not taken from current allotment) for this hunt. It would read as follows;

Sheep - Unit 13D: "Archery only," one ran with full-curl horn or larger by permit-**August 10 - October 15.**

ISSUE: Additional hunting opportunities are needed for archery hunters. The majority of the lower 48 states offer dedicated hunting areas and/or more desirable hunting dates for archery hunters. These states offer their "best hunting times" as an incentive for those choosing harder, less successful means of hunting. Alaska does offer a few token hunts, but as a whole archery hunters are not being represented very well.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Many hunters who are willing to hunt by bow have chosen not to because very few incentives are given to the archery community. By not having a separate hunting season, this user group will continue to use the rifle instead of the bow. Adding or increasing archery only hunting areas would open up more hunting opportunities and less hunting pressure for all users. We can continue to go with the status quo and continue to allow rifle hunters to have the majority of the harvest resulting in less hunting opportunities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Archery hunters would benefit by having their own allotment of tags and better hunting dates.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, if the extra tags are allocated.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Establish an open archery season, (not draw) for sheep in Unit 13D. Same dates mentioned above.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee (HQ-09S-G-087)

PROPOSAL 108 – 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Modify the regulations to provide the following changes to sheep hunting in Unit 13A:

Have the Department of Fish and Game allocate harvest numbers for both resident and nonresident sheep hunters. Once a group has harvested their quota, their hunting season is closed.

or

Establish two hunting seasons for sheep in Unit 13A, (like Tok Management Area).

First season, August 10-August 25; second season, September 1- September 20.

Each season will have its own harvest quota. Once this number is reached, season is closed.

or

Make Unit 13A a drawing permit area for nonresident sheep hunters. This means the season will remain open to resident sheep hunters, and nonresident sheep hunters would have to apply for a draw permit.

ISSUE: Sheep hunting in Game Management Unit 13A is at a point that it might need to go to draw. Before this happens, I would like to establish a harvest point system like we do for goat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If nothing is done we will see Unit 13A go to a draw. Having another unit go to draw will hurt hunting opportunities for all user groups.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. If done right we should see an increase in our sheep population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Options 1 or 2 would allow Unit 13A to remain open for all users and option three only for residents. The department would still be able to limit the numbers of sheep being harvested without having to go to draw.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Both nonresident and resident sheep hunters may not be able to hunt if the sheep harvest numbers are reached before their hunting dates. Nonresident sheep hunters if this unit went to draw.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Troy Vincent (SC-095-G-101)

PROPOSAL 109 – 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Modify the nonresident Dall sheep hunts in Units 13 and 14 as follows:

For Units 13 and 14, put all sheep hunting for nonresidents in the Talkeetna Mountains on a drawing permit system, and keep it as an open hunt (harvest ticket) for residents. And limit the number of nonresident permits so they will represent no more than 10 percent of the hunters in the field. Permit areas will have to be established and the actual number of permits per area will be determined by the Alaska Department of Fish and

Game biologists taking into account the much higher efficiency (3x) of guided nonresidents to residents and the estimated legal rams available for harvest (leaving a few survivors each season).

ISSUE: We've split the problem into two main concerns - A and B, both of which can be solved with one regulatory change. A.) Within the Talkeetna Mountains, there has been an ever-increasing ratio of nonresident to resident sheep hunters and an ever-increasing percentage of the sheep harvest taken by nonresidents. B.) Fewer and fewer open sheep hunting opportunities are available to resident hunters; drawing-permit only areas are increasing.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A.) The number of nonresident sheep hunters will continue to increase and the number of resident sheep hunters will continue to decrease. This is partly due to crowded hunting conditions, the scarcity of legal sheep, and the monetary incentives of professional hunters and their clients that drive some of them to extremes to harvest a sheep. Without the monetary incentive, many residents stop hunting sheep under these conditions, but there always seems to be enough professional hunters and their clients who will still "compete" for a sheep. B.) As more and more sheep hunting areas go to drawing-permit-only across our state, there will be even less opportunity for any hunter to hunt sheep and an even larger percentage of hunters will be nonresidents guided by professional hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, some of the large rams will survive the hunting season. This will result in at least a few larger rams for the following year's harvest, rather than pruning every legal ram each season. Our premise for this is that guided hunters with bush planes do take legal rams with greater efficiency than residents; after all, guides are professional hunters. As was recently reported by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (Kellyhouse, 2007) for Unit 14A in the Chugach Mountains, all the legal rams in a limited area can be taken by current sheep hunting methods - at least in that area when professional hunters with bush planes were not restricted. The majority of resident sheep hunters do not have bush planes at their disposal to spend hours flying to find these large rams nor to follow them from drainage to drainage on a daily basis until the animal is taken, as some professional hunters are willing to do for their nonresident clients. With mostly resident sheep hunters in the Talkeetna mountains, and the guided hunters restricted to a small portion of the hunters afield, some large rams will most likely survive each hunting season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Some resident hunters who have less-crowded hunting and some larger sheep to hunt for. Some nonresidents who get the drawing hunts will also have less-crowded hunting and some larger sheep to hunt for.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some nonresident hunters who do not draw the permits. Some resident hunters who can no longer take their close relatives sheep hunting because they did not draw a permit.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1. Put the sheep hunting in the Talkeetna Mountains on a drawing permit for everyone, with up to 10 percent of the permits going to nonresidents, as was done in the adjacent Units (14A and 13D) beginning in 2008. This was rejected because we would rather not see the continual progression of drawing permit only sheep hunting across Alaska if it can be avoided. We would like to see an alternative to this progression to avoid a foreseeable future when all sheep hunting in Alaska is drawing permit only. 2. Alternately, we considered creating a resident only sheep hunting area for all of the Talkeetna Mountains. This would certainly vastly improve the hunting experience and success for residents. However, the professional hunters and nonresident hunters do have a place in Alaska hunting that needs to be recognized and maintained at some level so that would be an unacceptable change.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-027)

PROPOSAL 110 – 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions; and 92.540

Controlled Use Areas. Restrict the use of motorized vehicles and aircraft for Units 13 and 14 as follows:

For Units 13 and 14, all airplane usage shall be restricted to only allow for the transportation of hunters to and from the field. I further suggest that this ban starts five days before hunting season and ends at midnight of the last day.

and /or

Make Unit 14C a Controlled Use Area; closed to using motorized vehicles.

ISSUE: I believe that aircraft should only be used to transport hunters to and from the field during big game hunting season. During hunting season aircraft are being used by "all user groups" to assist them in making their hunt easier and more successful. Here are several problems that may occur by allowing aircraft to fly into hunting areas during hunting season. 1) Game is being harassed. 2) It is unethical in my opinion to spot game via aircraft. Aircraft owners and users have an unfair advantage over those who don't have access to an airplane. 3) Hunters in the field may use an airplane that is spotting game as an unfair advantage.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Guided nonresident sheep hunters are having more success (60%) than the resident sheep hunters (13%). I believe one of the major reasons behind this extremely high success rate is due to the fact that guides are flying many hours looking for game prior to and during the season. Resident hunters are seeing our hunting opportunities diminished each year due to this exceedingly high success rate.

Sheep are smart, and if shot at in drainage will move. That makes it very hard for walking hunters to find them as they access areas that cannot be seen from below. However, plane spotting makes that a moot point and takes away their main defense and leads to easy success rates, which is what is unethical about it.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? I understand that it may not improve the quality of the meat harvested; however, less harassment by aircraft would in fact improve the quality of the game being harvested by reducing the stress level of hunted game, and loss of life to game from spooking etc... Game that has been harassed are much harder, if not impossible, to hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Every hunter (that doesn't use an airplane to spot game) would benefit, since harvest numbers would be lower. More game means more hunting opportunities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? All users that use aircraft to spot game. Sight-seeing tours from August 5 through September 20 would be restricted from flying in these units during hunting season.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Ban all flying in Units 13 and 14 for sheep hunting until sheep numbers recover. (Not rejected.) Establish that all aircraft, (except for taking off and landing) must remain XXXX feet above ground level. (Not rejected.)

PROPOSED BY: Troy Vincent

(SC-09S-G-097)

PROPOSAL 111 – 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures. In Unit 13D, 14A, and 14C, require a guide client agreement when applying for a draw hunt permit.

Require all nonresidents who apply for sheep and goat drawing tags in Units 13D, 14A, and 14C to have a guide-client agreement signed before or at the time of making the application, unless hunting with a qualified resident relative within the second degree of kinship.

ISSUE: Nonresident hunters apply for sheep and goat drawing permits in Units 13D, 14A, and 14C without a guide client agreement, then shop around for a deal and end up not using the permit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Permits will continue to be wasted by nonresidents who aren't serious about going hunting in areas where permit numbers are very low anyway.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Nonresident hunters who aren't even sure if they want to go hunting, or spend the money necessary to hire a guide as required, will be eliminated from the application process, decreasing the total number of applications and increasing the number of permits used.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Registered guides who sign up for these areas early because they are planning on taking clients into the area will benefit. All hunters that apply for the draw will benefit by having a greater chance of being drawn because there will be less applicants putting in.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident hunters who do not have a guide contract or a qualified resident 2nd degree kindred relative to hunt with will not be able to apply.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Leave regulations as they are, and continue to waste non-resident drawing permits.

PROPOSED BY: Daniel G. Montgomery (SC-09S-G-61)

PROPOSAL 112 – 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf. Change the season and bag limit for wolf in Unit 13 as follows:

Set the wolf harvest regulations back to the pre-Intensive Management rule that provided for 5 wolves annually in a season starting August 10 to April 30 for that small portion of Unit 13C that is in Wrangell St Elias National Preserve.

ISSUE: While the State of Alaska regulates hunting on lands managed by the National Park Service and designated by Congress as national preserves, it does so only in as far as that these state regulations do not conflict with park purposes, park regulations and management directives, and the legislative direction provided by Congress when Alaska's park units were created (36 CFR 13.40(d). National preserves in Alaska are bound to the Organic Act as well as to ANILCA and they are managed under the same management policies as parks in the Lower 48. Direction in both ANILCA and the management policies make it clear that while harvesting wildlife in national preserves can occur, it cannot deplete healthy populations or unacceptably impact natural processes, natural distributions, densities, age-class distributions and behaviors, and harvest cannot be done for the purpose of increasing the numbers of harvested species (i.e. predator control). Unfortunately, the passage of the State of Alaska's Intensive Management statute in 1994 set the state on a course of conflict with these NPS directives.

The National Park Service Organic Act clearly states that the purpose of the national park system is to "...conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein." The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (ANILCA) gives as one of its primary purposes providing "... for the maintenance of sound populations of, and habitat for, wildlife species...(section 101(b))", and in providing for these wildlife species, the populations in national preserves are to remain "healthy (section 815 (1))." And each park's enabling language clearly supports wildlife protection as a primary park purpose (see ANILCA Section II).

There is specific direction in ANILCA that provides for hunting in national preserves and we are not contesting that right. ANILCA section 1313 states that "A National Preserve in Alaska shall be administered and managed as a unit of the National Park System in the same manner as a national park... except that the taking of fish and wildlife for sport purposes... shall be allowed in a national preserve under applicable state and federal law and regulation." The key words here are "administered and managed as a unit of the National Park system in the same manner as a national park...under applicable State and Federal law and regulation". Management direction for all units of the national park system in Alaska is firmly grounded in the 1916 Organic Act as set forth in ANILCA Section 203.

Of particular concern to the request made in this proposal, the National Park Service Management Policies at 4.4.2, make it abundantly clear that the manipulation of wildlife populations is not allowed: "The Service does not engage in activities to reduce the numbers of native species for the purpose of increasing the numbers of harvested species (i.e., predator control), nor does the Service permit others to do so on lands managed by the National Park Service."

In this proposal, the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) is concerned only about the application of existing wolf harvest regulations in those parts of Unit 13C that are located in Wrangell St. Elias National Preserve. As such our proposed regulation change only addresses national preserve lands and makes no comment, judgment or suggestion for how the State of Alaska manages wildlife on its own or other federal lands.

When the state's Intensive Management Act was passed, wolf harvest in Unit 13C was five wolves/year from August 10 to April 30. Subsequent changes to the state's wolf regulations for this unit were made in regulatory year (RY) 1999 when the bag limit was increased to ten wolves/day .

From reading the Wolf Management Report (WMR) for Unit 13, it is obvious that liberalizing hunting opportunities, beginning with the significant increase in bag limit in 1999 to the more recent changes to land and shoot rules (which are not applicable to NPS lands), are focused entirely on growing more moose. The 1999 to 2002 WMR reports that "increased human harvest of moose and caribou became the primary objective for the unit. As a result, the Board of Game reduced the wolf population management objective..." Further in that report it states that "...wolf harvests must be increased to take a higher percentage of the wolf population in order to bring wolves within management objectives." In the 2002 to 2005 WMR, the unit's focus on moose and caribou for human consumption continues to be the driving management objective with statements like "...wolves must be reduced in order for the moose population to adequately recover."

These very clear statements directing the manipulation of wolf populations to benefit moose and caribou are in direct conflict with the direction given to the National Park Service that such manipulation cannot occur on its lands. As such, this proposal seeks to restore the bag limit of five wolves/year on that small part of Unit 13C that is in Wrangell St. Elias National Preserve.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? State regulations will continue to be in conflict with federal statutes and management policies, setting up an inevitable showdown between state and federal authority that will most likely end in court at a considerable cost of time and resources for both entities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Healthy wolf populations, as directed by ANILCA would be ensured in Wrangell St. Elias National Preserves and there would be no risk of the state's Intensive Management statutes, as embodied in the current liberalized harvest regulations, causing a reduction in the wolf population to an unhealthy level, which could/would cause the National Park Service to take action to close the area to hunting altogether.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All people who appreciate that a primary management goal of national preserves in Alaska is to sustain healthy populations of wildlife, including wolves, and that hunting in national preserves should be managed to meet federal wildlife statutes, regulations and policies, not the State of Alaska's.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those that wrongly believe that the federal government does not have authority to manage wildlife living within the boundaries of national park system units.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Jim Stratton, National Parks Conservation Association (SC-09S-G-038)

PROPOSAL 113 – 5 AAC 92.12(c). Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans. Establish an

experimental control area in the Unit 13 predator control area as follows:

Our proposed solution is for the Board of Game to amend the Predator Control Implementation Plan for Unit 13 so as to establish an experimental control area in Subunit 13A where wolves would not be reduced by private pilots permitted to take wolves with aircraft, and other control methods would be prohibited. Wolf hunting and trapping regulations would remain unchanged.

ISSUE: The wolf control program in Unit 13 is now in its 6th year. Because the protocol of the predator control program when it was initiated did not include an experimental control (i.e., an area where wolves were not reduced) it is impossible to determine whether or not reducing wolves resulted in increased moose numbers. If an increase in moose occurs, it is impossible to determine what caused the increase as several other variables including bear predation; winter severity, hunting, and habitat quality are well-known to affect moose in this area. In the absence of an experimental control, we cannot conclude that reducing wolves was the only cause of increases in moose rather than the single or combined effects of other variables. As a result, the controversial, expensive program of wolf control cannot be evaluated on a biological or public policy basis, nor can future wolf control programs be based on sound science.

Justification:

Unit 13 is one of the most important moose and caribou hunting areas in Alaska. Roads including the Glenn, Richardson, Parks, and Denali highways provide access to hunters as do several major rivers and a vast system of ATV trails. Numerous airstrips and water bodies provide aircraft access as well. This, combined with a moose population and a caribou herd that provide thousands of animals available for harvest, has made this unit a prime destination for resident hunters since the 1950s.

Because of its importance to hunters, research and management of moose and caribou in Unit 13 has resulted in a large amount of data and a historical picture of population fluctuations over a 6-decade time frame. This is perhaps the best studied unit in Alaska in terms of number and extent of projects designed to gather information for management purposes.

The area has an extensive history of predator control including a large poisoning and aerial shooting campaign in the 1950s that reduced the wolf population in this 20,000 square mile area to one surviving wolf pack. Public aerial hunting after statehood kept wolf numbers depressed as did land-and-shoot hunting in the 1970s following passage of the Federal Airborne hunting Act. In the late 1970s, an experimental wolf reduction program in a portion of the area virtually eliminated wolves but moose calf survival failed to increase until brown bears were transplanted out of the area.

In recent years following termination of land-and-shoot wolf hunting, wolf numbers increased and moose numbers declined, but a series of severe winters likely contributed to the moose decline. Prior to the decline moose increased and may have exceeded habitat carrying capacity.

In 2003-2004 when the latest round of predator control began, Unit 13 was one of the first areas targeted for wolf reduction by the board. A large number of private pilots were permitted to use fixed-wing aircraft to take wolves in portions of the unit. This reduced wolves to program objective levels in the later years of the program.

Now, it is claimed that the wolf control program is a success—that moose cow: calf ratios have increased along with total moose numbers (see the Department of Fish and Game “white paper” prepared in 2008 in advance of the ballot measure on same day airborne hunting). However, no scientifically valid analysis supports this claim of success.

Increases in several population segments of moose are claimed for Unit 13 following recent reductions of wolves. These claims are based on moose herd composition surveys, not census data. It is well established in the moose technical literature that population trends cannot be accurately estimated with survey data. The

number of moose counted with aerial surveys varies with total time spent searching, as well as with snow, light and wind turbulence conditions and observer experience and fatigue.

Furthermore, we are unaware of statistical analyses that were applied to the changes in survey data. Such changes may occur in the absence of true differences in the moose population due to sampling error. Conclusions cannot be valid unless significant differences among years are confirmed by statistical analysis.

Therefore, we do not know whether or not significant increases in moose population parameters for moose numbers have occurred as a result of reducing wolves in Unit 13, and we have seen now valid evidence that moose harvests have increased as a direct result of reducing wolves. Even if we assume that increases in moose survival have occurred, we cannot claim that reducing wolves caused the increase because the other factors may equal or exceed the effects of wolf control.

In 1997 the National Research Council (NRC) released its review of past predator control programs in Alaska and Canada. The review found that many prior control programs had unclear outcomes, i.e., it could not be determined whether or not predator control "worked" in terms of increasing ungulate numbers. The review stated that this was due to conducting predator control as management programs with insufficient attention to ensuring that the results could be evaluated. The NRC recommended that management actions should be planned as experiments so it is possible to assess their outcome. Control actions should be designed to include clearly specified monitoring protocols for sufficient duration to determine if predictions are borne out and why.

Unfortunately, despite this blueprint for success, when the board approved the Unit 13 predator control program it failed to heed the NRC's advice. Now, we are again unable to evaluate the success or failure of reducing wolves in this unit because the protocol guiding the reduction does not provide a valid means of conducting an evaluation.

We believe that it is not too late to salvage this opportunity to evaluate the effects of reducing wolves in Unit 13 on moose numbers, and ultimately, on hunter success. If an experimental control area is established now in a portion of the area where wolf control is not applied, it would be possible in the next several years to compare moose population parameters in areas where wolves are reduced in relation to those where they are not. An experimental control is the only way to assess the effect of wolf predation alone in contrast to other variables, and the only way to verify that reducing wolves causes increases in moose.

We propose that the board should amend the Unit 13 Predator Control Implementation Plan codified in 5AAC 92.125 to establish all or a portion of Unit subunit 13A as an experimental control area for the remainder of Unit 13. Unit 13A has the most detailed and inclusive data on past moose population information as a result of research conducted there since the 1970s including the recent studies of Dr. Ward Testa. This should allow an adequate base of information on which to compare future moose population changes. Unit 13A also is the only area within the entire unit with past moose census efforts that produced valid estimates of population size.

We caution that any experimental control must be of sufficient size to allow reestablishment of wolf packs and a return to predation patterns on moose similar to those pre-dating the control effort. Establishing an area that is too small to allow this would negate the purpose of the control. Obviously, it is also important to avoid changes in bear and moose hunting regulations that would affect the impact of these variables on moose and thereby confound interpretation of results.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to be unable to draw valid conclusions regarding the effects of reducing wolves on moose numbers--i.e., we will never know whether or not wolf control in this area "worked." The Board will be unable to use the results of the Unit 13 program as a template for similar programs in other areas. The Board and the department will continue to receive criticism from the scientific community over failure to use science-based management to guide predator reduction programs.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, because this proposal if adopted would allow evaluation of reduction program that currently cannot be evaluated. It would potentially provide guidance for adoption of similar programs in other areas. This has implications for providing more ungulates for hunters and for avoiding adoption of programs that may not be effective.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those interested in managing wildlife in Alaska with a science-based approach. Hunters who wish to support predator control programs that can be evaluated for success or failure and applied elsewhere.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solution seems appropriate.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Alliance (SC-09S-G-60)

PROPOSAL 114 – 5 AAC 92.125(c). Predation control areas implementation plans. Modify the predator control area boundary for Unit 13E as follows:

Move the boundary below the Gold Creek bridge on the Susitna River to the mouth of the Talkeetna River to the west bank of the Susitna River instead of the railroad tracks as the boundary for that portion of 13E is presently.

ISSUE: Present boundary below the Gold Creek bridge being the Alaska railroad denies hunting access to the Susitna River. The river bed is the only ski access for planes as from the railroad east is all heavy timber and cannot be hunted.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wolves along western border of Unit 13E Will remain largely un-hunted.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? There is heavy wolf predation on moose along west boundary of 13 E and relocating boundary to west bank of the Susitna River would allow those moose to benefit from predator control.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters and moose populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Wolves.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Greg Pepperd (HQ-095-G-014)

PROPOSAL 115 – 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures. Allow preference points to accumulate as follows:

Preference points for these are not drawn, would accumulate each year not drawn.

ISSUE: Would like applicants putting in for drawing hunts to be able to accumulate points in all drawing hunts for Units 11 and 13 for sheep, moose, and bison.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Applicants would not accumulate preference points.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those hunters who have been applying each year and not drawn.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who are lucky enough to be drawn year after year.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Tok Cutoff - Nabesna Road Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-086)

PROPOSAL 116 – 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Restrict the use of motorized vehicles in Unit 13A as follows:

Unit 13A: No four-wheelers from August 1- September 30. Aircraft may fly to and from a Department Natural Resources camps only, with a land use permit (LAS #).

ISSUE: Four-wheelers are chasing the game down and killing them. Trails are everywhere and destroying the land. Hunters flying and chasing the game down and killing them.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be no game to hunt there. All is left is sheep and bear and they are wiping them out.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It will go back to a fair chase hunt. Because it's now run them down and kill them

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? There will be more game. Everyone will with the game coming back.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Everyone because there will be no game out there, and there will only be four-wheeler trails and not caribou trails

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Frank Danford (HQ-095-G-006)

PROPOSAL 117 – 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Modify the sea duck hunting season for Unit 15 as follows:

Exploitation rates and thresholds of abundance need to be maintained within easily accessible areas like Kachemak Bay.

ISSUE: Localized depletion of sea duck species from guided hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Depleted areas cannot recover. Most of these ducks are not eaten or utilized.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED BE IMPROVED?

WHO WILL BENEFIT?

WHO WILL SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Nancy Hillstrand (SC-09S-G-089)

PROPOSAL 118 – 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Eliminate the hunting season for Sandhill Cranes in Unit 15C as follows:

The regulation would delete any reference to hunting of Sandhill Cranes in Unit 15C.

ISSUE: Remove Unit 15C from hunting of Sandhill Cranes.

Because of their limited numbers, threats at breeding, migration staging, and wintering areas, and concern that recruitment and breeding populations may decline from predation and hunting, it is recommended the regulation in allowing hunting of the lower Kenai Peninsula subpopulation of Lesser Sandhill Cranes (*Grus canadensis canadensis*) in Unit 15C be removed.

Crane studies and field observations have been conducted in the Fairbanks and Palmer areas by the Alaska Dept of Fish and Game, but little information has been gathered on the distinct and separate Homer subpopulations of Sandhill Cranes. Anecdotal population data exists based on field observations in the Homer area but there is scarce information on population size, recruitment, immigration, critical roost sites, nest sites, fecundity, availability of habitat and habitat selection, predation, affects due to weather, hunting harvest and needed conservation measures.

In an effort to monitor and track the Homer crane subpopulation, Kachemak Crane Watch has established a citizen science network of field observers and baseline of data for Sandhill Crane sighting in the lower Kenai Peninsula, principally the Homer region (2008). Data is recorded from field observations on population movements, flock sizes, number of successful mating pairs with colts, habitat preferences, and incidents of predation and other mortality factors. Beginning the summer of 2008, Kachemak Crane Watch, in cooperation with the International Crane Foundation, initiated a crane research project in Homer. Ten birds were outfitted with satellite/radio transmitters. The Homer subpopulation of Sandhill Cranes was hypothesized to winter in central California. The satellite program has verified the Homer subpopulation does migrate to central California.

The Sandhill Crane subpopulation in the Homer region is protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the cranes status throughout the Pacific Flyway is a concern to wildlife managers (International Crane Foundation). Because it is a migratory bird, the Sandhill Crane is subject to habitat limitations within the flyway and at the wintering grounds.

Gary Ivey, Western Manager for the International Crane Foundation, as part of his doctoral thesis, is examining the status of the Central California Valley wintering Sandhill Crane population of interspersed Greater and Lesser Sandhill Cranes. Mr. Ivey has found that much of the critical wintering habitat has been replaced by urban expansion, and land use conversion to incompatible crops (e.g. orchards and vineyards). (G. Ivey, pers. comm., 2008). In addition, there is habitat disruption within the Pacific Flyway Sandhill Crane migration staging areas (British Columbia, Canada, and Washington and Oregon) due to significant loss of privately owned Sandhill Crane habitat, agricultural conversions, land use development, disturbances at roost sites, and other disturbances (Littlefield and Ivey, 1999).

Currently, all Sandhill Crane subspecies are considered Endangered in Washington (Littlefield and Ivey, 2002) and vulnerable (Blue-listed) in British Columbia (Blood and Back house, 1999). The California Central Valley population of cranes has been classified as a sensitive population, receiving high priority for management by the US FWS (Littlefield and Cornely, 1997).

Sandhill Crane nesting preference is for emergent vegetation communities, and nest success is often dependent on seasonal water conditions that may be expand or restrict the habitat (Austin, et al 2007). Sandhill Cranes nest in water to protect the eggs, the incubating bird, and the young from ground predators (Stocking et al, 2007). The wetland condition is also critical to prevent roost disturbance (Littlefield and Cornely, 1997). A multi-year study of Greater Sandhill Cranes in Malheur National Wildlife Refuge, Oregon found Sandhill Crane chicks (also known as colts) experienced an 11 year mortality rate of 84.8 percent from depredations

mainly from common ravens and coyotes (Littlefield and Cornely, 1997). Predation may be a limiting factor in the small size of the Homer subpopulation and more data is needed to study the effects of predation, especially from high numbers of eagles attracted to the area by winter eagle feeding programs, and fish waste deposited along beaches from sport fishing, and from commercial fishing.

Population data for the Homer Sandhill Crane subpopulation collected by Kachemak Crane Watch (2008) for the past five years suggests a static population with little to no recruitment. The population size is estimated to be about 200 adults and sub-adults. In 2008, a flock of over 100 birds was observed regularly in a hay field near Homer, only seven colts were observed at any one time. Plumage studies to determine age class need to be done to determine the number of breeding adults. Cranes do not pair bond and breed until 4-7 years of age so a recruitment of seven young out of population size of 100 would mean the species composition of breeding adults is low (number of young + number of young+ number of breeding adults x 100 percent = Annual Production) (Littlefield and Cornely, 1997).

Limiting factors in the Homer Unit 15C include:

1) Unnatural predation. Based on field observations there is documented mortality of crane chicks from eagle predation (Kachemak Crane Watch, 2008). The eagle population in Homer has increased from less than 100 to now over 500 eagles congregating due to the winter feeding of eagles at the Homer Spit (500 lbs. of fish a day). Other eagle concentrations occur at other private feeding sites, the Homer landfill, and along beaches and rivers due to sport and commercial fish waste. In addition to predation by eagles, there have been at least ten mortalities from dogs killing colts.

2) Habitat Vulnerability. Sandhill Cranes are communal marshland roosters and when a population congregates in a limited habitat a significant portion of the population is subject to catastrophic disruption due to habitat loss or predation at roosting sites. Habitat protection and documented loss needs to be part of a comprehensive study on the Sandhill Crane subpopulation of the Homer region leading to better informed management measures. The International Crane Watch study currently underway will help locate critical roosting habitat or the Homer region subpopulation. Roost counts are not samples but an absolute count of that location at that time and will provide valuable population and age data (G. Ivey, 2000). Loss or disruption of critical wintering habitat in the Central Valley of California will affect the population dynamics of the Homer Sandhill Crane subpopulation.

3) Low Reproductive Success and First Year Hatch Success. There is an estimated population of 200 Sandhill Cranes in the Homer region. In a flock of over 100 Sandhill Cranes frequenting an area hayfield in late summer 2008, only seven colts were observed at any one time (pers. observation). Sandhill Cranes do not pair bond and reproduce until 4-7 years of age so there is low recruitment due to non-breeding adults. All the factors of low population recruitment make the species population unstable.

4.) Hunting harvest. Hunting regulations in Unit 15C allow a daily take of two birds and four in possession. In the summer of 2008, from a population of over 100 birds only seven colts were observed. The reduction of the population by only two hunters (eight birds killed) would effectively lead to negative recruitment in the subpopulation making this subpopulation even more vulnerable. No harvest data exists on the number of Sandhill Cranes taken in Unit 15C. Hunting of Sandhill cranes in the lower Kenai Peninsula is one limiting factor that can easily be managed by removing this threat to the population as a conservation measure.

The Sandhill Crane population in the Homer area has a wide-spread iconic appeal to local citizens and visitors to Homer. Sandhill Cranes frequent people's yards and have become habituated to people. Sandhill Cranes are the subject of much interest to the local community in its tourism, arts, nature study, and the aesthetic beauty of the bird's behavior and daily sightings, aerial flights, and clarion calls. Because the population is so habituated to people, it is very vulnerable to hunting in Unit 15C.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the game hunting regulations remain, more Sandhill Cranes will be lost to the point where the subpopulation could be seriously affected and unable to maintain a

viable population. We do not know what the population viability is for this subpopulation without further research studies. Research is needed on such issues as habitat preferences (with mapping of land use vulnerability of roosting, nesting, foraging sites), population recruitment and fecundity, migration stops and wintering habitat influences on population, extent of predation, and the identification of conservation measures.

Kachemak Crane Watch funded a research study in the summer of 2008 to place satellite/radio receivers on ten cranes from the Homer area. The data generated will be the first of its kind to monitor the population, help identify habitat preferences, locate roosting sites, and correlate the population recruitment to migratory staging and winter range vulnerability. The study will apply statistical analysis to population recovery or loss.

One major step towards ensuring stability of the population is to remove hunting as a limiting factor contributing to the vulnerability of Lesser Sandhill Cranes in Unit 15C. The current status of the population cannot sustain hunting harvest. Removal of hunting would be an effective conservation measure.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The proposal would eliminate one of the threats experienced by Lesser Sandhill Cranes in the Kachemak Bay area. Kachemak Crane Watch, The International Crane Foundations, local Kachemak Bay area citizens, and conservation groups are committed to protecting Homer's Sandhill Crane population and implementing conservation measures for a stable population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The solution would benefit a large majority of Homer residents who enjoy observing, hearing, feeding, and photographing cranes. Homer tourism showcases the Sandhill Crane as part of its promotion and a significant number of visitors come to Homer to observe and photograph Sandhill Cranes.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunting of Sandhill Cranes outside of Unit 15C is not affected. The Lesser Sandhill Crane Pacific Flyway population is not hunted in British Columbia, Canada, or in Washington, Oregon and California.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Change the hunting season to begin September 20 and reduce bag/possession limit to one crane, with one in possession. The Kachemak Bay Breeding population appears precariously low and therefore, without first ascertaining the local crane population and obtaining harvest data continued hunting is not justified. 2) Temporarily suspend (for 6 years) hunting of Lesser Sandhill Cranes in Unit 15C until such time as the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, the US Fish and Wildlife Service, the International Crane Foundation, or another entity can determine size of the breeding population of Lesser Sandhill Cranes in the Homer area, rates of immigration, fecundity, etc, and determine whether it is advisable to allow continued hunting of this subpopulation.

PROPOSED BY: John Wiles (SC-09S-G-031)

PROPOSAL 119 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Lengthen the trapping season date for beaver as follows:

Would like season to be the same as Units 11, 13, and 16, opening September 25 and closing May 31, for Units 7 and 15.

ISSUE: The beaver trapping season is too short. No open water trapping opportunity.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued loss of opportunity to harvest beaver in spring and fall conditions.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Allows more opportunity. Nuisance beavers could be handled in a more efficient manner.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All beaver trappers; land owners and managers with beaver issues; and younger trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Kenai Peninsula Trappers Association (HQ-09S-G-053)

PROPOSAL 120 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping; and 92.550. Areas closed to trapping. Close beaver trapping in a portion of Unit 15C as follows:

In Unit 15C, the area bounded by the Anchor River (south fork), Beaver Creek, Beaver Creek Flats and Fritz Creek (west fork), the Sterling Highway to the west, and East End Road to the south to be closed to the trapping of beaver for three to five years. (To allow for the re-establishment of the historic population, to be followed by a survey of active lodges and limited trapping as warranted. Education of the public regarding shooting also encouraged.

ISSUE: Over the past 20 years there has been a decline in the beaver population in certain drainages. Harvest data indicates a gradual decline. My concern is for the South 15C area around Homer. Twitter Creek, the west arm of Fritz Creek, and in Beaver Flats are devoid for this historic fur bearer. Increase in coyote and wolf populations maybe one contributing factor. Also, indiscriminate shooting of beaver has and does occur. Lack of beaver equates to loss of flood control and economic value both for fisheries and trapping. Habitat to support them is clearly there. The beaver needs protection.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If this is not addressed, there will continue to be a decline in active beaver lodges, to the detriment of local trappers, the local economy and fish habitat. Beaver were active in these watersheds when homesteaders came. They provide the best flood control, as we learned in 2002, how valuable that is to our fisheries. Twitter Creek would not have flooded as badly as it did, had beaver still resided and been active. In a flood it is a domino effect from upstream to downstream.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by restoring the numbers, it will create protections for fish habitat, for harvest, and give an opportunity for education the public to the value of beaver. This will be an economic benefit to our local trappers. A great place to educate young people into the value of trapping. And may provide an opportunity for tourists to see beaver.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen, trappers, and tourists. It is amazing to me how many of our summer visitors come to see wildlife, including even the indomitable beaver. As a representative on the Kenai Peninsula Borough Assembly for District 9, I have to look at all economic benefits. I was recently made award of the K-Bay NERR fish habitat research (Anchorage River Watershed) that supports the findings that beaver activity protect and enhance fish habitat. (Cowie Walker, NERR)

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I do not see anyone suffering. To continue as now doing will do more harm than good.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Do nothing, which would result in a continuing downward population trend. 2) Lower harvest numbers, which could help, but much slower recovery. 3) Curtail the season. Same as #2. I believe we are past this point.

PROPOSED BY: Mildred "Milli" Martin (HQ-09S-G-052)

PROPOSAL 121 - Trapping: 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Close the season for trapping red fox in

Units 7 and 15 as follows:

The November 10 through February 28 trapping season within Units 7 and 15, with a 1 fox limit, would be replaced with "No open season". The proposed change would not change the season and bag limit for red fox in 14C (Chugach State Park) though the Board of Game may consider restrictions here as well. If Kenai red foxes are a unique subspecies, and their range extends north to Chugach State Park, then this area may serve as a source for natural immigration or population augmentation to the Kenai Peninsula. Without specific genetic studies however, this premise is speculative.

ISSUE: Very low numbers of red fox on the Kenai Peninsula.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There has not been a recognized harvestable surplus of red fox on the Kenai Peninsula for many years and credibility of the trapping program and wildlife management objectives for the area is at question. Kenai National Wildlife Refuge has a Congressional mandate to maintain wildlife numbers in their natural diversity and should not risk loss of a species from the refuge no matter how insignificant the population numbers are.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal does not specifically improve the quality of the resource harvested, but does add credibility to current regulations in only offering harvest opportunity in areas and on species where a harvestable surplus is likely to occur. Red fox numbers are so low that most biologists working on the Kenai Peninsula have never seen one there, and most trappers never catch one. The current regulation seems to be in place to allow trappers the opportunity to take a "mistake" animal, yet this practice is not in place for other species. For example, when lynx numbers are low the season is closed. Imposing the restriction would hopefully eliminate trappers targeting fox with specific set types, provide incentive to release fox from sets wherever possible, and report to biologists any incidental take so that important management information can be obtained. The restriction should not be used to increase trapper liability for catching fox beyond what already exists for the capture of any closed season species.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who will benefit include supporters of wildlife management that includes regulations based on taking only species that have a harvestable surplus. Trappers would benefit from lowering the risk of additional restrictions that could result from the Refuge needing to impose actions to meet their Congressional mandates.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Few people will suffer from the proposal. Based on trapping reports, currently most Kenai trappers will never catch a red fox on the Kenai Peninsula in the foreseeable future.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The restriction on the take of red foxes could be limited strictly to Kenai National Wildlife Refuge. This would resolve the Refuge's concerns about the potential harvest of a poorly represented animal on the Refuge; however, there is no evidence that there is a harvestable surplus of red fox anywhere on the Kenai Peninsula.

PROPOSED BY: Kenai National Wildlife Refuge (HQ-095-G-027)

PROPOSAL 122 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Change the season and bag limit for marten in Unit 15 as follows:

Unit 15: November 10 through January 15, limit of 2.

ISSUE: Martin bag limit on highly populated road system areas with ease of access.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Localized depletions

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED BE IMPROVED?

WHO WILL BENEFIT?

WHO WILL SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Nancy Hillstrand (SC-095-G-91)

PROPOSAL 123 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Change the season and bag limit for wolverine in Unit 15 as follows:

Unit 15: November 10 through January 31; limit of 2.

ISSUE: Wolverine bag limit on highly populated road system areas with ease of access

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Localized depletions.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED BE IMPROVED?

WHO WILL BENEFIT?

WHO WILL SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? November 10 through February 28

PROPOSED BY: Nancy Hillstrand (SC-095-G-90)

PROPOSAL 124 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides; and 92.150. Evidence of sex and identity. Modify the salvage requirements for Units 7 and 15 as follows:

Change Unit 7 and 15 black bear salvage and evidence of sex requirements. Referring to the 2008-2009 Alaska Hunting Regulations, page 26, salvage and evidence of sex category, change the first paragraph as follows:

If you take a brown/grizzly anywhere in the state or a black bear in Units 1 - [7] 6, 11-[15] 14, 16-17, 19D, or 20 evidence of sex (penis sheath or...)

Change the third paragraph to the following:

From Jan. 1 - May 31 in Units 1 - [7] 6, 11-[15] 14, 16-17, or 20 the hide, skull, and meat must be salvaged and removed.....

Change the fourth paragraph to the following:

From Jan. 1 - May 31 in Units 7, 9-10, 15, 18, 19 (except 19D) and 21-26, the meat must be salvaged and removed from the field; from June 1 - Dec 31 either the hide or meat must be salvaged and removed from the field. Bears taken.....

Units 7 and 15 must bring skull in to Alaska Department of Fish and Game office to be sealed.

ISSUE: This proposal moves Units 7 and 15 in line with many other units. The requirement in black bear hunting to take the hide and skull and leave evidence of sex is unnecessary and burdensome. Hunters hiking long distances over tough terrain and even those with easy access should have the option of taking the meat and not having to take the hide.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo.

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

IMPROVED? Yes, more emphasis on salvaging the meat is positive and practical.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Cooper Landing Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-028)

PROPOSAL 125 - 5 AAC 92.125. Predation control areas implementation plans. Allow the sale of black bear hides in a Unit 7 and 15 under a predation control area plan.

Units 7 and 15, black bear - allow for the sale of hides and skulls.

ISSUE: Predation control areas and implementation plans. (Proposal one of three.) Reduce black bear numbers to lower but sustainable levels. Allow the sale of black bear hides and skulls to reduce the number of black bear. This alone will help the survival of calf moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose calf populations will continue to decline in Units 7 and 15. There is a steady decline in the Unit 7 moose population. Few if any calf moose observed near Seward this spring have been spotted this fall. My personal observation, with over 64 years in Seward, is that we now have a very serious bear problem, both black and brown bears.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will help the survival rate of calf moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anyone who opposes any form of predator management. Also, those who want to leave it the way it is.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Reclassify black bear, not only as a big game animal but also as a furbearing animal. This was done years ago (in the 1960's) in the Alaska Record Book where wolf and wolverine were recognized as both big game animals and furbearing animals. I rejected it because I did not think you would pass this solution, even though I still think this would make it much easier for the Department of Fish and Game to manage black bear under a predator control program.

PROPOSED BY: Seward Fish and Game Advisory Committee (HQ-09 S-G-042)

PROPOSAL 126 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear. Modify the bag limit for black bears in Units 7 and 15.

Increase the black bear harvest to 3 bears annually in Units 7 and 15.

ISSUE: The black bear population on the Kenai Peninsula is threatening the moose population. Black bears have become an increasing problem within the local areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The black bear population will continue to increase and become a greater local problem as well as continuing to decimate the moose calves and the general moose population.

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

IMPROVED? Yes, allow the moose population to recover and re-populate.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Black bear hunters and residents who utilize moose and wild game as a food source.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unknown.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Seward Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-09G-007)

PROPOSAL 127 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear; and 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Increase the black bear bag limit and lengthen the baiting season in Units 7 and 15 as follows:

Units 7 and 15: Black bear baiting season - [APRIL 15- JUNE 15] **April 15-June 30**

Units 7 and 15: Residents and non-residents - No closed season.
(General season only)

[2 BEARS; HOWEVER, ONLY 1 BEAR MAY BE TAKEN JULY 1 - DEC. 31 AND 1 BEAR MAY BE TAKEN JAN. 1 - JUNE 30]

Three Bears.

ISSUE: Units 7 and 15 have abundant black bear populations that have increased in recent years. Black bears are a significant predator of young moose, sheep, and goats. Moose, sheep, and goat populations on the Kenai Peninsula are far below historic highs and in most cases below population objectives.

The current bear baiting system on the Kenai encourages hunters to wait for a large boar. Taking a large percentage of mature boars has proven to actually increase overall bear populations. A three bear per year bag limit will allow a hunter to take a smaller bear for meat (likely a young bear or a sow without cubs), and wait to take a trophy later.

Most of the Kenai Peninsula is federal land that is currently off limits to predation control measures for wolves. Wolf numbers are high, but with poor quality fur trapping of wolves has declined. Brown bear populations are also increasing by most estimates but without concrete population numbers the Department of Fish and Game has been reluctant to increase take.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose and other ungulate populations on the Kenai Peninsula will continue to decline. Bear hunters will continue to be limited to one spring bear.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, younger bears are preferable table fare. Eventually ungulate populations will increase and harvest will shift back to preferable game animals.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bear hunters and other game populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who would rather hunt bears than moose may suffer if bear populations are reduced.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Increase the harvest of wolves and brown bears. Black bear predator control.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee

(SC-09S-G-052)

PROPOSAL 128 -5 AAC 92.200. Purchase and sale of game; and 92.990. Definitions: Allow the sale of black bear hides for Unit 15 as follows:

For Unit 15, change the classification of the black bear from just a big game animal to both a big game animal and a furbearer classification so that the hide may be sold.

ISSUE: Especially in Unit 15, we have too many black bears. They are killing off the moose population, especially the calves in the spring. The numbers need to be reduced. They are not something that people highly value for viewing and they are becoming too comfortable around people. It is a waste of the hide resource when they can't be sold. Selling the hides would provide another source of income for Alaskan residents and a good use for a valuable resource.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Many black bear hides will continue to be thrown away or stock piled for no purpose.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it provides a way to use a natural resource which is now being wasted and supplies fresh income into the hands of Alaskan residents. It increased creativity in the people and incentive to help reduce black bear population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The Alaskan residents, both hunters, businesses and public market who have interest in furs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I don't know of anyone who would suffer, except for the black bear.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Well, my freezer has been filling up with black bear hides over the years and I can't find enough people to give them too or need to have them in my home. It seems to me to be such a waste.

PROPOSED BY: Troy Jones

(HQ-09S-G-063)

PROPOSAL 129 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Open a nonresident season in Unit 7 as follows:

Nonresidents may apply for a drawing permit in Unit 7 with a guide client agreement every four years.

ISSUE: Open up the drawing to nonresident hunters and make it a guide-client agreement required.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The bears will be more and more in numbers and other people will be attacked. The next girl will be killed.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The state will be providing what is needed to take the bears out of there safely and letting a guide make a living.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? It will make life in Cooper Landing safer. The Department of Fish and Game will sell game tags and licenses, restaurants will sell food, hotels will rent rooms, big bear will be gone, and safer for people there.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The people who live in Cooper Landing if someone is killed because of

the bears there.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Frank Danford (HQ-095-G-008)

PROPOSAL 130 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Open a general hunt for brown bear in Unit 7 as follows:

Open season for brown bears in Unit 7 to harvest bag limit of one brown bear per every four years with season beginning October 1 through November 30.

ISSUE: Growing population of brown bear on Kenai Peninsula.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Brown bears on the peninsula have lost their fear of man; therefore they will most certainly raise the human-bear conflicts resulting in more defense of life and property incidents (DLPs), maulings, and deaths. The already low moose population will get worse.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; this proposal will help maintain a healthy population of brown bear and moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? State will benefit from increased bear tag revenue. Decreased brown bear problems.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Joe Mandurano (SC-09S-G-074)

PROPOSAL 131 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Create an archery hunt in Unit 7 as follows:

Archery only season, May 1 to September 30; Unit 7.

ISSUE: The amount of brown bear defense of life and property kills.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be more money and time spent on bear/human conflicts.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, historically - any archery season has had no negative impact on the game herds yet provides a hunting season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Joe Mandurano (SC-09S-G-076)

PROPOSAL 132 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear; and 92. 125.

Predation control areas implementation plans. Open spring and fall seasons for brown bear in Units 7 and 15 as follows:

For Units 7 and 15, have a brown bear spring and fall hunting season.

Spring season: March 15 to June 15.

Fall season: August 15 to November 15.

One brown bear by drawing permit only; a minimum of 50 permits to a maximum of 100 permits will be issued.

ISSUE: Predation control areas and implementation plans. (Proposal 2 of 3.) Have a spring and fall brown bear hunting season. Brown bear defense of life and property (DLP) mortalities determine whether or not we have a fall hunting season. Drop this regulation, as it should no longer apply. From 1973 to 2000, DLP kills averaged four to five bears per year. From 2000 to present the average DLP was 25-30 bear per year. This year (2008) the DLP kills hit a high of 40.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose populations will continue to decline in Units 7 and 15. Conflicts between people and brown bear will reach dangerous levels. In the late 1960's the Department of Fish and Game built a salmon weir at Bear Creek near Mile Seven on the Seward Highway. At that time, few people lived in that area. Today, there are dozens of homes near this weir. Within 100 yards of the weir there is a trailer park and RV park. This summer 12-14 brown bear were identified at or near the weir. Seven were counted fishing at one time. The salmon (reds, silvers and pinks) were backed up down stream right to the trailer park. The local residents are very concerned for their safety, especially children playing outside or waiting for the school bus, etc. To say the least, this is a serious problem and needs to be addressed before someone is hurt.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will help the survival rate or both calf and adult moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anyone who opposes any form of predator management. Also, those who want to leave it the way it is.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Seward Advisory Committee (HQ-09 S-G-043)

PROPOSAL 133 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

The hunting of brown bear will be by a drawing permit with a harvest of up to 20 reproductive females in Units 7 and 15. Immature females are not to be counted as part of the 20.

ISSUE: The brown bear population in Units 7 and 15 has increased drastically. Because of this increase predation on moose has resulted in an extremely low cow/calf ratio, lower moose populations, and lower harvest. Under the current brown bear harvest there is little to no brown bear hunting because the quota on reproductive females is too low and that quota is reached with defense of life and property (DLP) and automobile kills.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The brown bear population will remain too large and will continue to deplete the moose population. Hunting will be restricted. People won't be able to get moose meat to feed their families. A large numbers of DLPs and maulings will continue.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It will increase the moose population and cow/calf ratio. It will allow for a brown bear hunt. It is proactive instead of reactive.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone will benefit from a manageable brown bear population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions will work to achieve the objective. We considered a brown bear harvest of 50 bears.

PROPOSED BY: Central Peninsula Advisory Committee (HQ-09S-G-048)

PROPOSAL 134 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Modify the brown bear season dates for Units 7 and 15 as follows:

Units 7 and 15: The brown bear hunting season is August 20 to September 20. This is a drawing permit hunt.

ISSUE: The current season (when and if there is one) is too late in the fall. With the brown bear being a drawing permit it would only be logical to have the season the same as the moose season. This would be the least amount of burden on the hunters because they are there hunting moose and would not have to incur the expense and time of coming back after moose season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will be burdened with the time and expense of coming back after the moose season instead of hunting both at the same time. Less people will be able to hunt. Less likely the harvest objective will be met.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Reaching the harvest objective on brown bears will improve the quality and quantity of moose harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The hunter who draws a brown bear permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Leaving the brown bear season as is only burdens the hunter and is more than likely not going to provide enough of a harvest.

PROPOSED BY: Central Peninsula Advisory Committee (HQ-09 S-G-050)

PROPOSAL 135 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Allow brown bear hunting in areas of Units 7 and 15 as follows:

For Units 7 and 15, there would be a harvest of bears where the majority of the defense of life and property (DLPs) occur. The number of brown bear to be harvested would be determined by the management biologists. We as a state hired these biologists for a reason, to manage resource harvest.

ISSUE: The management of the brown bear on the Kenai Peninsula should be returned to the area biologists. The present system relies on a “no study - no survey and no fixing the problem”.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? DLP numbers will continue to escalate and tourists, sports fishermen, residents and children will continue to be bear food.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? DLPs are often wasted due to the time and area and confusion. A managed hunting season would allow for a harvest when the hide and meat are at their best and would leave little or no waste (known as wanton waste).

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport hunters, sport fishermen and all persons in the woods with these brown bears.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lee Martin (HQ-095-G-020)

PROPOSAL 136 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Change the season dates for brown bear in Units 7 and 15 as follows:

Increase the threshold for non-hunting human caused brown bear mortality on the Kenai Peninsula. Allow the fall Kenai Peninsula brown bear drawing hunts to proceed one month earlier. Request the Department of Fish and Game to eliminate the “species of special concern” designation for Kenai brown bears.

Unit 7: [OCT 1-NOV 30] **Sept 1-Oct 30** and Apr 1-June 15
1 bear every 4 regulatory years by drawing permit only; up to 50 permits may be issued.

Unit 15: [OCT 1-NOV 30] **Sept 1-Oct 30** and Apr 1-June 15
1 bear every 4 regulatory years by drawing permit only; up to 50 permits may be issued.

Fall hunts will be held unless total human caused mortality exceed 40 bears in the preceding 12 months.

ISSUE: The Kenai Peninsula population of brown bears was listed as a species of special concern in November 1998. The Department of Fish and Game took this action because this population is vulnerable due to low numbers, restricted distribution, limited habitat resources, or sensitivity to environmental disturbance. This administrative designation was a proactive measure designed to focus attention and research on Kenai Peninsula brown bears, an isolated population in an area experiencing steady human population growth and increased human activity. (Kenai Peninsula Brown Bear Conservation Strategy June 2000.)

This listing creates a unique circumstance in which the Board of Game has no regular input on the number of animals harvested. The Commissioner of the Department of Fish and Game makes the listing with recommendations from area biologists. After this listing is made, a harvest strategy is implemented by the department staff. The Kenai population seems to be managed through the Kenai Peninsula Brown Bear Conservation Strategy. This 94 page document makes little or no mention of the Board of Game.

This population of bears is the only population in Alaska that is managed for DLP and other human caused mortality. Chugach park drawing areas, which allow far fewer permits, are not managed to include other human caused mortality. This listing was based on several faulty assumptions and little or no direct data.

1) The population of brown bears on the Kenai is not an isolated population. Genetic and radio tracking studies have proven that Kenai bears have ranges that include areas of Units 6, 14, and 16. The population of brown bears on the Kenai was estimated at 250 bears by comparing the habitat to the Susitna River area and assuming there were fewer bears per square mile on the Kenai Peninsula. Without any scientific data to suggest a total population we must rely on other sources. Outdoorsmen spend countless thousands of user-days on the Kenai Peninsula annually. By most estimates through years of observation by thousands of people, the brown bear population on the Kenai is increasing or at least steady and healthy. The department has stated the sustainable human caused mortality rate of brown bears at 5.7% under optimum

productivity.

- The reported human mortality (DLP, hunting, road kill , etc.) of brown bears has averaged 18 bears annually over the last 20 years, or 7+0% of a 250 bear population. Even assuming optimum productivity the population should have declined noticeably. An annual harvest of 18 bears would require a population of about 320 bears to be sustainable.
- The reported human mortality of brown bears has averaged 25 bears annually over the last five years, or 10% of a 250 bear population. Even assuming optimum productivity the population should have declined substantially in the last five years. An annual harvest of 25 bears would require a population of about 450 bears to be sustainable.
- DLP mortality of bears is increasing at a rate far faster than the rate of increased human use, indicating bear population growth.
- Due to harvest data alone and the 5.7% human caused mortality rate the population of brown bears on the Kenai has been sustained at least 320 bears over the last 20 years. It is very likely that the population is closer to 450 bears based on the last 5 years harvest with no noticeable decline.

The department's population objective is a sustainable population of 250 bears. An annual harvest of 40 bears should bring the total population down to this objective within three years assuming a population of 320 bears, within ten years assuming a population of 450.

DLP kills are increasing rapidly in lowland and valley areas with an abundance of salmon heavily used by fishermen and other outdoorsmen. These are the same areas that are most utilized by fall brown bear hunter. Most spring hunting is conducted in upland areas. Opening the fall hunting season would result in more bears killed in the areas they are causing the most problems. The department area biologists could advise hunters to locations problem bears are frequenting. Earlier fall seasons will allow for the targeting of specific problem bears.

Although bear harvest (black and brown) are at an all time highs, bear populations seem to be healthy and increasing.

Overall moose harvest and hunter success rates on the Kenai have approached all time lows. Moose harvest on the Kenai is below the lower end of the harvest objective in some units and near the lower end in the rest. The Unit 15A harvest objective of 180-350 is not being met (134 moose 5 year average).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bear-human conflicts will continue to increase. The department will continue to manage the population more conservatively than it needs to be.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Brown bears will be taken by hunters rather than cars and DLP.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose will have some relief and populations will grow. Fishermen and residents of the Kenai will be safer as hunted bears will be more wary of people. Bears will eventually benefit by re-assuming their fear of humans.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fishermen who enjoy sharing their catch with bears. People opposed to the hunting of brown bears. Some wildlife managers that would like to stick to their faulty or outdated population estimate.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Eliminate DLP and other human caused mortality from management equations. Allocate a specific number of bears for spring and fall seasons independent of other mortality. Manage bears on the Kenai with a July 1-June 30 regulatory year. This would allow for closures during the spring season so problem bears could be hunted in the fall. The spring and half of the summer's DLP kills would not count against the fall hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee

(SC-09S-G-055)

PROPOSAL 137 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Alter the brown bear hunt in Units 7 and 15 as follows:

Kenai Peninsula:

Open season, August 20 - June 15; one bear per year; over bait April 15 - June – 15.

ISSUE: Restriction on brown bear hunting on the Kenai Peninsula.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued high level of defense of life and property (DLP), continued shot and left or buried brown bears; continuation in rapid moose decline.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, hunter harvest instead of state or defense of life and property kills.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Brown bear hunters and moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Brown bear viewers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close all brown bear habitat to humans and list moose as endangered on the Kenai Peninsula.

PROPOSED BY: Robert White

(HQ-095-G-012)

PROPOSAL 138 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Modify the season dates for taking brown bear in Unit 15 as follows:

Brown bear season in Unit 15: March 1 - April 15 and/or November 1 - December 15.

ISSUE: Allow an earlier spring season and later fall season to reduce the killing of sows and cubs and encourage the taking of large boars because they are the first out of the den and the last in the den. This would not hurt the overall health of the population and allow younger bears room to avoid populated areas without the threat of being eaten.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? You will continue to see defense of life and property kills above your quotas while not allowing local hunters to take any bears. The current draw only allows one or two tags to remain local.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose population, local hunters, ultimately the bear population.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The current draw system leaves very little chance of actually taking a trophy bear; whether it's the same chance of draws, or the small chance of someone capable of taking a large boar being drawn.

PROPOSED BY: Philip Jones

(HQ-09S-G-062)

PROPOSAL 139 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Increase the number of brown bear permits to be issued for Unit 15.

There needs to be a vast increase in the number of brown bears harvested by sport hunters in Unit 15 by increasing permit numbers (regardless of defense of life and property numbers).

ISSUE: Waste of a valuable resource in that a harvestable surplus of brown bears is not being utilized, but is lost to defense of life and property and traffic.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? An excess of female and immature bears will continue to be killed while large boars remain under-utilized.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Allows sport hunting of mature bears.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose populations and bear hunters, as well as hikers, fishermen, berry pickers, etcetera.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo or Alaska Department of Fish and Game kill more bears - both are bad solutions.

PROPOSED BY: Homer Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-09G-011)

PROPOSAL 140 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Open a general hunt for brown bear in Unit 15 as follows:

Open season for brown bears in Unit 15 to harvest bag limit of one brown bear per every four years with the season beginning October 1 through November 30.

ISSUE: Growing population of brown bear on Kenai Peninsula

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Brown bears on the peninsula have lost their fear of man; therefore there will most certainly be increased human-bear conflicts resulting in more defense of life and property incidents, maulings, and deaths. The already depleted moose population will get worse.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; this proposal will maintain a healthy population of brown bear and moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? A) State will benefit from increased revenue. B) Decreased brown bear problems.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Joe Mandurano (SC-09S-G-075)

PROPOSAL 141 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Create an archery hunt in Unit 15 as follows:

Archery only season, May 1 to September 30; Unit 15.

ISSUE: The amount of brown bear DLP's.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be more time and money spent on bear/human conflicts. Archery only season May 1st to Sept. 30th. Unit 15

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes! In history Archery hunting has had no adverse impact on game.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A.

PROPOSED BY: Larry Daly

(SC-095-G-77)

PROPOSAL 142 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Change the bag limit for drawing and registration permits for mountain goats in Units 7 and 15.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(3) ...		
Unit 7 and remainder of Unit 15	Aug. 10–Oct. 15 (General hunt only) Nov.1–Nov.30	Aug. 10–Oct. 15 Nov.1–Nov.30
1 goat by drawing permit only in the Aug. 10–Oct. 15 season (up to 500 permits will be issued), or 1 goat by registration permit only in the Nov. 1–Nov.30 season; <u>however, if a nanny is taken in either season, the hunter is prohibited from taking a goat on the Kenai Peninsula for 5 regulatory years;</u> the taking of nannies with kids is prohibited		

ISSUE: The goat population on the Kenai Peninsula has declined between 30-50% since the early 1990s. Various limiting factors may have contributed to this decline including overharvest. Recent studies have shown the sensitivity of small goat populations to the harvest of breeding aged females. Despite educational efforts showing hunters how to distinguish the gender of goats and emphasizing that targeting males-only will help with the long-term management of the Kenai population, the proportion of females in the harvest has not changed for over 25 years.

Managers are currently restricting goat hunting opportunities in order to help curtail the population decline. However, we could maintain hunting opportunity or even increase it if the proportion of nannies in the harvest decreased. The proposed restriction would encourage hunters to assist with herd management.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Seven hunting areas on the Kenai have closed in the past few years due to population declines; available permits are at a 27-year low. The status quo will guarantee a continued decrease in hunting opportunities for goats on the Kenai Peninsula.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Mountain goats have the slowest reproductive rate of any Alaskan ungulate yet they are the only ungulate that does not have some level of hunt restriction on females. Taking even a few adult females each year from small populations can be unsustainable. Reducing the female harvest will increase hunting opportunity and may help stabilize populations and promote growth.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All those who want additional opportunity to hunt goats and maximize population growth.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Many south-central residents hunt goats every year through registration hunts or apply every year for drawing permits. Those who do not educate themselves on distinguishing the sex of a goat before they hunt would lose some local goat hunting opportunities if they take a nanny.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Education alone has not solved the problem of high nanny harvests. Making it illegal to take a nanny is an option that may cause some problems. Because it is difficult to distinguish between the sexes, mistakes will occur. We believe our proposal is an option that will encourage hunters to choose billies yet not unduly punish them if they take a nanny.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G102)

PROPOSAL 143 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat; and 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures. Modify the permit hunt for Unit 7 as follows:
Guide requirements, with a guide-client agreement required for nonresidents to put in for the drawing.

ISSUE: Goat hunting drawings and out of state hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will stop hunting in Alaska for goats.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Because hunters are being put in for these hunts and they don't know that they need a guide and then they don't go.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The hunts will be coming who are trying to draw a tag and the Department of Fish and Game will sell tags. Hotels will rent rooms and sell food.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? It will not hurt anyone.
OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Frank Danford (HQ-095-G-007)

PROPOSAL 144 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Create a drawing hunt for goat in portions of Unit 7 as follows:

Create new drawing hunt for goat in Unit 7 on Mt. Marathon and Mt. Benson. The Unit 7 closed area #2 (Seward Closed Area) would need to be removed prior to establishing the area.

ISSUE: Unit 7 goat hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, increases hunting opportunity for goat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Robert White

(HQ-095-G-010)

PROPOSAL 145 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. Sealing of moose antlers. Require sealing of moose antlers in Units 7 and 15 as follows:

The antlers of moose harvested in Units 7 and 15 must be sealed with a plug by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game within 15 days of the kill.

ISSUE: Because of inadequate enforcement there are more illegal moose being shot and sneaked out of woods. If a hunter is required to seal the antlers then they would be less likely to shoot an illegal moose knowing that other hunters could ask the Department of Fish and Game if he had sealed his antlers.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The continuation of too many illegal moose being shot on purpose because they know there is little chance of getting caught and no accountability after the moose is cut up.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It will increase and protect the breeding bull that are illegal to shoot.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The unethical hunter who wants to harvest an illegal moose knowing there is little chance of getting caught.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None. We should give it a try. Hopefully it will make hunters look twice to make sure the moose is legal before they pull the trigger.

PROPOSED BY: Central Peninsula Advisory Committee

(HQ-09S-G-049)

PROPOSAL 146 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Provide a drawing permit hunt for moose in Units 7 and 15A as follows:

Harvest spike fork bulls by a limited drawing permit hunt in Units 7 and 15A, as required.

ISSUE: The collapse of moose population and the lack of young bulls to replace breed stock.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The young bulls will continue to be harvested and not be able to reach maturity thus significantly decreasing future breeding bulls.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this will increase the moose population and breeding stock.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Future generations of Alaskans and people who depend on moose as a food source.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unknown, if any.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Seward Fish and Game Advisory Committee

(SC-09G-006)

PROPOSAL 147 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish a moratorium on moose hunting in Units 7 and 15A.

Three year moratorium on moose hunting in Units 7 and 15A.

ISSUE: Loss of the moose population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unlikely recovery of the moose population in the foreseeable future.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, allow moose an opportunity to recover and repopulate.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Future generations of Alaskans, people who depend on moose as a food source.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unknown.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Seward Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-09G-009)

PROPOSAL 148 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change the moose season dates in Units 7 and 15 as follows:

The new regulation would state that 1 bull moose with spike-fork antlers of 50 inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side may be taken in Units 7 and 15A, B and C from August 20-27 or September 1-25 with bow and arrow only. And/or 1 bull moose with spike-fork antlers of 50 inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side may be taken in Unit 7 and 15A, B and C from September 1-25 with other legal apparatus (e.g. rifle). Note: this proposal does not seek to change the harvest limit of 1 bull moose per year; it just seeks to change the opening and closing dates for moose hunting in Units 7 and 15A, B and C.

ISSUE: I would like the Board of Game to consider changing the moose hunting season dates or both bow and arrow and general harvest on the Kenai Peninsula (Units 7 and 15A, B and C). Specifically, this proposal is seeking a bow and arrow season from August 20-27, and September 1-25, and a general season from September 1-25.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? First, the current season for bow and arrow of August 10-17 is too early, with many moose still in full velvet, which can make determining legal antler configuration problematic. By delaying the start of the bow and arrow season until August 20, less illegal moose are likely to be killed. Secondly, by modifying the current general season from August 20- September 20 to September 1-25, the overall season would be shortened by five days, however, the time period of September 21-25 would afford hunters a greater opportunity to harvest a legal bull moose. Thus, this proposal seeks to hopefully Reduce the number of illegally killed moose as well as providing some additional harvest opportunity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Delaying bow and arrow harvest from August 10 to August 20 should improve meat quality because of the potential for cooler temperatures as well as increasing the likelihood of taking legal bulls. Moreover, it is also likely that moose meat taken after September 20 would be of higher quality due to cooler weather.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The general hunting public.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The only people who might "suffer" from the adoption of additional days of hunting are people opposed to hunting in general.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? One alternative solution I considered was to have a permit hunt in Units 1=7 and 15A, B and C for the time period from September 21 to September 25. The same spike/fork or 50 inch/3 brow tine rules would apply. My only opposition to this is that it does not provide opportunity for everyone. That said, I would prefer this as an option to total rejection of this proposal

PROPOSED BY: Patrick Shields (HQ-095-G-015)

PROPOSAL 149 - 5 AAC 85.045(13). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the antler restrictions for Units 15 and 7 as follows:

Strike the spike-fork antler restriction for Units 15 and 7. Only the 50 inch or 3 brow tine regulation would remain.

ISSUE: I believe that unless we stop the killing of spike fork bull moose we will soon not have any bull moose to grow into breeding bulls. I see a sharp decline in breed size bull moose in Unit 15 and Unit 17.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will lose enough breed size bull moose, so, that this population can't sustain itself.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This is needed to help sustain our moose population in Unit 15 and Unit 17.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The moose population

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who can't see the danger of losing moose populations.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Unit 15 and Unit 17 have severe predation problems and if this was addressed, this problem would diminish.

PROPOSED BY: Douglas Blossom (HQ-09S-G-060)

PROPOSAL 150 - 5 AAC 085.045.(13) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change the bag limit for the drawing permits for moose in eastern Unit 15B.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(13)		
...		
Unit 15(B), that portion bounded by a line running from the mouth of Shantatalik Creek, Tustumena Lake, northeastward to the head of the west fork of Funny River; then downstream along the west fork of Funny	Sept. 1-Sept. 20 (General hunt only) Sept. 26-Oct. 15 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1-Sept. 20 Sept. 26-Oct. 15

River to the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge boundary; then east along the refuge boundary to its junction with the Kenai River; then eastward along the south side of the Kenai River and Skilak Lake; then south along the western side of Skilak River, Skilak Glacier, and Harding Icefield; then west along the Subunit 15(B) boundary to the mouth of Shantatalik Creek

1 bull with **spike-fork antlers** **or** 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only; up to 100 permits may be issued

...

ISSUE: Unit 15B-East has been managed as a trophy moose area since the early 1970s. During the past several years there has been a decline in the number of moose harvested and a noticeable decline in antler size (based on Boone and Crockett scoring). Causes for these declines likely include habitat succession and probably reduced population numbers due to predation. Given the current status we believe it is misleading to the public to continue advertizing this area as a “trophy” opportunity, however, it would be an excellent opportunity to offer a hunt with limited hunting pressure. We believe we can offer this by maintaining the current drawing hunt format for Sept.1-20 and adding spike-fork bulls as legal animals for harvest. It is our intent to issue 0 permits for the Sept.26-Oct.15 portion of the hunt until moose population demographics and habitat conditions change enough to allow for a reasonable opportunity to again harvest “trophy” quality bull moose from this area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Success rates will continue to decline for the limited number of drawing permit hunters.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The limited numbers of hunters who win a drawing permit for this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-103)

PROPOSAL 151 - 5 AAC 085.045.(13) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Unit 15(C).

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

(13)

...

Unit 15(C), that portion south of the south fork of the Anchor River and northwest of Kachemak Bay

1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or	Aug. 20-Sept. 20 (General Hunt only)	Aug. 20-Sept. 20
--	---	------------------

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; the taking of calves, and females accompanied by calves, is prohibited; up to 100 permits may be issued	Aug. 20-Sept. 20	Aug. 20-Sept. 20
--	------------------	------------------

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. The Homer benchland in Unit 15(C) often has high moose densities in winters when deep snow pushes moose down into human populated areas. These deep snow winters result in a high number of moose dying due to malnutrition and increased negative interactions with humans as moose become more aggressive in their search for food around human residences.

In the fall of 2005, 441 moose were counted in the permit area and 26% were calves. Fifty permits were issued in each of the last 6 years resulting in an average harvest of 23 cows per year. We recommend re-authorization of the antlerless hunt and anticipate issuing 50 permits for the fall 2009 hunt.

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wildlife viewers and hunters receiving permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals opposed to hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-122)

PROPOSAL 152 - 5 AAC 085.045.(13) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorize the antlerless moose season in the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area of Unit 15A.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(13)		
Unit 15(A), the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area		
1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 permits for spike-fork antlered moose may be issued; or	Sept. 15-Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15- Sept. 30
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 50 permits may be issued; the taking of calves, and females accompanied by calves is prohibited	Sept. 15-Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. A joint management objective developed for the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area (SLWMA) by the department and U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service calls for a fall population of approximately 2 moose per square mile or about 130 moose counted during the November survey. The SLWMA was last counted during December 2005 and yielded a count of 79 moose, the lowest count in over 20 years. The ratios observed were 12 bulls/100 cows and 9 calves/100 cows. Because the SLWMA is managed primarily for wildlife viewing, a second management objective requires that we maintain a minimum bull:cow ratio of 40 bulls/100 cows. The last permit hunt was held in 1999 when 40 permits were issued for antlerless and 20 for spike-fork antlered moose. The Department recommends maintaining the hunt, but not issuing permits for the fall 2009 season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The SLWMA is a wintering area for moose. In the past, during moderate to severe winters, this area supported up to 300 moose, more than twice the desired resident population size. If resident moose are allowed to increase beyond the management objective, excessive use of the habitat will occur, affecting both resident and migratory moose that depend on this area. Viewing opportunities will be adversely affected as well.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Since this is a proposal to re-authorize an existing hunt, no resource or product improvements are expected.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wildlife viewers and hunters receiving permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals opposed to hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Increase the moose carrying capacity of the area. Additional habitat enhancement is expensive and no projects are currently planned.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
(HQ-09S-G-121)

PROPOSAL 153 - 5 AAC 92.125. Predation control areas implementation plans. Establish a wolf control plan for Units 7 and 15 as follows:

Wolves: Allow the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to reduce wolf populations using any and all practical means possible.

ISSUE: Predation control areas and implementation plans. (Proposal three of three.) Wolves: Reduce population using any and all means possible. Unit 7 and 15 wolves are infested with domestic lice, making most of the hides almost worthless. Because of this, wolf-trapping efforts are minimal, taking about 35 wolves each year. The Kenai Peninsula is a relatively small area so surgical sterilization of wolves should be considered. Pay trappers something to catch these lice infested wolves. Some of these wolves really suffer and are in very poor condition. The most humane thing to do is kill them.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose and sheep populations will continue to decline in Units 7 and 15. It should be noted that large areas on the Kenai Peninsula (Units 7 and 15) are closed to all hunting. Point being, that predators will always have these large areas of protection.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will help the survival rate of both calf and adult moose. It will also help save sheep, as a single wolf can and do kill sheep.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anyone who opposes any form of predator management. Also, those who want to leave it the way it is.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Seward Fish and Game Advisory Committee (HQ-09 S-G-044)

PROPOSAL 154 - 5 AAC 92.125. Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans. Implement a predation control area for Unit 15 as follows:

Units 15A and 15C shall be managed under intensive management practices for predator control.

ISSUE: The moose population and harvest objectives are low because of the high number of brown bears and wolves. The cow/calf ratio is below threshold levels. The management of predator and prey needs to be proactive instead of waiting until the moose population is in a crisis that takes years to get out of.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose populations and harvest will continue to decline. People won't be able to rely on moose to feed their families. The predator/prey ratio will be out of balance.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Predator control will maintain the proper biological balance resulting in a healthy sustainable population of moose, brown bear and wolves.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone and the resource will benefit by having healthy, harvestable populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions will work. We must be proactive not reactive.

PROPOSED BY: Central Peninsula Advisory Committee (HQ-09 S-G-051)

PROPOSAL 155 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep.; 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat.; 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear:
Modify the number of tags issued to nonresidents for sheep, goat, and brown bear in Unit 7 as follows:

A percentage or number of tags will go to nonresidents.

ISSUE: In the drawings for sheep, goat, and brown bear, you have a number of tags that go to nonresidents in Units 13, 14, and 8, but not in 7. You should have this in 7 too; it's only fair.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fewer and fewer hunters will not put in for the drawing.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? More out-of-state hunters will come hunting - that's good.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The state's income.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one - because there are guided hunts.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Frank Danford (HQ-09S-G-137)

PROPOSAL 156 - 5 AAC 92.510(8)(B). Areas closed to hunting. Allow hunting within the Seward City limits as follows:

Remove the Seward Closed Area and open the Seward City limits to hunting (big and small game) by registration permit.

ISSUE: Unit 7, Seward Closed Area (#2).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued loss of hunting opportunity

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it would increase hunting opportunity in the Seward area and also inform hunters via registration permit of city firearm restrictions. Also it would open an area west of the Seward city limits and east of Kenai Fjords National Park.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Open closed area #2. Does not address Seward ordinance.

PROPOSED BY: Robert White (HQ-095-G-009)

PROPOSAL 157 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Change the season end dates in Units 7 and 15 as follows:

Seasons should end the last day of February.

ISSUE: Confusion with seasons ending on Feb 28th. (Leap year has 29 days)

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No. It seems to be a little common sense.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Kenai Peninsula Trappers Association (HQ-09S-G-054)

PROPOSAL 158 - 5 AAC 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures; and 92.165. Sealing of bear skins and skulls. Modify the brown bear permit conditions for Unit 8 as follows:

Alaskan resident hunters: Drawing permits and sealing can be obtained at your local Department of Fish and Game offices in Homer, Kenai, Seward or Anchorage for brown bear hunters in Unit 8.

ISSUE: On a drawing permit for brown bear, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game in Kodiak won't allow an individual to pick up his permit any place but Kodiak. The inconvenience of having to go to Kodiak to pickup brown bear permits for people who live in Homer or other places who hunt on Shuyak, Afognak or out of Port Lions is unnecessary. You can travel to these hunt areas either by ferry to Port Lions or by float plane to Afognak and Shuyak or Kodiak Island from other destinations in Alaska, not just the city of Kodiak. It's an inconvenience and time/money expense to have to go to the Department of Fish and Game in Kodiak to pick up the permit and seal the bear hide, when it could be done in Homer, Kenai or Anchorage.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It creates inconvenience and unnecessary expense for Alaskan residents living in other areas who would like to hunt on Kodiak Island and the surrounding areas.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It increases the chance of an Alaskan resident, who lives somewhere other than Kodiak, to take part in the harvest of brown bears in Unit 8 without additional cost and inconvenience.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskan residents who don't live in Kodiak.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? May upset the hierarchy of the department in Kodiak.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I drew a permit for Port Lions and planned to go with several other hunters. We brought 4-wheelers and camp suppliers for one week of hunting deer. I planned to use my bear tag also. We took the ferry from Homer to Port Lions. The department in Kodiak suggested that I make port in Port Lions with my gear and then fly or take the ferry to Kodiak to pick up my brown bear permit and fly back to meet the other hunters. They also suggested that I do this at the end of the trip to seal the bear. If I was to do this, with two days of return travel on the ferry between Homer and Port Lions, I would lose another two days of return travel to and from Kodiak. This would reduce my week available for hunting to

three separate days and cost a lot more. I think it's totally unnecessary because the department offices located in separate cities are well able to communicate with each other. Therefore, I decided not to use the brown bear drawing permit I won this year. Thanks for your consideration of this matter.

PROPOSED BY: Troy Jones

(HQ-09S-G-64)

PROPOSAL 159 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Modify the bag limit for caribou in Unit 8 as follows:

Bag limit of one caribou per hunter, per year in Unit 8.

Open season dates: September 1 to October 31.

Retain same-day-airborne regulation.

ISSUE: Feral reindeer on Kodiak Island currently may be harvested open season, no bag limit, same-day-airborne. Originally introduced on Kodiak Island in 1924 for a village herding project, these reindeer have run wild since the 1950's. Their range area is the southwest part of Kodiak Island, within the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge. Due to the remote location and low hunting pressure, no closed season and no bag limit was set. In 2002, same-day-airborne was allowed, as had been the case with Sitka Blacktail Deer in Unit 8. However, no closed season and no bag limit were continued for reindeer. Anecdotal reports over the last 40 years include stories of multiple reindeer shot and left on the beaches, especially in winter and spring; multiple reindeer being shot off the beaches, but recovery of meat failed due to high bear density.

A season of September 1 - October 31 would provide sufficient hunter opportunity to harvest reindeer in their prime condition. A bag limit of one reindeer per hunter per year would provide sufficient hunter opportunity and would help avoid situations of hunter-bear conflict. Kodiak residents, visiting hunters, and wildlife managers feel that these reindeer are a valued public resource that should be managed for sustained yield. At the November 12, 2008 Kodiak Fish and Game Advisory Committee meeting, the committee discussed the reindeer herd and management options. The Kodiak Refuge Manager told the committee that under US Fish and Wildlife Service regulations, these reindeer can be considered non-native, non-invasive animals and at current herd size they do not pose a threat to other species on the Refuge.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This public resource could be overharvested, and possibly eliminated.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Under the current no bag limit, no closed season, there is increased potential for waste.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Future hunters will still have reindeer to hunt in Unit 8.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who want to bring home more reindeer from a single trip. Occasional hunters who encounter reindeer outside proposed season.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Leave the season open year round. Rejected because of potential for overkill on beaches during winter and spring. 2) Eliminate same-day-airborne. Rejected due to remote location, adverse weather, high bear density in area and high cost of travel to this remote southwest Kodiak area. No same-day-airborne makes at least two aircraft charters to and from that remote area to enable prospective hunters to hunt legally. 3) Leave the no bag limit. Rejected as it encourages overkill, waste and because this herd, recognized as a distinct species by Safari Club International, is thought to number only about 250 animals. 4) Consider these reindeer expendable and harvest them until they're gone. Rejected because the public consider these reindeer a valuable resource that should be sustained.

PROPOSED BY: J.P. "Jake" Jacobson

(HQ-09 S-G-041)

PROPOSAL 160 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou, and 92.085(8)(5).

Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Modify the bag limit for caribou in Unit 8 and apply a same day airborne restriction as follows:

Bag limit of one caribou per hunter per year in Unit 8. No closed season. No same day airborne allowed.

ISSUE: A recent trend of increased harvest of reindeer on Kodiak Island is higher than sustained yield. Eliminating same day airborne and setting a bag limit of one per year will probably stabilize the harvest at a sustainable level.

Feral reindeer on Kodiak Island currently may be harvested open season, no bag limit, same day airborne. Originally introduced on Kodiak Island in 1924 for a village herding project, these reindeer have run wild since sometime in the 1950's. Their range area is the southwest part of Kodiak Island, within the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge.

Due to the remote location and low hunting pressure, no closed season and no bag limit was set. Prior to 2002, same day airborne was not allowed, and annual harvest averaged eight animals, often taken incidentally by deer hunters. Herd size has been stable around 250 to 300 for at least the past 30 years.

In 2002 the regulations were changed to allow same day airborne hunting. The reasoning to support the change was that even with no closed season and no bag limit there was low hunting pressure, and no conservation problem or fair chase issue was being served by the same day restriction. It also seemed appropriate to make the regulations consistent with the same day allowance for deer.

After eliminating the same day restriction the reported harvest increased significantly, averaging one animal from 2002 through 2007, and estimated at more than 35 in 2008. Recently there's been increased commercial interest in reindeer hunts, so it's possible the harvest will increase further under the current regulations. Continued harvest at this increased rate is probably higher than the sustained yield for this small herd.

The general consensus among Kodiak residents, visiting hunters, and wildlife managers is that these reindeer are a valued public resource that should be managed for sustained yield. At the November 12, 2008 Kodiak Fish and Game Advisory Committee meeting, the committee discussed the reindeer herd and management options. The Kodiak Refuge Manager told the committee that under US Fish and Wildlife Service regulations these reindeer can be considered non-native, non-invasive animals and at current herd size they do not pose a threat to other species on the refuge.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The attractive public resource could be overharvested, and possibly eliminated.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Under the current no bag limit, same day regulation there is increased potential for waste. Drop-off day hunters can over shoot their ability to take care of their meat on a one day hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Future hunters will still have reindeer to hunt in Unit 8.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who want to bring home more meat from a single trip. Commercial operators who are marketing the same day hunts on reindeer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1.) We can consider these reindeer expendable and harvest them until they're gone. Rejected because the public considers these reindeer a valuable resource that should be sustained. 2.) Leave the same day airborne in place, but reduce the bag limit to one per year for nonresidents. Rejected because most hunters, both residents and nonresidents, are currently only taking one per person

anyway. (Recent harvest is probably about 1.5 animals per hunter per year). The number of hunters targeting reindeer increased, and the average annual harvest almost tripled, after allowing same day airborne. 3.) Eliminate same day airborne, but set no bag limit so hunters who want to bring home more meat can do so. Rejected because the recent increased interest in hunting this herd will probably result in continued harvests above sustained yield if no bag limit is set.

PROPOSED BY: Rolan Ruoss (SC-09G-012)

PROPOSAL 161 - 5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets and reports; and 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer. Require harvest reporting for deer on the Kodiak archipelago as follows:

Require a deer harvest report for Unit 8 with the following questions:

- I hunted deer--yes or no
- I hunted ___ days in Unit ___; near the following specific location _____
- I killed a deer--yes or no
- For each deer harvested:
- Date of Kill ___
- Sex ___; if male--antlers normal, non-typical or velvet, unit specific location
if male, scrotum testes--1, 2, or 0

ISSUE: Since 1994, a huge increase in the number of Cryptorchid male Sitka Black Tail Deer has been determined to be sterile - for the past five years.

Hearsay evidence indicates sterility due to cryptorchidism is increasing throughout the Kodiak Archipelago. A more formalized method of gauging the frequency of this condition would be beneficial. A deer harvest report form, similar to the form for caribou would be helpful.

In some areas of the Kodiak Archipelago, increasing numbers of late birth fawns are seen still nursing their mothers at Thanksgiving time. In some areas of the Kodiak Archipelago, deer numbers have decreased by approximately half, apparently unrelated to hunting pressure, weather, etc.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This alarming increase in sterility, due to cryptorchidism may increase to the point of seriously reducing or eliminating the deer population in areas where it is found.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED BE IMPROVED? The Alaska Department of Fish and Game needs to record the presence, absence and/or chance in this condition. Hunters benefit from their attention being called to this situation.

WHO WILL BENEFIT? Future hunters, game management personnel, and the general public.

WHO WILL SUFFER? The minimal inconvenience of reporting the deer harvest is insignificant. Reporting is a component of proper management and stewardship of this public resource. No one is likely to suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Ignore the issue, rejected, as poor management and stewardship of this public resource.

PROPOSED BY: J.P. "Jake" Jacobson (HQ-09S-G-040)

PROPOSAL 162 - 5 AAC 85.035. Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk. Create an archery only hunt in Unit 8 as follows:

Open an archery only season for elk on all of Afognak from September 1-25. It could be drawing or registration; any elk or any bull. The Department of Fish and Game can decide regulations, number of tags given, or hunting dates. Hunters would be required to have an IBEP (International Bowhunter Education Program) card. Unit 3 already has a elk archery drawing season in effect similar to this proposal. There is also a successful archery season for deer and a successful registration archery season for goats along the Kodiak road system. Only small numbers of game are taken during these seasons and there should be little to no impact on elk numbers if this proposal is put into effect.

ISSUE: Lack of a separate archery season for elk on Afognak Island, Unit 8

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Archery hunters will not be afforded an opportunity to have a separate elk hunting season in Unit 8.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal should create a safer opportunity for hunters wishing to pursue game without the presence of rifle hunters. Many states have adopted archery only seasons to promote safety. Archery hunting, nationwide, is growing while firearm hunting is on the decline. Weather in September is generally better than the later elk hunts and longer delays make for more time pursuing game and meat transport if game is harvested. Bear encounters should be less because bears should still be occupied with salmon and the silent methods of bow hunters should not alert bears to a downed elk like some say a rifle shot "rings the dinner bell".

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Archery hunters because of increased opportunity, local businesses such as sporting goods stores, meat processing facilities, restaurants and grocery stores, local lodging and remote lodging businesses, air taxi services, native corporations (land use permits, trophy fees and cabin rentals), the State of Alaska (cabin rentals and drawing lottery fees), and guide services.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Severin Reed (HQ-095-G-029)

PROPOSAL 163 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Modify the permit and registration goat hunts in Unit 8 as follows:

Combine the Unit 8 drawing goat hunts (DG475 and DG477), and the registration goat hunts (RG475 and RG477) into a single registration hunt that runs from August 20 - December 15, is open to both resident and nonresident hunters, and has permits available through the internet and at local villages, and Alaska Department of Fish and Game offices. The bag limit would be one goat (either sex) and hunters would have to report their harvests within two days of returning from the field. Emergency orders would be used to limit over-harvests in specific areas.

ISSUE: Mountain goat populations on the southern half of Kodiak Island have increased dramatically in the past ten years and we would like to see more opportunities for hunters to use these goats before they become over-populated.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The mountain goat populations in this area may crash and cause long-range damage to their range.

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

IMPROVED? If the population continues to increase at the current rate, without increased harvests, it may crash and there will not be any goats for anyone to use in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who would like to harvest a goat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Additional hunting pressure may cause crowded conditions near accessible areas (such as alpine lakes).

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A) Maintaining the current system with more drawing permits issued - rejected because this may not accomplish the desired harvest. B) Increasing season length and bag limit - not necessary at this time because we feel the increased opportunity offered by the registration hunt will be sufficient.

PROPOSED BY: Kodiak Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-09G-010)

PROPOSAL 164 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Allocate permits in Unit 8 to nonresidents as follows:

30 percent of Unit 8 mountain goat permits will be separately allocated to nonresidents.

ISSUE: Lack of specific nonresident allocation for mountain goat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Mountain goat resources will continue to be under harvested. 45-50 percent of residents drawn do not hunt. Goat target population is 1000 whereas recent survey estimates is 1600.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Non-resident goat hunters, Kodiak economy.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Residents can hunt under the current registration hunt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Registration hunt for nonresidents.

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-09S-G-65)

PROPOSAL 165 - 5 AAC 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures. Modify the permit distribution system for goat hunting permits in Unit 8 as follows:

The permit should be available up to the start of the hunt.

ISSUE: The misuse of 5 AAC 92.052. The Board of Game has allowed area biologist to use this regulation to circumvent the non-rural preference statute. RG471-479 is just one of many hunts that show extremely well the very appearance of rural preference. You have to register October 6 to October 16. The hunt does not start until November 1. What possible biological concern could there be for two weeks of no hunting? Or is this to keep or discourage non-local residents from participating in the hunt?

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? I would have to believe a legislative review of this regulation is due, as the Board of Game continues to follow the recommendation by area biologists to hinder non-locals from participating in hunts.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, but neither does waiting two weeks after receiving a permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Goat hunters from other parts of the state who do not have two weeks to wait to hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? It appears to be the area biologist, who wants to appease the local community.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? n/a

PROPOSED BY: Allen Barrette (INT-09S-G-004)

PROPOSAL 166 - 5 AAC 92.125(d)(4) Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans. Modify the bear baiting season and methods within the Unit 16 predator control area as follows:

- 1) Bear Baiting season open all summer, no closures. (Black bear baiting season open May 1st through October 31st.)
- 2) Bait stations must be at least 600ft from cabins.
- 3) Black Bears taken under predator control may be taken with snares.
- 4) Two Brown Bears maybe taken at Black Bear stations under predator control.

ISSUE: Baiting season closure from June 30 to August 10; baiting station distance from cabins; and taking bears by other means as well as taking legal limit of brown bears at bait stations

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Black bear quota will never be reached. June 30 to August 10 is prime time to target sows and cubs. The distance from cabins makes hunting difficult, time consuming and expensive. Fewer bears are taken brown bears move the black bears away from bait stations and ruin baiting equipment

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The number of bears harvested will increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The people of Alaska who depend on wild meat will benefit and moose population will increase.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Nothing further.

PROPOSED BY: Ken Hughes (SC-09S-G-88)

PROPOSAL 167 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear. Modify the bag limit for black bear in Unit 14A as follows:

Increase the bag limit to 3 black bear per year in Unit 14A.

ISSUE: Harvest limit of black bear in Unit 14A and 14C is one bear while the rest of Unit 14 and Region II Units are three bears. This regulation keeps anyone who shot a bear in another unit from harvesting a bear in Unit 14A and 14C.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A hunting opportunity will be lost and the black bear in this area will continue to proliferate beyond the Unit's ability to sustain them while keeping a harvestable surplus available for human consumption.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, harvest should increase on an available surplus of black bear and at the same time allow a greater harvest of prey species for human consumption.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who wish to take more of black bear a year. Those who wish to take more of the prey species in future years. Those who wish to see more watchable wildlife such as moose and sheep.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Moving the limit to five bears and making any bear legal. Rejected this because this extreme is not yet wanted, but maybe in the future.

PROPOSED BY: Steven Flory Sr. (HQ-09S-G-068)

PROPOSAL 168 - 5 AAC 92.125(d). Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans. Amend the Unit 16 predation control plan to include the use of helicopters, participation by youth and nonresidents, group maintenance of bait sites, and no closed season for black bear baiting.

...
92.125(d)(4)(D) the commissioner may reduce the black bear population within the Unit 16 Predation Control Area by means and direction included in the Board of Game Bear Conservation and Management Policy (2006-164-BOG), dated May 14, 2006, and incorporated by reference, including the following methods and means under a department developed control permit:

- (i) legal animal is any black bear, including sows and cubs;
- (ii) no bag limit;
- (iii) same-day-airborne taking of black bears if the permittee is at least 300 feet from the aircraft, including the use of any type of aircraft, **including helicopters** to access black bear baiting stations. [FROM APRIL 15 THROUGH JUNE 30 AND AUGUST 10 THROUGH OCTOBER 15;]
- (iv) sale of unmounted, tanned black bear hides if the sale tag remains attached;
- (v) [APRIL 15 THROUGH JUNE 30 AND AUGUST 10 THROUGH OCTOBER 15] **no closed** baiting season for black bears; up to four black bear bait stations per permittee; black bear baiting allowed along the Unit 16 shorelines of the Susitna River, Yentna River below the confluence with the Skwentna River, the Deshka River (Kroto Creek) below the confluence with Trapper Creek, and Alexander Creek outside a 100-yard buffer on each side of the river; black bear baiting within one mile of a cabin if the cabin is on the opposite side of a major river system from the black bear baiting station and other permit conditions are met;
- (vi) **youth under 16 may participate in baited bear predation under the permit of a parent or guardian.**
- (vii) **Permittees may establish, maintain, and hunt bait stations of other permittees with written permission.**
- (viii) **non-resident hunters may participate in the black bear predation program as a permittee.**

ISSUE: Although black bear harvest has increased, largely due to the efforts of an organized effort by a citizens group (Sportsmen for Habitat (SPH)-Alaska), the Unit 16 black bear management effort has again fallen far short of its harvest objective. Many obstacles to help the department realize their goals have been presented that have hindered participation and effectiveness of those that do participate in the program.

1) The Board of Game has twice authorized the use of helicopters to access bait stations in this remote and has been over-ruled by the department. A donated helicopter was in route to Alaska for use in staffing and supplying bear bait camps in remote areas of the unit when the department decision was made to not allow

their use. The regulation still states “including the use of any type of aircraft”, but the department eliminated their use through permit conditions.

2) Dozens of hunters were turned away from participating in the effort due to the prohibition of participation by youth under 16. Baited bear hunting is one of the most controlled, safe, and selective situations in the hunting world, perfect for introducing youth to hunting and practical predator management. Many SFH sponsored family groups cancelled when they found out youth could not participate.

3) Dozens of hunters (resident and nonresident) hunters were discouraged from participating due to the prohibition of participation by nonresidents. Many SFH sponsored hunter groups were turned away because there were one or more non-resident hunters within the group.

4) Many bait stations went un-used because permittees could not allow another person to use their bait station without that person registering for that bait station. Many hunters established bait stations and did not have unlimited time to hunt. Others could have been taking bears in their absence, with their permission.

5) Many bait stations were not kept baited resulting in poor harvest. Much of the area is remote and expensive to access. If participants were allowed to bait hunting partners’ stations with their permission, expenses would be cut and baits would be more effective.

6) Baiting ends when most sows/cubs are just starting to hit bait sites. Large boars are generally the dominant bear in the area and will keep sows with cubs from using a bait station. It often takes several weeks to get enough dominant bears harvested in an area before sows with cubs will use a station. Most participants reported seeing increasing sows/cubs later in the spring. Stations are difficult to get re-established in fall, especially in areas of abundant berries or fish. If baiting were continued throughout the summer bears would continue to opt for the easy food source and fall hunting would be much more successful.

Unit 16 is vast, brush covered and very difficult to access in most areas. If all of these procedures are adopted we may begin to approach the harvest objective, we may still fall short. If we do not have these tools, the objectives are not even remotely realistic. In 2008 over 100 bears were killed in a 60 square mile area of Unit 16 by several groups of motivated hunters. This is less than one percent of the total area of Unit 16.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will not ever come close to their harvest objective.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Eventually the resource harvested will shift from bears to moose, which, in the eyes of most consumptive users is a vast improvement.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and that wish to teach their children about wildlife management and hunting and the children that learn these valuable lessons. Hunters who would like to help reduce bear numbers with nonresident companions. Hunters that would like to share bait sites. Hunters that would like to reduce bear numbers in remote in-accessible areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to using helicopters for any wildlife management. Those opposed to allowing youth and non-resident participation in predator management.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow any and all methods and means for hunting of black bears in Unit 16 until harvest objectives are met.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-058)

PROPOSAL 169 - 5AAC 92.125. Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans. Amend to allow more comprehensive youth participation in Unit 16 black bear management.

(d) Unit 16 Predation Control Area

(4) The permissible methods and means used to take predators are as follows:

(D) the commissioner may reduce the black bear population within the Unit 16 Predation Control Area by means and direction included in the Board of Game Bear Conservation and Management Policy (2006-164-BOG), dated May 14, 2006, and incorporated by reference, including the following **conditions**, methods and means under a department developed control permit:

Add:

(vi) participants must possess a valid Alaskan hunting license (except that a child, ages 8-15 years may participate under the direct supervision of a permit holder. The youth's take shall be reported by the permittee under permittees's permit.

ISSUE: Although black bear harvest has increased during the past two years, the Unit 16 black bear management effort has again fallen far short of its harvest objective. In 2008, over 100 bears were killed in a 60 square mile area of Unit 16 by several groups of motivated hunters. Yet, this effort represented a very small percentage of the total area of Unit 16.

While many obstacles have hindered the department from realizing their goals, the prohibition against youth participation has resulted in a number of adults declining the opportunity to participate without their young hunting partner.

Existing hunting regulations not only allow, but encourage youth participation. Predator management regulations should do so, as well.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Department of Fish and Game will not likely achieve their harvest objective.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Eventually the resource harvested will shift from bears to moose, which, in the eyes of most consumptive users is a vast improvement.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who wish to teach their children about wildlife management, as well as the children who learn these valuable lessons. Hunters who would like to see moose numbers recover.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to youth involvement in wildlife management.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow any and all methods and means for hunting of black bears in Unit 16 until harvest objectives are met.

PROPOSED BY: Sportsmen for Habitat—Alaska (SC-095-G-092)

PROPOSAL 170 - 92.080 Unlawful methods of taking game, exceptions; and 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions. Amend the regulations to allow the use of traps and snares for Unit 16 brown bear management as follows:

92.080 Unlawful methods of taking game, exceptions.

(8) with a snare, except for taking an unclassified game animal, a furbearer, grouse, hare or ptarmigan, **or as authorized under a predator control permit;**

92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions

(6) with the use of a trap or snare **unless authorized by a predator control permit;**

ISSUE: Although black bear harvest has increased during the past two years, the Unit 16 black bear

management effort has again fallen far short of its harvest objective. In 2008, over 100 bears were killed in a 60 square mile area of Unit 16 by several groups of motivated hunters. Yet, this effort represented a very small percentage of the total area of Unit 16. While many obstacles have hindered the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (the department) from realizing their goals, the limitation on permittee methods remains problematic. The addition of traps and snares will offer the department the flexibility to issue permits with additional methods when and where appropriate.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? the department will not likely achieve their harvest objective.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Eventually the resource harvested will shift from bears to moose, which, in the eyes of most consumptive users is a vast improvement.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who would like to reduce bear numbers by means other than bait stations. Hunters who would like to see moose numbers recover.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to using traps or snares for wildlife management.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow any and all methods and means for hunting or black bears in Unit 16 until harvest objectives are met.

PROPOSED BY: Sportsmen for Habitat – Alaska (SC-09S-G-093)

PROPOSAL 171 - 5 AAC 92.125(d). Predation control areas implementation plans. Allow black bear trapping in the Unit 16 predation control area as follows:

Trapping of black bears is allowed.

ISSUE: The Minimum black bear objective of 600 black bears and harvest objective is not being achieved in the Unit 16 predation control area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose population recovery may not occur.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, moose population improvement in Unit 16 B

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Trapping brown bears. Rejected - harvesting current objective.

PROPOSED BY: David McHoes (HQ-095-G-017)

PROPOSAL 172 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear, and 92.132. Bag limit for brown bears. Modify the bag limit for brown bear in Unit 14B as follows:

Resident and nonresidents: Unit 14B grizzly bear, one bear every year, September 1 through May 31.

ISSUE: Lack of moose in subunit 14B, with an overabundance of grizzlies.

I would like to see 14b be one bear every year. Although this will make a very minor impact if any to the harvest of bear in this area, it at least may make a positive impact. Even if it results in one extra bear getting

taken, that's a big plus for moose calf survival in the area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued low moose calf survival.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Improve calf moose survival

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Future moose hunters

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee (HQ-09S-G-083)

PROPOSAL 173 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Modify the brown bear season dates for Unit 16A as follows:

Resident and nonresident: Unit 16A grizzly bear,-one bear every year, August 10-May 31.

ISSUE: Issue: harvest dates for grizzly in Units 16A and 16B and the lack of moose in subunit 16A, with an overabundance of grizzlies. Although 16B is in worse shape, 16A also has a serious lack of moose. Currently 16B is two bears a year and 16A is one bear a year. It just makes sense that the harvest dates should be the same for both.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued low moose calf survival and different harvest dates in adjoining units.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Improves calf moose survival.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Future moose hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee (HQ-09S-G-084)

PROPOSAL 174 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. In Unit 16B alter this regulation for brown bear to provide the following:

Set the brown bear harvest regulations back to the pre-Intensive Management rule that provided for 1 bear every four years in a season starting September 1 to May 25 for that portion of Unit 16B that is in Denali National Preserve.

ISSUE: While the State of Alaska regulates hunting on lands managed by the National Park Service and designated by Congress as national preserves, it does so only in as far as that these state regulations do not conflict with park purposes, park regulations and management directives, and the legislative direction provided by Congress when Alaska's park units were created (36 CFR 13.40(d). National preserves in Alaska are bound to the Organic Act as well as to ANILCA and they are managed under the same management policies as parks in the Lower 48. Direction in both ANILCA and the management policies make it clear that while harvesting wildlife in national preserves can occur, it cannot deplete healthy populations or unacceptably impact natural

processes, natural distributions, densities, age-class distributions and behaviors, and harvest cannot be done for the purpose of increasing the numbers of harvested species (i.e. predator control). Unfortunately, the passage of the State of Alaska's Intensive Management statute in 1994 set the state on a course of conflict with these NPS directives.

The National Park Service Organic Act clearly states that the purpose of the national park system is to "...conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein." The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (ANILCA) gives as one of its primary purposes providing "... for the maintenance of sound populations of, and habitat for, wildlife species...(section 101(b))", and in providing for these wildlife species, the populations in national preserves are to remain "healthy (section 815 (1))." And each park's enabling language clearly supports wildlife protection as a primary park purpose (see ANILCA Section II).

There is specific direction in ANILCA that provides for hunting in national preserves and we are not contesting that right. ANILCA section 1313 states that "A National Preserve in Alaska shall be administered and managed as a unit of the National Park System in the same manner as a national park... except that the taking of fish and wildlife for sport purposes... shall be allowed in a national preserve under applicable state and federal law and regulation." The key words here are "administered and managed as a unit of the National Park system in the same manner as a national Park.. under applicable state and federal law and regulation". Management direction for all units of the national park system in Alaska is firmly grounded in the 1916 Organic Act as set forth in ANILCA Section 203.

Of particular concern to the request made in this proposal, the National Park Service Management Policies at 4.4.2, make it abundantly clear that the manipulation of wildlife populations is not allowed: "The Service does not engage in activities to reduce the numbers of native species for the purpose of increasing the numbers of harvested species (i.e., predator control), nor does the Service permit others to do so on lands managed by the National Park Service."

In this proposal, the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) is concerned only about the application of existing bear harvest regulations in those parts of Unit 16B that are located in Denali National Preserve. As such our proposed regulation change only addresses national preserve lands and makes no comment, judgment or suggestion for how the state of Alaska manages wildlife on its own or other federal lands.

When the state's Intensive Management Act was passed, brown bear harvest in 16B was one bear every four years from September 1 to May 25. Subsequent changes to the state's brown bear regulations for this unit were made in Regulatory Year (RY) 1999 when the season was liberalized to start earlier on August 10 to May 25, RY 2001 when the bag limit was increased to one bear/year, RY 2003 when the season was again liberalized to extend later from August 10 to May 31 and finally in RY 2005 the Board of Game increased the bag limit to two bears/year.

From reading the Brown Bear Management Report for Unit 16, it is obvious that extending the season in 1999 to the more recent change to two bears/year is motivated entirely on growing more moose. The 2002 to 2004 BMR states that "The Board determined that moose was the priority species in Unit 16, and a high population of brown bears conflicted with moose population productivity." As such, the Board of Game liberalized the season, bag limits and eliminated the resident tag fee to "reduce the bear population" and increase the "likelihood of additional (bear) harvests to reach the desired objectives," those objectives being an increase in moose population. In the 2004 to 2006 BMR, the units focus on moose for human consumption continues to be the driving management objective with statements like "...increasing the (bear) harvest because of low moose numbers..."

The bag limit increase in 2005 was also objected to by the National Park Service in its February 17, 2005 letter to the Board. Ignoring this NPS request to not change the bag limit conflicts with the spirit of cooperation and mutual decision making set forth in the Master Memorandum of Understanding between NPS and the State of Alaska.

These very clear statements directing the manipulation of brown bear populations to benefit moose for human consumption are in direct conflict with the direction given to the National Park Service that such manipulation cannot occur on its lands. And the fact that national preserve lands are a relatively small part of the Upper Yentna in Unit 16B should not deter our desire to resolve this conflict. As such, this proposal seeks to restore the bag limit and season for brown bears on that part of Unit 16B that is in Denali National Preserve to the pre-Intensive management levels of 1 bear every four years from September 1 to May 25.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? State regulations will continue to be in conflict with federal statutes and management policies, setting up an inevitable showdown between state and federal authority that will most likely end in court at a considerable cost of time and resources for both entities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Healthy brown bear populations, as directed by ANILCA would be ensured in Denali National Preserve and there would be no risk of the state's Intensive Management statues, as embodied in the current liberalized harvest regulations, causing a reduction in the wolf population to an unhealthy level, which could/would cause the Park Service to take action to close the area to hunting altogether.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All people who appreciate that a primary management goal of national preserves in Alaska is to sustain healthy populations of wildlife, including brown bears, and that hunting in national preserves should be managed to meet federal wildlife statutes, regulations and policies, not the State of Alaska's.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those that wrongly believe that the federal government does not have authority to manage wildlife living within the boundaries of national park system units.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Jim Stratton, National Parks Conservation Association (SC-09S-G-040)

PROPOSAL 175 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Extend the caribou season in Unit 16B as follows:

Extend the caribou season in Unit 16B to end on October 5.

ISSUE: Due to the change in climate over the past ten years or so, the caribou are not moving into these areas until driven down by snow and weather. Caribou hunts are not as successful as in the past as they are not here until late season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? By allowing caribou hunts to be conducted when the caribou are there, it also offers opportunity for hunters in the field to harvest predators (black/grizzly bears and wolves) thus improving the caribou (and moose) populations as well in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Caribou, moose, and sheep populations will benefit with more hunters in the field taking predators during the late season caribou hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one suffers; however, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game is concerned about the meat being inedible due to the rut. The history had caribou season for many years prior to 2000 open late into October and the meat was harvested. Ruddy meat as well as excellent meat can be found early and late in the season.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solution as very few caribou can be harvested during the season.

PROPOSED BY: Steven Perrin (HQ-09S-G-078)

PROPOSAL 176 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the archery season dates for moose in Unit 14A as follows:

Archery only hunt from September 23 thru September 30 in Unit 14A

ISSUE: The archery moose hunt normally scheduled for August 10 thru August 17 is too early in the season and should be moved to the end of the regular season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose hunters who harvest a moose during this time run a very high risk of the meat either getting fly blow on it or the meat spoiling due to the high temperature at that time of the year.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This would greatly improve the quality of the harvest since the hunter would not be fighting flies and the heat and could more easily take care of the meat harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone who archery hunts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I cannot think of any one individual or group that would suffer due to this change.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: John Corey (HQ-095-G-004)

PROPOSAL 177 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Provide an archery hunt for antlerless moose in Unit 14A as follows:

We request the Board of Game take a few antlerless permits from the general Unit 14A moose hunt and multiply them into a much higher, biologically sound number of antlerless moose permits usable only during the Unit 14A archery season. The shorter season and much lower success rate of archery hunting would allow a significantly higher number of antlerless moose permits to be issued. Perhaps a total of 20 permits taken throughout Unit 14A antlerless hunt areas could be multiplied to create 60 to 120 archery permits.

ISSUE: There are two problems we would like the board to address through this single proposal. A) Moose hunters in Unit 14A may hunt all or most of the season and not see or be able to tell if they saw a legal moose the entire season, unless they are fortunate enough to draw an antlerless moose permit. B) The chances of drawing an antlerless moose permit in Unit 14A are currently unnecessarily miniscule; with a drawing success ranging from one to four percent of applicants for each Unit 14A antlerless permit area in 2007.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The number of antlerless moose permits given for Unit 14A will continue to be unnecessarily restricted, and consequently some hunters will continue to be discouraged with the Unit 14A moose hunting opportunities - in particular those hunters who may see several moose, but are unable to identify a single legal animal.

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

IMPROVED? No and yes. Quality of moose harvested would likely not improve. Quality of moose hunt opportunity however, would undoubtedly improve as more hunters would draw antlerless permits and enjoy a much greater opportunity of seeing clearly legal animals during their Unit 14A moose hunt. If significant numbers of hunters chose to apply for archery permits rather than general permits, drawing success rates could also increase for Unit 14A general hunt antlerless moose permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Our hope is that all Unit 14A moose hunters who apply for antlerless permit hunts would enjoy higher drawing success rates. Creating more permits in this fashion would simply let more hunters win.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who prefer that all Unit 14A antlerless moose permits remain available only for the general hunt, would likely see a slight decrease in the number of general hunt antlerless permits.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? If the board has concerns about this proposal, it could be adopted on a trial basis, with a sunset clause causing the archery permits to away, after two or four years, if not readopted by the board.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee (HQ-09S-G-085)

PROPOSAL 178 - 5 AAC 085.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorizes the drawing permit hunts for antlerless moose in Unit 14(A).

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
Unit 14(A)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
...		
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 500 antlerless moose permits may be issued	Aug. 20-Sept. 25 (General hunt only) Nov. 1 – Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	No open season
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be re-authorized annually by the Board. During November 2008, the subpopulation of moose in Unit 14(A) was surveyed and estimated at 6,614 which was slightly more than the post-hunt objective of 6,000 – 6,500 moose. During this survey we observed 23 bulls and 40 calves: 100 cows. Snow depth accumulations in the subunit during the last 4 winters overall were average and survival of calves and adults was good.

During 1999 and 2000, we issued no permits because the subpopulation estimate remained below objective levels. In 2001 we resumed the antlerless hunts because the population had recovered and actually exceeded objectives. The 14A population is currently above the upper end of management objectives. Our strategy for harvesting cows from 8 different permit hunt areas within the subunit was to concentrate antlerless moose permits in those areas where moose densities were highest. Minor adjustments to permit numbers and drawing

areas were made in 2007 to address areas with numerous nuisance moose calls. Also, the addition of a youth antlerless moose hunt in the Point MacKenzie area was began in 2007 (DM412). Permits for this hunt were allocated from the existing antlerless permit hunt area (DM402).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Portions of the Unit 14(A) moose subpopulation could grow beyond the ability of the habitat to sustain that population level. Increased cases of starvation, conflicts with humans and vehicle collisions will occur.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; excessively high moose density can lead to nutritionally stressed animals in the harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All who wish a healthy, productive moose population in the Matanuska-Susitna valleys, and those who wish to use antlerless moose for human consumption.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who disagree with the harvest of antlerless moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-095-G-114)

PROPOSAL 179 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change the archery season dates for Unit 14A and 14B as follows:

In Unit 14A and B: 1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:	Residents	Nonresidents
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side by bow and arrow	[AUG. 10 - AUG. 17] <u>Nov. 1 – Nov. 7</u>	[AUG. 10 - AUG. 17] <u>Nov. 1 – Nov. 7</u>

ISSUE: Meat care during hot August hunts has proven problematic, especially in remote areas. Holding a hunt in October would allow moose hunting during the rut, possibly resulting in over harvest. A November hunt will allow hunters to spread out on snow machines while avoiding the vulnerability of a rut hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The season will go on as it has with meat lost due to spoilage.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, moose meat will be of much higher quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters who put in the time and efforts to become IBEP certified will benefit from the better conditions for meat care, the moose will benefit because fewer large bulls will be taking out of the gene pool prior to rut.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one is likely to suffer as this change will merely improve the quality of the hunt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Consider moving the season to the first two weeks in October. This was rejected as having too much likelihood of interfering with rut.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-050)

PROPOSAL 180 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Delay the moose season dates in Units 14B and 16A as follows.

Archery season: **August 20 - 28** [AUGUST 10-17]

General season: **September 1 - 25** [AUGUST 20 - SEPTEMBER 20]

ISSUE: Moose hunting seasons in these units are scheduled earlier than many hunters prefer. Many hunters prefer hunting later when temperatures have cooled and less insects are present.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? General moose hunts will continue to start in the second week of August and close on September 20, when many hunters prefer the opportunity to hunt later. Since school starts so much earlier than years ago, present seasons do not even provide much benefit to school age hunters anymore.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Quality of resource harvested could be improved with cooler temperatures and less bugs present which normally occurs later in the season. In addition, harvesting moose later in the season as proposed, gives moose at least ten additional days to grow in size - during the prime late summer growing period.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who prefer a later moose season and hunters whose work schedule makes a later season more desirable. Hunters who would like to call moose successfully. Testimony before our advisory committee and results from Alaska Department of Fish and Game's moose hunter survey indicate more hunters prefer a later season opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who prefer the present earlier season. Hunters whose work, school, or vacation schedule makes an earlier season more desirable.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A season with an ending date of September 30 was also considered, but present moose population numbers would likely not support such a later season, especially in Units 14B and 16A.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-026)

PROPOSAL 181 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Delay the archery season dates for moose in Units 14 and 16 as follows:

Units 14A, 14B, and 16A

Archery season: **August 22-30** [AUGUST 10-17]

General season: **September 1-30** [AUGUST 20-SEPTEMBER 20]

ISSUE: Moose hunting seasons in these units are scheduled earlier than many hunters prefer. Many hunters prefer hunting moose when it is later in the season due to the temperature and the absence of many insects.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? General moose hunts will continue to start in the third week of August and close on September 20. Many hunters prefer a later starting time for the season. Since school starts earlier now, school age hunters do not benefit either way.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quality of the resource harvested will be improved with cooler temperatures and the less likelihood of insects present.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who prefer a later hunting season. Hunters whose work schedules make a later season more desirable. Those hunters that prefer to call moose in. Those hunters that like less leaves on the trees.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters that prefer the current season due to work, school or vacation schedules. Those hunters that prefer hunting in T-shirts and wearing bug dope.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I would have liked to see the hunting season from September 1 through October 10 but decided the resource probably could not handle the extra time and be sustainable in the future.

PROPOSED BY: Ken Federico (HQ-095-G-036)

PROPOSAL 182 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish resident and nonresident hunts for Units 14 and 16 as follows:

Units 14A, 14B, and 16A:

Residents only: August 10-17, one bull by bow and arrow only, 50 inches or three brow tines or spike-fork.

Nonresidents: One bull 50 inches or three brow tines or spike-fork; dates to be based on rifle season, currently August 20-September 20

ISSUE: Out-of-state hunters are using a specialty hunt being able to harvest moose before the standard rifle hunter can harvest their meat. We see no reason why a nonresident should get the opportunity to harvest moose before many residents do, just because they use a special type of weapon. There are many "meat hunters" in Alaska who hunt a rifle because this is the most effective and economic way to fill their freezers. It is not right that they should have to learn to use a specialty weapon just to be on equal footing with a nonresident.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo; and a certain number of animals will continue to get shipped outside before the rifle hunters even get into the field.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident rifle hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident bow hunters will have to wait another week to get into the field.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Doing away with the early bow season for all, but it would create too much heat from the bow hunting group.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee (HQ-09S-G-082)

PROPOSAL 183 - 5 AAC 085.045(14). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorize the antlerless moose hunt on Kalgin Island in Unit 16(B).

**Resident
Open Season**

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

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be re-authorized annually. The population objective for this predator-free, 23-mi² island is 20-40 moose a density of 1-1.75 moose/mi². Following a November 2007 survey, we counted 118 moose which is approximately 4.74 moose/mi².

Because of concerns of over-population and deteriorating habitat conditions, a drawing permit hunt for cows was initiated in 1995. In an attempt to reduce the population quickly, the Board established a registration hunt for any moose for the fall 1999 season. The population of moose on Kalgin Island is high at this time and remains well above the objective of 20-40.

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

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

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If the island population size is kept at or near objective levels, moose will have adequate available forage and therefore, show less sign of being nutritionally stressed.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who make the effort to get to Kalgin Island will have the opportunity to take any moose.

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

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

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-123)

PROPOSAL 184 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Establish full-curl horn restrictions for Unit 14 as follows:

Unit 14A and 14B:

Residents - one ram with full-curl horns or larger

Nonresidents - one ram with full-curl horns or larger by permit only.

Permits available for nonresidents should be limited to 10 percent of average annual historical harvest data in this Unit.

ISSUE: To limit the number of nonresidents hunting Dall sheep in Unit 14A and B

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Over-harvest by nonresident hunters guided by professional hunters will deplete the number of legal rams in these areas, affecting not only quantity of legal rams, but the quality of future hunts.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal, if accepted, would allow more rams to grow old enough to realize their horn growth potential, and possibly improve the breeding dynamics of the sheep herd in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone who enjoys seeing multiple legal rams in a hunting area instead of practically none.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one suffers if the sheep herd is more healthy.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Scott Butler

(SC-09S-G-024)

PROPOSAL 185 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Align the Unit 16 wolf and coyote trapping season with Unit 13 as follows:

Wolf: Units 13 and 16 - October 15 - April 30; no limit.

Coyote: Units 13 and 16 - October 15 - April 30; no limit.

ISSUE: Align Unit 16 wolf and coyote seasons with Unit 13. October 15 - April 30 (current season is November 10 - April 30).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Lost trapping opportunity because of unit boundaries you can trap one side of a river but not the other.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to trapping.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Lynn Keogh

(HQ-09S-G-059)

PROPOSAL 186 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf. Modify the season and bag limit for wolf in Unit 16B as follows:

Set the wolf harvest regulations back to the pre-Intensive Management rule that provided for 5 wolves in a season starting August 10 to April 30 for that portion of Unit 16B that is in Denali National Preserve.

ISSUE: While the State of Alaska regulates hunting on lands managed by the National Park Service and designated by Congress as national preserves, it does so only in as far as that these state regulations do not conflict with park purposes, park regulations and management directives, and the legislative direction provided by Congress when Alaska's park units were created (36 CFR 13.40(d). National preserves in Alaska are bound to the Organic Act as well as to ANILCA and they are managed under the same management policies as parks in the Lower 48. Direction in both ANILCA and the management policies make it clear that while harvesting wildlife in national preserves can occur, it cannot deplete healthy populations or unacceptably impact natural processes, natural distributions, densities, age-class distributions and behaviors, and harvest cannot be done for the purpose of increasing the numbers of harvested species (i.e. predator control). Unfortunately, the passage of the State of Alaska's Intensive Management statute in 1994 set the state on a course of conflict with these NPS directives.

The National Park Service Organic Act clearly states that the purpose of the national park system is to "...conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein." The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (ANILCA) gives as one of its primary purposes providing "... for the maintenance of sound populations of, and habitat for, wildlife species...(section 101(b))", and in providing for these wildlife species, the populations in national preserves are to remain "healthy (section 815 (1))." And each park's enabling language clearly supports wildlife protection as a primary park purpose (see ANILCA Section II).

There is specific direction in ANILCA that provides for hunting in national preserves and we are not contesting that right. ANILCA section 1313 states that "A National Preserve in Alaska shall be administered and managed as a unit of the National Park System in the same manner as a national park... except that the taking of fish and wildlife for sport purposes... shall be allowed in a national preserve under applicable state and federal law and regulation." The key words here are "administered and managed as a unit of the National Park system in the same manner as a national Park.. under applicable state and federal law and regulation". Management direction for all units of the national park system in Alaska is firmly grounded in the 1916

Organic Act as set forth in ANILCA Section 203.

Of particular concern to the request made in this proposal, the National Park Service Management Policies at 4.4.2, make it abundantly clear that the manipulation of wildlife populations is not allowed: "The Service does not engage in activities to reduce the numbers of native species for the purpose of increasing the numbers of harvested species (i.e., predator control), nor does the Service permit others to do so on lands managed by the National Park Service."

In this proposal, the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) is concerned only about the application of existing wolf harvest regulations in those parts of Unit 16B that are located in Denali National Preserve. As such our proposed regulation change only addresses national preserve lands and makes no comment, judgment or suggestion for how the state of Alaska manages wildlife on its own or other federal lands.

When the state's Intensive Management Act was passed, wolf harvest in Unit 16B was five wolves per season from August 10 to April 30. In Regulatory Year (RY) 2003, that bag limit was doubled to ten wolves per season.

From reading the Wolf Management Plan for Unit 16, it is obvious that increase in bag limit was done solely to provide for an increased moose harvest. The Board of Game adopted Unit 16B as an intensive management area for wolves in 2003, corresponding with the year the harvest level was doubled. The 2002 to 2004 WMR states that "The purpose of the control program was to reduce the number of wolves in the unit and subsequently increase the number of moose calves recruited into the population".

These very clear statements directing the manipulation of wolf populations to benefit moose for human consumption are in direct conflict with the direction given to the National Park Service that such manipulation cannot occur on its lands. And the fact that national preserve lands are a relatively small part of the Upper Yentna in Unit 16B should not deter our desire to resolve this conflict. As such, this proposal seeks to restore the bag limit for wolves on that part of Unit 16B that is in Denali National Preserve to the pre-intensive management levels of five wolves per year from August 10 to April 30.

As such, this proposal seeks to restore the bag limit of five wolves/year on that small part of Unit 13C that is in Wrangell St. Elias National Preserve.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? State regulations will continue to be in conflict with federal statutes and management policies, setting up an inevitable showdown between state and federal authority that will most likely end in court at a considerable cost of time and resources for both entities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Healthy wolf populations, as directed by ANILCA would be ensured in Denali National Preserve and there would be no risk of the state's Intensive Management statutes, as embodied in the current liberalized harvest regulations, causing a reduction in the wolf population to an unhealthy level, which could/would cause the Park Service to take action to close the area to hunting altogether.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All people who appreciate that a primary management goal of national preserves in Alaska is to sustain healthy populations of wildlife, including wolves, and that hunting in national preserves should be managed to meet federal wildlife statutes, regulations and policies, not the state of Alaska's.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those that wrongly believe that the federal government does not have authority to manage wildlife living within the boundaries of national park system units.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Jim Stratton, National Parks Conservation Association (SC-09S-G-041)

PROPOSAL 187 - 5 AAC 92.125(d). Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans. Modify the predator control are in Unit 16 as follows:

Expand the predator control area to include all of Unit 16. Eliminate the arbitrary boundary dividing Unit 16A in half allowing the use of bear baiting in the fall.

ISSUE: Currently the predator control area does not include all of Unit 16A. The current boundary has no geographical distinction and bear populations continue to expand east of the line effecting the overall moose population as well as west of the line. Generally the area is thick spruce and swamps and bears are difficult to see in the fall when most hunters are afield. Expanding the predator control area will allow hunters to bait black bears in the fall, expanding hunting opportunity, increasing the likelihood of hunter success and consequently resulting in a reduction of bear numbers within the region.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose populations will continue decreasing due to increasingly unchecked predation on moose calves by a continually increasing bear population. Bear related damage to area cabins will increase.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It increases the likelihood of moose calf survival and subsequently increases the likelihood the moose populations will return to sustainable levels within the region.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who use the area, as well as cabin owners within the affected area. Moose populations will increase resulting in potentially greater hunter success rate. Cabin owners will see a reduction in bear related damage to their property.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Increase current limit of three bears within the region. Vegetation is largely the limiting factor on bear harvest and increasing the limit will not result in increased bear harvest.

PROPOSED BY: Stuart Barrows (HQ-095-G-028)

PROPOSAL 188 - 5 AAC 92.125(d). Predation control areas implementation plans. Modify the Unit 16 predation control plan as follows:

Under section (3)(A) of 92.125(d) "the objectives of the predation control program are to halt the decline of the moose population within the predation control area of **Unit 16** and to increase the fall (post-hunt) moose population to the intensive management objective of **10,000- 11,500** [6,500-7,500] moose, providing a sustainable annual harvest of **500- 960** [310-600] moose,"

ISSUE: In 2007, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game sent an informational booklet titled "Predator Management in Alaska" to local advisory committees. On page 20 it is stated: "the goal of the Unit 16 program is to increase the moose population to 10,000- 11,500 moose and harvests to 600- 960 moose." This is untrue as the goal is to increase only Unit (16 B) moose population to 6,500-7,500 moose and harvest of 310-600 moose. There is no requirement to increase Unit 16A moose populations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Local advisory committees may remain under the false impression that Unit 16 predator control program is intended to increase Unit 16A moose population to objective for subunit 16A from current estimate of 1,600 moose to an objective of 3,500- 4,000 moose.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, moose population improvement in Unit 16A

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Take the Board of Game to court regarding continued violation of regulation 5 ACC 92.106 which requires a finding of moose population depletions in Units 16A and 14 B and the implementing of management plans to increase moose numbers to objectives. Rejected - not inserted in feeding lawyers.

PROPOSED BY: David McHoes (HQ-095-G-016)

PROPOSAL 189 - 5 AAC 92.125(d). Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans. Amend to extend the season for Unit 16 black bear management as follows:

5 AAC 92.125(d) Unit 16 Predation Control Area

(4) the permissible methods and means used to take predators are as follows:

(D) the commissioner may reduce the black bear population within the Unit 16 Predation Control Area by means and direction included in the Board of Game Bear Conservation and Management Policy (2006-164-BOG), dated May 14, 2006, and incorporated by reference, including the following **conditions**, methods and means under a department developed control permit:

(iii) same-day-airborne taking of black bears if the permittee is at least 300 feet from the aircraft, including the use of any type of aircraft, **including helicopters** to access black bear baiting stations **and associated camps from April 15 through Oct 15;**

(iv) sale of un-mounted, tanned black bear hides if the sale tag remains attached;

(v) **April 15 through October 15** baiting season for black bears; up to four black bear bait stations per permittee; black bear baiting allowed along the Unit 16 shorelines of the Susitna River, Yentna River below the confluence with the Skentna River, the Deshka River (Kroto Creek) below the confluence of Trapper Creek, and Alexander Creek outside a 100-yard buffer on each side of the river; black bear baiting within one mile of a cabin if the cabin is on the opposite side of a major river system from the black bear baiting station and other permit conditions are met;

ISSUE: Although black bear harvest has increased during the past two years, the Unit 16 black bear management effort has again fallen far short of its harvest objective. In 2008, over 100 bears were killed in a 60 square mile area of Unit 16 by several groups of motivated hunters. Yet, this effort represented a very small percentage of the total area of Unit 16.

While many obstacles have hindered the Alaska Department of Fish and Game from realizing their goals, the season ending at the end of June, and then resuming on August 10 has resulted in fewer bears taken, as well as a disproportionately high number of males being taken.

Sows with young have demonstrated a reluctance to utilize Unit 16 bait stations until a number of boars have been removed from the area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Alaska Department of Fish and Game will not likely achieve their harvest objective.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Eventually the resource harvested will shift from bears to moose, which, in the eyes of most consumptive users is a vast improvement.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who desire to participate to a greater extent in predator management activities. Hunters who would like to see moose numbers recover.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to a longer season.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow any and all methods and means for hunting of black bears in Unit 16 until harvest objectives are met.

PROPOSED BY: Sportsmen for Habitat – Alaska (SC-09S-G-094)

PROPOSAL 190 - 5 AAC 92.039. Permit for taking wolves using aircraft; 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures; 92.068. Permit conditions for hunting black bear with dog; 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions; 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions; 92.106. Intensive management of identified big game prey populations; 92.108. Identified big game prey populations and objectives; 92.110. Control of predation by wolves; 92.115. Control of predation by bears; and 92.125. Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans. Review intensive management options to be used by the Department of Fish and Game or contracted government agents of the department.

The department is considering, but not necessarily recommending the following changes at this time:

- 1) Use of carbon monoxide cartridges as an option for euthanasia of wolves by government employees.
- 2) Use of helicopters by government employees to take wolves from the air or to transport employees to and from the field to conduct wolf and bear management activities.
- 3) Use of snares as a method to take black bear by government employees.

ISSUE: This proposal would provide the general framework for allowing additional predator management options by the department. In practice, any authorization available to the department by Board of Game action would then either be permitted or authorized under regulation to a government entity, which could include either the department or a federal agency.

This proposal is submitted for public comment and consideration by the board for allowing additional options for intensive management. State fish and game agencies and some federal agencies across the country routinely use a variety of methods for culling wildlife for purposes related to public safety and active management. This can be for game species (e.g., overabundance of deer) as well as nongame species (i.e., allowing the take of one species to enhance another that may be endangered, threatened, or declining). To accomplish these activities, state fish and game agencies, municipalities, or other government agencies frequently enlist the services of specialized federal agencies (i.e., USDA – Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service - APHIS). In Alaska, APHIS currently conducts activities in and around airports for public safety purposes and in other areas of Alaska to meet specific active wildlife management needs and objectives.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Existing intensive management programs can occur unchanged.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If additional options are adopted, predator management may become more feasible and efficient in some situations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Members of the public who rely on resources being actively managed.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to active management of wildlife.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No change to existing programs.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-104)

PROPOSAL 191 - 5 AAC 092.530(18). Palmer – Wasilla Management Area. Clarify the definition of firearms allowed for hunting and trapping in the Palmer–Wasilla Management Area as follows:

(B) the area is closed to hunting except that (i) big game may be taken by **muzzleloader** [MUZZLELOADING BLACK-POWDER FIREARM], shotguns with slugs, and bow and arrow only; (ii) small game, **deleterious exotic wildlife**, and fur animals may be taken by **muzzleloader** [MUZZLELOADING BLACK-POWDER FIREARM], shotgun, air rifle, falconry, or bow and arrow only; (iii) **fur animals and furbearers taken on a trapping license by methods other than by trapping or snaring may be taken by muzzleloader, shotgun, air rifle, falconry, or bow and arrow only;** (iv) water fowl taken on Finger Lake may be taken by falconry; and bow and flu-flu arrow only;

ISSUE: The current definition of firearms allowed in regulation was intended to limit hunters to “short-range” firearms to reduce the potential for problems with the discharge of firearms in the higher density housing and developed areas of the greater Palmer - Wasilla area. Under the current definition of methods allowed for taking of furbearers under a trapping license, modern firearms such as .22 caliber rim-fire rifles and handguns as well as modern high-powered rifles would be allowed for taking fur animals in the Palmer – Wasilla Management Area. Also, the existing language in this regulation doesn’t allow for the taking of deleterious exotic wildlife such as starlings, pigeons, and rats.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The current regulation will allow for those who hold a trapping license to take furbearers with modern firearms including high powered rifles and handguns in the Palmer – Wasilla Management Area. Also, the existing regulation language will continue to not allow the taking of deleterious exotic wildlife by hunters and trappers within the management area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, there will be less chance of having higher velocity modern rifle calibers used for hunting and trapping in the Palmer – Wasilla Management Area. This will reduce the potential for problems with the use of high velocity rifle ammunition in congested areas around Palmer and Wasilla. Hunters and trappers will legally be able to take deleterious exotic wildlife, benefiting local residents and native wildlife in the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents of the Palmer and Wasilla area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who want to take fur animals or furbearers on a trapping license in the Palmer-Wasilla Management Area with modern rifles and handguns.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-98)

PROPOSAL 192 - 5 AAC 92.039. Permit for taking wolves using aircraft; 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game, exceptions; 92.115. Control of predation by bears; 92.110. Control of predation by wolves; and 92.125. Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans. Amend the necessary regulations to allow the use of helicopters to access black bear baiting stations and associated camps as follows:

92.039. Permit for taking wolves using aircraft. Add the words “and bears” to the title and subsequent references to wolves throughout this regulation.

92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game, exceptions

(3) knowingly, or with reason to know, with the use of a helicopter in any manner, including transportation to, or from the field of any unprocessed game or parts of game; any hunter or hunting gear, or any equipment used in the pursuit or retrieval of game; this paragraph does not apply to transportation of a hunter, hunting gear, or game during an emergency rescue operation in a life-threatening situation. **Nor does it apply to the use of helicopters under a permit within a predator control area identified in 5 AAC 92.125.**

92.110. Control of predation by wolves. The words “(including helicopters)” should be added after every reference to aircraft within this regulation.

92.115. Control of predation by bears. The words “(including helicopters)” should be added after every reference to aircraft within this regulation.

5 AAC 92.125. Unit 16 Predation Control Area

d) Unit Predation control Area

(4) the permissible methods and means used to take predators are as follows:

(D) the commissioner may reduce the black bear population within the Unit 16 Predation Control Area by means and direction included in the Board of Game Bear Conservation and Management Policy (2006-164-BOG), dated May 14, 2006, and incorporated by reference, including the following methods and means under a department developed control permit:

(i) legal animal is any black bear, including sows and cubs;

(ii) no bag limit;

(iii) same-day-airborne taking of black bears if the permittee is at least 300 feet from the aircraft, including the use of any type of aircraft, **including helicopters**, to access black bear baiting stations **and associated camps**.

ISSUE: Although black bear harvest has increased during the past two years, the Unit 16 black bear management effort has again fallen far short of its harvest objective. In 2008, over 100 bears were killed in a 60 square mile area of Unit 16 by several groups of motivated hunters. Yet, this effort represented a very small percentage of the total area of Unit 16.

While many obstacles have hindered the Alaska Department of Fish and Game from realizing their goals, permittee access to the bulk of the area remains problematic. Unit 16 is vast, brush covered and very difficult to access in most areas.

The board has previously authorized the use of helicopters to access bait stations in this remote area. While the regulation still states “including the use of any type of aircraft”, helicopter use has been eliminated through conditions of the permit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Alaska Department of Fish and Game will not

likely achieve their harvest objective.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Eventually the resource harvested will shift from bears to moose, which, in the eyes of most consumptive users is a vast improvement.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who desire to participate to a greater extent in predator management activities. Hunters who would like to see moose numbers recover.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to using helicopters for wildlife management.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow any and all methods and means for hunting of black bears in Unit 16 until harvest objectives are met.

PROPOSED BY: Sportsmen for Habitat – Alaska (SC-09S-G-096)

PROPOSAL 193 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Ban the use of motorized vehicles for hunting in Unit 14A as follows:

Close the area known as the south side of government peak to the use of motorized vehicles for hunting. Mirror the Department of Natural Resources regulations for the same area. Publish in the hunting regulation book. (Specific area is "RIET19N sections 27, 28, 29, 30, 31 and section 26 on the west side of Hatcher Pass Road.

ISSUE: WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters assume this area is open to motorized access. The 1989 amendment to the Hatcher Pass Management Plan closed this area to motorized vehicles, but few are aware of this fact. Enforcement is difficult.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It reduces damage to the vegetation and improves surface water quality. There are numerous small streams in the area that are salmon fry habitat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Walk in hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? ATV hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Edward Strabel (HQ-095-G-039)

PROPOSAL 194 - 5 AAC 85.060. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals. Open seasons and modify the bag limits for coyote in Region II as follows:

For all Region II Units: Coyote bag limit, 10 per day, no closed season.

ISSUE: Make the season for coyotes in all of Region II "no closed season".

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Coyotes prove to be very successful predators of sheep, notably lambs in spring. While coyotes are not taken with great regularity, this change allows more incidental take and affords opportunities later in the season.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This change allows for management of predators in sheep habitat by removing seasonal restrictions. It is likely if not proven that a single pair of coyotes denning near a lambing area could kill as

many as 30 lambs in a six week period while weaning a litter of pups. Efforts made to prevent coyotes from having negative impacts on lamb recruitment are only a positive step in putting more sheep on the mountain.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sheep numbers will be positively impacted benefiting local hunters, guides, and nonresident hunters. Any efforts to improve sheep numbers should be given serious consideration.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Coyotes.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Chapter FNAWS/Wild Sheep Foundation (HQ-09S-G-072)

PROPOSAL 195 - 5 AAC 85.060. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals. No closed season for coyote in Region II Units as follows:

(a)(1) Coyote

Eliminate seasons and bag limits for coyotes region-wide.

ISSUE: Coyotes are plentiful in all Units in Region II. Hunting seasons and bag limits are not necessary to sustain healthy populations of coyotes. Most western states have organized federal programs to decrease coyote populations as well as unlimited hunting and trapping. Some states do not require licenses to hunt or trap coyotes. Coyotes have very little value as a fur bearer causing little dedicated interest in trapping coyotes. Alaska's vast area and small human population is protection enough to preserve healthy coyote populations for decades, if not centuries. Many hunters and outdoorsman have reported observing an increase in coyote numbers.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Coyote hunting will continue to be restricted unnecessarily.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No. The quantity of coyotes harvested may increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who wish to hunt coyotes year-round.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to unlimited coyote hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Unlimited trapping, rejected due to possible by-catch of more sensitive species and low fur prices. Eliminate seasons and bag limits state wide, rejected due to lower numbers in some areas.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-047)

PROPOSAL 196 - 5 AAC 85.010. Hunting seasons and bag limits for bison. Amend the bag limit for bison in Units 11 and 13 as follows:

If you draw a permit and harvest a bison in Units 11 and 13, then it is once in a lifetime permit in that individual unit. If you fail to harvest a bison, then you have to wait five regulatory years before you can apply in that unit again.

ISSUE: I would like the Board of Game to amend the bag limit on Bison so that if a permit is drawn and a bison is harvested, then it is a once in a lifetime permit in that unit. This will provide more hunters with an opportunity to hunt bison.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Limiting it to only five years still allows an individual to harvest another bison when there are so many hunters that put in for that permit.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; it improves the odds for more individuals to draw a permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Coby Thomas (HQ-095-G-031)

PROPOSAL 197 - 5 AAC 92.165. Sealing of bear skins and skulls. Modify the black bear sealing requirement for Region II Units as follows.

Exemption of sealing requirements for black bear harvested for human consumption by individuals not living on the road system.

ISSUE: Inconvenience of sealing requirements for black bear that are used for meat by individuals residing off the road system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? For some individuals, it would cause such a significant financial hardship to satisfy regulations that the resource could not be utilized for human consumption.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Could provide expanded utilization of a resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Benefit individuals that do not live on the road system and do not have the finances to transport the hide and skull for sealing purposes.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No perceived negative consequences.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? On-site inspection by game personnel abandoned because of cost incurred by the Department of Fish and Game. Issuance of special permit abandoned because of additional paperwork for the department.

PROPOSED BY: Bill and Judy Dyroff (HQ-09S-G-024)

PROPOSAL 198 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent; lures. Clarify and modify guided black bear baiting requirements for Region II Units as follows:

Option 1: “Wyoming System” A registered guide-outfitter may register and maintain up to two bait stations per contracted client annually. A licensed guide must accompany a client to the bait station and remain in contact (radio or otherwise) at all times.

Option 2: A person may contract with a registered guide-outfitter to establish and maintain their bait stations (2). All responsibility for clean up and registration will be of the guide. The guide will register the station with the contracted client’s name and sign for all registration requirements. A licensed guide must accompany a client to the bait station and remain in contact (radio or otherwise) at all times.

Option 3: Remove the language for Region II. “A person may not give or receive remuneration for the use of

a bait station, including barter or exchange of goods; however, this paragraph does not apply to a licensed guide-outfitter who personally accompanies a client at the bait station site;”

The remuneration portion is already statute that prohibits compensation for hunting activities without a guide license. The accompanying portion effectively eliminates Alaskan guides from competing with Canada and the Lower 48.

ISSUE: Alaska has the most stringent laws, by far, in North America for guided hunting of black bears over bait. No other state or province, that allows bear baiting, requires a guide to babysit hunters in the tree stand. All other states and provinces researched allow guides to maintain bait stations for their clients or allow guides a greater number of bait stations.

Guides in Alaska are regulated by the State Legislature and the Big Game Commercial Services Board. The provision that states: “a person may not give or receive remuneration for the use of a bait station, including barter or exchange of goods; however, this paragraph does not apply to a licensed guide-outfitter who personally accompanies a client at the bait station site;” is unique in board of game regulation in that it specifically dictates a guides action. No other the department or Board of Game regulation mandates a specific practice for guides (all other guide required laws are statute). It requires a guide to personally accompany a client (providing compensation), at a bait station. The Department of Law interprets this as; a guide (assistant or registered) must remain at the bait station at all times with the client. The first part of the regulation: “a person may not give or receive remuneration for the use of a bait station, including barter or exchange of goods;” is redundant, compensation for hunting services is already covered by guiding statutes. Baited black bear hunting is the most controlled method of hunting any species of game in Alaska. Hunters have the distinct advantage of observing their quarry at close range before making a shot. A guide is not required to hunt black bears by any method. A nonresident is not required to hire a guide to hunt black bears over bait, but if he chooses to hire a guide they must be accompanied.

Black bears are one of the most widespread and abundant game animals in southcentral Alaska. Many of these areas have too much vegetation to allow for spot and stalk hunting. Baited black bear hunting allows bears in these areas to be harvested. Bait hunting also provides a great opportunity for hunters with limited mobility.

Guided bait hunts in Canada and lower 48 are generally conducted with one guide per 3-5 hunters. Guides drop hunters off at stands with a radio or arrange a pick-up time. When a bear is shot the guide tracks and recovers the bear. Hunts costs range from \$1200-\$3000. With Alaska’s guide regulation registered guides cannot compete in the marketplace. Assistant guides cost from \$150-\$200 per day before payroll taxes and workers compensation insurance. Guides must also have additional staff to register bait stations and bait their specific stations. Guides are not allowed to bait stations for their own employees.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Harvestable surpluses of black bear will continue to be left under-utilized. Alaskan guide-outfitters will miss out on tourism dollars that will go to Canada or other States. Guides that do offer baited hunts will lose money or be forced to hunt other species. the department will continue to fail to reach management objectives in many areas.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quantity of black bears taken may be increased. Guides will have another option to make a living and may take some pressure off of ungulate resources, especially in areas that allow fall bear baiting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bear hunters, guides, and other game populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Canadian and lower-48 outfitters that will now be competing with bear hunts from Alaska.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Apply statewide: Rejected, out of cycle, Southeast Alaska has

dwindling bear populations and may benefit from guides present in stands to select only male bears. If successful, a similar proposal will be introduced for the interior region next year. Do not apply to Units 6D, 7 and 15: Rejected, guiding areas in these units are nearly all federal or private lands and guiding is limited by these entities.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-057)

PROPOSAL 199 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear. Lengthen the bear baiting seasons for Units 7, 14, 15 and 16A as follows.

Areas open for bear baiting in Units 7, 14A, 14B, 15 and 16A: April 15 - June 30.

ISSUE: The current length of the black bear baiting season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Allowable time for hunting can in some case be restricted because of deep snow fall from the previous winter, thereby limiting quality hunting time and opportunities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If our wild game resources are truly managed for quality hunting opportunities, hunters would enjoy more time afield with lengthened dates. If more bears are harvested because of a longer season, the result may be a decreased number of bears preying on young moose populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sportsmen and women who enjoy hunting bears over bait, and moose hunters from a better moose calf recruitment each year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Unlimited bear baiting season. Its my understanding this would create a hardship on the wildlife enforcement department.

PROPOSED BY: Scott Butler (SC-09S-G-023)

PROPOSAL 200 - 5 AAC 92.125. Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans; 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear; and 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend the bag limits for bear as follows:

Black and brown bears taken in intensive/predator management areas in which they have been identified as a cause of the decline in game populations and in which seasons and bag limits have been liberalized to reduce bear numbers for the purpose of increased prey populations will not count against the annual bag limit in other units.

Examples

The first two bears taken in Unit 16B (three bear limit) will not count against the bag limit in Unit 15 (one bear bag limit).

The first brown bear taken in unit 19A and 19D, 20E or 16B (two bear bag limit) will not count against the bag limit in any other area. The second bear will fill the bag limit statewide.

The first two black bears taken in units designated as predator management areas with three bear bag limits will not count against annual limits elsewhere.

ISSUE: Hunters that would like to help reduce bear numbers in designated areas are not able to do so without filling the bag limit in their traditional hunting areas or wasting long awaited drawing tags.

Hunters on that traditionally hunt black bears on the Kenai (Unit 15/7) or Prince Williams Sound (Unit 6) that would like to also hunt in unit 16 or unit 13 predator areas must kill a bear in the one bear area first or forfeit their chance.

Hunters that have drawn spring Kodiak or Umnak brown bear tags cannot hunt in two bear areas the fall before without eliminating their prized drawing tags.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will continue to have difficulty reaching harvest objectives in predator management areas. Bear hunters will be discouraged from participating in intensive management areas because they don't want to give up additional hunts in traditional hunting areas or tags that take years to draw.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quantity of bears taken in intensive management areas will increase easing the pressure on prey species. The resource harvested in IM areas will eventually shift from bears to moose, most Alaskan hunters would call this an improvement in the resource harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bear hunters will not have to give up their annual hunt or draw tags to hunt in predator management areas. Moose hunters will eventually have more moose. the department will have an easier tom meeting bear harvest goals.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to predator management.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow a bag limit exemption for all bears killed in IM areas. Do not consider a bag limit filled until it has been filled in a similar bag limit area; one bear in a one bear, two bears in a two bear area, etc.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-048)

PROPOSAL 201 - 5 AAC 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit. Require a wounded brown bear to count against the bag limit as follows.

Wounding (drawing of blood) constitutes harvest of brown/grizzly bear in Units 6, 7, 9, 10, 15, and 17. If an animal is wounded, the hunter may continue to hunt for that animal but not another.

ISSUE: Wounding (drawing of blood) constitutes harvest of brown bear in Unit's 6, 7, 9, 10, 15, 17 and 18. If an animal is wounded the hunter must continue to hunt for that animal but not another. This is not just a guide industry request. It is a standard that we feel should be adopted for the respect of Alaska's wildlife and for proper education of young or new hunters. It will require that hunters take extra care in shot placement and follow up.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued loss and suffering of wounded animals, continued defense of life and property (DLP) harvest and public safety concerns due to wounded animals, and hunters continuing to hunt additional animals after wounding others.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, fewer wounded bears are a benefit to the bears, wounded animals, especially bears represent a public safety factor for all persons. This proposal if implemented allows for elevating the respect for Alaska's wildlife that they deserve. Public opinion about hunting and hunting ethics will also be improved.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Brown/grizzly bears in these regions, new and young hunters through better stewardship mandates, wildlife-viewing public and fewer DLP incidents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Only hunters who do not believe that wounding an animal should not constitute harvest of that animal.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We would prefer that this regulation be adopted statewide all species but will continue to address it piecemeal.

PROPOSED BY: The Alaska Professional Hunters Association (HQ-09S-G-065)

PROPOSAL 202 - 5 AAC. 92.015 Brown bear tag fee exemption. Reauthorize the current resident tag fee exemptions for brown bear in Units 9B, D, E, 11, 13, 16, and 17.

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

- (1) Unit 11;
- (2) Unit 13 and 16(A), that portion outside of Denali State Park;
- (3) Unit 16(B);

...

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

- (1) Unit 9(B);
- (2) Unit 9(E), that portion including all drainages that drain into the Pacific Ocean between Cape Kumliun and the border of Unit 9(D) and Unit 9(E);
- (3) Unit 17

...

ISSUE: Brown bear tag fee exemptions must be reauthorized annually.

In March of 2003 the board liberalized brown bear hunting regulations including the tag fee exemption to increase the harvest of brown bears. In addition brown bear tags are not required for subsistence brown bear hunting in parts of Unit 9 and Unit 17. Continuation of the exemption is necessary to encourage hunters to take brown bears in these units.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the board does not reauthorize the tag fee exemption the fee will be reinstated and hunters will not be able to legally harvest a bear unless they had purchased the tag. This action may likely reduce the incidental harvest of bears by other hunters (i.e. sheep and moose hunters) and direct potential brown bear hunters to other units.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The goal by both the board and the department is to increase the harvest of brown bears to decrease the predation on moose calves. A tag fee exemption will help to achieve this goal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who incidentally encounter bears in these units that may be interested in harvesting one.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-09S-G-129)

PROPOSAL 203 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Limit the number of nonresident goat permits for Units 7, 8, 13, 14 and 15 as follows:

This proposal would limit nonresidents to a maximum of 10 percent of the total permits available in units that already have draw regulations in place for goats.

ISSUE: To provide more hunting opportunities for resident Alaskans by reducing the number of nonresident guided hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Due to the high success rate of nonresident guided hunters, overall numbers and the quality of goats taken will diminish!

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Due to the high success rate of nonresident hunters, reducing the total permits available to nonresidents would allow more goats to survive. Increasing trophy potential for resident Alaskans and those nonresidents who draw a permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters; including nonresidents looking to harvest quality, trophy class goats.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Coby Thomas

(HQ-095-G-030)

PROPOSAL 204 - 5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets and reports; 92.003. Hunter education and orientation requirements; and 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures. Modify the goat hunt requirements in Units 6, 7, 8, 11, 14 and 15 as follows:

1) In order to hunt mountain goat in the State of Alaska, one must have completed a mountain goat orientation class. (There should be an exception for those hunters in the field with a licensed guide who has passed the course.)

Or

2) Establish a goat orientation class but don't make it mandatory, but establish a female goat harvest tag. This is a tag that must be purchased after any hunter who harvests a female goat. The cost of this tag depends if you attended the orientation class or not. For those who attended the goat orientation class, this fee would be \$100; if you choose not to attend the class the fee is \$250. Each hunter would then have a monetary incentive in harvesting a male goat.

ISSUE: Determining the sex of mountain goats is extremely hard and I would like to see some educational material and/or classes that will help hunters differentiate between male and female goats. The harvesting of a female goat decreases everyone's hunting opportunities. Utah requires such a course. (See http://wildlife.utah.gov/hunting/goat/goat_orientation_08.pdf)

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The first words mentioned under the mountain goat section of the winter drawing permit hunt supplemental states: "Hunters are encouraged to take male goats." It is not mentioned once in our hunting regulations on how to differentiate between the male and female goat.

If nothing is done, hunters will continue harvesting female goats, when they believe they are shooting a male goat. Harvesting a female goat is the equivalent of harvesting two male goats, so for each female goat harvested, goat hunting opportunities for all users are decreased.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All goat hunters will benefit by learning the difference between male and female goats. Goat hunters will see more hunting opportunities if more male goats were being harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one would suffer, but the Alaska Department of Fish and Game would incur the expense and responsibility of teaching such a class.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Anyone who harvests a female goat will not be able to apply for a goat permit for four years. (Rejected) I believe most of the hunters who are harvesting these female goats are first and last time goat hunters, so mandating a four-year loss of goat hunting privileges is no big deal.

PROPOSED BY: Troy Vincent (SC-09S-G-098)

PROPOSAL 205 - 5 AAC 92.029: Permit for Possessing Live Game, 92.230; Feeding of Game; 93.070: Wildlife Stocking. Modify these regulations to provide the following:

Allow calf rescue of calves less than two years of age by organizations operating under permit of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game for purpose of rehabilitation and relocation of calves older than one year to Native Corporation owned wilderness, or remote areas away from the transportation corridors.

ISSUE: Moose are a renewable resource which is a keystone species that determines the success of hunting, subsistence and predator populations. Moose calves that are orphaned by vehicle collisions are currently euthanized or allowed to perish in the wild. Calves older than a year are killed if they are deemed to be a traffic hazard, even though there is a slim chance of their survival. Scientists tracking moose in Grand Teton National Park have noticed that nearly 90 percent of moose calves were born by the side of the road. The result is a loss of a renewable natural resource which is a keystone species the abundance of which determines the success of hunting, subsistence and predator survival.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? On average over 400 moose are lost in the Mat-Su Valley due to vehicle collisions. Scientists tracking moose in Grand Teton National Park have noticed that nearly 90 percent of moose calves were born by the side of the road. This study implies that a large percentage of the 300 moose lost will be cows with calves. Not only is the sex of the moose not recorded when lost to vehicle collisions, but the number of calves being euthanized results in a significant impact on the herd. In 2004 the desired density of moose is 1 moose per square mile. At that time there were only 0.54 moose per square mile. The loss of several hundred cow each year in the Mat Su Valley has significant affect on the herd which in turn impacts hunting and subsistence. Compounding this loss is the unrecorded death of the calves, which if they were to survive, would mitigate the moose lost to vehicle collisions.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Moose calves have a very low probability of survival up to two years of age. After the age of two moose have a high probability of survival to the age of 14. This means that every calf that survives to the age of two will most likely provide a surplus which will replace itself, or other moose harvested by hunting and subsistence or loss due to predation and increase moose density.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Native Corporations that will farm moose to the age of two then release them into the wild will benefit by increasing the moose population on their land. This will allow them to provide more permits for hunting and subsistence. Nonprofit corporations that rescue and rehabilitate calves to over the age of one will be able to raise funds through donations and tourism. Businesses in the Mat Su Valley will benefit by increased tourism and hunting in the valley. Hunting and subsistence opportunity will improve

in the Mat Su Valley as the moose density increases. A greater density of moose in the valley will reduce the need for the politically charged aerial wolf hunts and predator control programs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? An increase of moose density close to transportation corridors may also increase the probability of vehicle vs. moose collisions resulting in greater property damage and death. An increase of moose density may also impact the quality of browse in the valley. This could result in loss of moose to starvation.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Active moose mitigation is 98 percent effective in Canada using Electrobraid fencing as well as the construction of wildlife overpasses and underpasses. This would have a significant reduction in collisions resulting in the saving of life and property. But it will take a number of years to raise funds, purchase right-of-way and coordinate government organizations.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee (HQ-09S-G-086)

(Note: 5AAC 93.070 is not a Board of Game regulation..)

PROPOSAL 206 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish an archery moose season for Units 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15 and 16 as follows:

Split the limit into two seasons:

1st season - September 20 to September 30

2nd Season - November 1 - November 10, and delete current early season

Also, make moose hunters choose to either hunt by rifle or bow (not both). This can be done when purchasing their hunting license.

ISSUE: We would like to see additional hunting opportunities for archery hunters. The majority of the lower 48 states offer special hunts or dedicated hunting areas for archery hunters. These states offer their "best hunting times" as an incentive for those choosing harder, less successful means of hunting. Alaska does offer a few token hunts, but as a whole archery hunters are not being represented very well. For example, moose season in Unit 14A and 14B for archery is August 10-August 17; truly the worst moose hunting days available.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Many hunters who are willing to hunt by bow have chosen not to since very few incentives are given to the archery community. By not having a separate area or hunting seasons for these user groups hunting pressure will continue to grow. We can continue to go with the status quo and continue to allow rifle hunters to have the majority of the harvest.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Archery hunters would benefit by having better dates to hunt. All rifle hunters. If a separate season was established for archery hunters, hunting pressure would be spread over a longer period thus resulting in better hunting conditions for both user groups. Local archery shops would see an increase in business.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Any hunter who would want to hunt both the rifle and bow for moose in the same season would not be able to do so.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee (HQ-09S-G-088)

PROPOSAL 207 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Establish a youth moose

hunt in various Region II Units, as follows:

I propose that the Board of Game authorize an "any moose draw, youth hunt" for Units 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 16 as follows: Starting the first Saturday after Christmas break, and continuing for the next 10 days. This hunt would be open to all youth age 10-16. These tags should be in addition to the tags that are currently being issued. Hunts in Unit 14C, should be under the direction of a professional guide or the Department of Fish and Game

I also would suggest that all individuals drawing this tag would have to pass a weapons proficiency test such as what the bow hunter's use. If not, then at least make it mandatory to attend a hunters safety education class.

ISSUE: I have a concern that fewer and fewer youngsters are getting involved with hunting. More and more, we see our youth becoming involved with video games, illegal drugs, and other distractions rather than getting a hands-on-contact with the outdoors, in particular hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The following information was copied from:
<http://www.savingourhunting.com>.

“Are Hunter Numbers Declining?” Yes! Dramatically! According to an estimate by the National Shooting Sports Foundation, the number of active hunters has decreased from 23 million to 20.6 million in just the last five years. However figures from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service indicate that the number of persons who have a paid, certified hunting license is an even lower number, 14.7 million a decline of almost 11.5% over some previous years. When one considers that the overall population has grown a significant amount during the same time frame, you can begin to see an even greater unhealthy trend. Since 1990, the number of license holders in Massachusetts has dropped by 50,000, or 40 percent; in California since 1980 the number has fallen by almost half, from 540,000 to 300,000. In Michigan, there were 1.2 million licensed hunters in 1992 -- but fewer than 850,000 in 2004.

Age Matters –In 1980, only 40% of all hunters were over 35 years old, in 2004 that had increased to over 70% over 35 years, and according to the National Shooting Sports Foundation, today more than 90 percent of hunters are 35 years or older. And nearly 80 percent of current hunters started between the ages 6 and 15, the shooting sports foundation says. According to a Horton Study, the average age of the general hunting population has increased to 43.8 years, indicating that young people are not being recruited to the sport in anywhere near large enough numbers.

Will this affect the Future of Hunting? - "For every 100 adult hunters today, only 69 youth hunters are coming up to take their place. If allowed to continue, economic projections indicate funding for wildlife conservation could drop 25 percent by 2025. This decline could cause a 24 percent drop in revenue for the hunting industry."

Why should I Care? Well, not to mention the obvious impact that fewer and fewer hunters entering the sport will have upon the hunting industry as a whole, a far greater impact will be felt upon our State Conservation Departments across the U.S. You see, a major portion of the funding for State wildlife Agencies is derived from not only the sale of hunting licenses, but also from a distribution of Federal funds distributed to the various states according to a formula based in part upon the number of hunting licenses sold in that state. As hunter numbers drop, the state wildlife agencies feel a double pinch. Less revenue from license sales and less federal revenue distributed to that state as a result of those shrinking license sales. Obviously with fewer and fewer dollars to fund these agencies, enforcement efforts will also decline.”

If we begin an effort to recruit new hunters by getting young people interested in the sport, it will have a tremendous impact for years to come.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the quality of harvesting a moose in December compared to an August harvest would

improve and result in less spoiling of meat, thus less waste of this resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskan youth, the State of Alaska and the future hunting industries.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? All individuals that enjoy seeing moose within the city limits.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Set aside a set number of tags from our current moose draw areas and apply them towards "youth only" hunts. I would prefer to leave the current system alone and let everyone have an equal chance on getting these prized tags.

PROPOSED BY: Troy Vincent (SC-095-G-102)

PROPOSAL 208 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Close the seasons for ewe sheep hunting in Units 7 and 14 as follows:

The regulations would simply delete the seasons and permits allowing the harvest of ewe sheep in Unit 7 (delete permit hunt DS154) and Unit 14 (ewe permits in hunts DS111 - 129 and DS140 - 141 plus DS154).

ISSUE: Ewe sheep hunting in areas where sheep population numbers are well below historic levels is inconsistent with population maintenance and recovery. The biological reason for harvesting ewes is to lower sheep population levels which are too high for their food source. This is not a problem. Ewe harvests in these areas at this time are counterproductive to population maintenance and recovery. Stop ewe harvests.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Dall sheep population recovery in Region II will be delayed, and population declines accelerated.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The only reason to hunt ewes is to lower sheep populations which are already low compared to recent history, and some seem to be in further decline. Anything we can do to help these populations recover is now required if we are to realize benefits from harvesting them in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Generations of traditional Dall ram hunters whose harvest opportunities could be nearly doubled if Dall sheep populations were recovered will benefit. Also, those who understand the only biological reason to hunt ewes is to lower population size should feel some benefit. Additionally, the Department of Fish and Game and the Board of Game should benefit through having a biologically defensible harvest strategy.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The 105 archery permit hunters and 19 optional rifle hunters in Unit 14C who will have to restrict killing to rams which may lower their probability of killing somewhat. Also, the nine permit hunters in Unit 7 who would get permits to kill ewes there would suffer. The total number of Alaskans actually "suffering" adds to a total 124 who won't get permits to kill ewes where their odds of drawing are already average an overall slim six percent. Whether the 2,762 folks who applied but did not draw a permit to kill a ewe will "suffer" is an open question. They would all be \$5 richer. We do not think the department would suffer from not processing more than 2,500 unsuccessful applications for biologically inappropriate harvest opportunities.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We thought about leaving this alone, but decided offering the board the opportunity to do the right thing biologically was the Foundation's only logical choice.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Chapter Foundation for North American Wild Sheep (HQ-09S-G-069)

PROPOSAL 209 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Modify the sheep hunts in Units 14 A and 13D as follows:

Return Units 14A and 13D to harvest ticket, non-drawing hunts with the definition of a legal sheep being a ram of full curl or eight years old, or both horns being broomed / broken.

ISSUE: Insufficient opportunity for Alaska resident hunters without undue cost burden which the Board of Game failed to properly address.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaskan resident hunters will continue to be denied the opportunity to hunt sheep.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it restores loss of hunting opportunity for Alaskan residents and removes the danger of harvesting immature ram.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Many Alaskan sheep hunters who without the opportunity to hunt this area are unable to hunt sheep at all because of the logistical and economic barriers presented by the last accessible areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those few hunters who would win the drawing in order to just shoot a sheep.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Considered resident hunters only and rejected this because as long as full curl definition is used no biological danger presented itself.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Chapter Foundation for North American Wild Sheep (HQ-09S-G-071)

PROPOSAL 210 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Establish new archery permit hunts in Region II as follows:

Create a new archery permit hunt for each subunit in Region II in which there are already permit sheep hunts. Each new hunt would be one permit only. It would be for a full curl of better ram only. The dates of the hunt would be from August 1 through August 9. It would be stipulated that the holder of the Governor's sheep tag could hunt in any of those hunt areas in which firearms are allowed for big game hunting during this period using any weapon that he desired including a firearm. It would not allow use of a firearm in areas where firearms are never allowed such as Eklutna.

ISSUE: Provide additional opportunity for high quality/ low impact trophy Dall sheep hunts and simultaneously enhance the value of the Governor's sheep permit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Some quality trophy sheep hunting opportunities will be lost and the Governor's permit will continue to sell for a relatively low amount compared to what it might generate.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, if this change increases the amount of money that the Governor's sheep permit brings at auction then that extra money could be used for sheep management and that would enhance the quality of the sheep resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? 1) A few bow hunters for trophy sheep. 2) The Governor's permit holder since he could essentially begin his hunt competing with only a small number of bow hunters before the regular firearms hunts start. 3) The Alaska Department of Fish and Game through greater revenues from the Governor's permit. 4) Possibly some sheep as they would be subjected to a low level of pressure from one

bowhunter prior to the opening of rifle permit season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The holders of the first permits to hunt sheep from August 10-20 because the sheep might be more alert and a couple of rams might be missing.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: John Frost (HQ-095-G-022)

PROPOSAL 211 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Establish new archery permit hunts in Region II as follows:

Create new late season archery permit hunts. These hunts would be drawing permit hunts in each of the units in which there are already general season drawing permit hunts. The season would be October 1-10. The model for these types of permit hunts has been DS140 in Unit 14C. This allows a specific number of bow-hunters to hunt for any sheep during a period after the rifle season has closed. This hunt has proven to be popular but because the archer success rate is very low, this hunt has had minimal impact on sheep numbers.

ISSUE: Provide additional sheep hunting opportunity with minimum impact on the sheep resource.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Opportunity for additional sheep hunting will be lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It may allow additional hunting opportunity with no significant impact on the sheep population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Any hunter willing to take up the challenge of bowhunting for sheep. It would give them a chance to hunt when there would be less competition in the field.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Excellent harvest statistics are available from the 25 plus years that DS140 has been in effect. Very few sheep are actually killed during this hunt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A general archery hunt for sheep in early August. Most states with archery seasons for any game animals hold those seasons before the general rifle seasons. However i do not advocate a general archery season before the general rifle seasons in drawing permit areas. I have submitted a companion proposal for a very limited trophy ram archery hunt August 1-10 in Region II Units where drawing permits are held for sheep.

PROPOSED BY: John Frost (HQ-095-G-023)

PROPOSAL 212 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. . Modify the sheep hunts in Units 7, 13, 14, 15, and 16 as follows:

This proposal would limit nonresidents to a maximum 10 percent of the total permits available, in Units that already have draw regulations in place for sheep.

ISSUE: To provide more hunting opportunities for resident Alaskans by reducing the number of nonresident guided hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Due to the high success rate of nonresident guided hunters, overall numbers and the quality of sheep taken will diminish!

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

IMPROVED? Yes/ Due to the high success rate of nonresident hunters, reducing the total permits available to nonresidents would allow more sheep to survive, increasing trophy potential for resident Alaskan's and those nonresidents who draw a permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters. Including nonresidents looking to harvest quality, trophy class sheep.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Coby Thomas (HQ-095-G-032)

PROPOSAL 213 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Modify the sheep hunts in Units 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 16 as follows:

Turn all units mentioned above into a draw for sheep and limit nonresidents to a maximum 10 percent of the total permits available.

ISSUE: Due to the reduction of sheep numbers, hunting opportunities and recent actions taken by the Board of Game to pass new regulations on Unit 13 sheep. It has forced many guides and resident Alaskan hunters to compete for sheep in smaller and smaller tracks of land where these sheep live. I would like to see the Board of Game do away with general sheep hunting and put into place a draw hunt for the above mentioned units. Rather than the Board of Game enacting this one unit at a time, as sheep numbers fall and confrontations arise between guides and resident hunters. A proactive approach to this would save sheep numbers and quality of the rams before drastic measures have to be taken and possibly before someone gets hurt. I would also like to limit nonresidents to a maximum of 10 percent of those permits available.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Due to the high success rate of nonresident guided hunters, overall numbers and the quality of sheep taken will diminish. Units will inevitably have to go to draw and confrontations will rise.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; letting sheep populations rebound, increasing trophy potential for resident Alaskan's and those nonresidents who draw a permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters; including nonresidents looking to harvest quality, trophy class sheep.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Coby Thomas (HQ-095-G-033)

PROPOSAL 214 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Amend these regulations to provide the following:

Nonresident hunters are allowed up to but not guaranteed, 10 percent of the sheep harvested in all Region II hunting units including those that are registration for resident hunters.

ISSUE: The number of Dall sheep nonresidents are allowed hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Too many sheep will be harvested causing resident harvest areas to become drawing only, therefore making it very difficult for a resident to draw and hunt sheep.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This will improve the odds of a resident sheep hunter to obtain a trophy ram also by limiting the number of nonresident tags allowed guides will be able to demand top dollar for these magnificent trophies not unlike that which is demanded for stone sheep in British Columbia.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters and Alaska sheep guides

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident sheep hunters

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Joel Wagner (HQ-095-G-035)

PROPOSAL 215 - 5 AAC 92.171. Sealing of Dall sheep horns. Modify the sheep horn sealing requirement for Region II Units as follows:

All rams harvested in Region II must be sealed within 30 days of harvest.

ISSUE: To require the sealing of all sheep taken in Region II within 30 days of harvest. This would include all rams taken on permits including any ram permits. Requiring the sealing of all rams will begin to close any loopholes in the sealing of rams and will provide the new Alaska Department of Fish and Game sheep biologist with data.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Rams can be claimed from areas of the state not requiring sealing and not required to be full curl. Another incentive to prevent illegal take under full curl.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If the sealing of rams is needed in some hunts or some areas, it can be strongly argued that it is needed in all areas. This type of sealing will help to protect one of Alaska's unique resources. This is not a major change in procedure only making it universal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The resource will benefit from the control of sealing.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Poachers and others who will try to pass off sub legal rams as rams from other areas.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Chapter FNAWS/Wild Sheep Foundation (HQ-09S-G-067)

PROPOSAL 216 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Change the horn restrictions on Dall sheep in Region II Units as follows:

The bag limit should be full curl rams only.

ISSUE: The bag limit allowing the harvest of "any ram" was established arbitrarily and without biological reasons. It should be full curl rams only.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sheep hunters will suffer loss of traditional trophy hunting opportunity, and sheep will be managed by intuition not science.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The traditional sheep hunting bag limits have served sheep and sheep hunters well; "any ram" has hurt the value.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sheep populations which will be less impacted by hunting and hunters who desire more hunting opportunity will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Department of Fish and Game biologists who want to try new, untried approaches to Dall sheep management.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We can't leave this alone.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Chapter Foundation for North American Wild Sheep (HQ-09S-G-070)

PROPOSAL 217 - 5 AAC 92.171. Sealing of Dall sheep horns. Remove the sealing requirement for Dall sheep in Region II Units as follows.

Repeal the sealing requirements under 92.171 for Region II Units.

ISSUE: No sealing requirement, with only a harvest ticket for reporting was fine for years. Most of the sheep were harvested under this law and harvest reports were fairly accurate. Hunters did not have to find a state trooper, fish and wildlife officer or state biologist to seal the animals. Of this group, the biologists are probably the only ones qualified to seal the sheep horns.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will still be shooting rams that some people think are questionable. Many sheep will not be brought in for sealing and will be left in the mountains to spoil.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This is a good industry in this state, and brings approximately 1,500 non-residents to Alaska to enjoy hunting sheep, plus resident hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Denali Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-09S-G-69)

PROPOSAL 218 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Modify the sheep hunting season dates in the Region II Units as follows:

Sheep Season:

Residents: August 5th - September 13th. (Starts five days earlier and ends seven days earlier than traditional dates.)

Nonresidents: August 12th - September 20th. (Starts two days later than traditional date and ends on traditional date.)

Traditional Dates: [AUGUST 10TH - SEPTEMBER 20TH.]

ISSUE: Residents will have seven days of hunting that are not in conflict with commercial operations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The conflict between resident hunters and nonresident hunters (who are required to have guides or a family relative) will continue. Last year the Board of Game

mentioned that my suggestion starting two days earlier would not work because the guides would already have "their turf staked out." I feel that our public lands are a resource for all Alaskans and no one has the right to intimidate others from enjoying the space.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will create a quality experience for both the resident and nonresident hunter. In 2008, the board felt the sheep seasons were long enough and they were opposed to giving residents additional hunting time. This proposal adds no time on the hunting calendar. This will also allow air services more time to transport hunters and not have bottlenecks at the beginning of the season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides will complain but guided hunts are about 50 percent more successful than resident hunts. Most of the residents will be out of the field when the nonresidents arrive making their trip a better outdoor experience. Other species have different start dates for residents and nonresidents in Alaska and it is very common practice in other states.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Tom Lamal

(INT-09S-G-006)

PROPOSAL 219 -5 AAC 92.171 Sealing of Dall sheep horns. A person may not possess, transport, or export from the state, the horns of a Dall sheep ram taken in any hunt where there is a horn configuration bag limit **or a ram-only bag limit in southcentral**, unless the horns have been permanently sealed by a department representative within 30 days after the taking, or a lesser time if designated by the department.

ISSUE: The current sealing regulation does not apply to Dall sheep rams taken in any-ram bag limit hunts. The Department has utilized discretionary permit authority to require rams harvested under any-ram drawing permits be brought in to an ADF&G office for measuring and for samples to be taken, however the discretionary authority does not extend to the permanent marking of horns.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Dall sheep ram horns taken in any-ram hunts will continue to be exempt from the sealing regulation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Consistency in sealing requirement would be beneficial in the long run. In any hunt where the bag is limited to rams, as opposed to an any sheep bag limit, there is some conservation concern. The sealing program has provided the best opportunity for wildlife biologists to gain accurate age and horn measurement data to monitor the effects of different management strategies. When horns are permanently marked, officials can be assured this set of horns will not re-appear for sealing by another hunter, and anyone who handles the horns is made aware of their legality. This would ensure one set of horns could never be substituted for another, maintaining data quality used in the harvest monitoring program.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Given the majority of rams harvested in Alaska are from full-curl hunts, and the strict transporting regulations on unmarked Dall ram horns, this change would help to reduce confusion for other hunters, law enforcement officers, border officials, as well as taxidermists.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those hunters that do not want their horns permanently marked.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Extending the sealing requirement to rams harvested in all drawing hunts, however this would not cover areas where federal subsistence regulations provide additional harvest

opportunities for local sheep hunters (such as in the Wrangell Mountains). If these federal subsistence hunts were ram-only, it would benefit everyone to have these rams sealed and monitored using the same standards as state hunts.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-108)

PROPOSAL 220 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Amend this regulation as follows:

For Southcentral and Southwest Units, it is illegal for the client of a transporter to harvest any game located while being transported. If the board finds this too restrictive, limit the regulation to on-water or from a boat.

ISSUE: Providing hunting services without proper licensing and permits. Specifically, clients of transporters hunting game with transporters. Pursuing game with transporter, illegal guiding.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued illegal guiding and overharvest of the resources.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It would reduce harvest, thereby improving the quality of the population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Legal users of the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Transporters illegally providing hunting services and the clients who use them.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I submitted this proposal a few years ago and it was rejected as being redundant of an already existing statute and regulations. A recent case was prosecuted, I believe it was black bear in southeast Alaska, and the existing statutes and regulations proved to be unenforceable. This new regulation is required

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-09S-G-68)

PROPOSAL 221 - 5 AAC 92.085 (8) Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Modify the same day airborne restriction as follows:

Change the current rule for the Southcentral and Southwest Region Units to read as follows:

1. It is against the law to hunt or help someone else take big game until [3:00 AM], **24 hours** the day following the day you have flown.
- or*
2. It is against the law to hunt or help someone else take big game until [3:00 AM] **12:00pm/(noon)** the day following the day you have flown.

ISSUE: The "same day airborne" rule states: "It is against the law to hunt or help someone else take big game until 3:00am the day following the day you have flown." I believe this rule is weak and needs to be changed. I believe the original intent of this rule was to prevent hunters from searching for an animal from the air, land close to it and kill it. If so, this rule is not working. Some hunters are using aircraft late in the evening to spot game, land and shoot them at 3 a.m. This is not fair to the game they hunt nor to other hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This is not fair chase and those with aircraft will continue to use this loophole to their advantage (results in higher success rate) over those that don't have or

choose not to use aircraft in this manner. In areas where a tag is required, this high harvest success rate could reduce the number of available tags for next year's permit draw. Game will continue to be harassed by these aircraft. Once these so called hunters leave the hunting area or areas, they may have harassed more game than the ones they harvested. Game that has been harassed are much harder, if not impossible, to hunt. This makes it harder for hunters to fill their tags.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? I understand this proposal may not improve the equality of the meat harvested however, less harassment by aircraft would in fact improve the quality of the game being harvested by reducing the stress level of hunted game, loss of life to game from spooking, etc,. It will preserve the ethical standard of fair chase that all of us should have while hunting.

WHO WILL BENEFIT? All hunters and the game they pursue.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? All hunters that are transported via aircraft will have to wait until noon, or 24 hours before pulling the trigger.

OTHER SOLUTIONS YOU CONSIDERED? 1) Allow same day airborne hunting as long as hunters are X miles from the drop of point. Initial feedback from everyone including the Department of Fish and Game is that the current rule is hard to enforce, so requesting more restrictions isn't going to help. If this is the case, then maybe we should eliminate this rule all together.

PROPOSED BY: Troy Vincent (SC-09S-G-105)

PROPOSAL 222 - 5 AAC 92.080(1). Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Prohibit shooting within 50 feet of roads in Units 7, 13, 14, 15, and 16A as follows:

In the general hunting restrictions, amend "shooting on, from, or across the drivable surface of any constructed road or highway" by adding: "**or shooting within 50 feet of said road or highway within units 7, 13-15, 16A.**"

ISSUE: Eliminate the unethical and unsporting practice commonly called "road hunting" within those units accessible by highway vehicles and close to southcentral population centers. Reduce excessive take of upland game birds especially ruffed grouse, spruce grouse and ptarmigan which are attracted to roadside gravel. This is especially a problem early in the season when, before family broods disperse, entire broods are wiped out. Reduce hunting pressure for all species along the immediate roadside corridors. Indirectly, this proposed regulation change would discourage those who violate existing regulations prohibiting shooting on, from or across a road or highway and it will facilitate enforcement of this regulation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unethical and unsporting behavior will continue to put hunters in a negative light. Early season take of ruffed grouse, spruce grouse and ptarmigan; including entire broods attracted to roadside gravel will reduce overall hunting opportunities. Upland game bird populations may be excessively depleted in and near road accessible areas. Success of Alaska Department of Fish and Game's ruffed grouse introductions to portions of southcentral and the Kenai Peninsula may be jeopardized. Hunting pressure for all species will remain concentrated along the immediate roadside corridor.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quantity and quality of hunting for all species will be improved by reducing hunting pressure along the immediate roadside corridor. Hunting opportunity for upland bird hunters will improve due to increased survivability of broods allowing natural dispersal and reduction in the take of birds concentrated

by their attraction to roadside gravel.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The vast majority of hunters who support ethical and sporting practices as well as individuals interested in healthy wildlife populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those hunters who limit their activity to driving the road system searching for vulnerable game. However, even these individuals will be minimally impacted by the requirement that they move 50 feet from the roadway before taking game.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Walter Soroka (SC-09S-G-030)

PROPOSAL 223 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.

Modify the permit conditions for Region II Units as follows:

All nonresidents applying for a drawing permit hunt for sheep, brown/grizzly bear, and mountain goat must submit a completed guide-client agreement by the permit application deadline to qualify for the draw.

ISSUE: Nonresidents drawing permits without a guide-client agreement on guide required hunts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Clients will shop for guides and then post-date agreement.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Legally operating guides.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Illegally operating guides who contract a hunt without being registered for the area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-09S-G-064)

Note: This proposal was deferred by the Board of Game from the Fall, 2008 meeting. It was previously listed as Proposal 23.

PROPOSAL 224 – 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear. Modify the regulation restricting the taking of white-phase black bear in Unit 1D as follows:

We strongly recommend the Board of Game to direct the Department of Fish and Game to work with legal and regulatory staff to develop language which will be enforceable in a court of law to the effect of **“A light-phase black bear that has cream coloration (or lighter) over more than 30% of its body may not be taken regardless of any other coloration.”**

ISSUE: Efforts to protect the cream-colored black bear known as the Skagway “Spirit Bear” failed this spring when the department's regulation for protection of white-colored black bears in Unit 1D proved unenforceable.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department should be concerned that they have an unenforceable regulation on their books which will negatively impact protected light-phase bears not only in Skagway but also in Unit 1C as well as the partial Albino moose in Unit 20C.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposal gives a higher survivability rate to the unusually colored spirit bears, thereby protecting significant viewing opportunities for the more than 1 million people who visit Skagway each year. Without this regulation, these bears are selected against by individual trophy hunters and the genes are eliminated from the gene pool, to the detriment of the far greater majority who would enjoy viewing and photographing them.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The native community who consider spirit bears to be sacred, school children, visitors on tour, tour operators, professional photographers, independent travelers, and local residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trophy hunters looking for odd colored black bear hides.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? If the board cannot find any other way to protect the spirit bears, then we suggest banning the hunting of any black bear that is not black or very dark brown.

PROPOSED BY: John B. Warder, Jr. (HQ-09G-050)

PROPOSAL 225 - 5 AAC 085.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in Berners Bay.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(1)		
...		
Unit 1(C), Berners Bay drain- ages 1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 permits may be issued	Sept. 15–Oct.15 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15–Oct.15
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the Board. The Berners Bay moose management plan calls for a post-hunt count of 90 moose, based on the estimated moose carrying capacity of this area. ADF&G has been very successful at maintaining this population level through the harvest of both bull and cow moose.

During 1998–2006, the number of drawing permits issued by the department for this herd ranged from 10 bull permits and 10 antlerless permits to 7 bull permits and 0 antlerless permits. Mean annual harvest of bull moose during this period was seven, while cow harvests in years we issued antlerless permits was 4. Although we have the latitude of issuing up to 30 permits annually, the department has not issued more than 20 permits annually during any of the past 10 years.

The number of moose counted during the fall aerial surveys determines the number of drawing permits issued. Aerial counts during 1990–2006 ranged from a high of 107 moose in 1999 to a low of 59 in 2002. The fall 2006 count of 76 moose was just one lower than the mean annual count of 77 during 1990–2006. During the

winter of 2006/2007, severe winter weather and extremely heavy snowfall resulted in the death of 5 of 31 collared cow moose (17%) in this area, and the fall 2007 count was only 59 moose. The winter of 2007/2008 was nearly as severe, and though our collared moose did not experience as high a mortality level as the previous winter, we still lost a few animals and expect the fall 2008 count to be slightly lower than that of 2007.

As a result of the severe winters and the impacts they have had on this moose herd, we did not issue any permits in 2007 and do not anticipate issuing any permits for either bull or cow moose during the next year or two. We will continue to monitor this population through annual composition surveys, and use these numbers to decide whether or not we will issue any permits. In addition we will be collecting information on moose survival, mortality, and recruitment. If we begin to detect an increasing trend in moose numbers, and determine that this population is recovering, we can then decide whether a few permits can be issued. It is likely that only bull permits will be issued for the foreseeable future. The department prefers maintaining the antlerless authorization so we have this tool in the future when needed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population could increase and exceed the carrying capacity of the habitat as it has done in the past. The Berners Bay moose harvest will be restricted to bulls thereby limiting opportunity for hunters.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will have more opportunity to hunt moose. The moose population will benefit from either-sex harvests that will balance the herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S -G --109)

PROPOSAL 226 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season at Nunatak Bench.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(3)		
Unit 5(A), that portion south of Wrangell-Saint Elias National Park, north and east of Russell and Nunatak Fiords, and east of the east side of East Nunatak Glacier to the Canadian	Nov. 15 - Feb. 15	Nov. 15 - Feb. 15

Border (Nunatak Bench)

1 moose by registration
permit only; up to 5
moose may be taken

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the board. The Nunatak Bench (Unit 5A) hunt area is separated from adjacent moose habitat by fiords and glaciers, allowing for little immigration or emigration by moose. Therefore we manage this population separately from the remainder of Unit 5A, with a much longer and later running hunting season that spans the period of November 15-February 15. Because of the isolated nature of Nunatak Bench and the limited amount of moose habitat, we have traditionally allowed maximum hunter opportunity through an either sex hunt, thereby aiding in our goal of limiting herd growth to stay within the carrying capacity of this area. The either sex hunt strategy accommodates the timing of this hunt given that much of the hunt period occurs post antler drop making sex differentiation difficult.

The Nunatak Bench moose management plan calls for a post-hunt population of a maximum of 50 moose. During a February 2001 survey 52 moose were counted in this area followed by 25 in December 2003. However, since that time the moose population at Nunatak Bench has declined dramatically, with counts of 14, 11, and 13 moose in 2005, 2006, and 2007 respectively. The decline in moose numbers is almost certainly related to the 68 foot rise in water level that flooded this area in 2003 when the advancing Hubbard Glacier created a dam. A similar situation occurred in 1986 that caused a similar decline in moose numbers. The cause of the moose declines post flooding appears to be due to the decimation of preferred willow browse by the high water, causing emigration of moose from the area.

During 1997-2004 hunting seasons an average of 12 permits were issued, with only four people actually hunted each season. An average of 8 days of hunting was expended each year to kill 0 – 4 moose, with an average annual harvest of about 2 moose. Six cows and 9 bulls made up the total harvest during this period. No moose have been harvested since 2004 and the department has not issued any permits for this area since then.

Although the moose numbers at this time do not support a harvest, the department would like to keep this antlerless authorization active should the moose numbers again reach a harvestable level (25 moose). After the 1986 flood, this population rebounded within 8 years from 10 to 25 moose and again supported a hunt. If this herd follows a similar pattern, we may see an opportunity to harvest moose here in a few more years. The department will continue to monitor this moose population and again allow a harvest when the survey counts reach or exceed 25 moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose harvest at Nunatak Bench will be limited to bulls without any biological reason to do so. In addition, since much of the season occurs post antler-drop restricting the harvest to bulls would make it difficult for hunters to select a legal animal. Moose habitat is not abundant in this area and if herd growth is not restricted by a limited cow harvest, carrying capacity of winter range may be exceeded.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Adopting this proposal will provide more moose hunting opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will continue to have more opportunity to hunt moose. The moose population will benefit from either-sex hunts that will help balance the herd in this area of limited moose range.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-110)

PROPOSAL 227 – 5 AAC 92.015(a) (8) & (9) and 92.015 (b) (4), (7), (8) & (10) Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize the current resident tag fee exemptions for brown bear in Units 18, 22, 23 and 26A.

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

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

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

- ...
- (4) Unit 18;
- ...
- (7) Unit 22;
- (8) Unit 23;
- ...
- (10) Unit 26(A).

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

General Season Hunts: Reauthorizations are needed for: Unit 22, where the tag fee has been exempted for 7 years, and Unit 23, where the tag fee has been exempted for 3 years. Tag fee exemptions are desired to allow: 1) incremental increase in annual harvest, 2) opportunistic harvest by resident hunters, and 3) harvest by a wide range of users. Increased harvest is allowable because portions of these units have high bear populations.

General season brown bear harvest rates are within sustained yield limits and exempting the resident tag fee has not caused dramatic or unexpected increases in overall harvest. In Unit 22, during the tag-free period resident harvest has a 7-year average annual harvest of 47 bears, although during this period other regulatory changes were implemented and contributed to increased harvest. In Unit 23, general harvests have increased slowly since 1961 although there has been substantial annual variability in harvest levels. The increasing trend in overall harvest is probably most influenced by the increasing human population in Alaska rather than the result of regulatory changes. Annual variability in harvests is probably most affected by weather. Harvest results for Unit 23 show no trend in the sex ratio, age or size of bears harvested under all types of hunts.

Subsistence Season Hunts: Reauthorizations are needed for Units 18, 22, 23, and 26(A) where brown bear subsistence hunt requirements include: 1) registration permit, 2) tag fee exemption, 3) salvaging meat for human consumption, 4) no use of aircraft in Units 22, 23 and 26(A), 5) no sealing requirement unless hide and skull are removed from subsistence hunt area, and 6) if sealing is required, the skin of the head and front claws must be removed and retained by the department at the time of sealing. Continuing the tag fee exemption helps facilitate participation in the associated brown bear harvest programs maintained by the department for subsistence hunts.

In all GMUs, subsistence brown bear harvest rates are low and well within sustained yield limits and exempting the resident tag fee has not caused an increase in subsistence harvest. In Unit 18, we estimate 1-3

bears are taken annually in subsistence hunts. In Unit 22, 5 bears have been reported harvested during the previous 10-year period and this is <1 % of the total brown bear harvest in the unit. In Unit 23, an average of <5 bears have been harvested annually since 1992 and this is ≤10 % of the total brown bear harvest. In Unit 26(A), very few bears are taken annually by subsistence hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The tag fee exemption will lapse and hunters will be required to purchase \$25 tags for general season and subsistence hunts. The brown bear harvest will decline.

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-131)

PROPOSAL 228- 5 AAC 85.045(a)(16). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 18, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(16)		
...		
Unit 18, that portion north and west of a line from Cape Romanzof to Kusilvak Mt. to Mountain Village and excluding all Yukon River drainages upriver from Mountain Village; however, portions of this area may be closed by emergency order to the taking of calves		
1 antlered bull; or	Aug.10 - Sept. 30	Sept. 1-Sept. 30
1 antlered bull or 1 calf	Dec. 20 - Jan. 20	
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. The northwest portion of Unit 18, including all drainages downstream of Mountain Village on the Yukon River, has a winter hunt with a ‘calf’ bag limit that needs to be reauthorized as an ‘antlerless’ season.

In November 2005 the Board established a Dec. 20-Jan. 10 season for an ‘antlered bull’ or a ‘calf’ in response to a rapidly growing moose population in the lower portion of the Yukon River drainage. The Lowest Yukon Census Area has shown dramatic increases in the moose population since 1988 when no moose were found in the count area. In March 2008, the census estimate for this area was a total population of 3320 moose ± 13.1%; density of 2.8 moose per square mile; and an average annual growth rate of 27% over the last 13 years. Composition counts have not been conducted in this area since November 2005, but the winter count estimated the calf to adult ratio to be 55 calves per 100 adults. The estimated sustainable harvest for this portion of Unit 18 is approximately 700 moose.

When the moose population was very low and moose were colonizing the Yukon River drainage, hunting seasons were closed in response to a cooperative management process that recommended no harvest until moose populations were established. Hunting in the area below Mountain Village began in 1994 and harvests have increased steadily as moose have become more abundant. Reported harvest for this area in 2007-2008 was 162 moose in the fall hunt and 29 in the winter hunt (however, the proportion of calves is not known). For both the fall hunt and winter hunt, harvest rates are well within sustained yield limits and we recommend reauthorization of the antlerless moose hunt for this area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity for antlerless moose in portions of Unit 18 will be needlessly lost.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who wish to harvest an antlerless moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-124)

PROPOSAL 229 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(21). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 23, as follows:

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

(21)

Unit 23, that portion north of and including the Singoalik River drainage

<p>RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 moose by registration permit only; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from Nov. 1-Dec. 31; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied</p>	<p>July 1 - Dec. 31</p>
---	-------------------------

by a calf; or

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

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or
antlers with 4 or more brow tines
on one side by drawing permit
only; up to 125 permits may
be issued in all of Unit 23

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

Remainder of Unit 23

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose by registration
permit only; however,
antlerless moose may be taken
only from Nov. 1-Dec. 31;
a person may not take a calf
or a cow accompanied
by a calf; or

Aug. 1 - Dec. 31

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

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or
antlers with 4 or more brow tines
on one side by drawing permit
only; up to 125 permits may
be issued in all of Unit 23

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Moose density is currently low in large portions of Unit 23. As a result, in November 2003 the BOG restricted moose hunting for resident and nonresident hunters. These restrictions substantially shortened the resident antlerless moose season and limited the harvest of antlerless moose to hunters who register for registration permit hunt RM880. In November 2005 and 2007, the BOG considered public proposals and made no changes to the moose hunting seasons in Unit 23. Historically, the reported harvest of cow moose has been low throughout Unit 23 despite liberal antlerless seasons. We do not think maintaining an antlerless season during November and December, when moose harvests tend to be low, is a population-level concern for Unit 23 moose populations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity will be needlessly lost.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters who need to harvest an antlerless moose when caribou or other game is unavailable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-127)

This proposal was deferred by the Board of Game from the Spring, 2008 meeting. It was previously listed as Proposal #7 and amended to include Units 19 and 21.

PROPOSAL 230 - 5 AAC 92.025. Customary and traditional uses of game populations Revise the Amount Necessary for Subsistence for moose in Unit 18.

The Alaska Board of Game is requested to work with the department toward revising the existing Unit 18 Amount Necessary for Subsistence (ANS) for moose that is based upon the amounts needed for all the communities in Unit 18.

ISSUE: The Alaska Board of Game has made an Amount Necessary for Subsistence finding, for Unit 18 moose of 80 to 100 moose for the entire Unit. The board based its 1992 finding on outdated and incomplete harvest data that do not represent the individual community harvest amounts that are currently taken by the local subsistence moose hunters of Unit 18. The ANS for moose harvested by Unit 18 residents is grossly underestimated and, as a result, inaccurately misrepresents the needs of the residents within the unit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the ANS for Unit 18 moose is not revised to reflect the amount of moose needed by Unit 18 communities, then it is unlikely that reasonable opportunity can be evaluated and will not be provided through the state hunting regulations for the unit. Additionally, the Unit 18 moose population may not be able to provide for all subsistence uses. If the Unit 18 ANS finding for moose is not revised to reflect the moose harvest needed by each individual Unit 18 community, it will be difficult for the department to determine if “local and non-local” harvests of moose in Unit 18 are sustainable – especially during periods of declining and low moose populations and during periods of decline of other subsistence resources. Unit 18 hunters also hunt in the neighboring Units of 17, 19, and 21E. Even with some of the hunter effort distributed to other Units, hunting in some areas within Unit 18 is fairly competitive. Thus the existing ANS cannot be used for sound conservation management when the harvestable supply and demand of Unit 18 moose must be evaluated.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The establishment of accurate, community-based ANS findings for Unit 18 communities will provide the department with the tools necessary to help manage the moose populations within the Unit and will lead to better informed regulatory decisions concerning changes made to seasons and harvest limits for moose in Unit 18. Accurate ANS findings for Unit 18 communities will also help the department to meet the management objectives for Unit 18 moose populations, by providing the state with a tool to evaluate whether reasonable opportunity has been provided. The information gathered to revise the ANS will provide additional insights including harvest use patterns, hunter distributions, and customary and traditional use determinations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The users and the managers will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lester Wilde, Sr.

(HQ-08S-G-78)

PROPOSAL 231 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(20). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 22(C) and the remainder of Unit 22(D), as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(20)		
...		
Unit 22(C)		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull by registration permit only, or	Sept. 1-Sept. 14	
1 antlerless moose by	Sept. 15-Sept. 30	
registration permit only; or		
1 antlered bull by registration permit only; during the period Jan. 1 – Jan. 31, a season may be announced by emergency order	Jan. 1 – Jan. 31 (to be announced)	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by registration permit only		Sept. 1-Sept. 14
...		
Remainder of Unit 22(D)		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 moose; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from Dec. 1—Dec. 31; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf; only antlered moose may be taken from Jan. 1—Jan. 31	Aug. 10 - Sept. 14 Oct. 1 - Jan. 31	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with 50-inch antlers		Sept. 1 - Sept. 14

or antlers with 4 or more brow
tines on one side, by registration
permit only.

...

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Two areas in Unit 22 require reauthorization: Unit 22(C), and the Remainder of Unit 22(D).

In October 1999, the board authorized a registration hunt for antlerless moose in Unit 22(C) and the department manages this hunt with a quota of up to 30 permits annually. The intent of the hunt is stabilization of the Unit 22(C) moose population, which is believed to be at or near carrying capacity of its winter range.

The Unit 22(C) moose population grew steadily throughout the 1990s and the current population is estimated at 620 moose, which exceeds the departments' management goal of 450–525 moose. Calf crop and yearling recruitment is high and generally exceeds 20% annually. However, the bull:cow ratio is low, varying between 10–20 bulls:100 cows. The low bull:cow ratio makes additional bull harvest ill-advised. It appears that the antlerless hunt has helped stabilize moose numbers in Unit 22(C) and we recommend reauthorizing the antlerless moose hunt to achieve the moose population objectives for this unit.

In most other parts of Unit 22, low recruitment rates are believed to be causing moose population declines. However, in the Remainder of Unit 22 (D) we recommend continued authorization of antlerless moose hunting where moose populations are stable and hunting pressure is low. This portion of Unit 22(D) is relatively remote with difficult access and these factors contribute to limited hunting pressure in the area. The estimated number of moose has been stable since 1997 and composition surveys typically show higher calf:cow and calf:adult ratios than other parts of Unit 22, except Unit 22(C). A 2006 geo-spatial population estimation process completed in Unit 22(D) Remainder estimated the population at 599 moose with a calf:adult ratio of 35 calves:100 adults. The reported cow harvest in this area has been low, averaging 1 cow moose per year since 1997. Village harvest survey data (collected only in 2000-2001) shows 5 cow moose were harvested from Unit 22(D) Remainder, which is a more realistic estimate of annual cow harvest compared to harvest ticket reports. Low harvest rates of antlerless moose support our recommendation to reauthorize antlerless moose seasons in the Remainder of Unit 22(D).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity for antlerless moose in portions of Unit 22 will be needlessly lost.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who wish to harvest an antlerless moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-126)

PROPOSAL 232 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(24). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 26(A), as follows:

**Resident
Open Season**

Units and Bag Limits	(Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(24)		
Unit 26(A), that portion in the Colville River drainage upstream from and including the Anaktuvuk River drainage		
1 bull; or	Aug. 1 – Sept. 14	No open season.
1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 40 permits may be issued; up to 20 percent of the permits may be issued to nonresident hunters; or	Sept 1 – Sept. 14	Sept 1 – Sept. 14
1 moose; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf.	Feb. 15 – Apr. 15	No open season.
Unit 26(A), that portion west of 156° 00' W. longitude excluding the Colville River drainage		
1 moose; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf.	July 1 – Sept 14	No open season.

...

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Two areas in Unit 26(A) are considered by this proposal: 1) the Colville River drainage upstream from and including the Anaktuvuk River drainage; and 2) the portion of Unit 26(A) west of 156 00' W longitude and north of the Colville drainage.

Within the 'upstream' portion of the Colville River drainage, a winter hunt was established by the Board in November 2005 and opened in the 2005-2006 regulatory year to provide more hunting opportunity in an area where the moose population is increasing in Unit 26(A). Since most bull moose shed their antlers before the established season opening of February 15, the bag limit for this hunt is one moose, except a calf or cow accompanied by a calf may not be taken. In this antlerless hunt area, the moose population is currently increasing and a low number of cows have been harvested in the winter season: 2 cows in 2006, 3 cows in 2007, and 1 cow in 2008. A similar low harvest is anticipated for the current regulatory year (2009 hunt in progress Feb 15-Apr 15). Low harvests of antlerless moose (<10 per year) in the Colville River drainage should not limit the growth of the population and we recommend reauthorization of the antlerless moose season in this area.

The portion of Unit 26(A) west of 156 00' W longitude and north of the Colville drainage has a sparse distribution of moose. Each year a small percentage of moose (primarily bulls and cows without calves) disperse away from the major river drainages and across the coastal plain. These moose provide the only opportunities for harvest in the northwestern portion of Unit 26(A). Overall, the moose population in the unit is

increasing and the small number of cow moose that disperse and could be harvested under this reauthorization proposal will have very little impact on the growth of the population. To date, after several years of hunting, few antlerless moose have been harvested in this portion of the unit. One cow was harvested in 2006, none in 2007, and 1 in 2008 during this hunt. We recommend reauthorization of the antlerless moose season in this portion of Unit 26(A).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity will be needlessly lost.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters who need to harvest an antlerless moose when caribou or other game is unavailable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G-128)

PROPOSAL 233 – 5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize the current resident tag fee exemptions for general season brown bear in Units 19A, 19D, 20D, 20E (that portion outside of Yukon–Charley Rivers National Preserve), 21B, 21D, 21E, 25C, and 25D; and reauthorize the current subsistence registration permit tag fee exemptions for brown bear in Units 19A and 19B (downstream of and including the Aniak River drainage), 21D, and 24.

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

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

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

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

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

General Season Hunts. Annual reauthorizations are recommended for:

Unit 19A. The brown bear tag and fee requirement for Unit 19A was eliminated by the Board of Game beginning in regulatory year 2006–2007 (RY06, which begins 1 July 2006 and ends 30 June 2007). This exemption was meant to increase brown bear harvest to benefit moose calf survival consistent with the Central Kuskokwim Moose Management Plan. The difficulty in obtaining brown bear tags from area license vendors was also considered when this requirement was waived. Prior to the tag fee exemption, reported harvest of brown bears averaged 8 bears/year for RY96–RY05. Ten brown bears were taken during RY06, and 18 during RY07 in 19A. The tag fee exemption coincides with increased brown bear harvest, however it remains below levels required to significantly reduce the effect of brown bear predation on moose calf survival.

Unit 19D. The brown bear tag and fee requirement for Unit 19D was eliminated by the Board of Game beginning in RY98 to increase the harvest of brown bear to benefit moose calf survival. Calf mortality studies in Unit 19D indicate brown bears are a significant predator on moose calves. Prior to the tag fee exemption, reported harvest of brown bears averaged 2 bears/year for RY91–RY97. Since the exemption was implemented, reported harvest increased to an average of 5.5 bears/year for RY98–RY07. The estimated population in Unit 19D is 165 bears (13 bears/1000 mi²), based on extrapolation of estimates obtained in other areas. The tag fee exemption coincides with an increase in brown bear harvest, however it is still below levels required to significantly reduce the effect of brown bear predation on moose calf survival.

Unit 20D. The tag fee exemption was implemented in 1995 in the southern portion of Unit 20D primarily to increase the harvest of brown bears to reduce predation on moose and caribou calves. The tag fee exemption was expanded to all of Unit 20D in 2003. Current Unit 20D brown bear hunting regulations include an August 10–June 30 hunting season with a bag limit of 1 bear/year.

The current Unit 20D brown bear harvest objective adopted by the board in March 1995 is 5–15 bears/year. Harvest increased as a result of the tag fee exemptions in 1995 and 2003. Mean annual human-caused brown bear mortality from both hunting and nonhunting has averaged 11 bears/year since the 1 bear/year bag limit was implemented. Much of the increase was in the southwest portion of 20D, where mortality of brown bears killed in defense of life and property and kill of nuisance bears under hunting regulations in the vicinity of Delta Junction is significant.

Unit 20E. The current tag fee exemption in Unit 20E, excluding Yukon–Charley Rivers National Preserve, was implemented in RY02 to help reduce brown bear predation on moose calves. The brown bear population in all of Unit 20E (including Yukon–Charley Rivers National Preserve) was estimated at 320–394 in 2006. Harvest averaged 15 bears/year during RY92–RY01, prior to the tag fee exemption, and averaged 16 bears/year during RY02–RY07. Harvest is below a level that would significantly reduce the effect of brown bear predation on moose calf survival.

Unit 21B. The tag fee in Unit 21B was exempted in RY04, reinstated in RY05, then exempted again in RY06. This exemption was intended to increase harvest because the bear population is believed to be high and can support additional take. Before the exemption, the ten-year mean reported harvest was 0.4 bears (RY94–RY03). The RY05 harvest was zero bears. The harvest was one bear in RY06 and zero bears in RY07. In combination with Units 21C and 21D, a conservative harvest of 25 bears is sustainable. Demand for brown bears is low. Hunting success is also low due to dense forested habitat in most of the area.

Unit 21D. The tag fee in Unit 21D has been exempted since RY04. This exemption is desired to allow an increase in harvest because the bear population can likely support additional take. Before the exemption, the 5-year mean reported harvest was 5.6 bears (RY99–RY03) and the sex ratio of the harvest was 79 percent males. The 5-year mean reported harvest (RY03–RY07) was 5.6 bears. The harvest during RY05–RY07 was 8, 2, and 8, respectively. A conservative harvest of 25 bears in combination with Units 21B and 21C is sustainable. Demand for brown bears is low. Hunting success is also low due to dense forested habitat in most of the area.

Unit 21E. The brown bear tag and fee requirement for Unit 21E was eliminated by the Board of Game

beginning in RY06 to increase the harvest of brown bear to benefit moose calf survival consistent with the Yukon–Innoko Moose Management Plan. The difficulty in obtaining brown bear tags from area license vendors was also considered when this requirement was waived. During the 5 regulatory years prior to elimination of the tag requirement, an average of 5.2 bears were taken, with an average resident and nonresident take of 1.8 and 3.4, respectively. During RY06, 4 bears were reported harvested, 3 by residents and 1 by a nonresident. During RY07, 3 bears were reported harvested, 2 by residents and 1 by a nonresident. The tag fee exemption has not encouraged an increase in harvest, but does make it easier for local hunters to comply with hunting regulations. This harvest is well below levels necessary to reduce bear predation on moose calves.

Unit 25C. The Unit 25C brown bear tag and fee requirement was eliminated by the board beginning in RY06 to increase the harvest of brown bear to benefit calf survival of the Fortymile caribou herd. During the 5-year period prior to the tag fee exemption, the mean annual harvest was 4 bears, with 68% males. During the first year the tag fee was waived (RY06), 8 brown bears were taken, with 63% males. During the second year the tag fee was waived (RY07), 5 brown bears were taken, including 60% males. The Department manages Unit 25C for a 3-year mean annual human caused mortality of ≤ 6 bears (≥ 2 years of age) and $\geq 55\%$ males. At current densities, the estimated allowable harvest for Unit 25C is 6 bears, with a minimum of 55% males.

Unit 25D. The Unit 25D brown bear tag and fee requirement was eliminated by the board in RY98. The board identified the moose population in Unit 25D as important for providing high levels of human consumption. The tag fee exemption was intended to increase harvest reporting and to increase harvest of brown bears to benefit moose calf and adult survival. Prior to the exemption, relatively few local residents purchased a tag because they generally do not hunt specifically for brown bears. However, some brown bears are taken incidental to encounters in or near communities or fishing and hunting camps. Calf mortality studies in interior Alaska, including Unit 25D, indicate brown bears are often an important predator on moose calves. Prior to the tag fee exemption, annual reported harvest was 0–5 bears. During RY98–RY07, annual reported harvest was 0–10 bears. The tag fee exemption appears to have increased reporting and may have increased the harvest. Unreported harvest is probably higher than reported, but total harvest is likely below a level that would significantly reduce the effect of brown bear predation on moose calf survival.

Subsistence Hunts. Annual reauthorizations are needed for:

Units 19A and 19B, That Portion Downstream Of And Including The Aniak River Drainage. This tag fee exemption is part of a registration permit hunt created after the Western Alaska brown bear management area was eliminated in RY04. The hunt is intended to allow subsistence use of brown bears for food and to allow residents to continue to follow traditional beliefs regarding proper treatment of bear skulls that are inconsistent with normal sealing requirements. No permits were issued for this hunt. Reauthorizing this tag fee exemption does not have negative impacts on the grizzly bear population.

Units 21D and 24. In Units 21D and 24, a total of 13 RB601 permits were issued in RY06–RY07. One bear was reported harvested in Unit 24 in RY06. Harvest rates are low, are well within sustained yield limits, and exempting the resident tag fee has not caused an increase in subsistence take.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Additional brown bear harvest for the benefit of moose and caribou calf survival will not occur and subsistence users will find it more difficult to harvest bears for food.

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who feel brown bears should not be harvested to benefit moose and

caribou calf survival or to provide food for subsistence hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-09S-G-130)

PROPOSAL 234 - 5AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunting season in Units 20A, 20B, and 20D.

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

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
(18)		
Unit 20(A), the Ferry Trail Management Area, Wood River Controlled Use Area, and the Yanert Controlled Use Area		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or	Sept. 1 - Sept. 25 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Aug. 25 - Feb. 28 (General hunt only)	
1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 1000 permits may be issued; or	Sept. 1 - Sept. 25 (General hunt only)	
1 bull by drawing permit only; by muzzleloader only; up to 75 permits may be issued	Nov. 1 - Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		

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

Sept. 1 - Sept. 25

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only; by muzzleloader only; up to 75 permits may be issued

Nov. 1 - Nov. 30

Remainder of Unit 20(A)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 25

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf; or

Aug. 25 - Feb. 28

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 1000 permits may be issued

Sept. 1 - Sept. 25

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1 - Sept. 25

Unit 20(B), that portion within Creamer's Refuge

1 bull with spike-fork or greater antlers by bow and arrow only; or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 30
(General hunt only)
Nov. 21 - Nov. 27
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1 - Sept. 30
Nov. 21 - Nov. 27

1 antlerless moose by bow and arrow only, by drawing permit only; up to 150 permits may be issued in the Fairbanks Management Area; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area; or

Sept. 1 - Nov. 27
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1 - Nov. 27

1 antlerless moose by muzzle-loader by drawing permit only; up to 10 permits may be issued; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area

Nov. 21 - Nov. 27
(General hunt only)

Nov. 21 - Nov. 27

Unit 20(B), remainder of the Fairbanks Management Area

1 bull with spike-fork or greater antlers by bow and arrow only; or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 30
(General hunt only)
Nov. 21 - Nov. 27
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1 - Sept. 30
Nov. 21 - Nov. 27

1 antlerless moose by bow and arrow only, by drawing permit only; up to 150 permits may be issued; a person

Sept. 1 - Nov. 27
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1 - Nov. 27

may not take a calf
or a cow
accompanied by a
calf; a recipient
of a drawing permit
is prohibited from
taking an antlered
bull moose in the
Fairbanks
Management Area

Unit 20(B), that
portion within
the Minto Flats
Management Area

1 moose by registration
permit only; or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 25
(Subsistence hunt
only)
Jan. 10 - Feb. 28
(Subsistence hunt
only)

No open season.

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

Sept. 11 - Sept. 25

No open season.

Unit 20(B), the
drainage of the
Middle Fork of
the Chena River
and that portion
of the Salcha
River drainage
upstream from and
including Goose
Creek

1 bull; or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

1 bull, by bow and arrow only

Sept. 21 - Sept. 30

Sept. 21 - Sept. 30

Remainder of Unit 20(B)

1 bull; or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 15

Sept. 5 - Sept. 15

1 antlerless moose
by drawing permit
only; up to 300
permits may be issued;
a person may not

Sept. 1 - Sept. 30
(General hunt only)

No open season.

take a calf or a cow
accompanied by a calf

...

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

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1 - Sept. 15
(General hunt only)

1 bull by
drawing permit; or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 15
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose
by drawing permit
only; up to 1,000
permits
may be issued in
combination with
that portion in the
Delta Junction
Management Area; a
person may not take
a calf or a cow
accompanied by a
calf; or

Oct. 10 - Nov. 25
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose
by registration permit
only; a person may not
take a calf or a
cow accompanied by
a calf

Oct. 10 - Nov. 25
(General hunt only)

NONRESIDENT
HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 5 - Sept. 15

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

Sept. 1 - Sept. 30
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1 - Sept. 30

1 bull with spike-fork
or 50-inch antlers
or antlers with 4 or
more brow tines on
one side; or 1
antlerless moose,
per lifetime of a
hunter, by drawing
permit only; up to
10 permits may be
issued; a person
may not take a calf
or a cow
accompanied by a
calf

Unit 20(D), that
portion within
the Delta Junction
Management Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with spike-fork or 50-
inch antlers or antlers
with 4 or more brow
tines on one side
by drawing permit
only; up to 30
permits may be
issued; or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 15
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose
by drawing permit only;
up to 1,000 permits
may be issued in
combination with
that portion lying
west of the west
bank of the Johnson
River and south of

Oct. 10 - Nov. 25
(General hunt only)

the north bank of
the Tanana River; a
person may not take
a calf or a cow
accompanied by a
calf; or

1 antlerless moose by
registration permit only;
a person may not
take a calf or a
cow accompanied by
a calf

Oct. 10 - Nov. 25
(General hunt only)

**NONRESIDENT
HUNTERS:**

1 bull with 50-inch
antlers or antlers
with 4 or more brow
tines on one side
by drawing permit
only; up to 30
permits may be
issued

Sept. 5 - Sept. 15

...
ISSUE Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually.

Unit 20A

The primary justification for the Unit 20A antlerless hunts is to reduce the population to the desired objective of 10,000–12,000 moose or until we observe a density-dependent response in terms of improved productivity or condition. In addition, this hunt provides additional harvest opportunity which helps to meet human consumption interests and intensive management (IM) harvest objectives. The number of moose in Unit 20A was estimated at 17,000–18,000 in 2003. Research indicates this moose population is experiencing density-dependent effects, including low productivity, relatively light calf weights, and high removal rates of winter forage. As a result, in 2004 the Board adopted a unit-wide registration hunt for antlerless moose during September 1–December 10 (closed by Emergency Order when the desired number of antlerless moose were taken), and in 2006 expanded that hunt to August 25–February 28. The reported harvest of antlerless moose averaged 573 (range 461–679) during regulatory years 2004 through 2007 (RY04–RY07; RY begins 1 July and ends 30 June, e.g., RY04 = 1 July 2004 through 30 June 2005). Based on the high level of harvest and participation (average of 4491 permits issued annually during RY04–RY07), this hunt has been successful in reversing moose population growth and in increasing hunter participation. Additionally, antlerless moose harvest helped increase total average harvest to 1028, approaching the IM harvest objective of 1400–1600.

The current extended antlerless hunt, from August 25 to February 28, provides additional hunting opportunity and helps reduce hunter densities and crowding. Opening the antlerless season on August 25, a week before the general season, allows antlerless moose hunting under less crowded conditions. Extending the season through February also increases hunting opportunity, but only in the more remote areas because the more accessible areas are closed by emergency order when harvest quotas are reached. The main biological issue with antlerless seasons extending beyond early December is the potential take of bulls that have dropped their antlers. We estimated that approximately 40 antlerless bulls were taken during the winter hunt in RY06, with the majority taken in Zones 4 and 5 in the foothills of the Alaska Range. With an estimated 1200–1300 bulls in

those 2 zones, additional harvest at that level had minimal effect (1–2 bulls:100 cows) on bull:cow ratios in those zones. The estimated bull:cow ratio in 2006 was ≥ 37 bulls:100 cows. We do not have comparable data for 2007 because surveys were not conducted due to poor survey conditions. However, since the bull harvest in 2007 was 33% lower than in 2006, we suspect the effect was also lower.

Unit 20B:

Fairbanks Management Area (FMA) – The purpose of this antlerless hunt is to provide opportunity to harvest a surplus of antlerless moose in the FMA and potentially reduce moose–vehicle collisions and nuisance moose problems.

Population estimates in the FMA and adjacent areas, as well as anecdotal information, indicate high but stable moose numbers. The number of moose–vehicle collisions in the FMA is also high and continues to be a chronic problem that poses significant safety concerns to motorists. In addition, moose nuisance complaints continue to place significant demands on department staff. To increase hunting opportunity and harvest and reduce moose–vehicle collisions, the department increased the number of drawing permits for antlerless moose by archery hunting only (DM788) from 25 in 1999 to 150 in 2004. However, antlerless harvest has not increased commensurate with increases in the number of permits issued. Therefore to further increase harvest to meet management goals the board expanded the season beginning in fall 2006 from September 1–30 and November 21–27 to September 1–November 27. Harvest is limited by the number of permits issued rather than season length. The reported harvest for hunt DM788 averaged 47 antlerless moose (range 38–56) during RY04–RY07. At this juncture, we do not have sufficient data to evaluate the effect of higher antlerless moose harvests on moose–vehicle collisions or moose nuisance problems.

Minto Flats Management Area (MFMA) – The primary purpose of this antlerless hunt is to provide a reasonable opportunity for subsistence uses. In 2004, the board replaced the Tier II subsistence hunt TM785 (100 permits with a bag limit of “one moose” during September 1–20 and January 10–February 28) with 2 registration hunts (bag limit of “one moose” during September 1–25 and January 10–February 28). In addition, a 15-day general hunt (September 11–25) for bulls only with antler restrictions (spike-fork or 50” or 4 or more brow tines) provides additional hunting opportunity and helps to meet IM harvest objective of 600–1500 moose in Unit 20B.

Population estimation surveys indicate the moose density within the MFMA is high (>3.0 moose/ mi²). The reported harvest of antlerless moose taken during subsistence hunt TM785 averaged 24 during regulatory years RY96–RY03. The reported harvest for hunts RM775 and RM785 averaged 47 antlerless moose (range 32–61) during RY04–RY07. That harvest represents approximately 1 to 2 percent of the MFMA moose population and is sustainable.

Remainder of Unit 20B – The drawing permit hunt for antlerless moose was recommended to the board in 2006 to take advantage of relatively high and increasing moose numbers in the central portion of Unit 20B. Population estimates (12,313 in 2001; 15,485 in 2003; 16,572 in 2004; and 15,986 in 2006) and calf:cow ratios (37–43:100 in 2003, 2004 and 2006) suggest numbers are increasing. Moreover, moose densities are relatively high (1.0–1.8 moose/mi²) in central Unit 20B surrounding the Fairbanks area. The reported harvest for the central Unit 20B drawing hunts averaged 92 antlerless moose (range 83–101) during RY06 and RY07. This antlerless moose harvest will curb growth of this population that has surpassed the upper limit of the IM population objective of 12,000–15,000 moose and helps to meet IM harvest objectives for Unit 20B.

In addition, mortality from vehicle and train collisions has been high. An average of about 100 moose have been killed annually by motor vehicles in the FMA (1997–1998 through 2007–2008), an area of just over 300 mi² with an estimated 400–600 moose. By focusing harvest in the more heavily roaded central portion of Unit 20B, road kill may be reduced.

Finally, extensive burns in northcentral Unit 20B will provide excellent habitat in the foreseeable future.

Limiting moose densities during the immediate future, until shrubs have regenerated, would benefit the moose population in the long term.

Unit 20D

Reauthorization of drawing and registration permit hunts for cow moose without calves is proposed in order to continue stabilizing population growth in this area, and increase harvest to meet the IM harvest objective of 500–700 moose. The density of moose in Unit 20D south of the Tanana River and west of the Johnson River is high, at 5.6 moose/mi² in 2007. The Unit 20D moose population has reached its IM population objective of 8,000–10,000, with most population growth and highest densities in the southwestern portion of Unit 20D. Antlerless moose harvest (507 in RY07 and at least 338 in RY08) in southwestern Unit 20D has made it possible to meet the IM harvest objective in Unit 20D.

The moose population in southwestern Unit 20D is increasingly demonstrating the effects of increased competition for food; e.g. twinning rates are at moderately low levels of 16.3% average for the previous two years. Also, browse surveys indicate that moose are consuming moderately high quantities (25%) of available browse over the winter. Unit 20D antlerless moose hunts are conducted as drawing or registration permit hunts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? These moose population may increase, which may result in deterioration of the habitat and exacerbate a population decline in years with severe winter conditions. The opportunity to hunt a harvestable surplus of cow moose will be lost and our ability to meet intensive management harvest objectives in all of these units would be compromised. In central Unit 20B and the FMA in particular, moose/vehicle collisions and nuisance moose problems will likely remain high or increase. Subsistence hunters in the portion of Unit 20A outside the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence Area (part of the western Tanana Flats), as well as subsistence hunters in the MFMA of Unit 20B, may not have a reasonable opportunity to pursue moose for subsistence uses.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, hunting opportunity and harvest will increase. This reauthorization of antlerless moose hunts will likely improve or maintain the ability of moose habitat to support the current moose population. It will also allow hunters to increase moose harvest toward meeting intensive management harvest objective without further reducing the bull-to-cow ratios.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Meat and subsistence hunters will benefit from the opportunity to harvest cow moose. Urban residents may benefit from reduced moose/vehicle collisions and moose/human conflicts in Unit 20B. Moose populations will benefit by having moose densities compatible with their habitat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S-G--125)

This proposal was deferred by the Board of Game from the Spring, 2008 meeting. It was previously listed as Proposal 101. The proposal requests reauthorization of the existing predator control plan as provided in 5AAC 92.125(e). The updates by the Department of Fish and Game to the existing regulatory language for reauthorization of the Unit 19A plan can be viewed on the Board of Game website at <http://www.boards.adfg.state.ak.us>, or by contacting the Boards Support Section.

PROPOSAL 235 - 5 AAC 92.125(e). Predation control areas implementation plans. Extend the Unit 19A predator control plan as follows:

The predator management program for Unit 19A will be reauthorized for six years. This program will start July 1, 2009 and expire June 30, 2015. The reason for this number of years is that the program will then expire on a year when Unit 19 will be on the Board of Game meeting cycle.

ISSUE: The Predator Management Program that is operating in Unit 19A began July 1, 2004, and ends June 30, 2009. This plan, along with the moose hunting closure, is allowing the moose herds in Unit 19A to regenerate. More time is needed to make this recovery a success.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The wolf population in Unit 19A will increase and the small increase that has occurred in the moose population will be wiped out in a short period of time.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The herd numbers are increasing right now, due to the present predator management program. With the continuing program, there will be more time for moose socks to increase to a healthy level, capable of a sustainable yield.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups of moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Making the program a permanent one.

PROPOSED BY: Central Kuskowim Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-018)

Note: This proposal was deferred by the Board of Game from the Spring, 2008 meeting. It was previously listed as Proposal 104. The proposal requests reauthorization of the existing predator control plan as provided in 5AAC 92.125(f). The updates by the Department of Fish and Game to the existing regulatory language for reauthorization of the Unit 19D East plan can be viewed on the Board of Game website at <http://www.boards.adfg.state.ak.us>, or by contacting the Boards Support Section.

PROPOSAL 236 - 5 AAC 92.125(f). Predation control areas implementation plans. Extend the Unit 19D predator control plan as follows:

Extend the wolf control program in Unit 19D for another five years. If the population goals are reached before the end of this period it can be ended. The wolves will not be threatened by this action because they will quickly learn to take advantage of the denser cover. The number of permittees who want to hunt here will also be low but some harvest of wolves is better than no harvest. It will also slow the recovery of wolf packs in the Experimental Micro Management Area (EMMA) to better insure that moose population goals are reached.

ISSUE: The wolf control program was expanded last year in part of Unit 19D east to lower the population of wolves in the area surrounding the area. The harvest was low in that only about 17 wolves were taken. This was due in part to the heavier forest cover and the lack of good tracking snow during much of the season. It was enough however to insure that wolf packs did not reoccupy the area. This program is set to expire at the end of next winter (spring 2009).

The area in Unit 19D East outside the EMMA has been subject to increased hunting pressure due to the EMMA being closed to hunting. The area up the North Fork of the Kuskokwim is the primary hunting grounds for the community of Nikolai which is the most subsistence dependent community in Unit 19D. They have had to pay the price of increased hunting pressure due to increased pressure from residents of the area who had to travel to hunt. Pressure needs to be kept on the wolf packs in this area to allow the moose population to recover. It is also one of the areas hardest to hunt for wolves.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will remain low in this area. Wolf packs from this area will quickly reoccupy the area and slow the recovery program there. The goal of

achieving a moose population that can sustain a harvest of 130 to 150 for Unit 19D will be difficult to reach.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will help insure the recovery of healthy game populations in Unit 19D.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters who qualify for the registration hunt and others who will be able to hunt once the moose population recovers. The predators will also benefit in the long run if we can continue to increase their prey base.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Making the program a permanent one.

PROPOSED BY: McGrath Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-047)

Note: This proposal was deferred by the Board of Game from the Fall, 2008 meeting. It was previously listed as Proposal 54.

PROPOSAL 237 - 5 AAC. 92.125. Predation control areas implementation plans. Modify the predation control plan for Unit 20E to provide the following:

Under a bear control permit, allow the following: 1.) taking of all sex-age classes of both brown and black bears; 2.) the use of bear snares for taking bears; 3.) taking of bears same-day-airborne; 4.) sale of tanned and untanned hides and skulls from bears taken in the control program. Establish a working group to develop recommendations on methods, means and protocol for carrying out the bear control program. This working group should include members of local advisory committees, public sportsman's organizations including the Alaska Outdoor Council, and the Department of Fish and Game research and management staff.

ISSUE: Current conditions of the bear predation control program in the Upper Yukon/Tanana area have not resulted in elevated levels of bear removal and reduction of the bear-caused ungulate mortality.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Current restrictions on allowable methods to take bears will make bear population reduction impossible. High rates of bear predation will continue to limit moose and caribou populations in this important hunting area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Effective reduction of bear predation will allow moose and caribou populations to increase providing significantly higher harvests in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Thousands of moose and caribou hunters will benefit. Thousands of tourists will have a greater chance of viewing moose and caribou. Businesses catering to hunters and tourists will benefit economically.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People philosophically opposed to hunting and intensive management. A small number of hunters who may want to hunt specifically for bears in this area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana / Fortymile Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-038)

Note: This proposal was deferred by the Board of Game from the Spring, 2008 meeting. It was previously listed as proposal 112. The proposed regulatory language requested by the board for implementation of a new predator control plan for Unit 21E is provided by the Department of Fish and Game following this proposal, listed as Proposal 239

PROPOSAL 238 - 5 AAC 92.125. Predation control areas implementation plans. Amend the regulation to provide the following:

Adopt a wolf predation control plan for Unit 21E which can be implemented right away instead of waiting two more years for the Board of game to meet after the intensive management plan has been drafted and adopted.

ISSUE: The Yukon Innoko Moose Management Plan was endorsed by the Board of Game in March 2006. Members of the Yukon Innoko Moose Management Working Group, which included several members of the Grayling, Anvik, Shageluk, Holy Cross Advisory Committee (GASH) and non-local hunters, unanimously recommended a wolf predation control program in Unit 21E to prevent further decline in the moose population and maintain harvest opportunities. There has already been a two year delay in implementing this recommendation. In the letter endorsing the plan, the board requested the department to develop an intensive management plan to be considered by the board at the next available opportunity. The department is preparing an intensive management plan to submit to the board at the upcoming meeting. GASH feels it is crucial that the board endorse the intensive management plan and adopt this proposed regulation to authorize a wolf predation control now before the moose population declines to a very low level that would be very difficult to recover from.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? So far there is no wolf predation control plan in place, and the moose populations will plummet even farther if we wait for the intensive management plan to be adopted by the Board of Game and then have to wait until the March 2010 meeting to adopt a regulation for a wolf predation control program.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The wolf population can be reduced now instead of waiting two or three more years. Reducing wolf predation will help to increase the moose population and maintain hunting opportunities for local and non-local hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters in Unit 21E who want to see the moose populations begin to grow and continue to be able to harvest moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Persons from outside our area that does not like wolf control may not like the idea. We do not want to see wolves eliminated from the area and wolf numbers will come back up when there are more moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Wait until the entire intensive management plan has been adopted. We rejected this option because time is of the essence, and waiting 2 or 3 more years will cause moose populations to become even more reduced because of increased predation.

PROPOSED BY: Grayling-Anvik-Shageluk-HolyCross (GASH) AC (INT-08S-G-041)

PROPOSAL 239 - 5AAC 92.125. Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans. Establish a Unit 21E predation control implementation plan as follows, with a delayed effective date of July 1, 2010 and with implementation of wolf control activities only if the moose population declines below the current level. The Adaptive Plan for Intensive Management of Moose in Unit 21(E) that is referenced in the proposal will be available for review on the department's web site in late January 2009.

...

(j) **Unit 21(E) predation control area:** The Unit 21(E) Predation Control Area is established encompassing approximately 7,995 square miles; this predator control program does not apply within National Wildlife Refuge Lands unless approved by the federal agencies; notwithstanding any other provision in this title, and based on information contained in the Adaptive Plan for Intensive Management of Moose in Unit 21(E) and on the following information contained in this section, the commissioner or the commissioner's designee may

conduct a wolf population reduction or wolf population regulation program in the Unit 21(E) Predation Control Area:

(1) the discussion of wildlife population and human use information is as follows:

- (A) a Wolf Control Focus Zone is established within the Unit 21(E) Predation Control Area encompassing approximately 2,617 square miles surrounding the villages of Anvik, Shageluk, and Holy Cross, rather than over the entire game management unit; the Wolf Control Focus Zone concentrates control actions in a relatively small area around villages, rather than over the entire game management unit; the department will have the discretion to adjust the size and shape of the focus area where wolf predation control activities occur within the Unit 21(E) Predation Control Area;
- (B) prey population information is as follows:
 - (i.) local residents and other hunters have reported a decline in the Unit 21(E) moose population over the last several years and are concerned that additional declines may occur; however, there is little data available on the number of moose prior to 2000 for comparison; population estimates of 7,000–9,000 in 2000 and 2005 for Unit 21(E) indicated little change; moose density in the population estimation survey area in 2000 was 1.0 per square mile and in 2005 was 0.9 per square mile;
 - (ii.) the intensive management moose population objective established by the board for Unit 21(E) is 9,000–11,000 moose;
 - (iii.) the intensive management moose harvest objective established by the board for Unit 21(E) is 550–1,100 moose;
 - (iv.) composition surveys conducted during November 1987–1998 and 2007–2008 in the Holy Cross area indicated bull-to-cow ratios and the calf-to-cow ratios were at or above 25–30 bulls:100 cows and 30–40 calves:100 cows;
 - (v.) based on available data, habitat is probably not a factor limiting moose population growth in Unit 21(E); a browse survey conducted during spring 2006 found that moose were removing about 20% of the biomass; twinning surveys conducted during spring 2000–2008 have shown an average twinning rate of 33 percent;
 - (vi.) total estimated mortality is likely high relative to the size of the moose population; information gained from studies on moose in Unit 19(D) East and other areas of Alaska, and observations by local residents suggests that wolves are currently a limiting factor for moose in Unit 21(E); research from Unit 19(D) East also indicates that black and brown bear predation is a factor that contributes to calf moose mortality, and bears may be limiting the moose population in Unit 21(E);
 - (vii.) the harvestable surplus in Unit 21(E) is 280–360 moose based on a conservative harvest rate of 4 percent of the total estimated population;
 - (viii.) the upper end of the range of estimated moose population in Unit 21(E) is equal to the lower end of the range of the intensive management population objective; the number of animals that can be removed from the Unit 21(E) moose population on an annual basis without preventing growth of the population or altering the composition of the population in a biologically unacceptable manner is less than the harvest objective established for the population in 5AAC 92.108;
 - (ix.) the 2005 estimate of 0.9 moose per square mile within the Unit 21(E) population estimation survey area is considered to be near the upper end of the range of densities associated with low density dynamic equilibrium moose populations that are predator limited; a decline in moose numbers will result in the population moving further into the low density dynamic equilibrium state; without an effective wolf control program the moose in Unit 21(E) are likely to persist in

this state with little expectation of increase; results from moose mortality studies, and predator and prey studies, conducted throughout Alaska and similar areas in Canada indicate that reducing the number of wolves in Unit 21(E) can reasonably be expected to increase the survival of yearling and older moose; wolf control activities within the Unit 21(E) Wolf Predation Control Focus Area can reasonably be expected to increase moose densities in that and surrounding areas and increase the number of moose that can be harvested;

(C) human use information for the prey population is as follows:

- (i.) the board identified moose in Unit 21(E) as important for providing high levels of harvest for human consumptive use in accordance with AS 16.05.255(e)–(g);
- (ii.) estimated average annual moose harvest by all Alaska resident hunters in Unit 21(E) was 311; this harvest was based on all available harvest data between 1996 and 2005, including harvest ticket reports, division of subsistence household surveys, and other subsistence research; the average nonresident harvest between 2000 and 2004 was 30 moose;
- (iii.) according to harvest ticket reports, the number of moose harvested Unit 21(E) declined from an average of 182 annually during the 1998–2002 seasons to 127 during the 2003–2007 seasons; most of this decline can be attributed to a decrease in non-local harvest;
- (iv.) in a March 2002 report to the board, the division of subsistence estimated the average annual harvest of moose by residents of Unit 21(E) during 1996–1999 seasons was 226; division of subsistence household surveys indicated harvest by residents of Unit 21(E) during 2002, 2003, and 2004 seasons was 133, 118, and 94 respectively; harvest was unusually low in 2004–2005 due to low water and to forest fires that burned from summer until the fall moose hunting season;
- (v.) the amount necessary for subsistence established by the board for Unit 21 is 600–800 moose;
- (vi.) the intensive management harvest objective is 550–1,100, as the moose population increases and more harvest can be allowed, a greater portion of the unmet demand for moose in Unit 21(E) can be satisfied; based on management experience gained in the Unit 19(D) East and other areas of Alaska, an increase in the moose population is expected if the wolf population is reduced substantially; a reduction in the number of wolves would result in a higher rate of increase in the number of moose available for harvest; although the most pronounced effect is expected to be within the Wolf Control Focus Zone, it is reasonable to expect some lesser degree of increase in the moose population in the area immediately surrounding the focus area because of a reduction in wolf predation; without a wolf predation control program there is a very low probability that a further decline in the moose population could be prevented and recovery initiated to meet local subsistence needs or other harvest demands;

(D) predator population information is as follows:

- (i.) the pre-control wolf population in Unit 21(E) was estimated in fall 2005 using an extrapolation technique combined with sealing record and anecdotal observations; the population in the entire 7,995 square mile area was estimated at 180–240 wolves or approximately 23–30 wolves per 1000 square miles; in areas with limited human developments, habitat is not considered a significant factor in limiting wolf populations and it is presumed that numbers of wolves are limited mainly by prey availability; there is no evidence of disease or any other naturally occurring factors that would cause wolf mortality to be higher than normally expected;
- (ii.) using the 2005 moose and wolf population estimates, the moose to wolf ratio in Unit 21(E) is between 29:1 and 50:1;
- (iii.) studies in Alaska and elsewhere have repeatedly concluded that large reductions are required to affect wolf population levels and to reduce predation by wolves on their prey; research indicates a reduction of about 60–80 percent of the pre-control wolf population may be necessary to achieve prey population objectives; once the wolf population has been reduced to the population

control objective, annual reductions of less than 60 percent will likely regulate the wolf population at the control objective; the wolf population control objective will achieve the desired reduction in wolf predation, and also ensure that wolves persist within the plan area;

- (E) the human use information for the predator population is as follows:
 - (i.) average annual reported harvest of wolves by hunters and trappers during the 2003–2007 seasons was 16;
 - (ii.) the human population in Unit 21(E) is concentrated along the lower Yukon River corridor; the lower Yukon region weather is influenced by coastal conditions and often warm spells in the winter will melt snow and make travel and tracking conditions poor; in addition, the low price of wolf pelts and cost of fuel make it difficult for local residents to harvest a high number of wolves throughout the unit;
- (2) the predator and prey population levels and population objectives, and the basis for those objectives, is as follows:
 - (A) the most recent estimate for the moose population in the Unit 21(E) predation control area is 7,000–9,000 moose; the intensive management population objective for Unit 21(E) is 9,000–11,000 moose; intensive management objectives were based on historic information about moose numbers, habitat limitations, sustainable harvest levels, and human use;
 - (B) the pre-control estimated minimum wolf population in Unit 21(E) was 180–240 wolves in fall 2005; the primary objective of the Unit 21(E) wolf predation control plan is to reduce wolf numbers and wolf predation on moose within the 2,617 square mile Wolf Control Focus Zone to the lowest level possible; this plan also has a goal to maintain wolves as part of the ecosystem within Unit 21(E); the minimum wolf population objective for Unit 21(E) is 40 wolves, which represents a 60–80 percent reduction from the pre-control minimum estimated fall wolf population of 180 wolves (23 wolves per 1,000 square miles); the minimum wolf population control objective will achieve the desired reduction in wolf predation, and also ensure that wolves persist within the plan area;
- (3) justifications for the predator control implementation plan are as follows:
 - (A) the moose population size for Unit 21(E) was estimated at 7,000–9,000 in February 2005, with a density of 0.9 moose per square mile in the population estimation survey area; the harvestable surplus of moose is 280–360, based on a conservative harvest rate of 4% of the estimated moose population; the intensive management population objective of 9,000–11,000 and harvest objective of 550–1,100 have not been met; local residents and other hunters reported a decline in the moose population prior to 2000 and are concerned that additional declines may occur, making it increasingly difficult to achieve objectives; declines in the moose population occur because mortality exceeds recruitment into the population; wolf predation is an important cause of moose mortality; in Alaska and Canada where moose are the primary prey of wolves, studies documented kill rates ranging from four to seven moose per wolf per winter;
 - (B) a proactive approach is needed to allow for a timely response to any additional decline in the Unit 21(E) moose population; reducing wolf numbers through a wolf predation control program, combined with reduction in moose harvest, is the approach most likely to succeed in a recovery of the moose population if an additional decline occurs; wolf harvest through hunting and trapping efforts has not resulted in lowering the wolf population sufficiently to allow the moose population to grow;
 - (C) presently known alternatives to predator control for reducing the number of predators are ineffective, impractical, or uneconomical in the Unit 21(E) situation;
 - (D) moose hunting seasons and bag limits have been reduced in Unit 21(E); the February resident season for any moose was closed in 2003 and the nonresident season was shortened and made more restrictive in 2006; while helpful, these measures alone will not likely stop additional declines in the

moose population, and they will not be enough alone to allow the moose population to increase;

- (E) without an effective wolf predation control program, the wolf harvest objective cannot be achieved; a timely response to any additional decline in the Unit 21(E) moose population will not be possible, resulting in the population moving further into the low density dynamic equilibrium state with little expectation of increase; data from moose mortality and predator–prey studies conducted throughout Alaska and similar areas in Canada suggest that reducing the number of wolves in Unit 21(E) can reasonably be expected to increase moose survival, particularly for yearlings; reducing wolf predation on moose, in combination with carefully managing harvest (including minimizing cow harvest), can reasonably be expected to initiate an increase of the moose population;
- (4) the permissible methods and means used to take wolves are as follows:
- (A) hunting and trapping of wolves by the public in Unit 21(E) during the term of the program will occur as provided in the hunting and trapping regulations set out elsewhere in this title, including use of motorized vehicles as provided in 5 AAC 92.080;
 - (B) the commissioner may issue public aerial shooting permits or public land and shoot permits in Unit 21(E) as a method of wolf removal under AS 16.05.783 when the mid point of any density estimate obtained in any moose population estimation survey area declines below 0.9 moose per square mile;
- (5) the anticipated time frame and schedule for update and reevaluation are as follows:
- (A) for up to five years beginning on July 1, 2010, the commissioner may reduce the wolf population in Unit 21(E);
 - (B) annually, the department shall to the extent practicable, provide to the board at the board's spring board meeting, a report of program activities conducted during the preceding 12 months, including implementation activities, the status of moose and wolf populations, and recommendations for changes, if necessary, to achieve the objectives of the plan;
- (6) other specifications the board considers necessary are as follows;
- (A) the commissioner will suspend wolf control activities
 - (i) when wolf inventories or accumulated information from wolf control permittees indicate the need to avoid reducing wolf numbers below the management objective of 40 wolves in Unit 21(E) specified in this subsection;
 - (ii) when spring conditions deteriorate to make wolf control operations infeasible; or
 - (iii) no later than April 30 in any regulatory year;
 - (B) wolf control activities will be terminated
 - (i) when prey population management objectives are attained; or
 - (ii) upon expiration of the period during which the commissioner is authorized to reduce predator numbers in the predator control plan area; or
 - (C) the commissioner will annually close wolf hunting and trapping seasons as appropriate to ensure that the minimum wolf population objective is met.

ISSUE: The Grayling–Anvik–Shageluk–Holy Cross (GASH) Advisory Committee (AC) has expressed concern for several years about declining moose numbers in Unit 21E. In January 2003 the GASH AC recommended not reauthorizing the state antlerless winter moose hunt in Unit 21E due to their concerns about the declining moose population and to take proactive action to protect the reproductive potential of the population.

In 2004, ADF&G established the Yukon–Innoko Moose Management Working Group (YIWG) composed of GASH AC members and other stakeholders in Unit 21E moose management to evaluate all available data on moose populations, harvest levels, habitat and predation and to develop recommendations to the department

and board. The AC also heard testimony of local residents and other hunters who reported a decline in the moose population in the area. After reviewing all available information the YIWG unanimously recommended establishing a wolf predation control program for Unit 21E.

The Board of Game endorsed the Yukon-Innoko Moose Management Plan (YIMMP) in March 2006, authorized the taking of wolves by snowmachine, increased the hunting bag limit and lengthened the trapping season for wolves in Unit 21E. The board requested the department to proceed with preparing a draft Intensive Management Plan to be considered by the board at the next available opportunity. The department presented a preliminary "Adaptive Management Plan for Intensive Management of Moose in Game Management Unit 21E" to the board in February 2008, and will present a final plan to the board in March 2009. This plan recommended establishing a wolf predation control program in Unit 21E and beginning implementation of the program if an additional population surveys provide further documentation of a decline in the moose population. A copy of the plan will be available for public review on the department's web site in late January 2009.

The YIMMP is intended to help rebuild the moose population in Unit 21E and includes recommendations involving moose harvest reductions, habitat management and predation control. The Federal Subsistence Board (FSB) has also endorsed the YIMMP and if the department implements the wolf predation control program in Unit 21E a proposal will be submitted to the FSB to close the federal antlerless moose hunting seasons in Unit 21E.

Providing increased opportunity for taking wolves under the hunting and trapping regulations has not proven to be effective in reducing wolf numbers enough to increase moose calf and adult survival and promote growth of the moose population. The board has identified moose in Unit 21E as being important for providing high levels of moose for human consumptive purposes. The current moose population and annual harvest estimates are below the Intensive Management population and harvest objectives established by the board. Wolf predation control is necessary to help rebuild the moose population in Unit 21E and to better provide for human consumptive uses of moose.

As a first priority for wolf predation control ADF&G recommends focusing on a 2,617 square mile Wolf Control Focus Zone surrounding the villages of Anvik, Shageluk, and Holy Cross. This area is important for providing moose for local subsistence hunters and has a reasonable likelihood of success. We recommend using techniques that are as efficient and effective as possible.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The YIMMP is intended as a proactive approach to managing the moose population for high levels of harvest according to the state Intensive Management law. If a wolf predation control program is not implemented, the moose population may decline to a very low level from which it will be very difficult to recover. Regulatory proposals have previously been implemented by the board to reduce harvest of cow moose and place a limit on non-resident harvest in Unit 21E; however, harvest reductions alone are not expected to achieve significant increases in the moose population. If the moose population declines further, further harvest reductions will be required including the possibility of restricting harvest to residents of Alaska only and allocating among Alaska resident subsistence hunters through Tier II permits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If predation by wolves on moose is reduced in Unit 21E, the moose population may increase, resulting in greater moose harvests in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters will likely benefit from an increase in the moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who do not feel the current moose population is low enough to justify wolf predation control or who oppose wolf predation control on philosophical grounds will not agree with implementing wolf predation control.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? This proposal is one component of a multifaceted program recommended by the YIWG. The entire program includes reductions in moose harvest, monitoring habitat conditions and promoting a natural fire regime, and increasing harvest of bears.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game at the request of the Board of Game and the Yukon–Innoko Moose Management Working Group (HQ-09S -G -008)

PROPOSAL 240 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures. Increase the number of drawing permit hunts that hunters can apply for each year.

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

(1) the applicant or the applicant's agent shall complete the application form; a permit application that is incomplete, or that does not include, if required, an Alaska hunting license number, or that contains a false statement, is void;

(2) except as provided in 5 AAC 92.061 and 5 AAC 92.069, a person may not apply for more than six [THREE] different drawing permit hunts for the same species per regulatory year, submit more than one application for the same drawing permit hunt during a regulatory year, or apply for more than one moose drawing permit for a nonresident in Unit 23 per regulatory year; the commissioner shall void all duplicate applications, all applications by one person for more than three hunts for the same species, and all applications by one person for more than one moose hunt for a nonresident in Unit 23; a person may not hold more than one permit for the same species per regulatory year;

ISSUE: Over time, the number of drawing permit hunts has increased. Many Game Management Units, subunits and hunt areas have been divided up into a number of hunts, preventing applicants from applying for many of these drawing hunt areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People will continue to be limited to only three choices per species.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who wish to apply for more drawing hunts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Board of Game (HQ-09S -G -133)

PROPOSAL 241 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunting conditions and procedures. Establish a bonus point system for some drawing hunts.

(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 bonus point system as follows:

1. An applicant for a bonus drawing hunt must have a current license to apply for the hunt and complete the appropriate drawing application

2. An applicant must use consistent hunter identification each year when applying for a hunt
3. The applicant will accumulate 1 point for each year that he/she is unsuccessful in obtaining a permit for that species
4. If an applicant does not apply for two consecutive years he/she will lose all accumulated bonus points for that species
5. An applicant may indicate that he/she will be unable to hunt for the current year but still must apply (see item 1)
6. Once an applicant receives a permit to hunt a species that he/she has been applying for under a bonus point system his/her total points return to zero and they must start over to accumulate new points.
7. Drawings under the bonus point system:
 - A. Available permits for the specific hunt will be allocated on a 50%/50% basis; an applicant may only apply for one or the other of the hunts
 - 1) 50% will be available for everyone who applies for the hunt
 - 2) 50% will be allocated to those who have obtained bonus points
 - B. An applicant will have 1 additional chance for each bonus point that they have accumulated for that species in the 50% bonus point draw
 - C. There will be no party hunt applications under the bonus point system
 - D. Points are accumulated by the individual and can not be transferred or jointly accumulated
 - E. The department will apply the bonus point system to the following hunts:
 - (i) All bison drawing permits.

Note to reader —This list of allocation issues and the design of the bonus point system was developed based on 1) public and advisory committee proposals submitted at the January 2008 statewide Board of Game meeting, 2) testimony and Board discussion at the January 2008 meeting providing the department with general direction on the bonus point system, and 3) subsequent dialog with some Board members on the topic and an informal teleconference on November 1st with three members of the hunting public who are familiar with these hunting systems in other states, two members from the Board and staff from the department.

ISSUE: This is a Board generated proposal to establish a bonus point system for drawing hunts in Alaska. There is a desire among some hunters to participate in the Alaska drawing hunt system to be able to increase their chances of being drawn over time.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters who desire additional chances in drawing hunts after being unsuccessful in previous year drawing hunts will still only get once chance in the present hunt for which they are applying.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No. A bonus point system will have no change on the resource, only the odds of certain hunters in obtaining a drawing permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who participate in certain hunts annually and maintain their drawing hunt records according to the rules of program.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who fail to participate annually and who fail to carefully follow the application rules. If a bonus point hunt is cancelled or changed after a few years some hunters might suffer if they are previously “invested” in that particular hunt with a number of bonus points.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo; keep the system whereby a simple random draw is

conducted annually only and no points are given for applying in previous years.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Board of Game (HQ-09S-G-134)

Note: This proposal is deferred from the Fall 2008, meeting. It was previously listed as proposal 56.

PROPOSAL 242 - 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)

PROPOSAL 243 - 5AAC 92.530. Management Areas. Create special management areas to provide drawing permit hunts to disabled veterans.

5 AAC 92.530. Management areas. The following management areas are subject to special restrictions:

- Unit 14C Fort Richardson (DM422/423/424/425/427; currently muzzleloader or archery hunts with a total of 125 permits available)
 - (1) the Fort Richardson Management Area:
 - (A) the area consists of the Fort Richardson Military Reservation;
 - (B) the area is open to the taking of big game by permit only, and small game, and fur animals; the department will set conditions under 5 AAC 92.050 ;
 - (C) XX permits will be issued to applicants that qualify as disabled veterans.**
- Unit 20B Fairbanks Management Area (DM788; currently an archery hunt with 75 permits available)
 - (10) the Fairbanks Management Area:
 - (A) this area consists of that portion of Unit 20(B) bounded by a line from the confluence of Rosie Creek and the Tanana River, northerly along Rosie Creek to the middle fork of Rosie Creek through Section 26 to the Parks Highway, then east along the Parks Highway to Alder Creek, then upstream along

Alder Creek to its confluence with Emma Creek, then upstream along Emma Creek to its headwaters, then northerly along the hydrographic divide between Goldstream Creek drainages and Cripple Creek drainages to the summit of Ester Dome, then down Sheep Creek to its confluence with Goldstream Creek, then easterly along Goldstream Creek to Sheep Creek Road, then north on Sheep Creek Road to Murphy Dome Road, then west on Murphy Dome Road to Old Murphy Dome Road, then east on Old Murphy Dome Road to the Elliot Highway, then south on the Elliot Highway to Davidson Ditch, then southeasterly along the Davidson Ditch to its confluence with the tributary to Goldstream Creek in Section 29, then downstream along the tributary to its confluence with Goldstream Creek, then in a straight line to First Chance Creek, then up First Chance Creek to the summit of Tungsten Hill, then southerly along Steele Creek to its intersection with the Trans - Alaska Pipeline right - of - way, then southeasterly along the easterly edge of the Trans - Alaska Pipeline right - of - way to the Chena River, then along the north bank of the Chena River to the Moose Creek dike, then southerly along the Moose Creek dike to its intersection with the Tanana River, and then westerly along the north bank of the Tanana River to the point of beginning;

(B) the area is open to moose hunting by bow and arrow only;

(C) XX permits will be issued to applicants that qualify as disabled veterans.

- Unit 20D, Delta Junction Management Area (DM790, bull with spike-fork or 50-inch with 4 or more brow tines on at least one side; currently 10 permits available)

(19) the Delta Junction Management Area:

(A) the area consists of that portion of Unit 20(D) bounded by a line beginning at the confluence of Donnelly Creek and the Delta River, then up Donnelly Creek to the Richardson Highway (Mile 238), then north along the east side of the highway to the "12 Mile Crossing Trail" (Mile 252.4), then east along the south side of the "12 Mile Crossing Trail" and across Jarvis Creek to the 33 - Mile Loop Road, then northeast along the 33 - Mile Loop Road to the intersection with the Alaska Highway (Mile 1414), then southeast along the north side of the Alaska Highway to the bridge at Sawmill Creek (Mile 1403.9), then down the west bank of Sawmill Creek to its confluence with Clearwater Creek and down the south bank of Clearwater Creek to its confluence with the Tanana River, then down the Tanana River to its confluence with the Delta River, and upstream along the east bank of the Delta River to the point of beginning at Donnelly Creek;

(B) the area is open to moose hunting by permit only;

(C) XX permits will be issued to applicants that qualify as disabled veterans.

Other areas that could have special management areas:

- Unit 14C Elmendorf Air Force Base (DM 428, DM429, DM430; currently certified bow hunts with 25 permits available)
- Unit 20B Fairbanks – Creamer’s Field (DM789; currently a muzzleloader hunt with 10 permits available)
- Unit 20D Delta Junction (DM 798 and DM799; currently more than 500 antlerless permits available)

Disabled veterans who qualify for a free license under AS 16.05.341 would be the only eligible applicants in these hunts.

ISSUE: At the January 2008 Board of Game meeting, the board considered a proposal to develop hunts for disabled military veterans. The proposal was deferred to the November 2008 meeting to allow the department to determine which hunts could potentially provide this opportunity. At the fall Board meeting in Juneau the department presented hunt options to the board for consideration. This proposal was developed during that meeting and is provided here to allow public notice and comment on the details of the proposed hunts.

The department recommended that the board establish special hunts for disabled veterans, for specific moose hunts on the road system, since these provide opportunities with suitable access and relatively high moose

densities.

Creation of special hunts for disabled veterans is an allocation issue and a Board decision. The Board will have to allocate the number of permits and establish any criteria for qualifying for these hunts. In the case of restricted weapons hunts, the department's HIT program may have to modify certification requirements to accommodate disabled veterans.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Disabled veterans will continue to compete for permit hunts with all other applicants.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? There will be no change to the wildlife resource as all of the hunts are managed by limited permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Disabled veterans may have a better opportunity to draw a permit in a hunt with better access.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Non-disabled veterans will have fewer permits available for some hunts.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: Status quo. Methods and means exemptions in other hunt areas such as controlled use areas.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game as the request of the Board of Game (HQ-09S –G136)

Note: This proposal was deferred by the Board of Game from the Fall, 2008 meeting. It was previously listed as Proposal 48. The author's intent for proposal 48 was that it only apply only to Units 1-4. The board amended the proposal at the Fall meeting to apply statewide and for all calibers.

PROPOSAL 244 – 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Modify the methods for taking big game Units 1, 2, 3 and 4 as follows:

Big game in Units 1, 2, 3 and 4 may not be taken with the use of 223 caliber full metal jacket bullets.

ISSUE: Full metal jacket bullets are designed for maiming people in time of war. Soft tipped or solid bullets are designed to kill. 223 full metal jacketed should be a prohibited bullet type for the harvest of big game in Southeast Alaska (primarily for deer).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued loss of big game due to the wounding, maiming or crippling due to the use of an inappropriate type of bullet for hunting. Bullet wounds do not bleed openly as an indication of being hit during tracking. The silver of stainless steel zips through the animal and bullet impact may not be apparent if a body shot occurs while the animal is moving.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposal will reduce the loss of big game and improve the quality of the resource population by minimizing or reducing waste.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All big game hunters who desire a healthy game population and strive to achieve clean kill shots.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? All big game boat hunters interested in harvesting deer on the beaches that desire shooting deer from 223 caliber semi-autos loaded up with non-hunting bullets.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Most bullets available to the public as full metal jacket are in the

223 caliber so prohibiting use of all caliber of full metal jacket appears to overstep the primary problem. Hunters have access to 223 caliber hunting bullets and ammunition at very reasonable costs.

PROPOSED BY: Bradley Shaffer (HQ-09G-028)

PROPOSAL 245 - 5 AAC 92.003. Hunter education and orientation requirements. Require archers hunting black bear over bait to be IBEP certified statewide.

5 AAC 92.003. Hunter education and orientation requirements.

...
(g) A person may not take a black bear over bait [IN UNIT 7 AND UNITS 14 – 16] with a bow and arrow unless the person has successfully completed a department - approved bow-hunting course.

ISSUE: IBEP certification for archers hunting black bear over bait is not required in all areas of the state.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Archers in other areas of the state will not be required to demonstrate proficiency by obtaining IBEP certification.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Requirements for IBEP will be consistent statewide and it will be less confusing for the hunting public.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Archers in other units will now have to take the IBEP class.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: Status quo.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Board of Game (HQ-09S -G -132)

PROPOSAL 246 - 5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets and reports. Require black bear harvest tickets in any unit where black bear sealing is required.

5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets and reports.

(l) for black bear; a person may not hunt black bear **in a unit with black bear sealing requirements**, except in a permit hunt, [IN UNITS 1-5] unless the person has in possession a harvest ticket for the species and harvest report (issued with the harvest ticket).

ISSUE: At the fall 2008 Board of Game meeting Juneau, the board passed a regulation requiring harvest tickets for black bear hunting in units 1-5 (Southeast Alaska). This new regulation was passed because of continued, long-term increases in black bear harvest with no concurrent knowledge of hunter effort, resident versus nonresident effort and little knowledge of hunting patterns by black bear hunters. Currently (except for units 1-5 beginning next year) there is no requirement for hunting black bear other than a hunting license and a tag for nonresidents. The department requires sealing of bears that are harvested, but there is no hunter effort data available.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunter effort data for black bear will not be available.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Managers will have more information to make decisions concerning harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters in areas where conservative seasons are in place.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters will now be required to obtain a harvest ticket prior to going afield.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09S –G-135)
