

**PRELIMINARY  
RECOMMENDATIONS  
BOARD OF GAME PROPOSALS**

**March 2011-Region II**

*Alaska Department of Fish & Game*

*Division of Wildlife Conservation*

*The department's recommendations are based on analysis of the proposals with available information. These recommendations may change after further analysis based on public comment or additional information.*

**PROPOSAL 123**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Opens an archery season for black bear in Unit 6D: September 1 - 9, archery only; September 10 - June 10, general season.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: Black bears in Unit 6D are vulnerable to overharvest because of relatively easy boat access and popularity of Prince William Sound to bear hunters. The Department is concerned that black bears are being harvested at an unsustainable rate. The Board of Game and Department have been taking steps to control harvest as follows:

- 2003 - Shooting from boats prohibited,
- 2004 - Began monitoring age structure of harvest,
- 2005 - Shortened spring season by 20 days,
- 2005 - Bear baiting clinic required to hunt over bait,
- 2005 - Bear baiting closure of bays heavily used for spring recreation,
- 2009 - Delayed fall opening by 10 days.

Harvest has decreased during the last 2 seasons but not below the desired level. Archery harvest is not known but is probably low. Regardless, until bear harvest falls to an acceptable level, the Department is opposed to increasing opportunity for any hunters.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 124**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6A.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Staff proposal, See issue statement

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 125**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6B.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Staff proposal, See issue statement

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 126**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6C.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Staff proposal, See issue statement

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 127**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Establish a bag limit for pheasant and modify the bag limit for grouse and ptarmigan in Unit 6.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: Many islands in Prince William Sound already have spruce grouse and ptarmigan populations occurring at low density. The environment of the temperate rain forest is less than ideal for upland game bird species because of the approximately 150 inches of precipitation that falls per year. There is, however, an abundance of the more rain-resistant waterfowl in surrounding waters. History has repeatedly demonstrated that introducing exotic game species into island ecosystems is fraught with biological danger and should be avoided. Current seasons and bag limits for grouse, ptarmigan and waterfowl are suitable for PWS.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 128**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Close wolverine trapping in Units 6 and 14C.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: State regulations allow wolverine trapping on the former Fort Richardson and Elmendorf AFB (now Joint Base Elmendorf Richardson) and in the “remainder of Unit 14C” from November 10 through January 31, with a bag limit of 1 wolverine. However, the military installations have never issued access permits for trapping wolverines, and wolverines rarely use Elmendorf, the Anchorage Bowl, lower Eagle River valley, and most of Fort Richardson due to development and the Glenn Highway barrier. Chugach State Park has served as a refugia, maintaining population levels despite a relatively high annual harvest in the “remainder of Unit 14C.”

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 south-central Alaska is assumed to be about 7-8% of the fall wolverine population. The 2008-09 and 2009-10 harvest of 5 wolverines was about 23% of the estimated population. Presumably, Unit 14C wolverine population has been maintained by dispersal from neighboring GMUs. In 2010 federal subsistence season for wolverine was aligned with state season to help prevent additional late season take. Although the harvest has been historically high in Unit 14C, we believe that by maintaining Chugach State Park closed to wolverine trapping will serve as a refugia and source to maintain a sustainable population of wolverines in Unit 14C.

The area described in Unit 6D is not in, nor bounded by, Chugach State Park. Harvest in that portion of Unit 6D averaged only 0.44 wolverine per year during the last decade.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 129**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Change trapping regulations to reflect alignment of Elmendorf Air Force Base and Fort Richardson Army Installation into Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER). Provide the additional opportunity for marten, otters, and fox to be trapped on JBER lands.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Department Proposal. See issue statement.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 130**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Increase the bag limit for black bears in Unit 14C from 1 to 3 bears a year.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: see proposal 131

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 131**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Increase the bag limit for black bears in the Remainder of Unit 14C from 1 to 3 bears a year with no closed season.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No recommendation**

RATIONALE: The majority of Unit 14C is currently open to black bear hunting, either by harvest ticket or by registration permit, with a bag limit of one bear per year. Black bear hunting in Chugach State Park is restricted to the day after Labor Day to June 15 to avoid potential conflicts with other park users, while the Remainder of Unit 14C has no closed season. Black bear harvest has increased in the last 20 years; average annual harvest from 1990 - 1999 was 20 bears per year compared to 34 bears per year from 2000 - 2004 and 44 bears per year from 2005 - 2009. Total annual mortality, including hunter harvest, as well as defense of life and property and road kills, currently averages 62 bears a year (2005-2009). We estimate the Unit 14C black bear population to be 250 - 350 bears. Based on this population estimate, we are currently harvesting black bears at a rate of 15-25%. While marginally sustainable, additional harvest could potentially result in a decline of black bears in Unit 14C.

Measuring hunter effort for the entire subunit is difficult, since harvest tickets were not required until 2009. Therefore, the only data available to ascertain a change in hunter effort are for registration permit hunts. Hunter effort for registration hunts has decreased slightly in recent years from 46.1% (2001-2004) to 41.2% (2005-2009). However, the number of permits issued as has increased 59.8% (from 99 permits/year for 2001-2004 to 159 permits/year for 2005-2009). Regardless, registration hunter harvest has only realized an increase of 39.1% (from 5.75 to 8 bears/year) for the same time period.

Increasing the bag limit for black bears in Unit 14C from 1 to 3 bears annually would most likely not dramatically increase the overall harvest of black bears in the subunit, and therefore we have no recommendation concerning this proposal. Few individuals are likely take more than one black bear per year. Public opinion surveys conducted in 1996 and 2009 indicate that the majority of the residents are comfortable with the current population size of black bears within Unit 14C.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 132**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Increase available harvest for black and brown bears in Unit 14C

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: The intent of this proposal is to increase the harvest of black and brown bears by 100 bears in Unit 14C. However, the authors of this proposal are vague about what actual regulation changes they are requesting. Currently, there is extensive opportunity to harvest both black and brown bears in Unit 14C. The majority of Unit 14C is open to black bear hunting, either by harvest ticket or by registration permit, with a bag limit of one bear per year. Black bear hunting in Chugach State Park is restricted to the day after Labor Day to June 15 to avoid potential conflicts with other park users, while the Remainder of Unit 14C has no closed season. Brown bear hunting is permitted by general harvest in the Remainder of Unit 14C from September 1 to May 31 with a bag limit of 1 bear every 4 regulatory years, and by drawing permit in the Chugach State Park Management Area, Eagle River Management Area, and Eklutna Lake Management Area (1 bear per regulatory year). Areas closed to bear hunting include the densely populated areas of the Anchorage Bowl and Eagle River and the Joint Base Elmendorf Richardson (JBER). Hunting and trapping is prohibited in city parks without special approval from the Anchorage Parks Director, and a recent public opinion survey conducted by ADFG indicates that the residents of Anchorage do not support bear hunting in city parks. Regardless, home ranges of both black and brown bears extend beyond closed areas, and as a result, most bears range into areas where they are susceptible to hunting pressure.

The high harvest of black bears in Unit 14C is in part a reflection of the ample hunting opportunity. Black bear harvest has increased dramatically in the last 20 years; average annual harvest from 1990 - 1999 was 20 bears per year compared to 34 bears per year from 2000 - 2004 and 44 bears per year from 2005 - 2009. Total annual mortality, including hunter harvest, as well as defense of life and property and road kills, currently averages 62 bears a year (2005-2009). We estimate the Unit 14C black bear population to be 250 - 350 bears. Based on this population estimate, we are currently harvesting black bears at a rate of 15-25%. In addition, the percentage of females in the harvest has increased to 27-49% in the last 5 years. While marginally sustainable, additional harvest could potentially result in a decline of black bears in Unit 14C.

Brown bear harvest in Unit 14C has been historically low, with defense of life and property kills comprising the majority of brown bear mortality. Regardless, harvest and overall mortality rate

has increased since 2005. In 2008 and 2009, 10 and 11 brown bears, respectively, were killed in Unit 14C. Even if the population of brown bears was 100 individuals, this high rate of mortality has reached the limits of sustainable harvest. However we will continue to monitor the existing brown bear permit hunts and increase permits as necessary.

Opening additional areas within Unit 14C to bear hunting will most likely not result in a dramatic increase in overall harvest nor reduce human-bear conflicts in residential areas. Reduction of human-bear conflicts is best achieved through increased public awareness and removal of anthropomorphic food sources and other attractants.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 133**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Modify Dall sheep hunting in Unit 14C as follows: Eliminate ewe harvest and maintain a bag limit of 1 full-curl ram only, reduced the number of permits issued by 1/3, and eliminate non-resident tags for hunts where less than 10 permits are available, with the exception of the “Governor’s Tag”.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: In part, this proposal is an allocation issue between resident and non-resident sheep hunters, and therefore we have no recommendation. All Dall sheep hunts in Unit 14C are managed by drawing permit only, with separate hunts for residents and non-residents. It is under the discretionary authority of the Area Biologist to determine the number of permits and areas open to sheep hunting, as well as the type of sheep harvested (i.e. full-curl vs. any ram vs. ewe). Since 2002, we have annually reduced the number of permits available in response to population numbers, and starting in 2009 we eliminated ewe-only hunts and removed the ewe portion of the full-curl or ewe hunts. Currently, the only hunts in Unit 14C where a ewe or less than full-curl ram can be legally harvested are the archery-only hunts.

In 2009, the Board of Game allocated 13% of all rifle permits and 5% of archery only permits to non-resident hunters. This allocation was based on a 10 year average of non-resident drawing success.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 134**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Close Unit 14C to nonresident sheep hunting

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See Proposal 133

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 135**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Open a registration goat hunt for Unit 14C for a bag limit of one goat from November 1-30 with permits available in Anchorage only beginning October 28.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: This proposal would open a late season (November 1-30) registration goat hunt with a bag limit of one goat in the hunt areas for DG852, DG854, DG856 and DG858. While we do not have a recent estimate of mountain goats in Unit 14C, anecdotal evidence and observation of goats incidental to sheep surveys suggest that the population of goats is stable to increasing, with possible range expansions occurring into additional areas of Unit 14C. As a result, we have increased harvest quotas for existing registration goat hunts and increased the number of drawing permits available for DG852-858 to five permits per hunt, a 40% increase from 2009/2010.

The hunt areas for DG85-858 are relatively small with limited access and support small numbers of goats. Opening a registration goat hunt in these additional areas could easily result in overharvest of limited goat resources and overcrowding of hunters.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **PROPOSAL 136**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Replace the current non-resident drawing permit hunts for mountain goats in the Lake George area of Unit 14C with a non-resident, registration permit hunt, with a bag limit of one billy from September 1 to October 15. Establish a non-resident harvest quota of 8 billies.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Amend and Adopt**

RATIONALE: In 2007, the Board replaced the 4 goat registration hunts in the Twentymile River and Lake George drainages of Unit 14C with three drawing hunts (DG868, DG859 and DG869), two early-season, archery-only registration hunts, and a late-season, registration hunt to meet harvest objectives. The new regulation went into effect during the 2008-09 regulatory year.

Prior to the initiation of the new regulations, registration permit hunts in the Lake George and Twentymile drainages had become unmanageable. The popularity of these hunts increased dramatically in 2003 after goat hunts on the Kenai Peninsula became managed under a drawing permit hunt followed by a late-season registration hunt. Increased hunter participation resulted in emergency closures of the Lake George hunts during the 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007 seasons, sometimes as quickly as 2 weeks after the opening day. The Twentymile registration hunts were closed by emergency order in 2004, 2005, and 2007. Due to the high numbers of permits issued for each area, it became difficult to manage harvest quotas. When the hunts were closed by EO, there were numerous permit holders in the field, resulting in harvests which exceeded the desired quotas in 2003 through 2007. One of the most significant factors causing overharvests was increased participation of nonresident guided hunters with high success rates. From 2003 through 2007, 53-90% of successful hunters in the Lake George drainage were nonresidents. The Twentymile River drainage has experienced lower participation by nonresident guided hunters, due to guide restrictions on Forest Service lands and more difficult access.

Fall 2008 was the first time that the new drawing/registration hunt system was employed in the Lake George and Twentymile River drainages, and the harvest objective of 18 goat units was met in the Lake George drainage. This was the first time since 2003 that the harvest did not

exceed the desired quota. Unlike the previous registration hunts, the majority of successful hunters were residents. In the Twentymile River drainage, goats were only harvested during the drawing hunt. A total of 2 goats were harvested by resident hunters. While this was lower than the desired quota, it was not markedly different from registration hunt success in previous years.

In 2009, the Board of Game changed the harvest regime once again for both the Lake George and Twentymile areas. Currently, both areas are managed in tandem, with an early season archery-only hunt (August 16-31) followed by a resident only, registration hunt (September 1 – October 15) and a non-resident drawing permit hunt (September 1 – October 15). Then, if the desired quota is not met, we have the ability to open a late season registration hunt for both residents and non-residents. Although this management system has only been active for one season, harvest in the Lake George area was less than desired, with only 16 goat units taken. Under the drawing permit system, non-resident hunters did not harvest as many goat units as in previous years.

The Department recommends adopting the proposal to include the Twentymile goat hunt area and to base the harvest quota on a percentage of the harvestable surplus instead of a static number of animals. In order to maintain the desired level of harvest for goats in both the Lake George and Twentymile areas, we recommend that the Board replace the current non-resident drawing permit hunts in these areas with a registration goat hunt for non-residents only (September 1 – October 15). These specific hunts would have a harvest quota separate from the resident only hunt, and would be equivalent to 35% of the harvest quota for Lake George and 5% for Twentymile. The historic 10-year average harvest by non-resident hunters is 58% and 2% for Lake George and Twentymile, respectively. The permits would be issued for 7-day periods to avoid over-harvest.

There is no biological reason to restrict the non-resident hunts to billy-only and therefore we have no recommendation concerning this restriction. However, because mountain goats are the most difficult to sex in the field, we feel that this would perhaps set an unrealistic requirement that many hunters may inadvertently violate.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 137**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Increase the harvest object for moose in Unit 14C to 110 to 310 moose, with the objective of decreasing population number.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: The population of moose in Unit 14C is currently managed under the Intensive Management Law, with a population objective of 1500-1800 moose and a harvest objective of 90-270 moose. Currently, the moose population is estimated at 1800 individuals, with an annual harvest between 100 and 130 moose. In addition, an average of 150 moose are killed in vehicle collisions and subsequently salvaged for human consumption. Increasing the harvest of moose within Unit 14C could drive the population below the population objective.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 138**



EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Create a management area for Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER), and update other references to the military reservations. Realign moose hunting on Elmendorf Air Force Base and Fort Richardson Army Installation into the JBER Management Area and reauthorize the existing antlerless moose hunts.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Department proposal. See issue statement

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 139**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Create a bow only, drawing permit hunt for any bull moose in Edmonds Lake and Mirror Lake Parks (one hunt area) and maintain the ability to create and additional bow only, drawing permit hunt for the rest of the Remainder of Unit 14C

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Department proposal. See issue statement.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 140**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Open all of Unit 14C to wolf hunting with no closed season and a bag limit of two wolves per day.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Amend and Adopt**

RATIONALE: Currently, the Remainder of Unit 14C is open to wolf hunting from August 10 through April 30, with a bag limit of 5 wolves. In addition, wolf trapping is open in the same area from November 10 through February 28, with no bag limit. Historically, there have been four established packs of wolves in Unit 14C, primarily in the areas of Elmendorf Air Force Base, Fort Richardson and Ship Creek Drainage, and Twentymile River drainage, with an estimated population of 35 individuals. Annual wolf harvest has been historically low in Unit 14C, with no more than 4 wolves per year (11% of estimated population). Sustainable harvest of wolves is typically established at 35% of the population, which would be approximately 12 wolves. Therefore, additional harvest of wolves in Unit 14C is not a biological concern.

Negative wolf-human interactions in recent years within Unit 14C have involved habituated wolves from packs whose territories primarily include military lands, Ship Creek drainage, and areas of Birchwood and North Eagle River. Wolves can legally be killed in defense of life and property and larger public safety issues are dealt with by the Department. Currently, the Department and military personnel are working to cull habituated wolves to eliminate the public safety issue surrounding habituated wolves.

We recommend that the Board open upper Ship Creek Drainage within Chugach State Park for wolf hunting and maintain the current season and bag limit for the Remainder of Unit 14C. This

area supports at least one known wolf pack that is not currently susceptible to hunting and trapping pressure, and could sustain limited harvest. Moose and sheep hunters regularly see wolves in the fall hunting season in this area. Opening the season year round with a bag limit of 2 wolves per day in the entire Unit 14C could potentially create an unsustainable harvest situation. In addition, summer wolf hides have no market value and do not warrant harvest.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 141**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Re-authorize the antlerless moose season in the Anchorage Management Area in Unit 14(C).

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Department proposal. See issue statement

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 142**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Re-authorize the antlerless moose season in the Birchwood Management Area and the remainder of Unit 14(C).

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Department proposal. See issue statement.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 143**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Re-authorize the antlerless portion of the any-moose drawing permit in the upper Ship Creek drainage in Unit 14(C).

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Department proposal. See issue statement.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 144**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Re-authorize the antlerless moose season in the Twentymile/Portage/Placer hunt areas in Units 7 and 14(C).

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Department proposal. See issue statement.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 145 - 5 AAC 85.030 (6). Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.** Lengthen the archery and muzzleloader season for deer in Unit 8:

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Extend the deer hunting season on the Kodiak road system by 46 days for muzzleloader and bow-hunters less than 19 years old OR restrict the either sex primitive weapons hunt on the Kodiak road system to hunters less than 19 years old and extend the season 46 days.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: The deer hunting season on the northeastern part of Kodiak Island (Kodiak road system) has a more restrictive bag limit and shorter season than the remainder of Unit 8 because of high human population and easy access in that area. The bag limit is 1 buck from August 1 – October 31, with an either sex season for qualified primitive weapons hunters from November 1 – 14. The average harvest over the past 5 years was 488.4 deer, 95.8 of which were taken during the primitive weapons hunt (19.6%). During this same time period, 4.4% of the certified bow/muzzleloader graduates in Kodiak were 18 years old or under when they took the course.

If it is the intent of this proposal to restrict the primitive weapons hunt to hunters under the age of 19 years, this will reduce the harvest and eliminate opportunities for adult primitive weapons hunters to harvest a doe and to hunt without competing with rifle hunters. If the intent is to have a special youth-only primitive weapons hunt after the existing season (15 November – 31 December), the harvest will be additive, but is not anticipated to be significant. In either case, the impacts of the proposal are more allocative and enforcement related than they are biological. The board has made a positive C&T finding for deer in Unit 8. The board should address whether proposed regulations still provide a reasonable opportunity for subsistence.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 146**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Clarification of the definition of “take” of elk harvested in Unit 8.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Each year an undetermined number of elk are shot and wounded. Some of these elk are mortally wounded and not recovered, but they are not reported in the harvest and hunters may, in effect, be able to kill more than one bag limit per season. Adoption of this regulation would reduce these instances and strongly encourage hunters to carefully select their shots and make every effort possible to recover wounded elk. Enforcement of this regulation would be difficult and rely mostly upon the honesty of the hunter. Implementation of the regulation would encourage a widely accepted ethical practice and be consistent with the regulation passed for brown bears in 2007.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 147**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Increase elk harvest and potential disturbance during the rut by initiating an archery-only elk hunting season from September 1 – 30 on all of Afognak and Raspberry Islands.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: Elk numbers on Afognak Island have decreased from 960 in 2005 to 610 in 2010 due to higher than anticipated overwinter mortality and reduced productivity. We have reduced harvest rates to no more than 10% during the past 2 seasons fall by reducing the number of drawing permits in all areas and closing registration hunts by emergency order as soon as herd harvest targets are met. We do not favor adoption of this proposal because it would increase the hunting season by 25 days during the rut and potentially increase harvest and disrupt rutting activities at a time when we are working toward increasing herd sizes.

Establishment of an archery-only season is an allocation issue and we have no recommendation on that aspect of the proposal.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 148**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Expand the number of hunters eligible to participate in the registration goat hunt along the Kodiak road system by including certified muzzleloader hunters. Total goat harvest would not be impacted, but seasons may be shortened by emergency closures if harvest targets are met earlier.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: Mountain goat registration hunts on the Kodiak road system provide an opportunity to harvest surplus goats that were not taken during drawing hunts. To minimize chances for overharvest, permits are only issued in Kodiak two weeks prior to the season to certified bow hunters. Harvest targets during the 5 years these hunt have been in place have ranged from 20 to 30 (mean = 24.8). Emergency orders closing one of the registration hunts was issued in 2006. Allowing certified muzzleloader hunters in addition to bow hunters would probably double the number of hunters afield (Kodiak certified bow hunters = 218; muzzleloaders = 225; both = 57), but we do not anticipate it would jeopardize our ability to manage the hunt. Authorization of muzzleloaders may, however, complicate enforcement. Consequently, the impacts of the proposal are more allocative and enforcement related than they are biological.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 149**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Change the season date for trapping beaver in Unit 7 and 15.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Amend and Adopt**

RATIONALE: In 2009, the Board liberalized the beaver season from Nov. 10–Mar. 31 to Nov. 10–April 30 in order to provide open water trapping opportunities for beaver and to align the season in Units 7 and 15 with Unit 6. With 11% of the harvest in 2009 being in April, trappers did take advantage of the new open-water opportunity. In 1982, the bag limit for beaver was restricted from 20 in Unit 7 and 40 in Unit 15 to 20 beaver in Units 7 and 15. While the Department does not conduct formal surveys of beaver abundance, the abundance of beavers in

some parts of the Kenai such as in Unit 15C is not very high. Elsewhere on the Kenai, such as in Unit 15A, there are certainly additional opportunities for sustainable harvests. Given the bag limit restriction, the Department believes that an Oct. 10–April 30 season is sustainable in Units 7, 15A, and 15B. The Department does not recommend adopting this season change in Unit 15C where beaver abundance is lower and access is greater than the other areas on the Kenai. The Department would recommend, as in other units that open before Nov. 10, that from Oct. 10–Nov. 9, beaver could only be taken with submerged traps or snares.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 150**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Increase the bag limit for black bears in Units 7 and 15

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See recommendation and rationale for proposal 151.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 151**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Increase the bag limit for black bears in Units 7 and 15

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Amend and Adopt**

RATIONALE: The bag limit for black bears in Units 7 and 15 was 3 bears/year from statehood until 1994 when it was restricted to one bear in the spring (Jan. 1– June 31) and one bear in the fall (July 1– Dec. 31) due to concerns by the Department of a growing harvest. Since the restriction was made in 1994, the harvest has continued to grow, especially the non-resident portion of the harvest. Much of this non-resident harvest occurs through the use of non-guided transporters based out of Homer and Seward (Units 7 and 15C) and focus hunters exclusively along the coastal areas. It is believed that an increase in the non-resident bag limit to >1 bear/year could greatly increase the harvest in these relatively localized coastal areas and could negatively impact the bear population along the coast. A non-resident hunter who is already spending a lot of money on plane travel/hotel/transporter expenses would, if available, likely buy a second or third black bear tag (\$225/black bear).

When a similar proposal was considered at the March 2009 Board meeting, the Department recommended and the Board adopted a resident bag limit of 2 bears/year and a nonresident bag limit of 1 bear/year. In 2009, the first year of the bag limit of 2/year for residents, 28 hunters took 2 bears. In 1984, when the bag limit was 3 bears/year, an average of 2 hunters took 3 bears/year and an average of 15 hunters took 2 bears/year. We believe that the number of residents that would actually take 3 bears/year will be small and would not have any appreciable impacts on the overall harvest or in reducing moose predation. However, we believe that allowing this extra opportunity is justified and sustainable. Conversely, because the nonresident harvest continues to grow in Units 7 and 15C along the coast, we recommend the Board consider limiting the nonresident bag limit to 1 bear/season in Unit 15C south of Kachemak Bay and Unit 7 south of the city limits of Seward.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 152**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Increase the number of hunting permits for brown bear in Unit 15.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: The proposal does not call for any regulatory action. The Department has the authority to change the permit allocation for the drawing hunts for brown bears in Unit 7 and 15. At the March 2009 meeting, the Board lengthened the fall season which allowed a starting date of Sept. 15 and at the March 2007 meeting passed a proposal to allow the Department to issue up to 50 permits in Units 7 and up to 50 permits in Unit 15. Since the drawing hunt started in 2007, the number of permits the Department has issued has increased from 18 permits in 2007/08 to 39 permits available for the 2011/12 season. The hunter harvest was 1 bear in 2008, 7 bears in 2009, and 6 bears in 2010. Non-hunting mortality (which includes DLPs) has averaged 28 bears/year over the past 3 years. The Department’s management guidelines in Units 7 and 15 is to maximize hunting opportunities while keeping a relatively low level of adult female mortality from the combined efforts of hunting and non-hunting human causes. Given our management guidelines, the Department will continue to maximize the number of permits issued and we do not anticipate needing additional permit allocation at this time.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 153**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Modify the harvest objective for brown bear under intensive management in Unit 15C.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: The Department determines the management guidelines used to control the hunting pressure for brown bears in Units 7 and 15 based on various factors depending on trends in mortality and other research findings. There is no codified language to dictate these management guidelines, they are determined by the Department management staff. Currently, the harvest objectives for brown bears in Units 7 and 15 is to maximize hunting opportunities while keeping a relatively low level of adult female mortality from the combined efforts of hunting and non-hunting human causes. The number of drawing permits issued to hunters has increased every year. The Department does not recommend changing our management guidelines at this time.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 154**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Establish a registration brown bear hunt in Unit 15:

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: A drawing hunt for brown bears was established in Units 7 and 15 in 2007. The management of these hunts is new and we are continually evolving to maximize the hunting

opportunity while staying within our management guidelines and dealing with a continued high level of non-hunting, human related mortality of brown bears. Non-hunting human mortality (which includes DLPs) has averaged 28 bears/year over the past 3 years. Registration hunts for brown bears that were in place in Units 7 and 15 from 1997–2006 were very difficult to manage given the relatively low levels of acceptable mortality and frequently did not allow for any hunting opportunity. Furthermore, under the registration system, seasons were relatively short, unpredictable, and harvests generally occurred in a few accessible areas. Since the drawing hunt started in 2007, the number of permits the Department has issued has increased from 18 permits in 2007/08 season to 39 permits available for the 2011/12 season. The hunter harvest was 1 bear in 2008, 7 bears in 2009, and 6 bears in 2010. The Department will continue to increase the drawing permit allocation within our management guidelines considering yearly tallies of hunting and non-hunting, human related mortalities. We do not recommend changing the current drawing permit system at this time.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 155**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Change the season and bag limit for coyote in Units 7 and 15.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: There are no biological concerns regarding this proposal. Currently, other regions and Game Management Units across the state have various seasons and bag limits. At the Region III Board of Game meeting in Fairbanks last March, hunting regulations were passed that allow for no bag limit and an August 10 to May 25 season on coyotes in most of Region III. There is support from the Department to simplify and align coyote seasons and bag limits across the state where appropriate.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 156**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Change the registration permit distribution for goats in a portion of Unit 15C (RG365).

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: This proposal addresses an allocation issue. In 2007, the Board changed the Amount Necessary for Subsistence (ANS) in 2 adjacent goat hunting areas (RG364 and RG365) based information presented by the Division of Subsistence. The current ANS is 7–10 goats for both areas combined. The sustainable harvest levels for goats are managed by counting a harvested female as 2 goat units and males as 1 unit. The current harvestable surplus based on the most recent surveys is 4 goat units in Seldovia (RG364) and 16 goat units in English Bay (RG365). Since 2007, the average yearly harvest in both areas has been 12 goat units (3 in 364 and 9 in RG365). The proposal addresses only the English Bay (RG365) portion of the subsistence area, not Seldovia (RG364). Over the past 3 seasons, after both the early (Aug. 10–Oct. 15) and late (Nov. 1–30) seasons, there has been an additional harvest available in the English Bay (RG365) area of about 7 goat units/year.

Guided hunts for goats typically result in a higher proportion of males taken than in non-guided hunts. While ensuring the subsistence preference an additional limited number of registration permits could be issued in the English Bay area (e.g., up to 10 permits) to nonresidents with a season the same as the early registration season (Aug. 10–Oct. 15) without an impact on the sustainable harvest that meets subsistence needs. The number of non-resident registration permits to be issued could be determined yearly by the Department under discretionary permit authority.  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 157**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Change the moose antler restriction for Unit 15.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See recommendations in Proposal 169.  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 158**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Extends the moose season in Unit 15.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Amend and Adopt**

RATIONALE: The moose season in Unit 15 has been Aug. 20–Sept. 20 since 1993. While weather patterns appear to be changing causing warmer temperatures during moose season, the Sept. 20 end date is in place to prevent disrupting the rut. Although more optimal temperatures for moose hunting and meat preservation may be shifting later in the year, the rutting period is not changing. However the Department does recognize the conservation concerns in many parts of the Kenai (see recommendation and rationale for proposal 169) and recommends a shortening of the season to Sept. 1–20 in Units 7 and 15. In Units 15A and 15B where there is currently an early archery-only season (Aug. 10–17), the Department proposes moving these dates to Aug. 24-31.  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 159**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Change the moose antler restriction for Unit 15

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See recommendations in Proposal 169.  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 160**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Change the moose antler restriction for Unit 15

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**



RATIONALE: See recommendations for proposal 169.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 161**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Require that all moose taken in Unit 15 have their antlers sealed by the Department.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: A similar proposal was addressed and rejected at the 2009 Board meeting. Requiring moose antlers to be sealed by the Department would allow for assessment of the legality of each moose taken assuming hunters who take illegal moose would still bring in the antlers for sealing. If adopted, we would recommend to include Unit 7, and that antlers must be sealed at the Department offices in Soldotna or Homer during normal working hours, or at any of the Kenai Peninsula Alaska Wildlife Trooper (AWT) offices on the weekends by appointment only (hunters would need to call the AWT office before bringing the antlers in to be sure someone is available). The Department would have to generate a way to permanently seal antlers, maybe similar to sheep horn sealing. Arranging to bring antlers in for sealing would be burdensome on the hunters, especially considering there may be times when staff is not immediately available.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 162**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Establish check stations for moose hunters in areas of Unit 15.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: Check stations can be used in accordance with permit conditions and be effective in areas such as on the Koyukuk where there is one access point. However, the numerous roads and trails used to access over 3000 square miles of moose hunting country in Unit 15 would make check stations unmanageable and ineffective. For other alternatives, see recommendations and rational for proposals 161 and 169.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 163**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Modify population and harvest objectives for moose in 15A.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Staff proposal-see issue statement.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 164**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Modify bag limit for moose in Unit 15A.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: Staff proposal-see issue statement. See Department recommendation and rationale for proposal 169 which calls for antler restrictions in Units 7 and 15.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 165**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Reauthorize antlerless moose season in portion of 15A, the Skilak Loop Management Area.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Staff proposal. Due to the decline in moose in Unit 15A during the past 2 decades, the Department does not foresee issuing antlerless permits for this hunt in the near future.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 166**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Change the antler restrictions in Unit 15

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See recommendations for proposal 169.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 167**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Changes the season dates for the Tier II moose hunt (TM549) in Unit 15C.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: This is a very limited and isolated subsistence hunt for 4 permit holders, all of whom in recent years have been residents of the communities of Port Graham and Nanwalek. There is no general season hunt within the boundaries of this Tier II hunt because moose densities are extremely low in the area. In 2005 and 2010, the Board authorized a season extension for this hunt when hunters were unsuccessful during the regular season. The season for this hunt had been Sept. 1–30 since it was established in the late 1980s to 2004. At the 2005 Board meeting, proposal public proposal was submitted to change the season from Sept. 1–30 to Aug. 15–Sept. 15 because “hunters prefer not to hunt during rut or mating season. Rainy seasons floods lakes and difficult to get around.” The author of the proposal later clarified to the Department that his intent was to have a split season of Aug. 15–30, and Oct. 1–15. The Department did not support a hunt during the rut and the Board concurred and amended the proposal and changed the season from Sept. 1–30 to Aug. 20–Sept. 20. Shifting the season dates for a hunt with only 4 permit holders in an isolated area will not have much of an impact on the moose population, but will provide subsistence hunting opportunities in years when weather and the distribution of moose prevent harvests earlier in the season. A potential amendment could establish a post-rut season that would provide opportunity if harvests were not achieved earlier.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 168**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Reauthorizes antlerless moose season in a portion of Unit 15C.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Staff proposal-see issue statement.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 169**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Change the antler restrictions, close nonresident hunting, and increase predator permits, and enhance habitat through prescribed burns and other means in Units 7 and 15.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Amend and Adopt**

RATIONALE: There are several parts to this proposal. Closing hunting to nonresidents is an allocation issue to which the Department has no recommendation. Over the past 10 years, average yearly number of nonresident hunters for the general season was 14 hunters in Unit 7 (4% of all hunters); 25 hunters in Unit 15A (2% of all hunters); 5 hunters in Unit 15B (2% of all hunters); 27 hunters in Unit 15C (2% of all hunters).

Regarding the “enhancement of habitat, prescribed burns, clear cutting, etc.,” the Department recognizes the need and benefit of habitat improvements. However, we do not have the authority to orchestrate controlled burns or the project funding to engage in meaningful habitat improvements at this time.

Regarding an increase in predator permits for bears and wolves in Units 7 and 15, the Department has the authority to adjust the number of drawing permits issued for brown bears based on our management guidelines. The management of these hunts is new and we are continually evolving to maximize the hunting opportunity while staying within our management guidelines and dealing with a continued high level of defense-of-life-or-property and other non-hunting related mortality of brown bears. Regarding wolves, there is a liberal trapping season for wolves on in Units 7 and 15 (Nov. 10–Mar. 31, no bag limit). The Department is recommending a liberalization of the bag limit for black bears (see Department recommendation for proposal 151).

Regarding the change of antler restrictions for moose, the Department submitted proposal 164 which calls for removing the fork portion of the bag limit in Unit 15A due to population declines and a low bull:cow ratio in the western part of the subunit. Additionally, wide-ranging composition counts collected during fall 2010 have shown significantly low bull:cow ratios in Unit 15C. Of the 725 moose tallied during composition counts in Unit 15C during fall 2010, there were 9 bulls:100 cows. The low bull numbers may be associated with a chronic high harvest of yearling bulls (on average >60% of the harvest in Units 7 and 15 each year). Low bull:cow ratios can reduce the productivity of the moose populations by failing to have an

adequate number of mature bulls to mate with available cows. In order to ensure bull:cow ratios increase in the near-term, the Department recommends removing the spike-fork portion of the bag limit in Units 7 and 15. While Units 7 and 15B-west may not be suffering from as low bull:cow ratios as Units 15A and 15C, those areas are seeing a decline in moose numbers. It is recommended that any bag limit restriction be the same across the Kenai Peninsula.

There is the need to increase bull:cow ratios immediately in Unit 15C and the western 2/3rds of Unit 15A. Other possible regulatory actions to achieve this goal include not only eliminating the spike-fork portion of the bag limit, but also to restrict the bag limit to bulls with 50 inch antlers or 4 brow tines. Reducing only the season dates will not likely reduce the harvest but would maintain current hunting pressure and simply force hunting effort into a narrower time frame. However, as part of sweeping regulatory recommendations, the Department also recommends a reduced season (see Department recommendation and rationale for proposal 158).

To offset the reduction in harvest that the removal of the spike-fork portion of the bag limit would cause, 'any-bull' permits, years of alternating bag limits, and other possibilities can be discussed and proposed with the public, Advisory Committees, and the Board at the 2013 Board meeting.

If the Board does adopt changes to the bag limit for moose in Units 7 and 15, it should be recognized that the Federal Subsistence hunts would have to follow suit for any changes to be effective. The Department will actively petition the FSB to reduce their bag limits to match changes made to State regulations.

In summary, the Department recommends the removal of the spike-fork portion of the bag limit for moose in Units 7 and 15, reducing the general season dates to Sept. 1–20, (and as addressed in prop 158, archery season dates shifted to Aug. 24-31 in Units 15A and 15B), and we will commit to working with other agencies to create a long-term strategy that outlines active habitat enhancement projects.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 170**

**EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL:** Incorporate controlled burns and crushing program into a management plan for Units 7 and 15

**DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION:** **Take No Action**

**RATIONALE:** The proposal does not call for any regulatory action. The Department supports the need for habitat improvement and the benefit that burns have on the creation and improvement of habitat for moose and other wildlife. However, controlled burns are managed and conducted by individual land managers (such as the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge and the U.S. Forest Service) along with the Division of State Forestry. The Department has had an active voice in encouraging land managers to both increase controlled burns and to not suppress wildfires started in areas designated under limited suppression management.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 171**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Change the bag limit for wolves in Units 7 and 15.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: The Department does not believe that a 5 wolf bag limit for hunting on the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge (KNWR) will have a negative biological impact on the wolf population. However, without support from KNWR managers, the Refuge may supersede state regulations and create refuge specific seasons and bag limits. If the State adopts a 5 wolf bag limit for hunting on the KNWR while the Refuge retains the 2 wolf bag limit, the net effect is no additional opportunity, but increases the potential for hunters to be cited for a violation if they are not aware of a Refuge specific regulation.

The current hunting bag limit of 2 wolves on the KNWR was established in 1992 after consultation with the Department and support by the Board. It should be clear that there is no trapping bag limit for wolves on or off the KNWR. Since 1992, there has been one hunter (with a hunting license only) that has shot more than 2 wolves outside of the KNWR in Unit 7 and Unit 15, and only 4 times did a hunter shoot 2 wolves in a season in the KNWR. Most people interested in pursuing wolves have a trapping or combined hunting-trapping license that allows for a ‘no limit’ bag during the trapping season (Nov. 10–Mar. 30 compared to Aug.10–Apr.30 for hunting).

Given the difficulty of harvesting wolves through hunting practices alone, the Department would not anticipate a negative impact to the wolf population on the Kenai Peninsula, even with bag limit liberalizations exceeding those identified in this proposal. Since most hunters only reference the Alaska Hunting Regulation booklet, the Department believes that the hunting public is better served when State regulations are identical to Federal regulations on KNWR lands.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 172**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Allow aerial taking of wolves in Unit 15 under intensive management

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: The only populations on the Kenai Peninsula that have been identified for intensive management are Units 15A and 15C for moose. Unit 15B is not identified as an intensive management population. The population objective for Unit 15A is 3000–3500 moose with a harvest objective of 180–350. The last census conducted in Unit 15A in 2008 estimated 1670 moose (95% Confidence Interval: 1405–1934), well below the objective even with an inflation from an appropriate sightability correction factor (SCF). The harvest in Unit 15A has been within the objective only once in the past 10 years (2010 data are still preliminary). Almost all of the land in Unit 15A is within the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge or privately owned. Unit

15A has less than 20 square miles of state land. (See Department proposal 174 which outlines a proposed intensive management plan based on habitat improvements for Unit 15A).

The population objective for Unit 15C is 2500–3500 moose with a harvest objective of 200–350. The last survey conducted in March 2010 produced a moose population estimate of 2195 (95% Confidence Interval: 1918–2473), without a SCF. With a very conservative SCF of 1.25, the moose population estimate would have been within objectives at 2743 moose. The harvest in Unit 15C has been within the objectives every year since the objectives were set in 2000. Because Unit 15C is currently within Intensive Management objectives for both population size and harvest, we do not recommend creation or implementation of an Intensive Management Plan for moose in Unit 15C at this time. However, if proposed changes to the bag limit are adopted in Unit 15C (proposals 157, 159, 160, 166, and 169), we anticipate harvests would decrease to a level well below Intensive Management objectives. If this occurs, the Department and the Board would need to discuss whether an Intensive Management Plan should be created.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **PROPOSAL 173**

**EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL:** As part of an Intensive Management plan in Unit 15A, close nonresident hunting (with a sunset clause), restrict the bag limit for moose, institute predator management, allow for permits to be issued for DM522, DM 531, DM533, DM535, DM 537, and DM539; and calls for a new ‘any-bull’ drawing permit hunt.

**DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION:** **Do Not Adopt**

**RATIONALE:** There are several parts to this proposal. Closing moose hunting to nonresidents in Unit 15A is an allocation issue to which the Department has no recommendation. Over the past 10 years, nonresident participation averaged 25 hunters in Unit 15A (2% of all hunters). Regarding the Intensive Management plan for Unit 15A, see the Department proposal 174. Regarding the change in bag limit, see the Department recommendations and rationale for proposal 169.

Regarding the call for issuing permits for DM522, the Department has the authority to issue up to 25 permits for this hunt. DM522 was established in 1999 with a post-rut season that is currently Oct. 10–Nov 10 in a portion of Units 15A and 7. No permits have been issued in the past 3 seasons. While bull:cow ratios are still mostly within objectives around the hunt area, the Department has chosen not to issue any permits due to the long-term decline in moose in Unit 15A where about half of the DM522 harvest and most (78%) of the hunting effort occurs. The moose population in 15A has declined approximately 50% since 1990. The post-rut period is when bulls are in their worst condition of the year. When the moose population rebounds in Unit 15A, the Department intends to issue permits for DM522.

Regarding the call for issuing permits for DM 531, DM533, DM535, DM 537, and DM539, the Department has the authority to issue permits for these hunts. Drawing hunts in Unit 15B-east were established in the 1970s as a trophy area. The area has no general season hunt and there was a history of big bulls being taken out of the area. The area is divided into 5 separate hunt areas and the season spans 2 different time frames. Since 1983, the early season has been Sept.

1–20 and the late season has been Sept. 26–Oct. 15 (the peak of the rut). From 1986 to 2007, 50 permits were issued in both the early and late season. In 2008, the Department decreased the number of permits during the late season from 50 to 10. In 2009 and 2010, the Department did not issue any late season permits. The reason the Department has not issued permits in the late season is because a decline in the population as judged through steep declines in the harvest, success rate, and population counts in the past few years compared to previous decades. The area now rarely produces big ‘trophy class’ bulls, falls short of previous advertising as a trophy area, and is going through a similar decline in habitat quality as we now see in Unit 15A. When the population rebounds, the Department intends to issue permits for the late season.

Regarding the establishment of a drawing permit hunt for ‘any-bull’ in Units 7 and 15, see Department recommendation and rationale for proposal 169. With the decline in bull:cow ratios in many parts of the Kenai Peninsula and numerous proposals recommending restrictions to the bag limit, the Department would not recommend establishing an ‘any-bull’ permit hunt at this time.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 174**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Adopt Intensive Management Plan for moose in Unit 15A.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Staff proposal-see issue statement. The Department is currently preparing a feasibility assessment to help guide the Board through the decision process for Intensive management areas.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 175**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Allow the use of artificial light to hunt predators in Units 7 and 15.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: It is currently legal for trappers to use an artificial light for taking furbearers in Units 7 and 15 during Nov. 10–Mar 31, which fully encompasses the trapping season dates for wolves, coyotes, wolverine, and lynx in Units 7 and 15. In Units 7 and 15, the hunting season for coyotes is Aug. 10–May 25 and the hunting season for wolves is Aug. 10–April 30. Allowing hunters to use artificial light to take wolves or coyotes in Units 7 and 15 may provide some additional opportunity outside the trapping seasons and does not pose any conservation concerns. However, allowing artificial light to hunt black bears potential raises safety concerns if bears are wounded around residential areas and are difficult to track in the dark.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 176**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Allow the use of artificial light to hunt predators in Unit 15.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See recommendation for Proposal 175.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 177**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Close a portion of Unit 7 to trapping.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: This proposal addresses an allocation issue. There are no conservation concerns for furbearers in the Portage Valley-Portage Creek area.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 178**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Allow the use of motorized vehicles in Unit 15C (Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area) to retrieve meat

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See recommendations in Proposal 180.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 179**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Eliminates the Resurrection Creek Closed Area.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: This proposal addresses an allocation issue. There was and is no biological reason for the restriction and eliminating the restriction would provide additional hunting opportunity. The RCCA closes moose hunting in an area roughly 48 square miles around Hope. It was established in 1980 from a proposal submitted from a Hope resident due to local concerns about the “combined effects of wolf predation and hunting on moose.” There have been many proposals submitted to eliminate the restriction since it was established including previous proposals sponsored by the Department. There are no biological concerns for moose in and around the RCCA to warrant the closure.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 180**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Eliminate the Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: This proposal addresses an allocation issue. The Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area was established in 1985 to reduce hunting pressure in order to improve low bull:cow ratios. Initially, the establishment of the SF-50 regulation in 1987 removed the biological need for the



restriction. However, it should be noted that bull:cow ratios are again very low in Unit 15C (see Department recommendation and rationale for proposal 169). Initially, the vehicle restriction was from Sept. 11–20. In 1994, the Board created a window to allow vehicle use for moose hunting from Sept. 15–16 to address the issue of meat spoilage. The current vehicle restriction is from Sept. 11–14 and 17–20. Eliminating the LKCUA has been discussed at several past Board meetings. Many residents and local Advisory Committees have supported the restriction because it decreases conflicts between ATV and non-ATV users.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 181**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Eliminate the Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See recommendations in Proposal 180.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 182**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Eliminate the Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See recommendations in Proposal 180.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 183**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Allow handicapped and disabled hunters to use vehicles during Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area restrictions.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: This proposal addresses an allocation issue. See Department rationale for proposal 178. If adopted, there would need to be clarification of what constitutes a disability or handicap.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 184**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would create and replace the deer harvest surveys with a deer harvest report in Units 6 and 8.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: This is a Department proposal. See the issue statement. In addition, a similar proposal was adopted by the Board of Game at the last meeting in Southeast Alaska.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 185**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would establish a regional bag limit of five bears annually.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: Annual bag limits are set for areas relative to the bear populations and the public's interest in hunting. Where the Department (and the Board) have recognized conservation issues bag limits have been reduced. Conversely, the Board has liberalized regulations where populations can sustain additional harvest and where the Department would like to see the harvest come from. A regional bag limit would complicate management and may actually direct effort away from areas where harvest is desired.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 186**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Allow same day airborne hunting of black bear at bait stations in Region II.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: Same Day Airborne (SDA) take of black bear at bait stations is allowed where predator control programs have been adopted. This method was adopted in part to encourage more hunter participation and increase the take where objectives allowed. Within Region II hunting black bear with the use of bait is allowed in Prince William Sound and on the Kenai Peninsula. Airplane accessible areas in Prince William Sound would be primarily by float plane and may conflict with boat-based activities. On the Kenai there are few airplane accessible areas that are also open to bear baiting. Allowing the SDA take of black bear through general harvest regulations (in addition to predator control areas) may draw focus away from the Department's and Board of Game's intensive management programs.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 187**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Establish a trapping bag limit for black bear trapping in Region II of 10 bears. In addition the proposal suggests specific methods and means and a period of 72 hours for checking traps.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: At the Board meeting in October 2010 the Board considered proposals to establish black bear trapping seasons and bag limits. The Board deferred consideration to the 2012 meeting to gather more information

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 188**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would increase the bag limit for coyotes to no limit from 10 per day.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See recommendations in Proposal 155.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 189**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Change coyote hunting to no closed season and no bag limit.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See recommendation in Proposal 155.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 190**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal addresses sheep hunting regulations in Region II. The proponent asks for the following changes:

- Eliminate all Ewe hunting
- Full-curl hunting only
- Reduce all permits by 1/3
- Resident only for all hunts with less than 10 permits.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: See Proposal 133 also. In Region II this proposal affects GMUs 7, 15 (Kenai Peninsula) and 14C Anchorage area. On the Kenai Peninsula the bag limit in codified is one ram with full-curl horn or larger or one ewe by permit only for specific areas and one ram with full-curl horn or larger for the remainder of the area. The taking of ewes is allowed only when the Department estimates that a surplus exists. Currently no ewe hunting is allowed.

In the Anchorage area there is a more complex sheep management strategy. All sheep hunting is by drawing permit only. Most of the unit is restricted to full-curl only hunting however 2 units maintain the opportunity for archery hunters to take a ewe. In the past 10 years the harvest has been insignificant averaging less than one ewe per year.

Similarly the archery hunts are the only hunts where any sheep may be taken.

In 2009 the Board adjusted the nonresident allocation to reflect the historical use of the area. Currently in 14C, 13% of the permits for rifle hunts go to Non Residents and 5% of the archery permits go to non residents. Under this proposal all nonresident hunts would be eliminated except the archery hunts in unit 14C and nonresident hunting opportunity in the permit areas on the Kenai would be eliminated. Non residents would be allowed to hunt under general harvest ticket still on the Kenai.

The number of permits allowed for any given hunt area depends on many factors but are generally set in an attempt to achieve a certain harvest. The Department recognizes that some hunters will be unsuccessful and other's plans will change and they will not even hunt. Reduction of the numbers of permits by an arbitrary percentage (1/3) is unwarranted and will unnecessarily limit hunting opportunity.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 191**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Review and potentially repeal discretionary hunt conditions and procedures applied to permit hunts in the South-central Region, Units 6, 7, 8, 14C and 15.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: The Board of Game has requested a review of the discretionary conditions the Department applies to permit hunts. Use of these permit conditions allows the Department to manage hunts to provide for maximum opportunity, and still provide protection of the resource.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 192 (Regions II and IV)**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Restrict trapping near trails and roads in all Region II and Region IV Units.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt.**

RATIONALE: Similar proposals have been submitted at most Region II meetings for the past 10+ years. The board has carefully considered them and chosen to adjust trapping restrictions in specific instances.

A blanket restriction is not necessary at this time. Additionally, enforcement of "buffers" have always been difficult.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 193 (Regions II and IV)**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would reduce the daily bag limit for goldeneye ducks (Barrow's and Common goldeneyes) from 7, 8 or 10 per day to 2 per day, and reduce the possession limit from 21, 24, or 30 to 6 in Region II (Units 6, 7, 8, 14C, and 15), and Region IV (Units 9, 10, 14A, 14B, and 16). This proposal also lists several suggestions that include: 1) moving goldeneyes from the general duck bag limit to the sea duck bag limit (assume requesting same bag/possession reduction); 2) form a Board of Birds (BOB) to advise the BOG on waterfowl regulations;); 3) establish separate waterfowl regulations for hunters using waterfowl guide services (bag limits are not specified); and 4) At minimum for this proposal consider addressing regulatory changes for only the Gulf Coast Zone (Units 6, 7, 9, 10 (Unimak Is. only), 14, and 16) or Kachemak Bay (Unit 14C in part).

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

Maintain current bag and possession limits for all Unit's. In addition we recommend the following: 1) Keep goldeneyes in the general duck limit and 2) Do not enact separate regulations for hunters using the services of waterfowl guides.

RATIONALE: Sport harvest statewide for goldeneyes is relatively low averaging 1-5 thousand birds per year. A long-term change in goldeneye abundance statewide has not been detected. Additionally, evidence for specific areas within the Gulf Coast (e. g. Kachemak Bay, Prince William Sound, and Kodiak) suggests no significant change in goldeneye abundance. Harvest restrictions will not provide conservation benefits to the goldeneye population. While taxonomically classified as sea ducks, under the Federal Waterfowl Regulatory Framework goldeneyes are not considered sea ducks due to behavioral differences and are included in the general duck bag and possession limits.

Ornithologists are welcome to provide input to the BOG and we would encourage them to participate in the BOG process. Few commercial guides in AK specialize in waterfowl hunting. Consequently, we do not believe that their harvest contributes substantially to the overall waterfowl harvest in the state, or has it resulted in local depletion.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 194 (Regions II and IV)**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would create separate waterfowl regulations for waterfowl guides and their clients in Region II (Units 6, 7, 8, 14C, and 15), and Region IV (Units 9, 10, 11, 13, 14A, 14B, 16 and 17) when there is a conflict with users of the resource, declining species abundance, or localized depletions.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: This has been discussed in Proposal 193.

The number of hunting guides in AK specializing in waterfowl hunting is small. Consequently, we do not believe that their harvest contributes substantially to the overall waterfowl harvest in the state, or has it resulted in local depletion. A large proportion of clients utilizing waterfowl guides are non-resident, therefore they already have more restrictive regulations than resident sport hunters. The Department frames management efforts primarily at the population level, with consideration of status and trends of resources within regions. The Department has no practical way to monitor ducks or rational for controlling harvest at the spatial scale suggested by the proposal.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 195 (Region II)**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Modify the salvage requirements for black bear for Regions II and IV

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: This proposal as written would allow for hunters taking black bears for meat to not have to also salvage the hide from June 30 until December 31. The current regulation referred to in the proposal (from Region III) is actually from June 1 until December 31.

In Region II, the Department desires to continue requiring sealing of black bears in order to collect information from bears currently unavailable through general harvest and registration hunt reporting. As Department black bear harvest report forms are improved and utilized more effectively as a data collection tool in the future, staff in Region II will support moving towards eliminating the sealing requirement in those units where general harvest reporting provides the information needed to address management issues.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 196 (Region II)**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Eliminate black bear sealing where harvest tickets are required.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: The requirement for black bear hunters to obtain a harvest ticket was authorized in an effort to gather additional information from unsuccessful hunters. It was not intended to replace bear sealing. Bear sealing is a long standing practice to gather additional biological information from bears harvested in specific areas. Recently the board eliminated the need for sealing in some interior GMUs where bear harvest was presumed to be inconsequential. However in most south central units black bear harvest is high and the need to maintain quality harvest data is necessary. Because of this, the region feels it is important to continue the current use of harvest tickets and sealing of black bears.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 197 (Region II)**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would allow Same Day Airborne hunting for black bear at bait stations in Region II.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: Take no action based on actions taken on Proposal 186.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 198 (Region II)**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Change the bag limit for coyotes in Regions II and IV to “unlimited”

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See recommendations in Proposal 155.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 199 (Regions II and IV)**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Requests that the Board consider several regulation changes to encourage hunters to better salvage meat from big game.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: The author of this proposal suggests many ways to improve the salvage of meat from animals taken by hunters. In some cases these suggestions are for changes to the Department’s Hunter Education program while others are for strengthening salvage regulations.

The Department has invested considerable time and funding to develop hunter education programs that teach responsible hunting methods. Meat salvage is an important component of this program already. Excellent examples from these programs are the meat care video produced in 1999 and the hunt Alaska booklet which is provided to many nonresident hunters when they request information about hunting in this state and all basic Hunter education students. In addition the regulation booklet now has two full pages on meat care and salvage information.

The Department supports the concept of this proposal but does not see any recommendations that could be practically implemented or aren’t already in place. Additionally, in addition to 5AAC 92.220, Alaska Statute 16.30.010 (Wanton Waste of big game animals and wild fowl) carries one of the harshest penalties for existing wildlife violations.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 200 (Regions II and IV)**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would make it illegal for hunters to take game the same day they were transported to the field by commercial transporters.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: This is already illegal for airplane based transporters.

“ 5 AAC 92.085 (8) a person who has been airborne may not take or assist in taking a big game animal until after 3:00am following the day in which the flying occurred;...”

However the proposal goes beyond that to include other methods of transportation with the largest group being boat based transporters. This will eliminate the operators who provide “day trips” into the field through boat, four wheeler, snow machine or even street vehicle. Functionally it is unclear how this would work for boat based hunting where the hunters live on board either.

Since this proposal would effectively alter the allocation of resources to different users the Department has no recommendation.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 201 (Regions II and IV)**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would extend the prohibition for the taking of big game until 3:00 PM the day following the day a hunter flew but only with a commercial transporter. In addition this proposal adds other methods of commercial transportation to the prohibition.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: Currently the regulation prohibits the take until 3:00 AM. While the proposed change will address the proponents concerns of hunters spotting game the evening before and pursuing the same animals the very next day it would also unnecessarily restrict some hunters opportunities to fly in hunt by almost a day.

“ 5 AAC 92.085 (8) a person who has been airborne may not take or assist in taking a big game animal until after 3:00am following the day in which the flying occurred;...”

This will eliminate the operators who provide “day trips” into the field through boat, four-wheeler, snow machine or even street vehicle. Functionally it is unclear how this would work for boat based hunting where the hunters live on board either.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 214**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Establish a statewide requirement for second-degree-kindred relatives taking nonresidents on certain big game hunts.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: Current guiding requirements allow any nonresident hunting sheep, goat or brown bear to forgo hiring a guide if they are accompanied by a second-degree-kindred relative who is a resident of the state. This proposal would require that resident relative to possess a valid hunting license. It would also define personally accompany to clarify how much responsibility the relative should have while actually in the field.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 215**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Establish a bonus system for specific drawing hunts.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: This proposal was developed by the Board of Game during the March 2009 board meeting and was submitted for review at the request of the Board of Game. This board proposal will create a system for some drawing hunts whereby a hunter who pays careful attention to the application rules will increase his or her chances of being drawn in subsequent years when he or she accumulates more points (chances). How much a hunter’s probability of being drawn in a subsequent year will increase will depend on: (1) the number of applicants, (2) the number of bonus points he or she has, and (3) the established rules.



The Department has no recommendation because these systems and the way they could be implemented represent a myriad of allocation decisions. A number of state fish and game agencies in the U. S. have preference or bonus point systems for allocating hunting opportunities that vary from moose in Maine to bighorn sheep in many western states. The degree to which the hunting public likes or dislikes these systems varies. Most are expensive and administratively complicated to maintain. All have fees to maintain the respective program apart from other license and tag fees that support wildlife management programs.

The Department is neutral on the many allocation decisions associated with implementation of this system. The Department remains concerned about the cost to implement and maintain a bonus point system. Whether the Board adopts bonus points for a few or many hunts is largely irrelevant to the computer programming work necessary to implement the system. However, if pursued, the Department would prefer starting small, with a few hunts, so that inevitable “bugs” in a new system can be more easily and efficiently identified and addressed.

State fish and game agencies that have bonus or preference point systems charge additional fees to maintain these systems, with any additional funds being used for big game management and conservation. The Department is unable to subsidize development and maintenance of this system by taking away hunter dollars from other game management programs. Testimony from proponents of bonus points (avid Alaskan hunters) has consistently indicated a willingness to pay a modest increase in application fees to offset the cost of this system. This will require legislation allowing the Department to recoup the cost to operate a bonus point system, at which time the Department would institute the bonus point system.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 216**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Prohibit the feeding of Dall sheep.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: This is not a biological issue, but does identify safety issues. The Department agrees with AWT that the problems identified in the proposal could be addressed with adding sheep to the list of animals that cannot be legally fed without a permit.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 217**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Make it unlawful for persons to falsify information on harvest records.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Submitting false information on any harvest report has consequences for wildlife conservation across the state. In many areas, the Department relies heavily on harvest data when making management decisions. The Department agrees with AWT that false reporting is often an attempt to hide violations.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 218**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Allow Alaska Wildlife Troopers the authority to seize animals under certain circumstances.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: This proposal would provide AWT with additional authority if animals were taken under certain circumstances involving trespass or misconduct with a weapon. This would provide additional tools for AWT to enforce wildlife violations.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 219**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Prohibit the alteration of Dall sheep horns before sealing.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: AWT considers this a housekeeping proposal to align sheep sealing requirements with similar requirements for other species. It would prevent alteration of the horns prior to sealing. In areas with a full-curl bag limit, such violations impact wildlife populations.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 220**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Provide authority to the Alaska Wildlife Troopers to inspect taxidermy businesses.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Illegal harvest and transport of game poses conservation concerns, inside and outside of Alaska. An additional tool allowing AWT to inspect taxidermists would help prevent such violations.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 221**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Prohibit the use of Taser-type devices without permits.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Staff proposal – see issue statement

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 224**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Increase the black bear bag limit in units 7&15

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See recommendations in Proposal 151.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 225**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Introduce late season Archery registration hunts in all Sheep Drawing areas in unit 7 and 15.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: This proposal addresses an allocation issue. The 2 small drawing hunts for Dall rams on the Kenai (Round Mountain and Crescent Lake) are small hunts that have averaged a total of 8 permits issued each year due to a low number of available full-curl rams. The harvest has averaged about 1 legal ram taken each year for the past 5 years. If the proposal was adopted, the Department would likely decrease the number of permits in the Aug. 10–Sept. 20 season to ensure that hunters in the additional archery season had legal animals to hunt.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 226**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Liberalize wolf hunting methods and bag limits in Units 7 and 15.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See recommendation and rationale for proposal 171.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 227**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Allow all Kodiak goat registration permits to be available in person in designated villages DURING the hunting season and online.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: The strategy of the Department is to manage goat hunters primarily through drawing permits in most areas of Kodiak. As Kodiak goat population has expanded in number and area, the Department, with support of local Advisory Committees, have increased hunter opportunity and harvests. If this proposal were adopted it would drastically increase the number of hunters afield, reduce the quality of the hunt, and make the registration hunt much more difficult to administer. In 2010 goat hunts were liberalized so that approximately half of Kodiak Island is open from Aug. 1 to Dec. 15 for a registration hunt that is available on-line. The area included within this hunt has an increasing population with a large harvestable surplus. The areas that remain restrictive in the way their registration hunts are administered have stable goat populations and a limited number of goats available for harvest. A drastic increase in registration permits in those areas would divert pressure away from the portion of the island where harvest is

needed and jeopardize the areas where it is not. Consequently, it may be necessary to drastically reduce or eliminate registration hunts in those areas if this proposal is passed.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 228**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Open a late season archery-only any bull hunt in the Remainder of Unit 14C.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See recommendations in Proposal 139

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 229**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Require the Department to issue at least 20 drawing permits for moose in the Anchorage Management Area. At least one of these permits will be for any bull. Expand the hunt area to include municipal city parks and the upper Rabbit Creek area.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: The Department has the authority to issue up to 50 moose drawing permits in the Anchorage Management Area. Most of the Anchorage Management Area is urban/suburban, with limited opportunities for hunting. However, the management area includes portions of Chugach State Park and several large city parks where moose hunting is feasible. In recent years we have issued as many as 10 drawing permits in 2 hunt areas: upper Campbell Creek and McHugh Creek (DM 666). However, upper Campbell Creek is heavily used by other recreationists, which may lead to a level of conflict that will shut this hunt down.

Most of the proposed new hunt areas are municipal parks and some are actually outside of the Anchorage Management Area. We are currently working with the municipality to allow for limited moose hunting in city parks, and the Chugiak Eagle River Parks and Recreation Board of Supervisors voted in 2010 to support the opening of Mirror Lake and Edmonds Parks to an archery-only drawing permit moose hunt for any bull. If the municipality agrees to open additional parks within the Anchorage Management Area to moose hunting, we will issue additional permits. However, the only way to accomplish this objective is to show the municipality that moose hunting can be conducted safely in the more remote areas of Mirror Lake and Edmonds Parks in a noncontroversial manner.

This proposal requests to allow at least 1 permittee to harvest a bull moose in the Anchorage Management Area. Upper Campbell Creek is a rutting and post-rut concentration area for moose, and some bulls have antler spreads over 60 inches. This part of Chugach State Park attracts many viewers and photographers. It is not unusual to find crowds of people watching large bulls at very close range. Moose hunting in the Anchorage Management Area has been limited to antlerless moose to maximize the number of cows taken by a limited number of permittees. The objective is to maintain the moose population at a sustainable level. Although many Anchorage residents would like to see fewer moose in neighborhoods and support, or at

least tolerate, antlerless moose hunting in local parks, harvesting a large bull moose would provoke controversy among many residents.

When the Board re-established this drawing moose hunt after decades of public resistance, it added the provision that the hunt be held at the Department's discretion to avoid controversial situations that could kill the hunt. Deleting this provision, requiring the Department to issue at least 20 drawing permits, and establishing new hunt areas in city parks and private in holdings without local approval will create controversy and increase opposition to moose hunting in the Anchorage Management Area. However under the current regulatory framework this is already possible with Landowner's concurrence and public support.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 230**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Clarify and modify guided black bear baiting requirements.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: See similar proposals 74 and 107 for Region IV. Black bear baiting is a popular activity in many parts of Region II. Allowing guides to establish and maintain additional bait sites may conflict with other hunters however the Department should be able to monitor the harvest and recommend changes if conservation concerns arise in the future. Presumably these recommendations do not change the responsibility to clean up individual sites.

\*\*\*\*\*