

Hunting Permits

PROPOSAL 95 - 5 AAC 92.050(a)(8). Required permit conditions and procedures. Include targeted permits with the list of those that the Failure To Report penalty can be applied to as follows:

5 AAC 92.050(a)

(8) a person who has been issued a permit, or that person's proxy under 5 AAC 92.011, shall return the permit harvest report to the department within the time period stated on the permit; in addition to other penalties provided by law for failure to report harvest, and except as provided in this paragraph and (c) of this section, if a permittee or the permittee's proxy fails to provide the required report for a drawing permit, registration permit, **targeted**, Tier I subsistence permit, or Tier II subsistence permit, the permittee will be ineligible to be issued a drawing, registration, **targeted**, Tier I subsistence, or Tier II subsistence permit during the following regulatory year; notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, the department may determine that, for specific hunts, it is administratively impracticable, to apply the penalty for failure to report;

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? When the Board of Game created its first targeted permit it was a registration hunt that was handled unlike any other registration hunts. As the other targeted hunts were added and the Department of Fish and Game gained experience managing the hunts, it was clear the registration hunt was not an accurate label for the hunt. As a result, the board created what are now called targeted permit hunts. When the board created targeted permits they neglected to include them in 92.050(a)(8) because they originated as registration permits and were covered at that time. The purpose of this proposal is to once again include them as part of the failure to report process.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-164)

PROPOSAL 96 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures. Establish a point system for drawing hunts as follows:

Establish a preference point system for drawing hunts where there are more applicants than permits awarded.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Many long time Alaskans have applied for various permits for years and have never been successful drawing a permit that may be for their dream hunt. At the same time a first time applicant (resident or nonresident) has the same odds of being drawn as one who has applied for years. I personally know a number of Alaskans who have given up applying out of frustration. A preference points system would assure all hunters a chance to eventually obtain a permit for their dream hunt. It would also encourage more hunters to apply and continue to apply as eventual success was possible. This would have a side benefit of generating more revenue for the Department of Fish and Game. A number of other states have this system so Alaska won't have to "reinvent the wheel." Just adapt a similar system or parts of a preference system to fit Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: Con Bunde (EG-C15-014)

PROPOSAL 97 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.
Establish a point system for drawing hunts as follows:

Establish some type of bonus point or preference point system for the Alaskan drawing permit hunts.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? There is a need for a bonus point system in the drawing hunts in Alaska similar to systems in many other states. Too many hunters never draw any permits while other hunters may draw multiple permits. Several years ago the Board of Game passed some type of a system but the Department of Fish and Game never instituted it for unknown reasons.

PROPOSED BY: The Alaskan Bowhunters Association (EG-C15-090)

PROPOSAL 98 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.
Establish a point system for drawing hunts with an allocation for nonresident and nonresident permits as follows:

For hunt drawing permits a person may apply for as many hunts within a species as he/she is willing to pay the \$5 permit entry fee. (Currently limited to three entries per species.) This should increase state revenue.

No individual can draw more than one drawing permit per year, unless he has applied for a hunt which ends up being undersubscribed.

On the permit application individuals must rank their first, second, third and higher choice SPECIES but they may apply for as many hunts within each species as they wish and they must also rank the order of preference of hunts within each species.

All hunters' names who are applying for one or more drawing hunts would be assigned by the computer a random order number.

Starting with the hunter assigned number 1, the computer would award his first choice species and hunt to him. That hunter would then be unable to draw any other hunt for that year unless any other species hunt that he had applied for was undersubscribed after all other applications were considered.

No hunter would be allowed to be awarded hunts in the same species in two consecutive years.

All hunters who had not been drawn for any of their choices in year one of this new system would be given a single preference point and if they applied in a second consecutive year would be automatically assigned a number ahead of any hunter who had drawn a hunt in the preceding year. This process would continue so that for example in year four all of the hunters who had not been drawn for any of their hunts for years 1-3 would be in the top list of numbers in the year four draw. Failure to apply in consecutive years or winning any hunt would wipe out your preference points.

Resident hunters and nonresident hunters would be put in separate pools for the purpose of drawing hunts. No more than 10% of the permits for any specific hunt could be awarded to nonresidents.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The process for drawing permits needs to be revised. There needs to be a simple, transparent fair system. The basic problem is that some people apply every year and never seem to be drawn while others seem to be drawn on a regular basis. Also some hunters under the current system may get drawn in one year for multiple hunts that they cannot possibly take because the hunts overlap. There are many logical possible reforms that should be easy to implement in this era of computer technology. There is also a possibility of increasing state revenue through a modification of the drawing permit process.

PROPOSED BY: John Frost (EG-C15-105)

PROPOSAL 99 - 5 AAC 92.050(a). Required permit hunt conditions and procedures. To apply for a nonresident permit, a registered guide must provide an assigned verification code as follows:

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

...

(11) to apply for a drawing permit hunt, for any hunt that requires a registered or master guide, a nonresident or a nonresident alien must contract a qualified registered guide or master guide as their agent to submit the application and provide hunting services. The contracting registered guide or master guide, shall provide, at the time of application, their current unique verification code that has been issued to them pursuant to 12AAC 75.260(d).

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? We would like to address problems with Department of Fish and Game staff verifying the business relationship between a guide and a client on hunts that currently require a "guide client agreement." By requiring the "unique verification code" that the Department of Commerce has created, all verification burden will be removed from ADF&G staff. Requiring the UVC code will also make hunt administration easier and result in well managed participation by guided nonresident hunters.

Guided allocation will thus be fully utilized and maximum value for the limited allocation will continue to be realized.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Professional Hunters Association (EG-C15-106)

PROPOSAL 100 - 5 AAC 92.052(23). Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures. Modify the provision of surplus permits as follows:

(23) Except as otherwise provided, if a drawing permit is undersubscribed, surplus permits may be made available at the division of wildlife conservation office responsible for management of the applicable **hunt**; [HUNT.] Surplus permits are not subject to the limitations in 5 AAC 92.050(2) and (4)(F).

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? A recent determination by the Department of Fish and Game has changed the intent for how the surplus drawing permits may be issued in the Galena Management Area, (Units 21B, C, D and 24). According to the department, if the PERIOD in paragraph (23) is changed to a semicolon, then it will give the department more flexibility in how they apply the discretionary authorities for surplus permits. Because there is a PERIOD, not a semicolon in #23, it's an all-or-nothing condition (see bolded text above). We either apply #23 or we don't. If we apply it, then we must exempt **all of 5 AAC 92.050(2) and all of 5 AAC 92.050(4)(F).**

The department will not be able to issue surplus permits according to the original intention of the proposals adopted by the Board of Game. The Galena hunts were designed to provide distribution of hunters to specific hunt areas. If hunters are able to hold multiple permits in a given year, they will concentrate in the highest density moose areas. The bull: cow ratios will drop below the agreed upon management objectives in those areas. A change in the punctuation in 92.052(23) will give the department discretion to apply these conditions to the permit. Therefore if some hunt managers prefer to allow multiple permits that will not change how those hunts are managed.

Maintaining bull; cow ratios increases hunter success rates in the fall. The moose population benefits from healthy bull; cow ratios. There will be less likelihood of federal winter hunts being implemented. This change would compel hunters to use areas with higher bull; cow ratios, but lower densities, because they would only hold one permit.

PROPOSED BY: Jack Reakoff (EG-C15-031)

PROPOSAL 101 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep; 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep and mountain goat drawing permit hunts; 92.061. Special provisions for brown bear drawing permit hunts; and 92.069. Special provisions for moose drawing permit hunts. Limit the amount of drawing permits awarded to nonresidents to a maximum of ten percent as follows:

For all sheep permit hunts and all permit hunts listed under the special provision hunting regulations for mountain goat, moose and brown bear (5 AAC 92.057, 92.061, and 92.069), limit the permits available to nonresidents to a maximum of ten percent of the available permits.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Increase the opportunity for Alaskan residents to participate in drawing hunts. The current level of non-resident participation

in select drawing hunts seems to be unreasonably high. For instance, the 2014 Fall Season Kodiak Island Brown Bear drawing hunts:

- Total permits available = 150
- Permits allocated to guided nonresident hunters = 55 (36.67%)
- Permits allocated to residents & nonresidents hunting with an Alaskan resident within the 2nd degree of kindred = 95 (63.33%)
- There were 48 nonresident applications for the 55 dedicated permits (success rates for drawing a permit varied from 33% to 100%). There are 28 different hunts to apply for and 11 of those hunts (20 permits) didn't receive a single application. This system effectively allows a non-resident to buy a hunt and participate at their will.
- There were 3426 applications for the 95 permits available to residents and non-residents hunting with an Alaskan resident within the 2nd degree of kindred. There were applications for all 28 of the different hunts (success rates for drawing a permit varied from less than 1% to just over 10%). An Alaskan resident has a very small chance of drawing one of these permits.

PROPOSED BY: Gary Stevens

(HQ-C15-132)

PROPOSAL 102 - 5 AAC 92.061. Special provisions for brown bear drawing permit hunts.

Modify provisions to require all nonresident drawing permits be awarded from the permits allocated to nonresidents as follows:

Solution is to change the regulations so that all nonresidents are placed into a nonresident pool and no extra permits are taken away from residents for this. The statewide draft regulatory language could read as follows: All nonresidents applying for a drawing permit are required to be in the nonresident drawing.

If nothing is done residents are losing out on more hunting opportunities. A resident still has the option to use a guide if they so choose. Therefore the argument that this could hurt some guides does not stand up. If the guide is offering a quality product at a quality price the free market will determine if his/her services are utilized.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? A nonresident is a nonresident whether they hunt with a relative within second degree of kindred or not. I propose that all nonresidents who apply for drawing permits statewide be in the nonresident pool, and not placed into the resident pool because they are hunting with a second degree of kindred. Obviously for those permit hunts that do not require a guide this does not matter. To my knowledge only the Kodiak Brown Bear permits put the nonresidents with second degree of kindred into the resident pool at this time. This needs to stop.

PROPOSED BY: Birch Yuknis

(EG-C15-012)

PROPOSAL 103 - 5 AAC 92.071. Tier I subsistence permits. Require Tier I subsistence permit holders to report harvest information as follows:

5 AAC 92.071. Tier I subsistence permits

(x) All villages, communities, groups, or individuals participating in a Tier I hunt must make efforts to ensure that the applicable customary and traditional use pattern described by the board when adopting a positive finding for a particular game population, under 5 AAC 99.025, is observed by subscribers.

(i) Complete reports submitted by hunt administrators or individual subsistence permit holders shall report information about harvest and their efforts to observe the customary and traditional use pattern of the game population, as follows;

(1) Element 1, participation in a long-term, consistent pattern of noncommercial taking, use, and reliance on the game population: the number of years of taking and use of the game population; and involvement of multiple generations in the taking and use of the game population; and use of areas other than the community subsistence hunt area for harvest activities; and

(2) Element 2, participation in the pattern of taking or use of the game population that follows a seasonal use pattern of harvest effort in the hunt area: the months and/or seasons in which noncommercial harvest activities occur in the hunt area; and

(3) Element 3, participation in a pattern of taking or use of wild resources in the hunt area that includes methods and means of harvest characterized by efficiency and economy of effort and cost: costs associated with harvests; and methods used to reduce costs and improve efficiency of harvest; and number of species harvested during hunting activities; and

(4) Element 4, participation in a pattern of taking or use of wild resources that occurs in the hunt area due to close ties to the area: number of years of taking and use of the game population; and involvement of multiple generations in the taking and use of the game population; and variety of harvesting activities that take place in the hunt area; and evidence of other areas used for harvest activities; and

(5) Element 5, use of means of processing and preserving wild resources from the hunt area that have been traditionally been used by past generations: complete listing of the parts of the harvested game that are used; and preservation methods of that game; and types of foods and other products produced from that harvest; and

(6) Element 6, participation in a pattern of taking or use of wild resources from the hunt area that includes the handing down of knowledge of hunting skills, values, and lore about the hunt area from generation to generation: involvement of multiple

generations in the taking and use of the game population; and evidence of instruction and training; and

(7) Element 7, participation in a pattern of taking of wild resources from the hunt area in which the harvest is shared throughout the community: amount of harvest of the game population that is shared; and evidence of a communal sharing event; and support of those in need through sharing of the harvest of the game population; and

(8) Element 8, participation in a pattern that includes taking, use, and reliance on a wide variety of wild resources from the hunt area: the variety of resource harvest activities engaged in within the hunt area; and evidence of other areas used for harvest activities.

(ii) failure to report under this subsection may result in denial of subsistence harvest permit during the following regulatory year.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Currently the Board of Game is unable to accurately determine the number of subsistence users who qualify for a Tier I subsistence permit. Without accurate information on the number of subsistence users of a customary and traditional game population the board cannot determine an accurate amount of harvestable surplus necessary to meet subsistence uses as required in regulation 5 AAC 99.025.

Due to financial constraints the ADF&G Division of Subsistence has not been able to fulfill their statutory obligations found in AS 16.05.094(4). ADF&G is required to assist the Board of Game in determining what uses of fish and game, as well as which users and what methods, should be termed subsistence uses, users, and methods.

If adopted by the Board of Game this proposal would require Tier I subsistence permit holders to provide reports about harvest and their efforts to observe the customary and traditional use pattern of the game population as determined by the Board of Game in 5 AAC 99.025. This information could then be used by the Board of Game to accurately implement the state subsistence law, AS 16.05.258.

If not adopted by the Board of Game an under-funded ADF&G Division of Subsistence will continue to not fulfill their statutory obligations to determine which users would qualify for a Tier I subsistence permit.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Outdoor Council (EG-C15-089)

PROPOSAL 104 - 5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets and reports. Require hunters to submit a subsistence hunt report as follows:

Add section (m) to 5 AAC 92.010:

(m) subsistence hunters shall submit a completed written report, on a form provided by the department, for participating in subsistence hunts described in 5 AAC 85.005–5 AAC 85.070 to observe customary and traditional use patterns of subsistence game harvest.

(1) efforts shall be made to collect a completed report from each subsistence hunter, that describes efforts by the subsistence harvester to observe the customary and traditional use pattern using the eight elements described in (m)(2) of this section. The completed form shall be submitted to the department no later than 30 days after the season ends for a particular hunt.

(2) Complete reports shall include information about efforts to observe the customary and traditional use pattern of the game population, as follows;

(A) Element 1, participation in a long-term, consistent pattern of noncommercial taking, use, and reliance on the game population: the number of years of taking and use of the game population; and involvement of multiple generations in the taking and use of the game population; and use of areas other than the community subsistence hunt area for harvest activities; and

(B) Element 2, participation in the pattern of taking or use of the game population that follows a seasonal use pattern of harvest effort in the hunt area: the months and/or seasons in which noncommercial harvest activities occur in the hunt area; and

(C) Element 3, participation in a pattern of taking or use of wild resources in the hunt area that includes methods and means of harvest characterized by efficiency and economy of effort and cost: costs associated with harvests; and methods used to reduce costs and improve efficiency of harvest; and number of species harvested during hunting activities; and

(D) Element 4, participation in a pattern of taking or use of wild resources that occurs in the hunt area due to close ties to the area: number of years of taking and use of the game population; and involvement of multiple generations in the taking and use of the game population; and variety of harvesting activities that take place in the hunt area; and evidence of other areas used for harvest activities; and

(E) Element 5, use of means of processing and preserving wild resources from the hunt area that have been traditionally been used by past generations: complete listing of the parts of the harvested game that are used; and preservation methods of that game; and types of foods and other products produced from that harvest; and

(F) Element 6, participation in a pattern of taking or use of wild resources from the hunt area that includes the handing down of knowledge of hunting skills, values, and lore about the hunt area from generation to generation: involvement of multiple generations in the taking and use of the game population; and evidence of instruction and training; and

(G) Element 7, participation in a pattern of taking of wild resources from the hunt area in which the harvest is shared: amount of harvest of the game population that is shared.

(H) Element 8, participation in a pattern that includes taking, use, and reliance on a wide variety of wild resources from the hunt area: the variety of resource harvest activities engaged in within the hunt area; and evidence of other areas used for harvest activities.

(3) failure to report under this subsection may result in denial of a subsistence harvest permit during the following regulatory year.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Subsistence reporting. We believe collecting yearly accountable data pertaining to subsistence and uses is very important to allocation and subsistence users and prohibits misuse by participants.

We are proposing adding a new section (m) to 5 AAC 92.010 Harvest tickets and reports. The goal of the annual report of subsistence effort, harvest and how customary and traditional uses are occurring. This new section would provide a more quantified way to review subsistence and uses, in some ways, would simplify the review and analysis.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee (EG-C15-053)

PROPOSAL 105 - 5 AAC 92.070(a). Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system.
Modify the qualification under the Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system as follows:

Amend 5 AAC 92.070(a) by deleting 5 AAC 92.070(a)(1) - (3) and replace 5 with:
92.070(a) **(1) the number of consecutive years in which the applicant has spent over 180 days per year in the noncommercial harvesting and preserving of wild fish and game within Alaska; 5 points are given for each year, up to 85 points.**

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Define a "mainstay of livelihood" that encompasses subsistence uses of game populations as more than just 70 days a year spent in noncommercial harvesting of fish and game within a hunt area boundary for up to 50 years, plus points for up to ten years maximum for living in a household that hunted or eats from the customary and traditional use game population.

Spending less than 20% of the year in the noncommercial harvesting of fish and game can hardly qualify as a mainstay of anyone's livelihood who is dependent on a wild food source. No society of hunter/gatherers in recorded history were able to have gathered enough sustenance to feed themselves in northern nonagricultural areas during only 20% of the year.

Current technology allows for a far greater area to hunt in than within walking distance of your domicile. Very few, if any, current subsistence users in Alaska do not use a motorized vehicle to hunt and retrieve game. Being restricted to gathering a subsistence harvest by game management area is unreasonable with today's modern modes of transportation.

PROPOSED BY: Rod Arno

(EG-C15-081)

PROPOSAL 106 - 5 AAC 92.062. Priority for subsistence hunting; Tier II permits. Provide for changes in hunt type (Tier I and Tier II) to occur during the regulatory cycle as follows:

The Department of Fish and Game requests that the Board of Game adopt regulations that provide for changes in hunt type (Tier I to Tier II and vice-versa) to occur during the regular regulations cycle. This would eliminate out of cycle Tier II hunts which can delay or prevent hunts from occurring.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The Board of Game has established tiered seasons and bag limits for some game populations in order to clearly define the triggers used to step down from the broadest hunting opportunities to the most restrictive (Tier II).

The Department of Fish and Game conducts annual surveys of game populations in order to determine the level of harvest sustainable during the hunting season. It is after these surveys are completed that the department evaluates the harvestable portion of the population and, for the populations with tiered seasons and bag limits, determines if the population is in a Tier I plus, Tier I, or Tier II situation.

This presents problems implementing a Tier II hunt for species which are surveyed in late winter or summer, well after the regular Tier II application and permitting cycle is complete. To implement Tier II for these species, a special out-of-cycle Tier II notice, application, and processing sequence must occur. The time needed to publish the supplement and get the information to subsistence users throughout the state normally takes 1.5 months. The application period is open for 1.5 months, and processing takes another few weeks.

This lengthy process conducted out-of-cycle causes several problems for both the users and the department. Hunters have come to rely on a consistent process with predictable dates, and changes made outside of this schedule may affect the allocation of permits. Both urban and rural residents are conducting other activities during the summer and are hard to contact. In addition, the notice and application period may have to be reduced. In the case of summer caribou surveys, implementation of Tier II is not possible before the normal season opening or in time to have a hunt at all.

As an alternative, the board could determine a time certain (e.g. May 1) after which a Tier II hunt is not implemented until the next regular cycle. However, this remains expensive and diverts staff from other duties. Lastly, for hunts lasting longer than 120 days, a special board meeting is required to make the regulations permanent.

While we recognize that this proposal deals strictly with the timing of allocation of resources, the department suggests the following regulation as a placeholder to consider options to remedy this problem with administration of Tier I and Tier II hunts:

(x) if the department learns that the harvestable portion of a population has declined to a level that requires a change from Tier I to Tier II or vice-versa, the department must implement the appropriate change at the next regularly scheduled Tier I and Tier II application period.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-165)

PROPOSAL 107 - 5 AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep and mountain goat drawing permit hunts; 92.061. Special provisions for brown bear drawing permit hunts; and 92.069. Special provisions for moose drawing permit hunts. Establish a permit allocation of ten percent for nonresidents as follows:

All areas open to drawing hunts for both residents and nonresidents, the nonresident allocation will be limited to a maximum of 10%.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Tag Allocation. For all the special provision permit hunts for moose, Dall sheep, goat, and brown bear, nonresidents should be limited to 10%. This is consistent with other states as listed below and a benefit of being a resident. Nonresident quotas are as listed below.

Arizona - 10% of any tag quota for any hunt, except for sheep and bison where nonresidents are also limited to draw hunts with two or more tags.

California - 10% of total sheep tags, one tag for antelope and one tag for elk for the entire state.
Colorado - 10% for sheep, goat, moose; up to 35% for deer and elk in some units; no limit on antelope.

Idaho - 10% of controlled hunt permits issued statewide for each species (bighorn sheep, mountain goat, moose, elk, deer, antelope).

Kentucky - 10% Elk tags

Montana - nonresidents are allowed up to, but are not guaranteed, 10% of the draw tags per region for sheep, goat, and moose. For elk and deer draw tags there a 10% nonresident cap per unit instead of region.

Nevada - gives nonresidents approximately 10% of the big game tag quota (elk, deer, antelope, bighorn sheep).

New Mexico - 10% of special draw hunts for all big species awarded to residents or nonresidents contracted with an outfitter; another 6% will go to nonresidents not contracted with a guide.

Oregon - 5% of deer and elk tags, 3% of antelope tags, no less than 5% and no more than 10% of sheep tags.

Pennsylvania - Elk, no restrictions for nonresidents.

Utah - 10% of tags given per a hunt code unless there are less than 10 total tags, then there will be no non-resident tags given (deer, elk, antelope, moose, bison, rocky mountain bighorn sheep, desert bighorn sheep, rocky mountain goat).

Washington - no restrictions for nonresidents; odds for sheep, goat, and moose are between 1/300 to 1/3000.

Wyoming - 15% of elk tags; 20% of the total number of deer, antelope, sheep, moose, and goat tags go to non-residents.

PROPOSED BY: Brad Sparks

(HQ-C15-137)

PROPOSAL 108 - 5 AAC 92.069. Special provisions for moose drawing permit hunts.

Remove the nonresident guide requirement for those species not required by Alaska Statute as follows:

Guide information, per the hunting regulations book, page 10:

Nonresidents who hunt brown bear, Dall sheep, or mountain goat must be personally accompanied in the field by an Alaska-licensed guide or an Alaska resident 19 years or older within second-degree of kindred holding a current Alaska hunting license. The guide or relative must be within 100 yards when the nonresident attempts to take game. **No other Alaska big game species requires a licensed guide but a hunter has the right to hire a guide if he or she wants for any species.**

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Guide requirements. Guides are already required for mountain goat, Dall sheep, and brown/grizzly bear. In recent years, it is becoming a requirement to use a guide for black bear in Southeast Alaska and for moose in Units 21, 23, and 24. Nonresidents should have a choice if they want to use a guide or not for those species not required by statute. Also, every area a guide is given locks up his or her area, making it more difficult for residents to hunt in that area. This proposed change should include bears in Southeast Alaska but as I understand, it would have to be submitted for the Southeast Region meeting.

PROPOSED BY: Brad Sparks

(HQ-C15-136)
