



Alaska Board of Game
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, AK 99811-5526
(907) 465-4110
www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2016 STATEWIDE REGULATIONS PROPOSAL BOOK

<u>INTRODUCTION SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE NUMBER</u>
Reviewer Letter.....	ii
Guidelines for Public Testimony	iv
2015/2016 Meeting Schedule	v
Board of Game Long-Term Meeting Cycle.....	vi-vii
Board of Game Membership Roster	viii
Boards Support Section Staff.....	ix
Meeting Agenda.....	x
<u>PROPOSAL SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE NUMBER</u>
Proposal Index	1
Definitions.....	9
Crossbow and Archery.....	13
Miscellaneous Topics	20
Sheep Hunting.....	22
Use of Game, Possession and Transportation.....	44
Bear Baiting	51
Unlawful Methods of Taking Game	56
Licenses, Tags, Harvest Tickets & Reports	69
Off Road Vehicle (ORV) Policy.....	72
Miscellaneous Permits	73
Hunting Permits	80
AC Jurisdiction for Reauthorizing Antlerless Moose Seasons	92
Game Management Units	93
Antlerless Moose and Tag Fee Reauthorizations.....	95
Regional and Multiple Units.....	133

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

REVIEWER LETTER

Dear Reviewer:

September 2015

The Alaska Board of Game will consider the attached book of regulatory proposals at its meeting scheduled for **March 18-28, 2016**. The proposals generally concern statewide changes to hunting and trapping regulations under 5 AAC Chapter 92. The board will also consider a number of statewide sheep hunting season and bag limit proposals which were accepted under an expanded Call for Proposals this year. Finally, there is a section of proposals accepted as Agenda Change Requests for this cycle. Members of the public, organizations, advisory committees, and Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) staff submitted these proposals. The proposals are published essentially as they were received.

The proposals are presented as brief statements summarizing the intended regulatory changes. In cases where confusion might arise or where the regulation is complex, proposed changes are also indicated in legal format. In this format, bolded and underlined words are **additions** to the regulation text, and capitalized words in square brackets are [DELETIONS] from the regulation text.

You are encouraged to read all proposals presented in this book, as regulations may have regional, species-specific, and statewide applications. Proposals are organized by broad topics and are listed in the tentative order in which they are to be considered during the meeting. The final order of proposals to be deliberated, also known as the “roadmap,” will be available approximately two weeks prior to the meeting. However, the roadmap may be changed up to and during the meeting.

Before taking action on these proposed changes to the regulations, the board would like your written comments and/or oral testimony on any effects the proposed changes would have on your activities.

Please submit written comments:

Online: www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov

Via fax: 907-465-6094

Via mail: ATTN: Board of Game Comments
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Boards Support Section
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, AK 99811-5526

Public comment, in combination with Advisory Committee comments ADF&G staff presentations, provide the Board of Game with useful biological and socioeconomic data to form decisions. Written comments become public documents. The following are recommendations for providing written comments:

Timely Submission: Comments received by an established deadline for each meeting, usually two weeks in advance, are considered “on-time” comments and are provided to the board and the public in advance of the meeting.

After the on-time comment period has closed, written comments are accepted via fax and mail. Comments received after the on-time period will not be included in board member workbooks until the beginning of each meeting. Comments are also typically accepted during the meeting. At a

meeting, submit 20 hard copies, known as “record copies,” to Board Support Section staff, who will distribute them to board members and ADF&G staff. Include your name on each copy, and if including graphs or charts, please indicate the source.

Length: For on-time comments, the board will accept up to 100 single-sided pages from any one individual or group for any one meeting. For comments received after the on-time period or during the meetings, comment is limited to ten single-sided pages.

List the Proposal Number: Written comments should indicate the proposal number(s) to which the comments apply. Written comments should specifically state “support” or “opposition” to the proposal(s). If the comments support a modification in the proposal, please indicate “support as amended” and provide your preferred amendment in writing. This will help ensure written comments are correctly noted for the board members. You do not need to list the Alaska Administrative Code number.

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

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

Write Clearly: Comments will be scanned and photocopied so please use 8 1/2" x 11" paper and leave reasonable margins on all sides to allow room for insertion into the board workbooks. Whether typed or handwritten, use dark ink and write legibly.

Advisory Committees: In addition to the above, please make sure the Advisory Committee meeting minutes reflect why the committee voted as it did. If the vote was split, include the minority opinion. A brief description consisting of a couple of sentences is sufficient. Detail the number of members in attendance (e.g., 12 of 15 members) and indicate represented interests such as subsistence, guides, trappers, hunters, wildlife viewers, and others.

Meeting information, documents, and a link to the audio is available through the Board of Game website at: www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov. Board actions will also be posted on the website shortly after the meeting.

Persons with a disability needing special accommodations in order to comment on the proposed regulations should contact the Boards Support Section at (907) 465-4110 at least two weeks prior to the schedule meeting to make any necessary arrangements.

We thank you for your interest and involvement with the Board of Game and the regulatory process.

Kristy Tibbles, Executive Director
Alaska Board of Game



Alaska Board of Game

P.O. Box 115526

Juneau, AK 99811-5526

(907) 465-4110

www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov

GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC & ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY

Persons planning to testify before Board of Game hearings must fill out a blue PUBLIC TESTIMONY SIGN-UP CARD and turn it in to the board's staff. Persons providing written material for the board members must provide at least **20 copies to submit with the blue sign-up card**. Do not wait until it is your turn to testify to submit written material, as it may not be distributed to the board in time for your testimony. **Provide a name and date on the first page of written material and identify the source of graphs or tables, if included in materials.**

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

If you wish to give testimony for more than one group (i.e., yourself plus an organization, or yourself plus an advisory committee), please fill out a blue sign-up card for each testimony you would like to give. For example: if you are testifying for an Advisory Committee as well as for yourself, please fill out two cards, one specifying your AC and one specifying personal testimony. When you begin your testimony, state for the record the group you are representing. Keep your comments separate for each group. For example: give comments for the first group you are representing; then, after stating clearly that you are now testifying for the second group, give comments for that group.

Please be aware that when you testify you may not ask questions of board members or of department staff. This is your chance to make comments on proposals before the board. If board members and/or department staff need clarification, they will ask you questions. **A person using derogatory or threatening language to the board will not be allowed to continue speaking.**

Generally, the board allows **five minutes** for oral testimony for an individual or an organization, and **15 minutes** for ACs. If you are testifying once for an organization and once as an individual, these testimonies are considered separate, and each allotted its own time. The board chair will announce the length of time for testimony at the beginning of the meeting. Time limits on testimony do not include questions the board members may have for you.

Advisory Committee representatives are usually allotted 15 minutes to testify, and should restrict testimony to relating the advisory committee's discussion(s). Testimony should be a brief summary of the minutes of the meeting, and copies of the minutes should be available for the board members. An Advisory Committee representative's personal opinions should not be addressed during Advisory Committee testimony.



Alaska Board of Game
 P.O. Box 115526
 Juneau, AK 99811-5526
 (907) 465-4110
www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov

**2015/2016 Cycle
 Tentative Meeting Dates & Locations
 Statewide Regulations - Cycle A and Cycle B Schedules**

Statewide regulations include the general categories of: licenses, harvest tickets, tags and harvest reports, methods and means, possession, transportation and use of game, intensive management and predator control, definitions, emergency taking of game, descriptions of game management units, and areas of jurisdiction for antlerless moose reauthorization.

Meeting Dates	Topic	Location	Comment Deadline
March 17, 2016 (1 day)	Work Session	Fairbanks Pike's Waterfront Lodge	March 4, 2016
March 18-28, 2016 (11 days)	Statewide Regulations (Cycle A and Cycle B)	Fairbanks Pike's Waterfront Lodge	March 4, 2016

Total Meeting Days: 12
 Agenda Change Request Deadline: January 18, 2016
 Proposal Deadline: Friday, May 1, 2015

2016/2017 Meeting Cycle: The Board of Game recently changed its meeting schedule to a three-year cycle. The new schedule is posted online at www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov. For the 2016/2017 meeting cycle, the board will address regulations for the Interior, Arctic, and Western Regions (also referred to as Regions III and V and include Game Management Units 12, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26). The deadline to submit proposals for the 2016/2017 meeting cycle will be 5:00 p.m., Friday, April 29, 2016.



Alaska Board of Game

P.O. Box 115526

Juneau, AK 99811-5526

(907) 465-4110

www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov

Long Term Meeting Cycle
(Three-year Cycle)

The Board of Game meeting cycle generally occurs from January through March. The board considers changes to regulations on a region-based schedule that cycles every three years. When the regional regulations are before the board, the following regulations are open for consideration within that region:

- Trapping Seasons and Bag Limits -- All species
- General and Subsistence Hunting Seasons and Bag Limits -- All species (Except antlerless moose hunts as noted below)
- Intensive Management Plans
- Closures and Restrictions in State Game Refuges
- Management Areas, Controlled Use Areas, and Areas Closed To Hunting and Trapping
- Changes specific to Units or Regions under 5 AAC Chapters 92 and 98

Proposals pertaining to reauthorization of all antlerless moose hunts, 5 AAC 85.045, and all brown bear tag fee exemptions, 5 AAC 92.015, are taken up annually. Changes having statewide applicability to 5 AAC Chapters 92 and 98.005 listed on the following page are considered once every three years at Statewide Regulations meetings.

The proposal deadline is May 1 every preceding year. If May 1 falls on a weekend, the deadline is the Friday before. Boards Support issues a “Call for Proposals” generally in December or January before the May 1 deadline, which will also specify which regulations are open for proposed changes.

Topic & Meeting Schedule
<p>Southeast Region - Game Management Units: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5</p> <p><i>Meeting Cycle: 2018/2019 2021/2022 2024/2025</i></p>
<p>Southcentral Region - Game Management Units: 6, 7, 8, 14C, 15</p> <p><i>Meeting Cycle: 2018/2019 2021/2022 2024/2025</i></p>
<p>Central and Southwest Region - Game Management Units: 9, 10, 11, 13, 14A, 14B, 16, & 17</p> <p><i>Meeting Cycle: 2017/2018 2020/2021 2023/2024</i></p>
<p>Arctic and Western Region - Game Management Units: 18, 22, 23, 26A</p> <p><i>Meeting Cycle: 2016/2017 2019/2020 2022/2023</i></p>
<p>Interior and Northeast Region - Game Management Units: 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, 26C</p> <p><i>Meeting Cycle: 2016/2017 2019/2020 2022/2023</i></p>
<p>Statewide Regulations (see next page)</p> <p><i>Meeting Years: 2015/2016 2017/2018 2020/2021</i></p>

The three year schedule was adopted at the January 2015 Work Session.

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
Statewide Regulations ~ 5 AAC Chapters 92 and 98

General Provisions & Definitions:

- 92.001 Application of this Chapter
- 92.002 Liability for Violations
- 92.003 Hunter Education and Orientation Requirements
- 92.004 Policy for Off-Road Vehicle Use for Hunting and transporting game.
- 92.990 Definitions

Licenses, Harvest Tickets, Harvest Reports, Tags, and Fees:

- 92.010 Harvest Tickets and Reports
- 92.011 Taking of Game by Proxy
- 92.012 Licenses and Tags
- 92.013 Migratory bird hunting guide services
- 92.018 Waterfowl Conservation Tag
- 92.019 Taking of Big Game for Certain Religious Ceremonies

Permits:

- 92.020 Application of Permit Regulations and Permit Reports
- 92.028 Aviculture Permits
- 92.029 Permit for Possessing Live Game
- 92.030 Possession of Wolf Hybrid and Wild Cat Hybrids Prohibited
- 92.031 Permit for Selling Skins, Skulls, and Trophies
- 92.033 Permit for Science, Education, Propagative, or Public Safety Purposes
- 92.034 Permit to Take Game for Cultural Purposes
- 92.035 Permit for Temporary Commercial Use of Live Game
- 92.037 Permit for Falconry
- 92.039 Permit for Taking Wolves Using Aircraft
- 92.040 Permit for Taking of Furbearers with Game Meat
- 92.041 Permit to Take Beavers to Control Damage to Property
- 92.042 Permit to Take Foxes for Protection of Migratory Birds
- 92.043 Permit for Capturing Wild Furbearers for Fur Farming
- 92.044 Permit for Hunting Black Bear w/the Use of Bait or Scent Lures
- 92.047 Permit for Using Radio Telemetry Equipment
- 92.049 Permits, Permit Procedures, and Permit Conditions
- 92.050 Required Permit Hunt Conditions and Procedures
- 92.051 Discretionary Trapping Permit Conditions & Procedures
- 92.052 Discretionary Permit Hunt Conditions and Procedures
- 92.057 Special Provisions for Dall Sheep Drawing Permit Hunts
- 92.062 Priority for Subsistence Hunting; Tier II Permits
- 92.068 Permit Conditions for Hunting Black Bear with Dogs
- 92.069 Special Provisions for Moose Drawing Permit Hunts
- 92.070 Tier II Subsistence Hunting Permit Point System
- 92.071 Tier I Subsistence Permits
- 92.072 Community subsistence Harvest Hunt Area and Permit Conditions

Methods & Means:

- 92.075 Lawful Methods of Taking Game
- 92.080 Unlawful Methods of Taking Game; Exceptions
- 92.085 Unlawful Methods of Taking Big Game; Exceptions
- 92.090 Unlawful Methods of Taking Fur Animals
- 92.095 Unlawful Methods of Taking Furbearers; Exceptions
- 92.100 Unlawful Methods of Hunting Waterfowl, Snipe, Crane
- 92.104 Authorization for Methods and Means Disability Exemptions

Intensive Management and Predator Control:

- 92.106 Intensive Management of Identified Big Game Prey Populations
- 92.110 Control of Predation by Wolves
- 92.115 Control of Predation by Bears
- 92.116 Special Provisions in Predation Control Areas

Possession and Transportation:

- 92.130 Restrictions to Bag Limit
- 92.135 Transfer of Possession
- 92.140 Unlawful Possession or Transportation of Game
- 92.141 Transport, Harboring, or Release of Live Muridae Rodents Prohibited
- 92.150 Evidence of Sex and Identity
- 92.160 Marked or Tagged Game
- 92.165 Sealing of Bear Skins and Skulls
- 92.170 Sealing of Marten, Lynx, Beaver, Otter, Wolf, and Wolverine
- 92.171 Sealing of Dall Sheep Horns

Use of Game:

- 92.200 Purchase and Sale of Game
- 92.210 Game as Animal Food or Bait
- 92.220 Salvage of Game Meat, Furs, and Hides
- 92.230 Feeding of Game
- 92.250 Transfer of Musk oxen for Science and Education Purposes
- 92.260 Taking Cub Bears & Female Bears with Cubs Prohibited

Emergency Taking of Game:

- 92.400 Emergency Taking of Game
- 92.410 Taking Game in Defense of Life or Property
- 92.420 Taking Nuisance Wildlife

Game Management Units:

- 92.450 Description of Game Management Units

Antlerless Moose Reauthorization:

- 98.005 Areas of Jurisdiction for Antlerless Moose Seasons.



Alaska Board of Game
 P.O. Box 115526
 Juneau, AK 99811-5526
 (907) 465-4110
www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov

BOARD OF GAME MEMBERS

NAME AND ADDRESS	TERM EXPIRES
Ted Spraker, Chair 49230 Victoria Ave. Soldotna, AK 99669	6/30/2017
Nathan Turner, Vice Chair P.O. Box 646 Nenana, AK 99760	6/30/2016
Stosh (Stanley) Hoffman P.O. Box 2374 Bethel, AK 99559	6/30/2017
Teresa Sager Albaugh HC 72 Box 835 Tok, AK 99780	6/30/2018
Pete Probasco P.O. Box 861 Palmer, AK 99645	6/30/2016
David Brown P.O. Box 491 Wrangell, AK 99929	6/30/2017
Kip Fanning P.O. Box 333 Yakutat, AK 99689	6/30/2018

Alaska Board of Game members may also be reached through:
 ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
 Boards Support Section
 P.O. Box 115526
 Juneau, AK 99811-5526
 (907) 465-4110 PHONE
 (907) 465-6094 FAX
www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov
 Kristy Tibbles, Executive Director, Alaska Board of Game
 e-mail: kristy.tibbles@alaska.gov

BOARDS SUPPORT SECTION STAFF LIST

Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Mailing address: P.O. Box 115526, Juneau, AK 99811-5526
Physical location: 1255 West 8th Street
Phone: (907) 465-4110; Fax: (907) 465-6094

HEADQUARTERS

Board of Fisheries

Glenn Haight, Exec. Director II, 465-6095
Frances Leach, Pub. Specialist II, 465-4046

Board of Game

Kristy Tibbles, Exec. Director I, 465-6098
Jessalynn Rintala, Pub. Specialist II, 465-6097

Shannon Moeser, Administrative Officer I, 465-6096

Krista Messing, Administrative Assistant II, 465-4110

REGIONAL OFFICES

Southeast Region (North of Frederick Sound)

Frances Leach
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, AK 99811-5526
Phone: 465-4046
Fax: 465-6094

Southeast Region (South of Frederick Sound)

Jessalynn Rintala
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, AK 99811-5526
Phone: 465-6097
Fax: 465-6094

Southcentral Region

Sherry Wright
333 Raspberry Road
Anchorage, AK 99518-1599
Phone: 267-2354
Fax: 267-2489

Southwest Region

Taryn O'Connor-Brito
P.O. Box 1030
Dillingham, AK 99576
Phone: 842-5142
Fax: 842-5514

Western Region

Vacant
*Please Contact the Boards Support
Headquarters office at 465-4110.*
P.O. Box 1467
Bethel, AK 99559
Phone: 543-2433
Fax: 543-2021

Arctic Region

Carmen Daggett
P.O. Box 689
Kotzebue, AK 99752
Phone: 442-1717
Fax: 442-2420

Interior Region

Nissa Pilcher
1300 College Road
Fairbanks, AK 99701-1599
Phone: 459-7263
Fax: 459-7258

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
Statewide Regulations Meeting
March 18-28, 2016
Pike's Waterfront Lodge, Fairbanks, Alaska

~TENTATIVE AGENDA~

Note: This Tentative Agenda is subject to change throughout the course of the meeting. This Tentative Agenda is provided to give a general idea of the board's anticipated schedule. The board will attempt to hold to this schedule; however, the board is not constrained by this Tentative Agenda.

Friday, March 18, 8:30 AM

OPENING BUSINESS

- Call to Order
- Introductions of Board Members and Staff
- Board Member Ethics Disclosures
- Purpose of Meeting (overview)

AGENCY REPORTS

THE DEADLINE TO SIGN UP TO TESTIFY will be announced prior to the meeting. Public testimony will continue until persons who have signed up before the deadline and who are present when called by the Chair to testify are heard.

Saturday, March 19, 8:30 AM

PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY

Sunday, March 20, 9:00 AM

BOARD DELIBERATIONS (Upon conclusion of public testimony)

Monday, March 21, 8:30 AM – Saturday, March 26, 8:30 AM

BOARD DELIBERATIONS Continued

Sunday, March 27, 1:00 PM (EASTER SUNDAY)

BOARD DELIBERATIONS Continued

Monday, March 28, 8:30 AM

BOARD DELIBERATIONS Continued

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, including petitions, findings and policies, letters, and other business (Upon conclusion of deliberations)

ADJOURN

Special Notes

- A. Meeting materials, including a list of staff reports, a roadmap, and schedule updates, will be available at: www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=gameboard.meetinginfo or by contacting the ADF&G Boards Support Office in Juneau at 465-4110.
- B. A live audio stream for the meeting is intended to be available at: www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov
- C. The State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game complies with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). Individuals with disabilities who may need auxiliary aids, services, and/or special modifications to participate in this hearing and public meeting should contact 465-4110 no later than March 4, 2016 to make any necessary arrangements.

Statewide Proposals

Definitions	9
PROPOSAL 1. Remove hovercraft and airboats from the definition of motorized land vehicles	9
PROPOSAL 2. Modify the definition of ATV.....	9
PROPOSAL 3. Establish a definition for general hunt	9
PROPOSAL 4. Amend the definition of bag limit.....	10
PROPOSAL 5. Modify the definition of edible meat for all game birds.....	11
PROPOSAL 6. Modify the definition of a moose antler	12
PROPOSAL 7. Clarify the definition of antler point	12
Crossbow & Archery	13
PROPOSAL 8. Allow the use of lighted sight pins in restricted weapons hunts.....	13
PROPOSAL 9. Update the definition of barbed arrows to take into account improvements in technology	13
PROPOSAL 10. Modify the requirements for crossbow	14
PROPOSAL 11. Allow the use of crossbows in restricted-weapons hunts	14
PROPOSAL 12. Modify the current definition of a legal crossbow for taking big game	15
PROPOSAL 13. Allow the use of crossbows in restricted-weapons hunts for hunters 65 years of age or older.....	16
PROPOSAL 14. Allow the use of crossbows in restricted-weapons hunts	16
PROPOSAL 15. Require certification for all big game hunters in Alaska using crossbows...	17
PROPOSAL 16. Require successful completion of a crossbow education course for those hunting with crossbows	18
PROPOSAL 17. Provide an exemption for bowhunter education requirements	18

PROPOSAL 18. Prohibit the use of slingbows 19

Miscellaneous Topics20

PROPOSAL 19. Establish a regulation for board-generated proposals 20

PROPOSAL 20. Clarify the meaning of “specific location” of wildlife..... 20

Sheep Hunting22

PROPOSAL 21. Modify the restrictions on the use of aircraft for sheep hunting..... 22

PROPOSAL 22. Modify the restrictions on the use of aircraft for sheep hunting..... 23

PROPOSAL 23. Repeal the restrictions on the use of aircraft for sheep hunting..... 23

PROPOSAL 24. Repeal the restrictions on the use of aircraft for sheep hunting..... 24

PROPOSAL 25. Repeal the restrictions on the use of aircraft for sheep hunting..... 24

PROPOSAL 26. Repeal the restrictions on the use of aircraft for sheep hunting..... 25

PROPOSAL 27. Amend the definition of legal Dall sheep ram 25

PROPOSAL 28. Modify seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep statewide 26

PROPOSAL 29. Define the term broken as it applies to the definition of full-curl horn of male (ram) Dall sheep 27

PROPOSAL 30. Establish a nonresident bag limit for sheep of one every four years 27

PROPOSAL 31. Allow one sheep or goat draw permit per hunter every three years 27

PROPOSAL 32. Change all sheep hunts to drawing or registration permit hunts..... 28

PROPOSAL 33. Extend the sheep hunting season statewide; provide a timeframe for resident-only and nonresident-only hunting; and establish a statewide registration season 28

PROPOSAL 34. Extend the sheep hunting season statewide; provide a timeframe for resident-only hunting; establish a statewide registration season; and limit methods and means..... 30

PROPOSAL 35. Establish statewide sheep hunting seasons for residents and nonresidents based on last names 32

PROPOSAL 36. Modify resident and nonresident sheep hunting seasons 33

PROPOSAL 37. Modify resident and nonresident sheep hunting seasons 33

PROPOSAL 38. Modify resident and nonresident sheep hunting seasons	34
PROPOSAL 39. Shorten the nonresident sheep hunting season statewide	34
PROPOSAL 40. Restrict nonresident sheep hunting to a limited number of drawing opportunities.....	35
PROPOSAL 41. Establish a ten percent nonresident sheep permit allocation	36
PROPOSAL 42. Change nonresident sheep hunts to drawing permit hunts with a 12% allocation cap.....	37
PROPOSAL 43. Establish a ten percent nonresident sheep permit allocation	37
PROPOSAL 44. Allocate ten percent or less of sheep permits to nonresidents	38
PROPOSAL 45. Establish nonresident sheep permit allocation of ten percent.....	38
PROPOSAL 46. Establish a statewide archery season for sheep, August 1–9	39
PROPOSAL 47. Establish a statewide youth hunting season for Dall sheep, August 1–5.....	39
PROPOSAL 48. Review and potentially modify sheep hunting opportunities statewide	40
PROPOSAL 49. Restrict the bag limit for Dall sheep in certain areas	42

Use of Game, Possession, & Transportation.....44

PROPOSAL 50. Remove the requirement for evidence of sex for hunts with bag limits of only one sex	44
PROPOSAL 51. Modify bag limits for nonresidents accompanied by a resident relative	44
PROPOSAL 52. Clarify the requirements regarding retrieval and salvage of wounded game	45
PROPOSAL 53. Remove the restriction that wounded game counts against the annual bag limit	45
PROPOSAL 54. Establish an additional statewide bag limit for big game species.....	46
PROPOSAL 55. Change the statewide brown bear bag limit to one bear every regulatory year	48
PROPOSAL 56. Prohibit the transport of hide and skull of black or brown bear from the field until edible meat has been salvaged	49
PROPOSAL 57. Allow the sale of brown bear hides and/or skulls	50

Bear Baiting.....51

PROPOSAL 58. Prohibit the use of chocolate at bear bait stations..... 51

PROPOSAL 59. Clarify and restrict the use of liquids at bear bait stations 51

PROPOSAL 60. Allow use of Northern Pike designated as invasive species as bait..... 52

PROPOSAL 61. Allow the use of game as bait 52

PROPOSAL 62. Remove the requirement to remove all contaminated soil from bear bait stations..... 53

PROPOSAL 63. Amend bear baiting regulations to require specific locations to be given at the time of registration and to update the nomenclature of the signs required 53

PROPOSAL 64. Allow harvest of brown/grizzly bear at black bear bait stations..... 54

PROPOSAL 65. Remove the requirement to salvage brown bear meat at bait stations..... 54

Unlawful Methods of Taking Game.....56

PROPOSAL 66. Allow the use of felt soles..... 56

PROPOSAL 67. Prohibit hunting and trapping from highway right-of-ways 57

PROPOSAL 68. Prohibit the use of forward looking infrared (FLIR) devices 58

PROPOSAL 69. Prohibit hunting with domestic dog 59

PROPOSAL 70. Restrict the use of aircraft for spotting or locating big game species while hunting..... 60

PROPOSAL 71. Clarify same day airborne prohibitions..... 60

PROPOSAL 72. Establish minimum caliber ammunition for moose hunts 61

PROPOSAL 73. Establish minimum caliber ammunition for caribou hunts..... 61

PROPOSAL 74. Establish minimum caliber ammunition for black and brown bear hunts 62

PROPOSAL 75. Allow use of blackpowder cartridge rifles and crossbows in bison hunts 62

PROPOSAL 76. Adopt minimum caliber requirements for use of high-power air rifles to take big game 63

PROPOSAL 77. Allow the use of artificial light for taking furbearers 64

PROPOSAL 78. Remove all requirements for identification tags on traps and snares 64

PROPOSAL 79. Require traps to be checked every 24 hours 65

PROPOSAL 80. Move trapping away from cities with a population of 1,000 or more 66

PROPOSAL 81. Define the term underwater for the purposes of allowing furbearers to be harvested with underwater traps or snares 68

Licenses, Tags, Harvest Tickets & Reports.....69

PROPOSAL 82. Amend the requirement to fix a big game locking tag 69

PROPOSAL 83. Eliminate the use of harvest tickets in any hunt requiring a metal locking tag 69

PROPOSAL 84. Clarify the inspection requirements for licenses, harvest tickets, and permits 70

PROPOSAL 85. Remove the exception for harvest tickets and reports for caribou..... 71

PROPOSAL 86. Remove the exception to harvest tickets and reports for sheep 71

Off Road Vehicle (ORV) Policy.....72

PROPOSAL 87. Prohibit the Board of Game from adopting regulations restricting the use of off-road vehicles for declining quality of an outdoor experience 72

Miscellaneous Permits73

PROPOSAL 88. Add sugar gliders to the list of animals allowed to be sold and possessed without a permit..... 73

PROPOSAL 89. Add sugar gliders to the list of animals allowed to be sold and possessed without a permit..... 75

PROPOSAL 90. Eliminate domestic sheep (*Ovis aries*) and goats (*Capra hircus*) from the “Clean List” and require a permit for possession with stipulations if located within 15 air miles of all sheep habitat 76

PROPOSAL 91. Include cow in the definition of feral game 76

PROPOSAL 92. Modify the allocation provisions for nonresident falconry permits..... 77

PROPOSAL 93. For nonresidents, allow the take of eyas raptors, increase the allocation for falconry permits, and lengthen the season..... 78

PROPOSAL 94. Require the implementation of state wildlife plans before issuing permits for education or telemetry 79

Hunting Permits80

PROPOSAL 95. Include targeted permits with the list of those that the Failure To Report penalty can be applied to 80

PROPOSAL 96. Establish a point system for drawing hunts 80

PROPOSAL 97. Establish a point system for drawing hunts 81

PROPOSAL 98. Establish a point system for drawing hunts with an allocation for nonresident and nonresident permits..... 81

PROPOSAL 99. To apply for a nonresident permit, a registered guide must provide an assigned verification code 82

PROPOSAL 100. Modify the provision of surplus permits..... 83

PROPOSAL 101. Limit the amount of drawing permits awarded to nonresidents to a maximum of ten percent..... 83

PROPOSAL 102. Modify provisions to require all nonresident drawing permits be awarded from the permits allocated to nonresidents..... 84

PROPOSAL 103. Require Tier I subsistence permit holders to report harvest information ... 85

PROPOSAL 104. Require hunters to submit a subsistence hunt report 87

PROPOSAL 105. Modify the qualification under the Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system..... 88

PROPOSAL 106. Provide for changes in hunt type (Tier I and Tier II) to occur during the regulatory cycle 89

PROPOSAL 107. Establish a permit allocation of ten percent for nonresidents 90

PROPOSAL 108. Remove the nonresident guide requirement for those species not required by Alaska Statute..... 91

AC Jurisdiction for Antlerless Moose Seasons92

PROPOSAL 109. Add Units 7, 15, and 14C to the Seward Advisory Committee’s jurisdiction for authorizing antlerless moose hunts 92

PROPOSAL 110. Add Units 13 and 16 to the Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee’s jurisdiction for authorizing antlerless moose hunts..... 92

Game Management Units.....93

PROPOSAL 111. Move Kalgin Island from Unit 16 to Unit 15 93

PROPOSAL 112. Divide Unit 2 into two subunits 93

Antlerless Moose and Tag Fee Reauthorizations95

PROPOSAL 113. Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 1C..... 95

PROPOSAL 114. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 5A, Nunatak Bench 97

PROPOSAL 115. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6C 99

PROPOSAL 116. Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Units 7 and 14C 99

PROPOSAL 117. Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 14C..... 101

PROPOSAL 118. Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 15C..... 103

PROPOSAL 119. Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 13 105

PROPOSAL 120. Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Units 14A and 14B 106

PROPOSAL 121. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season on Kalgin Island in Unit 16B... 107

PROPOSAL 122. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 17A 108

PROPOSAL 123. Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20A 109

PROPOSAL 124. Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20B..... 113

PROPOSAL 125. Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20D 121

PROPOSAL 126. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Remainder of Unit 18 124

PROPOSAL 127. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 23..... 126

PROPOSAL 128. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the western portion of Unit 26A 127

PROPOSAL 129. Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemptions for the Central/Southwest Region 128

PROPOSAL 130. Reauthorize resident grizzly bear tag fee exemptions throughout Interior and Eastern Arctic Alaska 130

PROPOSAL 131. Reauthorize the current resident tag fee exemptions for brown bear in Units 18, 22, 23 and 26A 130

Regional and Multiple Units 133

PROPOSAL 132. Modify the hunting season for snowy owls 133

PROPOSAL 133. Modify the hunting season for cormorants 133

PROPOSAL 134. Increase the bag limits for Mulchatna caribou in Units 17, 18, 19A & 19B, and 9A & 9C..... 134

PROPOSAL 135. Increase the number of nonresident drawing permits for brown bear in the Remainder of Unit 22 138

PROPOSAL 136. Establish winter draw and registration hunts for moose in Unit 16B 140

PROPOSAL 137. Modify the Intensive Management population and harvest objectives for moose in Unit 20A 143

Definitions

PROPOSAL 1 - 5 AAC 92.990(a)(47). Definitions. Remove hovercraft and airboats from the definition of motorized land vehicles as follows:

Amend 5 AAC 92.990(a)(47) by deleting "includes hovercraft and airboats;"

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Hovercraft and airboats are defined twice in regulation. Once as a "boat" under 5 AAC 92.990(a)(10) and again in 5 AAC 92.990(a)(47) as "motorized land vehicles." Hovercraft and airboats are not motorized land vehicles.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Outdoor Council (EG-C15-080)

PROPOSAL 2 - 5 AAC 92.990(a)(5)(A). Definitions. Modify the definition of ATV as follows:

Amend 5 AAC 92.990(a)(5)(A) by deleting "operated on land weighing less than 1,000 pound dry weight."

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? A number of all-terrain vehicles (ATV) manufactured today have a dry weight of over 1,000 pounds. Defining an ATV as a motorized, tracked vehicle, or a vehicle with four or more wheels, operated on land weighing less than 1,000 pounds dry weight excludes a number of motorized vehicles weighing over 1,000 pounds dry weight that are also all terrain vehicles.

ATV weight restrictions are an inappropriate standard for determining whether or not a vehicle is causing habitat damage. Pounds per square inch of surface area would be a more appropriate measuring standard for restricting ATV use while hunting.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Outdoor Council (EG-C15-079)

PROPOSAL 3 - 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. Establish a definition for general hunt as follows:

General hunt means: a hunt is regulated in non-subsistence areas; a regulated hunt that lays outside a non-subsistence area and the game being taken does not have a positive finding of customary and traditional use (C&T); when the harvestable surplus is above the maximum amount necessary for subsistence (ANS) and the board has determine other uses can exist; the nonresident opportunity is a general hunt.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? New definition; define general hunts. The term general hunts appears mainly in 5 AAC Section 85 (in codified) hunting seasons and bag limits. The other term used is subsistence hunts. (Both are used somewhat randomly.) Some have no designation. We need to keep subsistence opportunity or allocation

separate from non-subsistence opportunity. This new definition is needed to keep the harvest accounted for by who is eligible and the choice or level the user participates in.

If you research Section 85 you will find many inconsistencies of our issue. Examples of three but there are many more:

1.) 85.025 20E Fortymile caribou. This population has a positive C&T, yet no designation of subsistence or general season. How do users know what kind of hunt they are participating in? How is the harvest accounted for? Was the resident harvest all subsistence? Are all residents participating as subsistence users?

2.) 85.045 25B moose. This population has a positive C&T and has been designed as a general hunt. Clearly it is a subsistence opportunity.

3.) 85.056 wolves, 85.057 wolverine, and 85.060 furbearers. Outside any of the non-subsistence all these game have a positive C&T, yet designed as a general hunt.

What we are pointing out here is how do Alaskans know if they are participating in a subsistence allocation or not? Does an individual want to participate in a subsistence hunt? And how do we record the harvest, subsistence or other uses? This becomes real important data when determining ANS. We should also expect consistency in our regulations.

We also will point out in each section of game (Sec. 85) species it says: “(a) in this section, the phrase “general hunt only” means that there is a general hunt for residents, but no subsistence hunt, during the relevant open season. For those units or portions of units within the non-subsistence areas established by the Joint Board of Fisheries and Game (5 AAC 99.015), there is a general hunt only.” This also seems inconsistent with how it is applied as we pointed out and you can review throughout Sec. 85. (Most notable in 85.056–060)

Lastly this also complies with the regulatory definitions of tier I and tier II. As both state “means the circumstance where the board has identified a game population that is customarily and traditionally used for subsistence.” Tier I goes on to state “and where it is anticipated that a reasonable opportunity can be provided to all residents who desire to engage in that subsistence use.” Tier II also states further in regulation, “and where, even after non-subsistence uses are eliminated, it is anticipated that a reasonable opportunity to engage in that subsistence use cannot be provided to all residents eligible at tier I who desire to participate.”

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee (EG-C15-051)

PROPOSAL 4 - 5 AAC 92.990(a)(6). Definitions. Amend the definition of bag limit as follows:

In the definition of bag limit replace the word "take" with "kill.”

So the new definition of bag limit - the maximum number of animals of any one game species a person may **kill** [TAKE] in the unit or portion of a unit in which the **killing** [TAKING] occurs[;

AN ANIMAL DISTURBED IN THE COURSE OF LEGAL HUNTING DOES NOT COUNT TOWARDS A BAG LIMIT]

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The definition of bag limit is excessively inclusive and not clear because it includes the word "take." The word "take", which has been defined in legislation and cannot be changed by the Board of Game, includes "attempting to take, pursue, hunt, fish, trap or in any manner capture or kill fish or game." The word "take" should be removed from the definition of bag limit and could be replaced with either the word "killed" or the words "killed or mortally wounded." This definition can be changed by the Board of Game.

Under the current definition of bag limit, if a hunter attempts to hunt black bear in Unit 16 and is not successful in even seeing a bear, that hunter may not legally pursue or hunt a bear in Unit 16 (bag limit of one bear) because he has already taken one or more bear in Unit 16 merely by attempting to hunt them.

PROPOSED BY: John Frost (EG-C15-114)

PROPOSAL 5 - 5 AAC 92.990(a)(26). Definitions. Modify the definition of edible meat for all game birds as follows:

92.990(a)(26) "edible meat" means, in the case of a big game animal, except a bear, the meat of the ribs, neck, brisket, front quarters, hindquarters, and the meat along the backbone between the front and hindquarters; in the case of a bear, the meat of the front quarters and hindquarters and meat along the backbone (backstrap); **For all game birds, the meat from the breast, back, thighs, legs, wings, gizzard and heart;** [IN THE CASE OF SMALL GAME BIRDS, EXCEPT FOR CRANES, GEESE AND SWAN, THE MEAT OF THE BREAST; IN THE CASE OF CRANES, GEESE, AND SWAN, THE MEAT OF THE BREAST AND MEAT OF THE FEMUR AND TIBIA-FIBULA (LEGS AND THIGHS);] however, "edible meat" of big game or small game birds does not include meat of the head, meat that has been damaged and made inedible by the method of taking, bones, sinew, incidental meat reasonably...

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Define edible meat for all game birds to reduce or eliminate wanton waste of migratory birds, consistent with the proposed language of the spring/summer subsistence hunt. This proposal is up for adoption by the Service Regulations Committee of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 2015.

During the Spring 2015 Alaska Migratory Bird Co-Management Council (AMBCC) meeting wanton waste language was adopted for the spring/summer subsistence harvest season defining edible meat as: the meat from the breast, back, thighs, legs, wings, gizzard and heart. However, the head, neck, feet, other internal organs and skin are optional.

The Yaquillrit Kelutisti Council would like the fall hunt to be consistent with the spring/summer subsistence regulations proposed by the AMBCC for the 2016 season. The customary and traditional practices in our region and all the included areas participating in the spring/summer

subsistence season defined by the AMBCC utilize the entire bird. Although the Yaquillrit Kelutisti Council is comprised of migratory bird harvesters in Units 9B, 9C, 9E, 17A, 17B and 17C, we feel that there is support for this language to be adopted throughout the state of Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: Yaquillrit Kelutisti Council (EG-C15-121)

PROPOSAL 6 - 5 AAC 92.990(a)(46). Definitions. Modify the definition of a moose antler as follows:

92.990(a)(46)(B) "spike-fork antlers" means antlers of a bull moose with only one or two tines on at least one antler, **antler projections originating within two inches of the base of the antler and less than three inches in length will not be counted as a tine**; male calves are not considered spike bulls;

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? We feel that burl points in excess of an inch, and less than three inches, are beyond what should be required of a hunter to see from a reasonable distance. These points may be easily blocked from view by the hair or ear.

PROPOSED BY: Wrangell Fish and Game Advisory Committee (EG-C15-029)

PROPOSAL 7 - 5 AAC 92.990(a)(61). Definitions. Clarify the definition of antler point as follows:

Amend 92.990(a)(61) "point" means any antler projection that is at least one inch long, and that is longer than it is wide[, MEASURED ONE INCH OR MORE FROM THE TIP];

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? In the current definition of antler or tine, there seems to be some unclear language. If a tine or point has to be at least one inch long and is longer than wide. So what does "measured one inch or more from the tip" mean or what is the significance of this phrase?

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee (EG-C15-057)

Crossbow & Archery

PROPOSAL 8 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Allow the use of lighted sight pins in restricted weapons hunts as follows:

Alaska Hunting Regulations, page 20:

The new regulation would simply say: "You MAY NOT use a sight that projects a light or beam such as a laser or similar device. Lighted sight pins, or other sights that use a battery to illuminate the sight externally or internally are legal provided no beam is projected."

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? I would like to have the restriction against lighted sight pins or similarly lighted sights removed during archery/weapons restricted hunts. Currently, a bow hunter may hunt in the general season WITH a lighted sight pin legally attached to their bow. However during a "restricted" weapons hunt the light/sight becomes illegal. It makes little sense that you may pursue game in a given area, during a given time period with a lighted sight and then hunting the same animal a day later becomes illegal because that area becomes weapons restricted. A lighted pin does nothing more than allow better visibility for a hunter to see their aiming device and as such potentially make a more accurate shot. Legal shooting hours dictate the close of shooting times and this change would not affect the legal shooting hours. It would allow for better aiming on cloudy days, inclement weather days as well as in deep forest canopy. The vast majority of states already allow the use of lighted pins during their archery hunts. Further, the state of Alaska already allows electronics (bow mounted cameras, lighted nocks) attached to the bow in pursuit of game. This change would clarify the use of a particular piece of equipment for all archery hunters and avoid confusion. My proposal does not include the use of laser aiming devices, only those sights that do not project a beam of light.

PROPOSED BY: Hugh Leslie (EG-C15-013)

PROPOSAL 9 - 92.990(a)(8). Definitions. Update the definition of barbed arrows to take into account improvements in technology as follows:

(8) "barbed" means, in the case of an arrowhead, having any fixed portion of the rear edge of the arrowhead forming an angle less than 90 degrees with the shaft when measured from the nock end of the arrow; **a notch or space of no more than two millimeters between the base of the blade and the shaft shall not be considered a barb;**

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Technology has changed since the Board of Game adopted the current definition of barbed. Many of the newer broadheads are technically barbed if the current definition is applied. However, the broadheads made illegal by applying the current definition are clearly not in the same category of barbed that the board intended to prohibit. The Department of Fish and Game recommends the board update the existing definition to allow hunters to utilize newer models of broadheads without altering the original intent of the definition.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-162)

PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 92.085(15). Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.
Modify the requirements for crossbow as follows:

Update the language of the regulation to more accurately reflect modern crossbow technology by adjusting the current language to read:

2015–2016 Alaska Hunting Regulations, page 19:
Big game hunting restrictions:

...

“-Hunting big game with a crossbow, *UNLESS*:

-- the cross bow is at least **150** [100] pounds peak draw weight and **13** [14] inches draw length.”

This simple change would encompass the great majority of crossbows currently manufactured and still maintain or exceed the energy levels intended in the original regulation while also keeping the ease of field enforcement provided in the original regulation.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Regarding legal crossbow minimums, current regulations are exclusionary of most crossbows manufactured. A great majority of the crossbows manufactured in recent years fail to meet Alaska's draw length requirement while they are still generating significant energy for hunting Alaska's heavy boned big game animals.

The regulation currently states; "big game MAY NOT be taken by the following methods:
-Hunting big game with a crossbow, unless: (a) the cross bow is at least 100 lbs. peak draw weight and at least 14 inches draw length."

This regulation seems to be dated and fails to take into account variables in the bow and arrow system that determine generated energy of modern crossbows. While the regulation, as written, is readily enforceable, it excludes the majority of crossbows currently manufactured which generate energy levels greatly in excess of the current regulatory minimum yet do not meet the draw length requirement. The vast majority of crossbows currently manufactured have draw weights in excess of 150 pounds yet may only have draw lengths of 12.5 to 13.5 inches, making them illegal for use in Alaska. However the draw poundage is generally much higher than the required minimum which more than makes up for the lesser draw length. Adjusting the regulation will make purchasing a crossbow less onerous on the average shooter.

PROPOSED BY: Robert Swanson (EG-C15-001)

PROPOSAL 11 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game, exceptions; 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions; and 92.990(a)(11) and (19). Definitions.
Allow the use of crossbows in restricted-weapons hunts and adopt crossbow standards as follows:

The new regulations would remove the reference banning the use of crossbows in restricted weapons hunts as they would be added to the definition of archery equipment allowed.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? I would like the Board of Game to consider the inclusion of crossbows in the definition of archery and allow for the use of crossbows in archery only hunts. There is little difference in the accuracy or effective range between crossbows and modern compound bows, both are accurate, short range weapons capable of harvesting all small and big game animals in Alaska. The difference is that not every Alaskan is capable of effectively utilizing a compound or traditional bow due to lack of upper body strength or joint problems while they are more likely able to use a crossbow as it does not require the same amount of strength or flexibility. I would restrict the crossbows to "iron sights" with no optical sights allowed and also require the same or similar certification as is now required for bow and arrow archery hunters.

PROPOSED BY: James Fitzpatrick (EG-C15-017)

PROPOSAL 12 - 5 AAC 92.085(15). Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.

Modify the current definition of a legal crossbow for taking big game as follows:

(15) with a crossbow, unless [THE]

(A) **the** bow peak draw weight is 100 pounds or more;

(B) **Repealed** [THE BOW HAS A MINIMUM DRAW LENGTH OF 14 INCHES FROM FRONT OF BOW TO BACK OF STRING WHEN IN THE COCKED POSITION;]

(C) **the arrow** [BOLT] is tipped with a broadhead and is a minimum of 16 inches in overall length and weighs at least 300 grains; and

(D) **the** crossbow has no attached electronic devices, except for a scope or electronic sight that does not project light externally;

(E) it is a shoulder-mounted crossbow;

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? In 2012 the Board of Game adopted the current definition for crossbow. As with most newly adopted definitions it has become apparent it is in need of some fine-tuning. In the short amount of time since the board adopted the definition the technology has improved to make this young regulation obsolete. The Department of Fish and Game suggests making changes to the existing definition based on the reasons listed below:

1. (B) was removed since technology has advanced to allow shorter crossbows that still follow the rest of the regulation. The term "draw length" is only used for vertical bows (archery equipment), the crossbow term for "the distance the string travels from point of rest to full draw" is "power stroke." The length of the arrow and the peak draw weight still prevent the use of smaller, ineffective crossbows which the original language was intended to prevent.
2. Under (C), switch to "arrow" instead of "bolt" because bolt is an outdated term. "Arrow" is the correct archery/firearm industry term and also the correct term approved by the North American Crossbow Federation.
3. Addition of new (E) language, which is borrowed from Maine's "Conditions on the Use of Crossbows," prevents the use of smaller, ineffective bows that can't harvest a big game animal quickly/ethically.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-163)

PROPOSAL 13 - 5 AAC 92.080(11). Unlawful methods of taking game, exceptions; 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions; and 92.990(a)(11). Definitions. Allow the use of crossbows in restricted-weapons hunts for hunters 65 years of age or older as follows:

Hunters over 65 years old may use crossbows during regular archery season; the same requirements for crossbow as stated in the 2014–2015 Alaska Hunting Regulations booklet, page 19.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Crossbow hunting during archery season for older hunters over 65 years old. Most hunters at this age no longer can pull bows back. We must give up bow and arrow hunting that we love.

PROPOSED BY: William Thomas Sr. (EG-C15-049)

PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game, exceptions; and 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions. Allow the use of crossbows in restricted-weapons hunts as follows:

In order to allow more opportunity for those hunters wishing to use a crossbow while hunting during special hunts like the roadside "targeted hunts" for moose in Southcentral and the Interior, or while hunting in specific game management areas or state refuges around the state where either muzzleloaders or shotguns and bow and arrow are the approved hunting tools, I would ask the Board of Game to include the use of crossbows as a fourth approved hunting tool.

In addition to those wishing to hunt with a crossbow, there are those older or smaller hunters who, for whatever reason, cannot use a bow and arrow that meets the existing requirements. A person who cannot draw and hold a bow and arrow can normally still use a crossbow if that tool was legal for use.

What I am proposing is that the category of crossbow be added to the list of approved hunting tools for those hunts in game management areas, state game refuges, and special hunts where either a muzzleloader or shotgun is legal along with bow and arrow. For areas or hunts that are specified as bow and arrow only, nothing will change.

A crossbow has certain advantages over a bow and arrow and also has some major disadvantages compared to a bow and arrow. However, the two hunting tools are still relatively comparable in power and range. A crossbow does not even come close to a muzzleloader or shotgun in comparison. If a muzzleloader or a shotgun is legal to use, along with bow and arrow, then there are no practical concerns to not allow a crossbow along with bow and arrow in those areas or hunts which also allow a muzzleloader or shotgun.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? There are currently several state game management areas, state refuges, and special hunts statewide which support weapons restricted big game hunts. Most of these hunts prohibit the use of centerfire, high-powered rifles and specify that only muzzleloaders, shotguns using slugs, or bow and arrow (or some combination of the specified implements) are allowed. Hunters choosing to use muzzleloaders or

bow and arrow must comply with existing regulation requirements for these hunting tools, i.e., things like muzzleloading caliber or the bow's draw weight.

These restrictions in areas or refuges or special hunts are done largely for safety reasons because all of the approved hunting tools are considered short-range compared to a highpowered rifle.

The Board of Game recently defined crossbows in regulation into their own category with requirements on power, bolt length, etc. This was done because crossbows as hunting tools are gradually increasing in hunting use for big game in Alaska during the general season and have become the fastest growing hunting tool in the Lower 48 for hunting animals like white-tailed deer and black bear. It was felt that a distinction between bow and arrow and crossbow was necessary.

Since crossbows are defined separately from bow and arrow, current regulations allowing the use of bow and arrow exclude the use of a crossbow for hunting during that same hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Howard Delo (EG-C15-037)

During the 2014–2015 Meeting Cycle, the Board of Game amended this proposal (Proposal 35) to apply statewide and deferred it to the Statewide Regulations meeting scheduled for March 2016.

PROPOSAL 15 - 5 AAC 92.003. Hunter education and orientation requirements. Require certification for all big game hunters in Alaska using crossbows as follows:

All hunters pursuing big game with a crossbow in Southeast Region units must have passed a certification course presented by ADF&G and carry their certification card in the field. This regulation to be effective starting July 2016.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The Board of Game passed a regulation stating that all hunters hunting with bow and arrow for big game must pass the IBEP Certification and carry their certification card while hunting starting in July 2016. The board did NOT include hunters who hunt with a crossbow in this regulation. There are safety issues involved with use of a crossbow which are unique to crossbows and do not apply to regular archery equipment or firearms. A crossbow is a different implement than bow and arrow but kills in the same fashion with sharp cutting of vital structures rather than shock as with a firearm. Firearms hunters who pick up a crossbow need to learn the limitations of the weapon, acceptable shot angles and target anatomy. In addition they need to learn appropriate follow-up and recovery techniques which may differ significantly from their experience with firearms. Crossbow hunters who wound animals may leave a visible projectile in the animal which can reflect poorly on not only crossbow hunters but also on bowhunters and impact on all hunters. I believe that all hunters who use a crossbow for hunting big game in Alaska should be required to pass a crossbow certification course developed and presented by ADF&G and should be required to carry their certification card while hunting big game with crossbow. The course should

include a field day in which the student demonstrates knowledge of safe use of the crossbow and a minimum level of shooting proficiency.

Nothing in this should be interpreted to imply that crossbows are the same as archery equipment. The course must be separate from the IBEP Certification and taught by instructors knowledgeable in use of crossbows and certified to teach the course. Also, nothing in this proposal should imply that crossbows are acceptable for use in special archery only areas or hunts.

This proposal is to cover all regions open for proposals for consideration by the Board of Game during their 2015 meetings. It is my intention to make the same proposal next year to apply to the Interior and Arctic/Western Regions. This proposal is to be effective starting in July 2016 which would align it statewide with the recently passed regulation for bowhunters and would also give ADF&G time to implement the education programs.

PROPOSED BY: John Frost (EG-C14-293)

PROPOSAL 16 - 5 AAC 92.003. Hunter education and orientation requirements. Require successful completion of a crossbow education course for those hunting with crossbows as follows:

Crossbow specific education course should be developed by the state of Alaska and should be a mandatory requirement to hunt any big game animal anywhere in Alaska with crossbow devices.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Crossbows are effective killing devices that have been legal to use in Alaska's general hunting seasons for years. However they have been rarely used when the option of using a firearm was available. The crossbow industry with intensive marketing has increased interest in hunting with crossbows. However crossbows are unique devices with their own set of safety issues and inadequately trained hunters using crossbows are a problem. Neither basic hunter education nor bowhunter education adequately train hunters to use crossbows. Crossbow hunters are even more in need of weapon specific education than muzzleloader hunters or conventional bowhunters.

PROPOSED BY: The Alaskan Bowhunters Association (EG-C15-100)

PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 92.003. Hunter education and orientation requirements. Provide an exemption for bowhunter education requirements as follows:

If you were born before January 1, 1986 you are not required to have a bowhunter certification course or to carry your bowhunter certification card in the field in general season big game hunts. However you still are required to have the education and carry your card for all specific archery only hunts and areas.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? There are many experienced older bowhunters who have never taken a bowhunter education course yet are highly

experienced, ethical bowhunters. In addition there are many other older bowhunters who have taken the International Bowhunter Certification Program who no longer have their certification card and unfortunately there is no national (or often even state) registry of those who have completed the certification in the past. The new requirement that all hunters using conventional archery gear have a state or international certification AND carry their card while hunting big game with archery gear in Alaska may be a burden to them and prevent their hunting. Also, Alaska and many other states have a grandfather clause in hunter education requirements. For example in Alaska if you born before January 1,1986 you are not required to have basic hunter education to hunt in Units 7, 13, 14, 15 and 20.

PROPOSED BY: John Frost (EG-C15-115)

PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Prohibit the use of slingbows as follows:

Prohibit the use of slingbows in the stateof Alaska for the taking of all big game.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Prohibit the use slingbows (slingshot bows) for the taking of big game in the stateof Alaska. These are low poundage weapons and not very accurate which would increase wounding loss.

PROPOSED BY: Bob Ermold (EG-C15-110)

Miscellaneous Topics

PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. Board generated proposals. Establish a regulation for board-generated proposals as follows:

Add a new section: 92.XXX Board generated proposal.

The Board of Game, when considering a board-generated proposal, shall meet all the elements as outlined in this chapter.

1. A request to consider a board-generated proposal must be brought forward by at least two Board of Game members.
2. It shall be in the public's best interest.
3. There shall be an urgency in the issue.
4. The current processes to bring the issue before the Board of Game are insufficient.
5. There shall be adequate opportunity for advisory committee and public comment.
 - i. Adequate opportunity means a minimum of 65 days.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Board-generated proposals are not codified. Thus are not in the normal cycle of statewide calls. Currently board-generated proposals are a policy of the Joint Boards (2013-34-JB) and the policy is interpreted independently by each board. To preserve the integrity of the Board of Game and the transparency of the public process, we ask the Board of Game to codify board generated proposals as are agenda change requests, emergency petitions, and normal call proposals.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee (EG-C15-055)

PROPOSAL 20 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. Specific locations of wildlife. Clarify the meaning of "specific location" of wildlife as follows:

The Department of Fish and Game requests implementing regulations for a statute that prohibits the release of "specific location of fish and wildlife species" (AS 16.05.815(d)). The department needs guidance to interpret the statute in a consistent and meaningful way. Criteria to determine whether a location is a "specific location" could include time since collection as well as a determination that release of the locations will not cause harm to wildlife, the public, or the ability of the department to carry out its management or research duties and that the release of locations will not increase the likelihood of specific animals being taken by legal methods and means.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Alaska Statute 16.05.815 prohibits release of the "specific location of fish and wildlife species." The department has struggled to consistently interpret what "specific" location means. All would agree that up-to-the-minute location data of animals currently collared would be "specific" location. Would those same locations be considered "specific" if they were collected two weeks or two months or two years ago? Does it vary by species?

The department requests that the board adopt regulations that implement the statute in a manner that clarifies what is meant by “specific location of fish and wildlife species” and allows the release of location data when it is no longer deemed “specific.”

The department, many other fish and wildlife agencies, and others now radio-tag wildlife with sophisticated instruments that use GPS and other technologies using satellites for both near real time and highly accurate location information. Many organizations post wildlife location information on the web and allow the public to essentially zoom in to the specific location of the animal. Examples include whales, turtles and birds of prey that migrate thousands of miles. This public dissemination of wildlife movement information is useful for conservation and education efforts. The department places instruments on a variety of wildlife for management, research, and education efforts. Examples include many species of marine mammals, big game, birds of prey, and even small birds. In some cases, the location data presented to the Board of Game to aid in decision making could be considered specific and illegal under the statute. In addition, the department frequently gets requests to share location data with other researchers and industry but it is not clear which data can be released.

There is a realistic problem with the release of certain wildlife location data, particularly for some big game such as caribou or Dall sheep. In-season requests for location data could result in take of specific animals. Numerous in-season requests for location data could deter managers from other duties and responsibilities and disrupt hunts. In such cases, it would not be in the interest of the state to release location data.

The department is seeking regulation clarifying what is meant by “specific location of fish and wildlife species.”

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-166)

Sheep Hunting

PROPOSAL 21 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Modify the restrictions on the use of aircraft for sheep hunting as follows:

Option 1. Delete the following [FROM AUGUST 10 TO SEPTEMBER 20 AIRCRAFT MAY ONLY BE USED TO PLACE HUNTERS AND CAMPS, MAINTAIN EXISTING CAMPS, AND SALVAGE MEAT AND TROPHIES WHILE USED FOR THE PURPOSE OF DALL SHEEP HUNTING. USING AN AIRCRAFT FOR THE PURPOSE OF SPOTTING SHEEP OR LOCATING DALL SHEEP DURING THE OPEN HUNTING SEASON IS PROHIBITED]

Option 2. Change the wording of proposal 207 to read: **From August 9 to September 20 the use of aircraft to judge Dall sheep for trophy/legal status for the purposes to hunt/harvest is prohibited.**

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Repeal (or change wording) of the Board of Game generated proposal 207. 1.) Alaska Wildlife Troopers were not in support of 207 and publicly commented that it would be very difficult to enforce. 2.) Proposal 207 was not generated from the public, and when it went out for comments the majority of public written comments were not in support of 207. Advisory Committees that represent the majority of sheep hunters (Anchorage, Mat-Valley and Fairbanks) all opposed proposal 207. Personnel phone calls to board members were used as "public support" 3.) Proposal 207 specifically targets Alaskan residents that use aircraft for the purpose of sheep hunting. Proposal 207 gives hunting guides that use aircraft /nonresidents hunters a big advantage over residents since guides have the time and money to pre-season locate and establish camps before August 10 and are also flying in support of camps during season. (I doubt their eyes are closed when doing it.) If a resident wants to go sheep hunting later in the season to avoid crowds they are at a huge disadvantage. 4.) Proposal 207 does not help at all with the crowding problem. The number one complaint that came from Dr. Brinkman's sheep hunter satisfaction survey was over-crowding; proposal 207 will make that worse during the first part of the season. 5.) Since the ADF&G has not identified any biological reasons to support proposal 207, it appears to be strictly an allocation away from Alaskan residents that use aircraft. 6. **Most importantly**, the way the current regulation reads goes far beyond the board's intent when they passed it. The board intent during discussion was to stop the practice of buzzing sheep to judge them thus affecting other hunters and not being ethical under fair chase. The wording in this regulation prohibits far more than that practice and ties the hands of resident hunters during season when going to unfamiliar areas to change plans based on weather, crowding, and changes in landing areas. This causes a serious safety issue if pilots are worried about getting reported if they want to look for a different spot that would be safer for them to land/hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Daniel Jirak

(EG-C15-024)

PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Modify the restrictions on the use of aircraft for sheep hunting as follows:

Delete: ****From August 10 to September 20 aircraft may only be used to place hunters and camps, maintain existing camps, and salvage meat and trophies while used for the purpose of Dall sheep hunting. Using an aircraft for the purpose of spotting sheep or locating Dall sheep during the open hunting season is prohibited. -****

Replace above language with: - From August 10 to September 20 you must avoid using an aircraft in any manner to spot Dall sheep for the purpose of taking a specific sheep. -

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Rescind 2015 proposal #207. Proposal 207 is excessively broad; therefore we suggest fixing this problem by replacing it with language that mirrors current Big Game Commercial Services regulation prohibiting the use of aircraft to spot a "specific animal." This simply conforms the language for "commercial service providers" and hunting methods and means, while eliminating a redundant regulation.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Professional Hunters Association (EG-C15-112)

PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Repeal the restrictions on the use of aircraft for sheep hunting as follows:

The Board of Game should totally rescind proposal 207 as adopted by the board into regulation. The wording in brackets would be deleted: [FROM AUGUST 10 TO SEPTEMBER 20 AIRCRAFT MAY ONLY BE USED TO PLACE HUNTERS AND CAMPS, MAINTAIN EXISTING CAMPS, AND SALVAGE MEAT AND TROPHIES WHILE USED FOR THE PURPOSE OF DALL SHEEP HUNTING. USING AN AIRCRAFT FOR THE PURPOSE OF SPOTTING SHEEP OR LOCATING DALL SHEEP DURING THE OPEN SEASON IS PROHIBITED.]

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Repeal the Board of Game generated proposal 207, option 1, as adopted by the board, for reasons including the following: 1.) The Alaska Wildlife Troopers were not in support of 207 as passed and publicly commented that it would be very difficult to enforce this proposal. 2.) Proposal 207 was not generated from the public, and when it went out for comments the majority of the written comments were not in support of proposal 207. A total of 224 comments were received at the April 24 and May 28 meetings; of these, 184 comments were to rescind proposal 207 and only 27 were in support of keeping proposal 207 as a regulation. The three Advisory Committees that represent the majority of sheep hunters (Anchorage, Mat Valley and Fairbanks) all opposed proposal 207. 3.) Proposal 207 specifically targets hunters that use aircraft for the purpose of sheep hunting. If a resident wants to go sheep hunting later in the season to avoid crowds they will be at a huge disadvantage. 4.) Proposal 207 does not help at all with the crowding problem, which was the number one complaint that came from Dr. Brinkman's sheep hunter satisfaction survey. If anything, this proposal will make crowding worse during the early season period. 5.) Since the Department of Fish and Game has not identified any biological reasons to support proposal 207,

it appears to be strictly an allocation away from hunters that use aircraft. 6.) The Board of Game generated this proposal without following 13-34-JB; Criteria for Development of Board-Generated Proposals. 7.) There are many Dall sheep draw hunts that have openings mid-season. Hunters that have these tags would not be able to do scouting.

PROPOSED BY: Mat Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee (EG-C15-122)

PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Repeal the restrictions on the use of aircraft for sheep hunting as follows:

[FROM AUGUST 10 TO SEPTEMBER 20 AIRCRAFT MAY ONLY BE USED TO PLACE HUNTERS AND CAMPS, MAINTAIN EXISTING CAMPS, AND SALVAGE MEAT AND TROPHIES WHILE USED FOR THE PURPOSE OF DALL SHEEP HUNTING. USING AN AIRCRAFT FOR THE PURPOSE OF SPOTTING SHEEP OR LOCATING DALL SHEEP DURING THE OPEN HUNTING SEASON IS PROHIBITED]

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Repeal the Board of Game generated proposal 207. 1.) Alaska Wildlife Troopers were not in support of 207 and publicly commented that it would be very difficult to enforce.2.) Proposal 207 was not generated from the public, and when it went out for comments the majority of public written comments were not in support of 207. Advisory Committees that represent the majority of sheep hunters (Anchorage, Mat Valley and Fairbanks) all opposed proposal 207. 3.) Proposal 207 specifically targets Alaskan residents that use aircraft for the purpose of sheep hunting. Proposal 207 gives hunting guides that use aircraft /nonresident hunters a big advantage over residents since guides have the time and money to pre-season locate and establish camps before August 10. If a resident wants to go sheep hunting later in the season to avoid crowds they are at a huge disadvantage. 4.) Proposal 207 does not help at all with the crowding problem. The number one complaint that came from Dr. Brinkman's sheep hunter satisfaction survey was over-crowding, if anything proposal 207 will make that worse. 5.) Since the Department of Fish and Game has not identified any biological reasons to support proposal 207, it appears to be strictly an allocation away from Alaskan residents that use aircraft.

PROPOSED BY: Kevin Asher and Adam St. Onge (EG-C15-004/026)

PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Repeal the restrictions on the use of aircraft for sheep hunting as follows:

Repeal the regulation created by Board of Game proposal #207

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The recently passed board generated proposal #207 is a bad solution to a problem. The prohibition of spotting sheep during sheep season from an aircraft will lead to increased crowding of sheep hunters during the first week of the season. It will be a safety hazard by causing pilots to push weather to get to a spot before season or by being afraid of making more than one pass to determine the safety of a

landing zone. It will be an opportunity for any hunter or guide to harass another hunter using the same area by falsely reporting that a given plane was being used to spot sheep. It will create anxiety in any hunter using his own aircraft for placing sheep hunters in the field. It will not change the fact that there are still too few sheep to satisfy sheep hunters.

PROPOSED BY: John Frost (EG-C15-116)

PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Repeal the restrictions on the use of aircraft for sheep hunting as follows:

Rescind proposal 207. Address aggressive spotting and/or multiple low level passes and circling during sheep season under the hunter harassment law. Require 12 inch numbers on all planes used to hunt Dall sheep. Have the Department of Fish and Game develop an "airplanes and hunting etiquette" DVD or pamphlet.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Rescind the 2015 proposal #207. Proposal 207 is excessively broad and makes everyone flying in the mountains during sheep season suspect to illegally spotting sheep. Also, the Board of Game has expressed their concern numerous times about resident hunters being disenfranchised and not participating due to overcrowding. This will further discourage resident hunters. Many don't have a lot of time to hunt, and to not even be able to do a quick fly by through nearby valleys looking for legal rams or other camps without risking prosecution and/or loss of their air craft, is likely to discourage many resident hunters from participating at all. Most use their planes to separate themselves from other hunters, not hunt on top of those already there. Though I sincerely feel proposal 207 is unenforceable, it could cost a lot of money to prove one's innocence.

PROPOSED BY: Wayne Kubat (EG-C15-126)

PROPOSAL 27 - 5 AAC 92.990(30). Definitions. Amend the definition of legal Dall sheep ram as follows:

Change the definition of legal Dall sheep ram from: full curl or eight years old or double broomed to: full curl or **nine years old** or double broomed

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? I would like to address too many young Dall sheep rams being harvested. It would be a good move to raise the average age at harvest. It is good to have a few eight year old rams left in the population every fall and this will help save some of the young rams that won't take on breeding stress. There are a good number of 7/8 curl rams out there that are eight years old. If they live one more year they end up being nine years old and full curl. In my opinion this is a good thing.

PROPOSED BY: Atlin Daugherty (EG-C15-099)

PROPOSAL 28 - 5 AAC 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit; and 92.990(a)(30). Definitions.

Modify seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep statewide as follows:

Statewide Dall sheep bag limit, unless otherwise provided in 5 AAC 85-92:

One “Full Curl Ram” annually, however,

Only one “Full Curl -” (Full Curl Minus) ram may be taken every four regulatory years by resident hunters; one every ten years by nonresident hunters;

One “Full Curl +” (Full Curl Plus) ram may be taken every regulatory year.

If a second “Full Curl -” ram is taken in a four year period, the hunter may not hunt sheep for the next five years anywhere in the state.

Definitions:

“Full Curl -”: Same as the current definition of full curl (full curl, or broken on both sides, or at least eight years old)

“Full Curl +”: Full curl, broken on both sides, or at least eight years old; AND at least 38”; or at least ten years old

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? This proposal directly addresses sub legal harvest, the lack of older rams in the population and declining trophy quality concerns.

At least ten % of all rams taken are deemed sub-legal at sealing. In addition, an estimated ten % more are deemed “too close to call, or close enough”, likely sub-legal but too close for the Department of Fish and Game and Alaska Wildlife Troopers to pursue a case.

Justification:

#1 This proposal will allow hunters to hunt every year as long as they are diligent and take large or mature rams. Rather than raising the standard for the bag limit, this allows a hunter to pursue a currently “just legal” ram once every four years, or use the small ram bag limit in case he misjudges a ram they think is larger or older.

#2 This proposal also imposes an administrative penalty for taking two smaller, but yet still legal rams rather than a legal violation. (They may not hunt sheep for the next five years.)

#3 This proposal will force sheep hunters to be very diligent to take old age or large rams at least three out of four years, cutting down sub-legal take drastically.

#4 It is suspected that some very old rams are beneficial to sheep populations.

PROPOSED BY: Steve Untiet and Cary Bloomquist

(HQ-C15-130)

PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 92.990(a)(30). Definitions. Define the term broken as it applies to the definition of full-curl horn of male (ram) Dall sheep as follows:

(30) “full-curl horn” of a male (ram) Dall sheep means that

(A) the tip of at least one horn has grown through 360 degrees of a circle described by the outer surface of the horn, as viewed from the side, or

(B) both horn tips are broken, or

(C) the sheep is at least eight years of age as determined by horn growth annuli;

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The efforts by the public and the Department of Fish and Game to scrutinize all aspects of sheep management are still ongoing and as a result the department felt it necessary to submit a proposal to allow the Board of Game to further define broken if an acceptable definition is uncovered as the efforts of the public and the department continue. The department is in the process of creating educational materials for judging full-curl horns of male (ram) Dall sheep and is proactively submitting this proposal in the event the board would like to adopt a definition.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-158)

PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Establish a nonresident bag limit for sheep of one every four years as follows:

Change Dall sheep bag limit for nonresident hunters to read: One legal ram every (three) four regulatory years. (One ram every three years is a viable alternative to the one every four years.)

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? We have repeatedly expressed concerns about the numbers of legal rams as well as emphasized our goals to have sustainable, well managed hunting opportunities. Restricting brown bear bag limits for both residents and nonresidents to one every four years has proved very effective over time and eventually resulted in lifting the "one every four" restriction in many units. We are optimistic that this will save some sheep each year, thus this helps to conserve the resource.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Professional Hunters Association (EG-C15-113)

PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep and mountain goat drawing permit hunts. Allow one sheep or goat draw permit per hunter every three years as follows:

Both resident and nonresident hunters cannot put in for a sheep or goat draw permit if they have had a successful draw for that species permit in the past three years. In other words, you may only draw a sheep permit or a goat permit once every three years. By only being able to draw a permit every three years, hunters will think carefully about whether they can utilize a sought after permit before they apply for it.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Both sheep and mountain goat draw permits are awarded to resident and nonresident hunters who then don't use them for various reasons, but then they can put in for the same species draw permit in another area the next year. This takes opportunity away from serious hunters trying to draw a permit, while people without a real commitment to use a hard to draw permit are awarded one.

PROPOSED BY: Dan Montgomery (EG-C15-123)

PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Change all sheep hunts to drawing or registration permit hunts as follows:

Dall sheep hunts should go to draw permits for everyone. No state in the country has sheep hunts without a permit. Going to a draw permit for August 10–September 10 and a registration permit issued for September 11–September 20 if harvest numbers are not met. This proposal will be better for everyone. Residents will have their priority. Dedicated sheep hunters who don't draw will be able to hunt the late season which is generally better for the big rams. Guides on federal lands already have their permit numbers issued by the federal land manager they occupy. Draw areas have been working well. Look at the Tok Management Area, Delta Controlled Use Management Area and the Chugach State Park areas.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Dall sheep numbers have been on the decline for years due weather, wolves and hunting pressure. If nothing is done, the state will be forced to go to permit or emergency order shutdown with big repercussions to sheep numbers.

PROPOSED BY: Demitrios Deoudes (EG-C15-047)

PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Extend the sheep hunting season statewide; provide a timeframe for resident-only and nonresident-only hunting; and establish a statewide registration season as follows:

General Sheep Seasons:

Residents Only **August 2–9** **Registration Permit**
(One permit for all statewide open areas). Hunters may only hunt this season once every three (two?) years.

Nonresidents Only **August 10–17** **Registration Permit**
(One permit for all statewide open areas). Hunters may only hunt this season once every ten year (See justification # 9)

Residents and Nonresidents **August 18–Sept 20** **Registration Permit**
(One permit for all statewide open areas)

“Auction Tag” recipients may hunt all seasons

Early registration periods for residents and nonresidents would alternate years to start first. (Alternative: Residents could start first two out of three years to provide a small advantage).

Drawing areas and seasons would remain unchanged.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Hunters have long complained of crowding during the early portion of season and in easily accessed areas. The only way to alleviate crowding without drastically reducing opportunity (such as a drawing) is to separate hunters over time and space. Resident hunters have asked for a time to hunt without the competition from nonresident hunters and guides. Guides would also benefit from a premier time to hunt without resident competition and crowding.

Justification:

#1 This proposal will reduce crowding by separating both resident and nonresident hunters over time early in the season.

#2 Resident hunting in the early season must be limited to once every two or three years or crowding will only be made worse. Residents account for more than 70% of all sheep hunters and over half of those hunt over the opening week.

#3 Outfitters will likely choose to take a larger percentage of their clients in the nonresident exclusive season, likely slightly reducing conflicts in the remaining season after August 18.

#4 The new aircraft restrictions passed by the board will only increase early crowding due to the desire of some hunters to spot their sheep from the air before hunting. These hunters will all hunt the opener when previously some hunted later in the season. This fact, combined with an already crowded opening week necessitate separation of hunters.

#5 This proposal may encourage those that have quit sheep hunting due to being frustrated by crowding to re-enter sheep hunting.

#6 Ideally, this proposal will be passed in conjunction with a proposal to slightly restrict the bag limit to counteract any increase in harvest resulting from the additional resident hunters that may decide to hunt due to the exclusive season.

#7 By allowing auction tag recipients to hunt all seasons, it will increase the revenue to ADF&G through these already valuable tags. Auction tags for the Brooks Range, Wrangell Mountains, etc. may be viable revenue sources.

#8 Nonresidents probably do not need to be limited to the number of times they can hunt the exclusive season because very few take more than one sheep in Alaska, in a lifetime. This provision was included simply for appearance purposes. If residents are limited to every three years in their exclusive season, they may have angst with nonresidents being able to hunt every year in the exclusive season.

Resident hunters may only hunt each of the “Limited Entry Areas” (drawing or registration) once every five years. This will minimize the people that are really good with registering online from getting the same tag every year. Nonresidents are limited by the drawing.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Hunters have long complained of crowding during the early portion of season and in easily accessed areas. The only way to alleviate crowding without drastically reducing opportunity (such as a drawing) is to separate hunters over time and space. Resident hunters who do not have access to aircraft or are on a budget have asked for a time to hunt without the competition from nonresident hunters and guides. Increased drawing areas have caused a drastic reduction in resident success rates and opportunity over the last decade or so.

Justification:

#1 This proposal will reduce crowding by separating both resident and nonresident hunters over time by allowing them to choose which season is most desirable to each individual. The two early seasons could be ten days long. Seven days was chosen to allow for more “Open” hunting under current methods and means.

#2 Seasons in this proposal get less restrictive as the hunting season progresses; allowing for current regulations only eight days later than currently in place. This will progressively remove hunters from the field causing much less of an “Opening Day Phenomena” on August 17.

#3 This proposal will allow for a limited resident only season in area most easily accessed by those on a budget or for those that are willing to work very hard to hike into remote areas.

#4 The new aircraft restrictions passed by the board will only increase early crowding due to the desire of some hunters to spot their sheep from the air before hunting. These hunters will all hunt the opener when previously some hunted later in the season. This fact, combined with an already crowded opening week, necessitate separation of hunters.

#5 This proposal may encourage those that have quit sheep hunting due to being frustrated by crowding to re-enter sheep hunting.

#6 Allowing a resident-only opportunity with a walk-in only restriction will greatly increase opportunity without greatly increasing harvest. This slight increase in harvest is allowed by slightly decreasing the harvest the second season by limiting method of take.

#7 Ideally this proposal will be passed in conjunction with a proposal to slightly restrict the bag limit to counteract any slight increase in harvest.

#8 By allowing auction tag recipients to hunt all seasons with any weapon, it will increase the revenue to ADF&G through these already valuable tags.

#9 This proposal seeks to address long-term issues with crowding of sheep hunters by making changes to each area of board jurisdiction and examining the below issues:

Board of Game jurisdiction categories and solution categories:

Methods & Means: Restricted weapons hunts, controlled access, etc.

Seasons: Longer but more limited seasons to avoid crowding, multiple shorter seasons, Registration hunts (Mt. goat model), etc.

Bag limits: Full curl, etc.

Documented Issues

- Sub-legal harvest
- Declining populations
- Declining hunter opportunity
- Decreasing hunter participation

Perceived Issues

- Early season crowding
- In-field conflicts
- Full curl management vs. ?
- Residency allocation
- Second degree of kindred allocation
- Guide conflicts
- Air taxi conflicts and crowding
- Declining trophy quality

PROPOSED BY: Steve Untiet and Cary Bloomquist (HQ-C15-129)

PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Establish statewide sheep hunting seasons for residents and nonresidents based on last names as follows:

Change resident and nonresident sheep season dates to: August 10 to September 20, except that hunters with last names starting with letters A–M (or where ever the half way point of hunters falls in the alphabet) can only harvest a ram from August 10–19 on odd number years, and hunters with last names starting with letters N–Z can only harvest a ram August 10–19 on even number years (all hunters can hunt and/or harvest a ram from August 20–September 20 every year but only one per year total).

This is easy to enforce. All that has to be done is look at the last name on the license and if it starts with the wrong letter and a hunter has harvested a ram prior to August 20, they are in violation. This still gives everyone 32 days to hunt every season and with whoever they want. Also, they can still accompany their buddy, they just can't kill a ram before August 20 on alternate years.

Other options: Divide the alphabet in thirds or fourths and only allow hunters to hunt the first ten days of season every three to four years.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Overcrowding of sheep hunters during the first ten days of season. Half of the sheep are harvested during the first ten days of season and half of those during the first five days.

PROPOSED BY: Wayne Kubat (EG-C15-125)

PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Modify resident and nonresident sheep hunting seasons as follows:

Traditional sheep hunting dates: August 10–September 20

Proposed sheep hunting start dates:

Residents: **August 10–September 20** unless they have a drawing permit that requires a different date to start hunting.

Nonresidents: **August 17–September 20** unless they have a drawing permit that requires a different date to start hunting.

The flying regulations required by the Board of Game’s proposal 207 will start for all parties on August 10.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? I would like the Board of Game to separate certain parts of the sheep season so residents and nonresidents are in the field at different times. In the **nonrandom** survey, 77% of those surveyed wanted nonresidents to start a week later than residents and in the **random** survey 65% of those surveyed wanted the nonresidents to start a week later than residents. This would create less crowding and less air traffic at the same time, which would make a better experience for both the resident and nonresident. It is not an uncommon practice in all states to have hunting dates that benefit residents and this is a highly requested option by Alaskans.

PROPOSED BY: Tom Lamal

(EG-C15-085)

PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Modify resident and nonresident sheep hunting seasons as follows:

Resident hunting season for Dall sheep shall be August 10 to September 20 and nonresident hunting season shall be from August 20 to September 20. Drawing permit areas will start ten days earlier for Alaska residents and if there is a split season, the second half will be shortened by ten days for nonresidents such that residents can start the second half ten days prior to nonresidents.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? I would like the Board of Game to address the issues expressed in the 2014 sheep hunter survey that was contracted out by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game for the board. Two main issues were expressed in this survey: 1.) fewer legal sheep are available for harvest, and 2.) there are too many nonresident hunters and their associated guides causing overcrowding and shooting too many rams (Fact: Nonresidents which are 20% of all sheep hunters took over 40% of rams harvested between 2009 and 2013).

These are not the opinions of a few disgruntled hunters from Fairbanks which has been portrayed by several people in response to the various proposals submitted to the board over the past few years—77% of the respondents want the board to reduce sheep permit allocation to nonresidents

hunting with professional guides. 77%. This number is from your survey. Please use your survey to guide your decisions on managing OUR game and put Alaska and Alaskans FIRST.

PROPOSED BY: Jake Sprankle (EG-C15-088)

PROPOSAL 38 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Modify resident and nonresident sheep hunting seasons as follows:

Hunting seasons for general season sheep hunts:
Resident general season sheep hunts will open on August 10.
Nonresident general season sheep hunts will open on August 20.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Overcrowding during sheep season. Overcrowding was one of the main problems identified from the Brinkman study. There are also conflicts and tension between resident hunters and nonresident hunters/guides during sheep season. I propose for general season sheep hunts, resident sheep season begin August 10 and nonresident sheep season begin on August 20. This would dramatically decrease overcrowding during the sheep season and any conflicts that may exist between resident sheep hunters and nonresident hunters/guides.

PROPOSED BY: Brad Sparks (HQ-C15-138)

PROPOSAL 39 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Shorten the nonresident sheep hunting season statewide as follows:

Amend 5 AAC 85.055 to shorten the nonresident season in each listed Game Management Unit to be **Sept. 1** [AUG. 10] to Sept. 20.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? According to ADF&G, Dall sheep populations in Alaska statewide have declined over twenty percent since 1990. See ADF&G, DWC, “*Trends in Alaska Sheep Populations, Hunting and Harvests*” (2014), p. 4, stating a 1990 point estimate of 56,740 sheep (and a range estimate of 53,900–62,400 sheep), a 2000 point estimate of 50,850 sheep (and a range estimate of 48,300–55,900 sheep), and a 2010 point estimate of 45,010 sheep (and a range estimate of 42,800–49,500 sheep). Also, according to ADF&G, in the 14 areas for which it issues reports, sheep population trends currently are: (1) **decreasing in four areas**, (2) **stable or decreasing in two areas**, (3) **stable at low levels in two areas**, (4) **unknown in one area**, (5) **stable in four areas**, and (6) **stable or increasing in one area**. *Id.* at 7.

In other words, after 25 years of a declining total population statewide, in only one area out of 14 is the population showing any sign of increasing. Given that the 20% decline is over 25 years, and that the trends for most area populations are that they fall toward decreasing or low levels, rather than toward increasing or high levels, the assertion that normal variability accounts for this

20% decline over 25 years since 1990 (*id.* at 7) seems questionable. A more reasonable explanation may be that too many hunters are chasing too few sheep.

My preferred solutions would be either (a) to amend 5 AAC 92.008 (Statewide Provisions, Harvest Guideline Levels) to establish a statewide **NONRESIDENT HARVEST GUIDELINE LEVEL** that “the annual statewide harvest of sheep by nonresident hunters shall be managed by the department so that in any three year period the annual statewide harvest by nonresidents does not exceed an average of 65 rams per year,” or (b) amend 5 AAC 85.055 (Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep) to provide shortened season dates for **NONRESIDENTS** to be from September 1 to September 20 in conjunction with the Board of Game directing the Department of Fish and Game to close the nonresident season when it estimates that doing so should result, across a three-year period, in an annual statewide harvest by nonresidents not exceed an average of 65 rams per year. However, the board refuses to accept ever, for a public hearing, any proposal from the public that would establish a statewide nonresident harvest guideline level for sheep. The board’s reason is that, regarding other species, current harvest guidelines codified as “statewide” provisions under 5 AAC 92.008 are in fact guidelines for particular game management units rather than statewide, and the board (through Boards Support staff) has said that guideline harvest levels could only be proposed on a regional or game-management-unit specific basis, rather than on a statewide basis. I think the public has a right to propose a statewide harvest level for nonresidents and to be heard on such a proposal.

This proposal would promote population growth by reducing hunting pressure, **and would also avoid putting residents on a drawing permit system.**

PROPOSED BY: Mike McCrary (HQ-C15-167)

Note: The board does not have authority to restrict nonresident guide services in Alaska.

PROPOSAL 40 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Restrict nonresident sheep hunting to a limited number of drawing opportunities as follows:

According to biologists’ research, a given number of tags will be available to nonresident hunters per area. (Word that however the area research comes out.)

Sheep hunting guide services are reserved to licensed Alaska residents **only**. (This will eliminate some pressure from the should-be breeding rams of the flock).

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Declining sheep populations in Alaska. I propose we start towards sheep population increase and maintain the resource of the residences in Alaska by first eliminating all nonresident licensed guiding services for Dall sheep hunting in Alaska. Second, restrict nonresident sheep hunting to limited number draw opportunities per area (biologist to determine). **Too many trophy rams are being taken from the gene pool causing a weak flock to fend off harsh weather and disease.** We all know guiding outfitters hold a high success rate, they have to, and it’s a business, money talks. Why should the power of the almighty dollar get in the way of a sheep recovery program?

The majority of Alaska resident sheep hunters have full time jobs that prevent them from extensive area research, which leave the success rate at an overall lower level compared to the commercialized guiding businesses.

PROPOSED BY: Steven Landa (EG-C15-062)

PROPOSAL 41 - 5 AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep and mountain goat drawing permit hunts; and 85.055 Seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Establish a ten percent nonresident sheep permit allocation as follows:

I would like the Board of Game to implement a 90/10 allocation for sheep in Alaska. The board should only allow 10% of sheep permits to be purchased by nonresidents on a statewide basis, but 10% is not guaranteed. The 10% would be calculated on an average of resident and nonresident sheep hunters from the past three years and 10% would be calculated form that total. This 10% allocation would include next of kin and guided hunts.

Example: If there was a total of resident and nonresident hunters that equals 2,000 – (10% of 2,000 = **200 nonresident sheep permits.**) Alaska residents would like to enjoy the same high allocations that other states give their residents. Those states fund their fish and game departments through license fees and don't have guide requirements.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? I would like the Board of Game to address the overcrowding issue for sheep hunters and implement allocation rules that give Alaska residents a minimum of 90% of the resource. The board has been quoted saying the residents need to “share the burden” with the nonresidents if they reduce the numbers of sheep hunters. Other states seem to value their residents and have a 90/10 allocation so their residents are a higher priority. There have been two sheep surveys conducted by Dr. Brinkman. A random survey was given to the board in February and the results of the nonrandom survey were just published. Those who took the nonrandom survey contacted Dr. Brinkman and requested the survey so they could be part of the process in some fashion. Those who took the time to participate in the nonrandom survey showed a high level of interest in the process. In the random survey 77% agreed that nonresidents should be limited and in the nonrandom survey 100% strongly agreed that nonresidents should be limited. When was the last time you saw 100% of people strongly agree on anything?

This 90/10 concept has been presented to the board several times by several people and the board has always opposed giving the residents a higher allocation. The board has now started generating proposals that the public has not requested through the submission of proposals. I hope the Governor and our representatives become aware of current requests and the currents results.

PROPOSED BY: Tom Lamal (EG-C15-084)

PROPOSAL 42 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Change nonresident sheep hunts to drawing permit hunts with a 12% allocation cap as follows:

Dall sheep tag/permit (statewide)
Resident: Harvest tag.
Nonresident: Drawing permit, capped at 12%

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? As an Alaska resident hunter I would request the Board of Game to take a hard look at the Dall sheep hunting problem that's been happening for a while now and change the current regulations for nonresident hunters from a harvest ticket to a draw tag with a cap at 12%. The sheep survey that I took part in was a good first step but now it's time to make a change in the regulations to benefit future Alaskan hunters.

PROPOSED BY: Jacques Etcheverry (EG-C15-086)

Note: The board does not have authority to restrict nonresident guide services in Alaska.

PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Establish a ten percent nonresident sheep permit allocation as follows:

1. Allocation limits: Guides with their nonresident clients should be limited to 10% of overall sheep permits. Most states have a 90/10 allocation which strikes a fair balance from an allocation standpoint. The wildlife is a state resource that should be utilized by residents first. We live here full time, we put up with the winters, the hardships, etc., and we also love the satisfaction that comes from a fair chase, well thought out and planned, successful hunt.
2. Guide qualifications: Hunting guides and assistant guides should be full time residents. If you live here they you can guide here, period. As a starting point, I suggest the same standard to qualify for the Alaska PFD, be used to qualify a person to operate as a hunting guide. Most of us live here full time; we deal with the snow, the breakup, the flooding, along with the beauty of Alaska. Our wildlife is just as valuable as our PFD, please leave its treasure within the state.
3. Scientific data based decisions: The management of our game should be based on scientific data. Bag/harvest limits should be closely tied to trending population data. Obviously over hunting is bad for everyone, and all parties need to participate in supporting limitations should they be necessary. The Board of Game should not place limitations on one particular group based on political views. Recent passage of proposal 207 is a good example of this. Decreasing Dall sheep numbers provided an excuse for the board to target small airplane owners. Airplane owners were an easy target, because they are a small minority in the overall hunting community. In fact, hunting guides use airplanes everyday under the guise of resupply and moving resources between camps. I guarantee they will be spotting sheep for the benefit of their clients. In fact it is impossible to not spot sheep when flying through their habitat. This is an example of a hasty, ill-conceived decision not based on science but on politics.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? As a resident hunter I am concerned with the increasingly limited quality hunting opportunities and over saturation. A recent survey concluded that 40% of Dall sheep harvested was taken by out of state hunters. This is unacceptable, especially with the cyclical reduction in Dall sheep population. Resident hunters are limited in their opportunities for a successful hunt due to over saturation. I suspect the other species will mirror these numbers. Also I see our valuable resource being sold to nonresident big money by the guiding industry. Finally, use science to make management decisions. Please do not let politics overshadow your responsibility to manage this treasure.

PROPOSED BY: Greg Origer (EG-C15-101)

PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep and mountain goat drawing permit hunts; and 85.055. Seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Allocate ten percent or less of sheep permits to nonresidents as follows:

Nonresidents are limited to no more than 10% of the draw tags available for Dall sheep.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? It is time Alaska adheres to the standard practice of limiting nonresidents to no more than 10% allocation of its draw tags for species such as Dall sheep.

With nonresidents having a two to three times greater success rate than residents, for every additional nonresident given a tag above the 10% standard, two to three residents must come out of the field to maintain the same harvest quota.

PROPOSED BY: Brian Bagley (EG-C15-117)

PROPOSAL 45 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Establish nonresident sheep permit allocation of ten percent as follows:

Replace the majority of nonresident permits with resident only permits, so the permit allocation would be 90/10 percent.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Alaskan residents allotted more sheep hunting than the nonresident hunters. The residents of a state should always have greater access to their state's natural resources. It encourages ownership therefore encouraging those residents to preserve and maintain a healthy sheep population.

Nonresidents are more likely to abuse the hunt with illegal activities. Hunting is expensive for non-residents and I believe Alaska has some of the "cheapest" hunts available.

I would also propose the state require a comparable fee for nonresident hunters to those hunts in the continental U.S. (A deer hunt in Ohio can cost \$8,000. Caribou in Alaska is about \$2,000) but this would require a change in Alaska Statute.

PROPOSED BY: Amy Cooper (EG-C15-098)

PROPOSAL 46 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Establish a statewide archery season for sheep, August 1–9 as follows:

Establish an archery (conventional bow and arrow NOT crossbow) season for sheep, August 1–9, statewide in any unit that has a general (harvest ticket) sheep hunt. The hunt would be for mature (full curl, double broomed or eight years old or older) rams only. No scope sighted high power rifles or scope sighted high power pistols allowed in the field.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? There have been many complaints by sheep hunters of overcrowding reducing the quality of the sheep hunting experience in hunting areas especially at the beginning of the season.

This proposal would spread out the initial group of hunters heading into the mountains to hunt sheep. It is not exclusive as anyone can learn to hunt with archery gear. Sheep hunters seeking a quality uncrowded hunt for undisturbed sheep may be willing to limit themselves to hunting with a device that markedly reduces their ability to actually harvest a sheep. This would give guides an extra hunt to sell. It might move a few rams into more inaccessible terrain before the opening of the general season and thus reduce the harvest of rams during that initial opening week.

PROPOSED BY: The Alaskan Bowhunters Association (EG-C15-102)

PROPOSAL 47 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Establish a statewide youth hunting season for Dall sheep, August 1–5 as follows:

Alaska resident youth hunting season for Dall sheep shall be August 1 through August 5, regardless of whether it is general, registration or a draw permit hunt. Dall sheep taken during the youth season will be counted against the bag limits of both the child and the adult, parent, stepparent, or legal guardian who accompanies the child.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The Board of Game needs to address the lack of full curl legal rams available to Alaska residents as well as the future of sheep hunting in Alaska as a whole. The availability of legal rams, much less large trophy rams, has been significantly reduced and is in serious decline. Fewer and fewer youth are hunting and this is largely due to the degradation of game resources and lack of quality hunting opportunities for children 17 years of age and younger.

Sec. 16.05.255 (i) reads: For the purpose of encouraging adults to take children hunting, the board shall establish annual hunting seasons in appropriate areas of the state for big game, other than bison and musk ox that are open before schools start in the fall and before regular hunting seasons begin. Only a resident child accompanied by a resident adult or a child accompanied by the child's resident parent, resident stepparent, or resident legal guardian may take big game in an area where a season established under this subsection is in effect. The adult, parent, stepparent, or legal guardian who accompanies the child may only assist the child in taking big game. A big game animal taken under this subsection must be counted against the bag limits of both the child and the adult, parent, stepparent, or legal guardian who accompanies the child. In this subsection,

- (1) "adult" means an individual who is 21 years of age or older;
- (2) "child" means an individual who is not more than 17 years of age and not younger than eight years of age.

Who will benefit if the proposal is adopted? Alaska resident youth, and future Alaskans. Dall sheep populations may also improve as more youth would be interested in sheep management and game management as a whole. This benefits Alaska, all of Alaska’s game resources, and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game as well. Resident youth hunters will have an improved, quality hunt experience which would increase their interest in the future of hunting, the future of game management in Alaska, and the future health of Dall sheep populations and its management. This five day season would not conflict with the August 10 opener for Dall sheep by residents and non-residents over the age of 17. In addition, ending it on the 5th of August will provide a buffer to the regular season as few adults would wait until the 10 to start their own hunt. Counting against the bag limits of both the child and the adult, parent, stepparent, or legal guardian who accompanies the child would further reduce suspected "abuses." A five day jump would help reduce conflicts with guides and their clients, and avoid competition from them as well as other resident hunters. Transport services associated with sheep hunting will improve as this will lessen the bottleneck on transporters seen at the beginning of each season. This may also increase the safety of hunters and transporters by spreading out the season and users more.

This proposal is a win-win for Alaska youth, Dall sheep, and the future of hunting in Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: Jake and Tanner Sprankle (EG-C15-069)

During the 2014–2015 Meeting Cycle, the Board of Game deferred this proposal to the Statewide Regulations meeting scheduled for March 2016. It was previously numbered as Proposal 208.

PROPOSAL 48 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep; and 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep and mountain goat drawing permit hunts. Review and potentially modify sheep hunting opportunities statewide as follows:

Status quo:

- 1. Current hunt types, seasons, and method and means will remain unchanged.

Existing draw hunts:

- 1. All existing drawing and registration hunts will stay in place and remain unchanged.

Options for nonresident hunters:

- 1. Nonresident hunters on private, state, and BLM managed lands will be entered into a limited draw for the entire season, permit allocation by Subunit.
- 2. Nonresident hunters on private, state, and BLM managed lands will be entered into a limited draw from Aug. 10 to 31, (permit allocation by Subunit) followed by a general season harvest ticket hunt.

3. NOTE: Nonresidents hunting on National Park Service and US Fish and Wildlife Service managed lands are already limited due to guide concession programs, so this proposal does not address those hunters and hunt areas.

Options for resident hunters:

1. Resident hunting season will change from a general season harvest ticket to a limited draw for August 10–August 31, and will remain a general season harvest ticket for the remainder of the season. Drawing hunt areas will be defined on a Game Management Subunit level.
2. Resident hunting season will change from a general season harvest ticket to a limited draw for August 10–August 25, and will remain a general season harvest ticket for the remainder of the season. Draw hunt areas will be defined on a Game Management Subunit level.
3. Resident hunting season will change from a general season harvest ticket to a limited draw for August 10–August 19, and will remain a general season harvest ticket for the remainder of the season. Draw hunt areas will be defined on a Game Management Subunit level.
4. Hunters must chose to apply for current drawing hunts or one of the registration hunts by the December Drawing deadline. Hunters may not choose a registration hunt if they apply for any drawing hunt. All hunters may hunt the late open season.
 - a. 1st season registration: August 10–13 (length of season is very short to discourage choosing the “opener”, length of season could be up to 5 days if desired)
 - b. 2nd season registration: August 14–21 (short season but not too short to encourage choosing this option over 1st season)
 - c. 3rd season registration: August 22–31 (longer season for those that want a traditional ten day hunt)
 - d. 4th season general harvest: September 1–20 (Open season for all applicants that didn’t get drawn in drawing hunts, forgot to apply for either drawings or registrations or were not successful in earlier hunts.)
5. Hunters must register according to his/her last name. The season will be divided into three hunt periods. Hunters with a last name starting with letters A through I can only hunt during the first period (August 10–August 23); hunters with a last name starting with letters J through Q can only hunt during the second period (August 24–September 6); hunters with a last name starting with letters R through Z can only hunt during the last period (September 7–20). The following year, hunters from the first period hunt second, hunters from the second period hunt last and the last group hunts during the first period. This rotate allows hunters to hunt the first period once every three years.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? During the last few Board meetings, the Board of Game (board) has received several proposals requesting changes to sheep seasons statewide. Hunters are expressing dissatisfaction with Dall sheep harvest opportunities. Many of the concerns expressed have noted increasing conflict among Alaska resident sheep hunters, hunting guides, transporters, and non-resident sheep hunters. Proposals were deferred

until the February 2015 board meeting in Wasilla. At that time, the board will consider changes to all aspects of sheep hunting seasons across the state.

The Department of Fish and Game has contracted with the University of Alaska to survey the public that may be impacted by these changes, including sheep hunters, guides, transporters and air taxi operators. The survey attempted to learn more about sheep hunter characteristics and behaviors, to quantify the extent of hunter satisfaction or dissatisfaction with current sheep hunting opportunities, and to quantify the extent of hunter approval or disapproval of potential changes to sheep hunting regulations and management. The results are available on the Board of Game website at <http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=gameboard.main>. The public is encouraged to review the results of the survey and provide comments to the Board by January 30, 2015 for the February 2015 meeting.

PROPOSED BY: The Alaska Board of Game (WS-2015-02)

PROPOSAL 49 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Restrict the bag limit for Dall sheep in certain areas as follows:

In areas of Alaska where the Department of Fish and Game lacks population trends or shows decreasing trends, the bag limit should be changed to “one ram” for those hunts having bag limits of ewes, $\frac{3}{4}$ curl or less, or three sheep. The following units and bag limits would be affected:

- Unit 19C – 1 sheep with $\frac{3}{4}$ curl horn or less (subsistence hunt only for registration hunt RS380);
- Unit 14C – 1 ewe;
- Unit 24B – 3 sheep, within the John River drainage upstream from the Till Creek, and that portion within the Glacier River drainage.
- Unit 25A – 3 sheep;
- Units 26C – 3 sheep, (RS595); and
- Units 26B – 3 sheep, and on private lands within the Gates of the Arctic National Park.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The estimated population of Dall sheep has declined statewide from between 53,900–62,400 in 1990 to between 42,800–49,500 in 2010 according to the Department of Fish and Game’s best guess. The department’s Survey and Inventory Report for the Alaska Range West herd states that it doesn’t even know what the population trend is; for the Chugach Mountains herd it states that it figures the trend is stable at low levels; for the Central Brooks Range and Western Brooks Range, it states the department figures the Dall sheep population trend is decreasing. Declining sheep populations would imply the population is below the past known carrying capacity of the range.

Dall sheep populations are in decline in the Western Brooks Range. The Alaska Board of Game closed all Dall sheep hunting to all hunters in Unit 23 and 26A west of the Etivluk River drainage during their Spring 2015 meeting. The Gates of the Arctic National Park is considering taking over Dall sheep management and allocation due to declining sheep populations. Accurate sheep harvest is critical in order for the department to manage the sheep herds on the sustained-

yield basis as required by state law AS 16.05.255. Regulations of the Board of Game, management requirements.

Until adequate survey data on the Dall sheep population in these areas can be obtained showing an increase in the sheep population to historic levels, there should be no harvest of ewes, smaller rams, or a three sheep bag limit, for conservation reasons.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Outdoor Council

(EG-C15-074)

Use of Game, Possession, & Transportation

PROPOSAL 50 - 5 AAC 92.150. Evidence of sex and identity. Remove the requirement for evidence of sex for hunts with bag limits of only one sex as follows:

Simply eliminate the "evidence of sex requirement" for most species. Note this is not intended to stop the requirement for leaving evidence of sex (attached to the hides of black and brown bear in units where sealing is required) attached to hides of bear when this evidence of sex is used for monitoring and managing bear harvest.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The requirement to leave evidence of sex naturally attached to one quarter of game (when take is limited to one sex only) is burdensome on hunters and may create an unintentional violation in an otherwise completely legal hunt. There has been no suggestion that eliminating this regulation would have any adverse effect on any game population. Currently DNA analysis is available so that if any enforcement officer suspects that a hunter is in possession of two or more different animals, the enforcement officer may either seize all of the meat or take small samples of different parts of the meat for DNA testing. The expense would be borne by the state in any instance of DNA confirmation that the meat was from only one animal and that animal matched the antlers or whatever. The expense would be added to the fines of the hunter when DNA evidence showed that he was in possession of illegal meat.

PROPOSED BY: John Frost (EG-C15-111)

PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets, and reports; and 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit. Modify bag limits for nonresidents accompanied by a resident relative as follows:

5 AAC 92.130 (new subsection):

A guide required species under AS 16.05.407(a) taken by a nonresident personally accompanied by a resident relative under AS 16.05.407(a)(2) will count as the bag limit of both the nonresident and the resident relative who accompanies the nonresident.

5 AAC 92.010(a)(new subsection):

A nonresident may take guide required species under AS 16.05.407(a) on behalf of a resident relative permit holder who personally accompanies the non-resident under AS 16.05.407(a)(2).

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? We would like to address second degree of kindred provisions with a regulation that is modeled off of the current "youth hunt" bag limits and harvest requirements.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Professional Hunters Association (EG-C15-108)

PROPOSAL 52 - 5 AAC 92.220(i). Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. Clarify the requirements regarding retrieval and salvage of wounded game as follows:

5 AAC 92.220(i) **repealed 7/1/2016** [A PERSON WHO HAS WOUNDED GAME SHALL MAKE EVERY REASONABLE EFFORT TO RETRIEVE AND SALVAGE THAT GAME.]

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? This proposal change was requested at the 2015 Central/Southwest Region meeting in Wasilla and was voted down by the Board of Game. The concern for the Alaska Wildlife Troopers is the board documented on record the preference for reasonable means or lawful means to retrieve and salvage game. This added to the burden of the troopers to prosecute an individual who may use otherwise unlawful methods and means to harvest a wounded animal.

The Alaska Wildlife Troopers respectfully request the Board of Game repeal 5 AAC 92.220(i) from the regulations. This will eliminate confusion and remove the legal concern of reasonable versus lawful. An individual would still be held liable for the salvage of all edible meat for human consumption under 5 AAC 92.220(d). An individual would still be charged under Alaska Statute 16.30.010(a) for failing intentionally, knowingly, recklessly, or with criminal negligence to salvage for human consumption the edible meat of the animal or fowl.

The removal of 5 AAC 92.220(i) would also be applied to the professional ethics standards for guides under 12 AAC 75.340(d)(1) Field Craft Standards. All classes of guides shall use every lawful means at the licensee's disposal to bag a wounded animal while it is in danger of escaping, or, in a serious emergency, while human life or well-being is endangered.

The Alaska Wildlife Troopers feel the removal of 5 AAC 92.220(i) is the easiest and most efficient means to eliminate possible future conflicts and discussion on what is reasonable. The subsection (i) has only been a regulation for 11 years and the removal of a regulation for clarity is always encouraged.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Troopers (EG-C15-043)

PROPOSAL 53 - 5 AAC 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit. Remove the restriction that wounded game counts against the annual bag limit as follows:

Eliminate statewide the requirement that wounded equals taken for any big game animals. An alternative solution (but not as good) would be to insert the word "mortally" in front of wounded in this regulation.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The regulation stating that any evidence of a wound from a hunting projectile must equal taking of that animal specific for bear in Units 1-5, bear in Unit 8 and elk in Unit 8 is a bad one and should be rescinded statewide.

Alaska is the only state with this requirement and the requirement applies to only two species in a very small part of the state. There has never been any evidence that wounding loss was detrimental to any animal population in the state. This regulation is a restraint on ethical hunters but does not limit unethical hunters. This regulation was originally pushed by guides who wanted the state of Alaska to reinforce their policy but now many guides no longer believe it is a good idea.

PROPOSED BY: The Alaskan Bowhunters Association (EG-C15-103)

PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit. Establish an additional statewide bag limit for big game species as follows:

Provide a “mulligan” bag limit for all species as follows:

Statewide Bag Limits, unless otherwise provided in 5 AAC 85–92:

Establish an additional statewide bag limit for the following species and additional waiting period penalties for taking animals important for the conservation of below species:

Moose: In areas where moose bag limits are limited by antler size and configurations. **Establish an additional moose size limit of 45”; or, spike/fork that has one additional point less than 3” long or any additional point within three inches of the base (easily concealed by hair or ears) in a “spike” or “fork” area. If the hunter takes an animal under this bag limit, the hunter may not hunt moose anywhere in the state for five (5) years anywhere antler restrictions exist; hunters may hunt in those areas where the bag limit is “any bull”, or “cow.” Any animal taken under this regulation that has had the skull split will be considered a “sub-legal animal” (same as current regulation).**

Dall Sheep: In areas where sheep horns are limited to full curl: **Establish an additional bag limit of at least one horn breaking the plane of the bridge of the nose when leveled off the base of the horns. If the hunter takes an animal under this bag limit, the hunter may not hunt sheep anywhere in the state for five (5) years anywhere horn restrictions exist. Any animal taken under this regulation that has had the skull split or nose area removed and is not legal under current “full curl” regulations will be considered a “sub-legal animal.”**

Mountain Goats: In areas where goat tags are calculated using a nanny as two goat units. **If a nanny is taken the hunter may not hunt goats anywhere in the state for five (5) years except areas where the bag limit is two goats.**

Brown Bears: In areas where the brown bear bag limits are one bear every four years or in drawing areas. **If a sow is taken, the hunter may not hunt brown bears anywhere in the state for an additional two (2) years (total of six years in one-in-four areas) except for those areas where the bag limit is one bear per year or greater.**

Caribou: In areas where the caribou bag limit is currently limited to bulls. **Establish an additional bag limit for cows. If a cow is taken, the hunter may not hunt caribou anywhere in the state for ive years except those areas where the bag limit is not restricted by sex.**

In all cases the hunter must report the animal to ADF&G as soon as possible for verification, and in no case more than ten days after take.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? This proposal directly addresses sub-legal harvest and the legal penalties. At least 10% of all rams taken are deemed sub-legal at sealing, a similar percentage of moose are sub-legal. Female caribou, bears, and goats are often mistaken for males.

The current system is burdensome and humiliating for those law abiding citizens that make an honest mistake with no intent to break the law. Fighting a violation in court of any of the above will cost at least a couple thousand dollars and several days' time. The consequences are not necessarily applied evenly by the courts. Consequences almost always include loss of the animal, which many depend upon to feed themselves and their family; and a fine of several hundred dollars. Consequences can also include loss of firearms, and equipment.

Many of the Alaska's most dedicated conservationists have been cited for some of these unintentional violations, in some cases souring them on the system.

Justification:

- #1 This proposal will allow hunters to make a mistake. Even the most diligent hunters can make the wrong call when faced with the conditions of remote Alaska.
- #2 This proposal imposes automatic administrative penalties (a waiting period before hunting that species again) freeing up already over-burdened Alaska Wildlife Troopers (AWT) and district attorneys to concentrate on more egregious cases.
- #3 This proposal will allow the hunting public to know exactly what the penalty will be for a mistake they have made by not staying within the traditional bag limit.
- #4 Waiting periods are intentionally harsh to dissuade intentional "sub-legal" take.
- #5 Moderate penalties for taking bear sows in low limit areas may help address conservation measures.
- #6 Harsher penalties for sheep, moose, and goats will force the public to be more careful when judging these species.
- #7 Some hunters have voiced concern that the five year bag limits in this proposal are too harsh, especially for sheep and moose hunting. If a hunter would rather deal with the legal system and current penalties than the multi-year bag limits above they may simply split or alter the skull for moose or sheep making the animal "sub-legal" by definition. This would trigger the normal legal process and the likely confiscation of their animal, fine, and possible greater consequences.
- #8 AWT and ADF&G staff will no longer need to worry about letting cases slide that are marginal. By providing these new regulations hunters are already afforded a legal "margin of error." Any deviation from these bag limits should result in immediate citation.

PROPOSED BY: Aaron Bloomquist (EG-C15-118)

PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 92.132. Bag limit for brown bears. Change the statewide brown bear bag limit to one bear every regulatory year as follows:

A person may not take more than one brown bear every [FOUR] regulatory year[S], except that

(1) **repealed xx/xx/xx** [THE BAG LIMIT FOR BROWN BEAR IN UNIT 1C, BERNERS BAY DRAINAGES, UNITS 6 (EXCEPT UNIT 6D), 7, 11, 12, 13, 14B, THAT PORTION WITHIN CHUGACH STATE PARK MANAGEMENT AREA, UNITS 15, 16A, 17, 18, 19B, 19C, 20 (EXCEPT UNIT 20E, 21, 22B, 22C, 22D, 22E, AND 23-26 IS ONE BEAR PER REGULATORY YEAR; A BEAR TAKEN IN THESE UNITS DOES NOT COUNT AGAINST THE ONE BEAR EVERY FOUR REGULATORY YEARS' BAG LIMIT ESTABLISHED FOR BROWN BEARS IN OTHER UNITS.) In Unit 20(E), a person may take two brown bears per regulatory year; [A BEAR TAKEN IN THIS UNIT DOES NOT COUNT AGAINST THE ONE BEAR EVERY FOUR REGULATORY YEARS' BAG LIMIT ESTABLISHED FOR BROWN BEARS IN OTHER UNITS;]

(2) repealed 8/9/90;

(3) repealed 8/9/90;

(4) The bag limit for a resident hunting in Unit 9B, all drainages in Unit 9E that drain into the Pacific Ocean between Cape Kumliun and the border of Unit 9D and Unit 9E, Unit17, Unit18, that portion of Units 19A and 19B downstream of and including the Aniak River Drainage, Unit 21D, Unit 22, Unit 23, Unit 24, and Unit 26A with a subsistence brown bear registration permit one bear per regulatory year; [A BEAR TAKEN UNDER A REGISTRATION PERMIT IN ANY OF THESE AREAS WILL NOT COUNT AGAINST THE ONE BEAR EVERY FOUR REGULATORY YEARS BAG LIMIT ESTABLISHED FOR BROWN BEARS TAKEN UNDER A RESIDENT TAG;]

(5) repealed 7/1/2004;

(6) A person may not take more than one brown bear, statewide in any regulatory year, except that in Unit 16B, 19A, 19D, 20E, and 22A, a person may take two brown bears per regulatory year.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Change the brown bear statewide bag limit from one bear every four regulatory years to one bear every regulatory year. This would result in fewer exceptions than the current regulation and should make it easier to understand and enforce.

The current regulation was implemented in the early 1960's. This was a time of heavy exploitation, much of it illegal, and the population was suspected to be declining. The current brown bear population has recovered and the Board of Game has encouraged an increased harvest.

In Alaska, there are currently 72 units/subunits used for bear management. Nineteen of these units conform to the harvest of one bear every four years and 53 units have exceptions to allow for the harvest of at least one bear every regulatory year. Seven of these exceptions are to allow the harvest of two brown bears every regulatory year.

This vast number of exceptions makes it difficult to comprehend and follow the regulations. If the brown bear population in some units/subunits require additional protection, a permit system, alternating season dates or a longer waiting period could be reestablished for those few areas. There would be fewer exceptions this way. In fact the majority of the units/subunits still adhering to the one per four years restriction, presently operate under a registration permit system. This system allows ADF&G to rapidly close the hunting season when a desired harvest has been reached and would fit nicely in a one bear per season limit without needing a bag limit exception. The proposed change should have no impact on the statewide brown bear harvest, but it would certainly simplify the regulations making compliance and enforcement more clearly defined.

PROPOSED BY: Nick Steen (EG-C15-071)

PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 92.220(e). Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. Prohibit the transport of hide and skull of black or brown bear from the field until edible meat has been salvaged as follows:

5 AAC 92.220(e). Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides.

...

(e) Antlers, [OR] horns **or the hide and skull of a brown bear or black bear** may not be transported from the kill site until all edible meat salvaged in accordance with **regulation** [(d) OF THIS SECTION] has been transported to the departure point from the field. However, antlers, [OR] horns **or the hide and skull of a brown bear or black bear** may be transported simultaneously with the final load of edible meat salvaged.

(f) Antlers, [OR] horns **or the hide and skull of a brown bear or black bear** may not be transported from the field unless accompanied by all edible meat or unless possession of the meat has been transferred in accordance with 5 AAC 92.135.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The current regulations specify antlers or horns may not be transported from the kill site until all edible meat is salvaged in accordance with the regulation and has been transported to the departure point from the field or simultaneously with the final load of edible meat.

The issue the Alaska Wildlife Troopers would like the board to address is the transportation of a black and brown bear hide and skull being transported from the field before any of the edible meat is salvaged where the salvage of meat is required. Currently a resource user can salvage the hide and skull from a black or brown bear and leave the edible meat in the field until a later time. A black or brown bear is considered a trophy animal and the hide and skull should hold the same restrictions for transporting from the field as antlers and horns of other trophy big game animals.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Troopers (EG-C15-041)

PROPOSAL 57 - 5 AAC 92.200(b). Purchase and sale of game. Allow the sale of brown bear hides and/or skulls by resident hunters as follows:

Statewide; allow resident Alaskan hunters to sell the hides with claws attached and/or skulls of legally taken brown bears harvested in units where the bag limit is two or more bears per season.

The Nushagak Advisory Committee submitted a similar proposal for Unit 17 only during the February 13–20, 2015 Board of Game meeting. At that meeting, the recommendation to the Board of Game by the Department of Fish and Game was that this proposal would be best addressed at a statewide board meeting because it is addressing a statewide regulation. Hence we are submitting this proposal for consideration in the 2016 Statewide Regulations meeting.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The abundant population of brown bears in some units needs reduction to reduce predation on moose and caribou and to reduce bear hazards around communities. The advisory committee believes brown bear predation on moose and caribou calves is a significant concern. Recent years have seen an increase in brown bears damaging remote cabins and other property. Therefore in several units, regulations allow a generous two per year bag limit. But individuals are limited in their ability to use many brown bear hides and skulls. Adoption of this regulation would provide economic incentives to encourage the harvest of more brown bears. It has been too difficult to get brown bears included in local predator control programs and this might be a helpful alternative.

PROPOSED BY: Nushagak Advisory Committee (EG-C15-015)

Bear Baiting

PROPOSAL 58 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Prohibit the use of chocolate at bear bait stations as follows:

The use of chocolate as bear bait is not allowed in all units.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? I would like for all bear baiting to not allow the use of chocolate as bait. This is for all units. Studies have shown that chocolate has a dangerous effect on bears and may even kill cubs. It is easy to use other products without this one.

PROPOSED BY: Nicholas Humphreys (EG-C15-011)

PROPOSAL 59 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting bear with the use of bait or scent lures; and 92.990. Definitions. Clarify and restrict the use of liquids at bear bait stations as follows:

Amend 5 AAC 92.044(8) to read: only biodegradable materials may be used as bait; if fish or game is used as bait, only the head, bones, viscera, or skin of legally harvested fish and game may be used, except that in Units 7 and 15, fish or fish parts may not be used as bait;

- (A) **A person may not use liquid bait except for:**
 - (i) **Pouring over or mixing with other absorbent bait that is contained in a receptacle such as a barrel, pail or drum.**
 - (ii) **For this section absorbent bait means, bait that is dry in nature such as commercial dog food, breads, grains, or other biodegradable bait that absorbs liquid.**
 - (iii) **Liquid means a biodegradable fluid that readily flows.**

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? There have been several proposals dealing with removing “contaminated soil” from a bait site. We understand the language under the regulation does not define “contaminated soil,” but this is the very common term used by those with the Department of Fish and Game and Alaska Wildlife Troopers (AWT). We are then dealing with the word “bait” and its regulatory definition. Within that definition, it uses the words “place to attract.” So the permittee is responsible for removing all bait/attractants, to include soil that has been contaminated (AWT’s interpretation). We believe there is room to improve this regulation conundrum.

First we must realize a bear bait site can never really be cleaned up well enough after hunting has been completed to not continue to attract bears or other game. Especially long time well established sites.

Secondly we have put other conditions on permittees such as a person may not use bait or scent lures within one-quarter mile of a publicly maintained road, trail, or the Alaska Railroad; one mile of a house or other permanent dwelling, except that bait may be used within one mile of a

cabin if the cabin is on the opposite side of a major river system, as identified by the department in the permit, from the bear baiting station; business; or school; or one mile of a developed campground or developed recreational facility; all of which are in place to protect other consumptive or non-consumptive users and to protect property.

Thirdly we know of no persons who have been injured by encountering non-active bear bait sites, or private property that has been damaged by a direct cause of an inactive bear bait site. We have submitted new language to be added to section 8 of this regulation, to address those using liquid bait and who have been doing so negligently.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee (EG-C15-056)

PROPOSAL 60 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting bear with the use of bait or scent lures.

Allow use of Northern Pike designated as invasive species as bait as follows:

All bait must be biodegradable. The parts of fish and game that may be legally used as bait are heads, bones, guts, skin or other parts of legally taken game not required to be salvaged (see current Alaska Hunting Regulations, page 26). **All parts Northern Pike taken from areas where they are designated as an "invasive species" may be used as bait.** In Units 7 and 15, fish or fish parts may not be used for bait.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Northern Pike are designated as an invasive species in southcentral Alaska. Pike not retained must be disposed of in a responsible manner to include returning dead pike to the water. Live pike may not be returned to the water. Bear baiting regulations state "All bait must be biodegradable. The parts of fish and game that may be legally used as bait are heads, bones, guts, skin or other parts of legally taken game not required to be salvaged (see current Alaska Hunting Regulations). In Units 7 and 15, fish or fish parts may not be used for bait." The use of whole fish designated as an "invasive species" on black bear bait sites would provide a use for pike not retained for human consumption. Additionally it would provide incentive to fish for pike.

PROPOSED BY: Robert Lane (EG-C15-005)

PROPOSAL 61 - 5 AAC 92.044(8). Permit for hunting bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Allow the use of game as bait as follows:

Amend 5 AAC 92.044(8) to read: only biodegradable materials may be used as bait; if [FISH OR] game is used as bait, **it must be in accordance with 5 AAC 92.210 [ONLY THE HEAD, BONES, VISCERA, OR SKIN OF LEGALLY HARVESTED FISH AND GAME]; if legally harvested fish is used as bait, only the head, bones, viscera, and skin can be used,** except that in Units 7 and 15 fish or fish parts may not be used as bait.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The use of game for bait. Currently the regulation does not allow the use of furbearers such as beavers, muskrats or bear meat for bait where the meat does not have to be salvaged. This should be changed because we believe this was an oversight in the permit conditions. Many Alaskans have been using game like beaver for many years and bear baiting classes given by the Department of Fish and Game have recommended such practices.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee (EG-C15-061)

PROPOSAL 62 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting bear with the use of bait or scent lures.

Remove the requirement to remove all contaminated soil from bear bait stations as follows:

Specifically remove the black bear bait permit condition "must remove all contaminated soil."

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The discretionary condition for black bear bait sites "must remove all contaminated soil" is a source of unnecessary anxiety for hunters who have registered black bear bait stations. It is felt that it can be used by overzealous enforcement to persecute hunters by individuals of authority who personally oppose bear baiting. This condition was never mandated by the Board of Game.

PROPOSED BY: The Alaskan Bowhunters Association (EG-C15-094)

PROPOSAL 63 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting bear with the use of bait or scent lures.

Amend bear baiting regulations to require specific locations to be given at the time of registration and to update the nomenclature of the signs required as follows:

5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting bear with the use of bait or scent lures. (a) A person may not establish a bear bait station to hunt bear with the use of bait or scent lures without first obtaining a permit from the department under this section.

(b) In addition to any condition that the department may require under 5 AAC 92.052, a permit issued under this section is subject to the following provisions:

...
(7) a person using bait or scent lures shall clearly identify the site with a sign reading **"bear bait station"** ["BLACK BEAR BAIT STATION" OR "BLACK AND BROWN BEAR BAIT STATION"] that also displays the person's hunting license number, and the permit number;

...
(12) in Units 1–5, before a person establishes a black bear baiting station and places bait at the baiting station, that person shall, at the time of registration, provide to the department the location, in a global positioning system (GPS) format of latitude and longitude, of the baiting station on a form provided by the department.

...
(14) before a person establishes a bear baiting station and places bait at the baiting station that person shall, at the time of registration, provide to the

department the specific location of the baiting station on a form provided by the department.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The purpose of the sign is to warn the public that there is a bait station in the area, and there is some confusion from hunters as to what activities they can do at the bait site based solely on the title of the sign. Given that the reason behind the requiring the sign is to alert the public, we ask the board change this seemingly trivial title to more accurately state it is a bear bait station.

The department currently uses its discretionary authority to require specific locations of bait sites to be given in all areas of the state excluding Units 1–5. This authority is being questioned more frequently, and the use of bait is also increasing. Considering those two factors the department asks the board to specifically require the exact location of the bait site be given at the time of registration, before a permit is issued. The department considered asking for GPS coordinates to be required but is comfortable managing with just the specific location. Many baiters already provide the department with GPS coordinates even though it is not required, because of that the department does not feel this will be any additional burden on the public. Bait stations can only be registered in person at department offices where staff are available to help the public ensure the accuracy of their bait site locations.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-161)

PROPOSAL 64 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting bear with the use of bait or scent lures.
Allow harvest of brown/grizzly bear at black bear bait stations as follows:

Statewide allow harvest of brown/grizzly bear at registered black bear bait stations, subject to the established seasons for brown/grizzly bear in each unit. No baiting of brown/grizzly bear in units that do not have black bear.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? There are only a few units statewide which have both brown/grizzly bear and black bear, that do not allow shooting brown/grizzly bear at registered black bear bait sites. Change the regulation to allow shooting brown/grizzly bear at established registered black bear bait sites statewide subject (of course) to established seasons for brown/grizzly bear. Black bear bait stations should not be allowed to be registered in units or subunits that have no black bear.

PROPOSED BY: The Alaskan Bowhunters Association (EG-C15-091)

PROPOSAL 65 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. Remove the requirement to salvage brown bear meat at bait stations as follows:

Eliminate the requirement to salvage the meat of brown/grizzly bear when taken at a black bear bait site.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Salvage of brown/grizzly bear meat when taken at black bear bait stations makes no sense when salvage of brown/grizzly bear meat is not required otherwise (except when taken on in a subsistence hunt).

PROPOSED BY: The Alaskan Bowhunters Association (EG-C15-093)

Unlawful Methods of Taking Game

PROPOSAL 66 - 5 AAC 92.080(16). Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Allow the use of felt soles as follows:

Abolish 5 AAC 92.080(16).

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The Board of Game's ban on wearing felt soles while hunting, making wading and rafting while hunting unsafe and dangerous for people. Anyone who has spent much time in the field—or worse, had unexpected "swims"—knows how dangerous our cold waters are and how quickly one could lose their life. Even a quick dunk can be unforgiving and have dire consequences. The difference between wearing felt and wearing rubber or caulked boots is like night and day. Unfortunately, there are no alternatives, regardless of what you are told. If you personally are unaware of this fact, then you have little experience wading rivers or streams and need to better educate yourself on the issue. Safety wise, it is the same as driving without a seat belt, or running a chainsaw without a pair of chaps. Sure you may get by without them, but do you want to get into an accident without your seat belt on? In essence, that's what the Board of Game's (and the Board of Fisheries) ban does. Your ban states loud and clear that our safety—our lives, and that of our children's and loved ones—is unimportant to you.

What will happen if this problem is not solved? People will die—drown and perish while hunting, due to our cold water temperatures. It's as simple as that. While your attempt to thwart the spread of invasive plants and animals is noteworthy, your lack of adequate analysis of the scientific data on this subject is both troubling and reckless. Can felt soles transport invasive plants and animals? Unfortunately, yes they can. But please look at the research—which is extremely limited at best. This small amount of research, much which has not been peer reviewed, has indicated that felt soles can spread such invasives as Didymo (rock snot), possibly whirling disease, and one New Zealand mudsnail was proven to be transported by a felt boot. ONE. Research has also proven that these invasives can be carried and transported to other waters on shoe laces, socks, inside the wading boots themselves, on the wading material itself and even on rubber wading boots. Furthermore, research has also proven invasives can be transported from one water body to another by boat trailers and through bilge water of boats and float planes traveling to and from different water bodies. Even Darwin wrote many years ago, about migrating waterfowl transporting plants and animals from one water body to another, both internally and externally. Why not ban all of these vectors then? Your ban on felt soles is as sensible as an open season on waterfowl, float planes and boats. Perhaps you should just ban people all together. Please—research the information yourself, not just the data and information you have been spoon fed by environmental alarmists.

What solution do you prefer? In other words, if the board adopted your solution, what would the new regulation say? A better and more proactive approach would be to educate people on invasives and how to prevent spreading them instead of "outlawing" personal protective equipment. Use ADF&G's internal education program to educate people on how to treat their felt soles, waders, bilge water etc. before AND after being in Alaskan waters. According to ADF&G personnel, their concern is not so much with Alaskans spreading invasives as it is with

tourists bringing them into the state. Why punish Alaskans then? Why not educate and target the tourists when they come into the state?

Does your proposal address improving the quality of the resource harvested or products produced? If so, how? NO. But it improves the safety of Alaska hunters. The ban on felt soles does nothing to improve the quality of resources harvested either. And this question addresses an underlying issue to this ban which the Board of Game has implemented. Your mandate is to manage fish and game—not people. Your mandate and charge is to "improve the quality of the resources harvested or products produced" as your question asks above. Seasons, bag limits, methods of taking, harvest areas—not wardrobes, and definitely not personal safety equipment. This ban is an inherent attack on our personal freedoms to travel afield as we see fit. It is also making normally law abiding citizens break the law for the purposes of our personal safety. Our safety and that of our children is more important than any of the perceived benefits you believe are achieved by this ban-especially when there are so many other vectors which you have not addressed. The last time I looked, this country is a free one, with "inalienable rights" of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness (which for many of us is the pursuit of fish and game.). When did we give up the right to decide what we should wear and not wear while in the field? What legal authority gives you the right to ban articles of clothing and make our travels less safe and even dangerous? Every time we allow another entity to take away our rights, we lose more of our personal freedoms and your taking of our right to travel afield as we see fit is an abuse of your power. None of us want to see invasive plants and animals overtake our waters and lands, but your ban on felt soles is baseless, unwarranted, poorly thought out, and most of all reckless. The next drowning of an Alaskan hunter, possibly a young hunter, may well be because of your poorly thought out decision to ban felt soles.

Who will benefit if your proposal is adopted? Alaskan hunters—residents and non-residents alike.

Who is likely to suffer if your proposal is adopted? No one--and our streams and rivers will not suffer either.

List any other solutions you considered and why you rejected them. Ban nonresidents from traveling to Alaska with felt soles and hunting and fishing our waters. Impossible to implement and enforce. Not fair, not right, and not smart either given the research available and for all the reasons mentioned above.

PROPOSED BY: Jake Sprankle (EG-C15-070)

PROPOSAL 67 - 5 AAC 92.080(1). Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Prohibit hunting and trapping from highway right-of-ways as follows:

Modify 5 AAC 92.080(1) -The following methods of taking game are prohibited:

(1) by shooting, from, on or across a highway;

(a) it is unlawful to hunt or trap within State Federal Aid right-of-ways without written documentation granting permission from private land owner[s].

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Regulatory language for hunting or trapping in right-of-ways is non-existent in state regulations. Laws and regulations in Alaska do not specify whether it is legal to hunt or trap in right-of-ways. Members of the Alaska Board of Game need to address the nonexistent regulatory language to clarify where hunters and trappers are allowed to hunt or trap wild game.

Hunters take wild game and trappers set traps in right-of-ways on state and private lands because laws and regulations are nonexistent and unclear whether hunting or trapping can occur in right-of-ways. Taking action to clear up hunting and trapping in federal aid highway right-of-ways will disallow hunting and trapping in right-of-ways crossing through private property.

It may also provide safety for the public to disallow shooting or trapping in a public right-of-way, hunters usually park vehicles in right-of-ways while hunting in the field. Setting traps without land owners' knowledge on private lands is also unsafe. Safety of everyone in crowded hunting areas should be paramount so that accidental shooting of other hunters does not occur. Setting traps without land owners' permission should also be addressed to avoid unsafe trapping practices.

PROPOSED BY: Ahtna Tene Nene' Customary & Traditional Use Committee (EG-C15-050)

PROPOSAL 68 - 5 AAC 92.080(7). Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Prohibit the use of forward looking infrared (FLIR) devices as follows:

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

...

(7) with the aid of a pit, fire, artificial light, laser sight, electronically enhanced night vision [SCOPE], **any forward looking infrared device**, any device that has been airborne, controlled remotely, and used to spot or locate game with the use of a camera or video device, radio communication, cellular or satellite telephone, artificial salt lick, explosive, expanding gas arrow, bomb, smoke, chemical (excluding scent lures), or a conventional steel trap with an inside jaw spread over nine inches.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The use of forward looking infrared scopes and hand held devices have gained in popularity due to the cost and expense of the units dropping dramatically. Currently the regulations only address the prohibition of electronically enhanced night vision scopes. The Alaska Wildlife Troopers have received multiple inquiries over the past year regarding hunters wanting to use FLIR scopes and hand held devices when pursuing game. The current regulations do not prohibit their use when taking game.

The use of FLIR scopes, hand held devices, and electronically enhanced night vision devices give an individual an unfair advantage when taking game. The current regulations do not prohibit an individual from wearing electronically enhanced night vision goggles with iron sights on their

rifle to take game, only with an electronically enhanced night vision scope. Technologies are evolving faster than the regulation can be amended and with the Board of Game on a three year cycle we feel it is imperative the board discuss adding this prohibition to regulation.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Troopers (EG-C15-042)

PROPOSAL 69 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Prohibit hunting with domestic dogs as follows:

5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions.

The use or accompaniment of domestic dogs is prohibited while hunting. Dogs used as service animals as defined under Title II and Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act are exempt if the hunter is in possession of a current official certificate of veterinary inspection for the service dog.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? There is concern that domestic dogs will transmit diseases to Alaska's wildlife populations. The Department of Fish and Game has stated that Alaska's wild game populations are immunologically naive and wildlife disease specialists expect there to be profound impacts of climate change on animal and parasite distributions. Diseases, primarily transmitted through dog ticks, are serious and potentially deadly to Alaska's wildlife populations according to an ADF&G memo dated April 12, 2014. (see http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/static/species/disease/pdfs/dog_tick_memorandum.pdf)

ADF&G states that the diseases of concern include Rocky Mountain Spotted Fever, tularemia, canine ehrlichiosis, canine babesiosis, Lyme Disease, and Q-fever. Only tularemia and Q-fever are already present in Alaskan wildlife but others could be easily introduced by just a single tick biting an infected pet carrying the infection and passing it on to their next meal. ADF&G along with the Office of the State Veterinarian have detected an increasing incidence of dog ticks that are exotic to Alaska (that is Alaska is not part of the reported geographic range). Other diseases potentially transmitted by canines as identified on ADF&G's website include cystic hydatid disease, alveolar hydatid disease, sarcocystosis, and muscle tapeworm cysts.(see <http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=disease.diseaselist>.)

ADF&G states that dog ticks are competent vectors of disease (carriers able to transmit disease) and that tick-borne diseases in other animals will follow.

I propose to prohibit the use of and/or accompaniment of domestic dogs while hunting.

If this proposal doesn't pass, there will be an increased risk of disease transmission to Alaska's wildlife populations. If disease transmission occurs, it will have substantial economic and aesthetic impact. If this regulation is adopted, it could prevent mass die offs that could eliminate any harvestable surplus of big game and/or small game animal populations. This regulation will help to ensure long term population persistence and allow us to harvest according to the sustained yield principle, as well as enjoy the aesthetic benefits of having healthy Alaskan wildlife.

As an alternate solution, a health certification program for dogs was considered, but in many cases the specific microorganisms, diseases, and parasites responsible for these disease outbreaks are either undetectable at certain times of the year, or can persist at low levels in dogs, or in some cases parasites can be transmitted through feces. Also, ticks may leave the dog, cling to vegetation, and then through a behavior called "questing" attach themselves to a new host.

PROPOSED BY: Guy Fulton (EG-C15-036)

PROPOSAL 70 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Restrict the use of aircraft for spotting or locating big game species while hunting as follows:

Changes to "Use of aircraft for hunting":

Aircraft may only be used to place hunters and camps, maintain existing camps, and salvage meat, trophies and associated equipment while used for the purpose of hunting **big game species**. Using an aircraft for the purpose of spotting **big game species** or locating **big game species** during the open hunting season is prohibited.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The use of aircraft while hunting big game species in Alaska. I fully support the Alaska Board of Game's recent passage of proposal 207, option A, at the March 2015 meeting in Anchorage and would like to see that type of regulation extended to all big game species in Alaska.

I strongly feel that this will broaden the efforts to promote and practice ethical, fair chase hunting for ALL hunters that engage in hunting in Alaska and will help strengthen Alaska's conservation efforts. Thank you very much.

PROPOSED BY: Fred Harbison (EG-C15-022)

PROPOSAL 71 - 5 AAC 92.085(8). Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Clarify same day airborne prohibitions as follows:

5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. The following methods of taking big game are prohibited:

...

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

- (A) taking deer;
- (B) repealed 7/1/92;
- (C) a person flying on a regularly scheduled commercial airline, including a commuter airline;
- (D) taking caribou from January 1 through April 15, in Unit 22 if the hunter is at least 300 feet from the airplane at the time of taking;
- (E) repealed 7/1/2009;

(F) repealed 7/1/2008;

(G) a hunter taking a bear at a bait station with the use of bait or scent lures with a permit issued under 5 AAC 92.044, and if the hunter is at least 300 feet from the airplane at the time of the taking;

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The current unlawful methods and means listed in regulations prohibit an individual from taking a big game animal the same day they are airborne; however, it does not prohibit an individual from taking a big game animal using information given to them by an individual who was airborne. If any individual takes a big game animal on the same day they receive information from an individual who was airborne on the same day only the individual who was airborne would be in violation of the regulation.

Another loophole in this regulation may include a pilot spotting big game and landing at a strip to provide the location of a big game animal to the hunter. In this scenario, the hunter has not been airborne and therefore could not be charged under this regulation. Since the use of radios to take big game is already prohibited, a person utilizing radios to communicate may be cited for the use of radios from the ground to the aircraft; however, they would not be cited for same day airborne. By changing the regulation as requested, it would allow Alaska Wildlife Troopers to consider charges for same day airborne in very narrow circumstances when a person who has taken a big game animal receives information from the person who was airborne that directly impacts the take of the big game animal. This proposal would make both individuals responsible for violating the regulation.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Troopers (EG-C15-044)

PROPOSAL 72 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.
Establish minimum caliber ammunition for moose hunts as follows:

Must use any caliber .243 or larger for hunting moose.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? High wounding and loss of game.

PROPOSED BY: Tim Crace (EG-C15-007)

PROPOSAL 73 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.
Establish minimum caliber ammunition for caribou hunts as follows:

Use any caliber .243 or larger for caribou.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Lost or wounded animals

PROPOSED BY: Tim Crace (EG-C15-008)

PROPOSAL 74 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Establish minimum caliber ammunition for black and brown bear hunts as follows:

Use any caliber .243 or larger for black and brown bear.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Lost or wounded animals

PROPOSED BY: Tim Crace (EG-C15-009)

PROPOSAL 75 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Allow use of blackpowder cartridge rifles and crossbows in bison hunts as follows:

Since the Board of Game has defined a crossbow in its own category, the general regulatory term bow-and-arrow does not include crossbows. Crossbows are comparable to compound bows in many ways, including general range and trajectory limitations. Crossbows have both advantages and disadvantages when compared to bow-and-arrow equipment, but are similar in the way they kill an animal. I would propose that crossbows be added to the list of longbows, recurve bows, and compound bows as legal implements for hunting bison.

Many of the larger blackpowder cartridges were developed specifically for the bison market hunters of the second half of the 1800's. We all know how efficient these cartridges and firearms were in decimating the plains bison during that time. Yet, using the definition developed for centerfire calibers, few blackpowder cartridge loads can be found which meet the energy requirements. Few, if any, muzzleloading loads currently legal to use would meet those same centerfire cartridge requirements.

Replica blackpowder cartridge rifles are becoming fairly common along with the interest in shooting them, both in competition and for hunting. Both the NRA and the NMLRA hold local, state, regional, and national blackpowder cartridge rifle matches at ranges as far as 1000 yards. Regarding hunting, a 45-caliber rifle shooting a 400-grain bullet backed by 70 grains of blackpowder would be a legal muzzleloading load for bison. However, put that same load in a 45-70 blackpowder cartridge rifle and it is illegal. I would prefer not to specify legal blackpowder cartridges, but that method would follow the current muzzleloading specifications. I would propose the following blackpowder cartridges as legal for hunting bison in Alaska: 44-77, 45-70, 45-90, 45-120, 50-70, 50-90, 50-110. These tend to be the more common current chamberings in the more commonly available blackpowder cartridge rifles. There are other calibers which were developed for match shooting which could be considered, but they would be on the "lighter" side for hunting large, tenacious animals.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Hunting bison for food or market goes back to the founding of this country. Alaska established a free-ranging plains bison herd in the Delta Junction area decades ago and two other herds were developed from those animals -- the Copper River herd and the Farewell Burn herd. During the spring of this year

(2015), ADF&G transplanted about 100 wood bison into the Interior to begin re-introducing a native species back into the Alaska ecosystem.

These plains bison herds have been hunted on a limited drawing basis for many years. The hope and intent of the wood bison reintroduction is to also allow limited hunting at some point in the future. Because both the plains and wood bison are large, tenacious animals, the Department of Fish and Game has developed requirements for the hunting implements used to better assure humane take of the animals.

The ADF&G webpage specifies weapons legal for bison hunting. Modern rifles and handguns must meet minimum energy requirements using bullets weighing a specified minimum weight to be legal. Muzzleloaders have minimum caliber requirements for using round balls or conical bullets weighing a specified minimum amount. The bow requirements are spelled out and are the same as the larger category of big game animal equipment requirements. However, two groups of hunters are excluded by these definitions of legal "weapons:" crossbow hunters and blackpowder cartridge rifle hunters.

PROPOSED BY: Howard Delo (EG-C15-038)

PROPOSAL 76 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Adopt minimum caliber requirements for use of high-power air rifles to take big game as follows:

Adopt regulations that would contain caliber and feature restrictions to ensure humane harvesting of animals. High powered air rifles are available in calibers from 9 mm to .72 with bullet weights from 92 grains to 1000 grains. In other states they commonly take deer, hogs, and black bears. Even a 2000 pound bison has been taken with one.

Example or revised regulation:

5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions: The following methods and means of taking big game are prohibited in addition to the prohibitions in 5 AAC 92.080: (1) with the use of a firearm other than a shotgun, muzzleloader, **air rifle** or rifle or pistol using a center-firing cartridge, except that (A) in Units 23 and 26, swimming caribou may be taken with a firearm using rim fire cartridges; (B) the use of a muzzleloader is prohibited unless the firearm is a shoulder mounted long gun, 45 caliber or larger, with a barrel that is either rifled or smoothbore, and discharges a single projectile; and (C) the use of a muzzleloader equipped with a scope, or a muzzleloader using smokeless powder as a charge, during any permitted, registered, or special season hunt for muzzleloaders only, is prohibited; **(D) the use of an air rifle is prohibited unless the air rifle is .XX caliber or larger (most likely .40 caliber or above) with a rifled barrel and discharges a single projectile.**

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Provisions for harvesting small and big game utilizing high powered air rifles. Providing another method of harvesting animals.

PROPOSED BY: Zachary Bulacan (EG-C15-046)

PROPOSAL 77 - 5 AAC 92.080(7)(C)(i) Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions.

Allow the use of artificial light for taking furbearers as follows:

Allow the use of artificial lighting **on land only** in all units in the taking of furbearers during each unit’s open trapping season.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Adopt a regulation change that will allow trappers in all units the use of artificial lighting for the taking of furbearers on a trapping license.

The proposed regulation change will allow another method of taking furbearers for all trappers. It will also allow physically disabled and senior trappers another method that are unable to run a trap line or hike long distances. Some trappers may opt for this method in populated areas that may reduce conflicts with non-trappers, and may lessen the chance of domestic animals from being caught in snares, conventional traps, and killer style (body grip) traps.

PROPOSED BY: William Wertanen (EG-C15-025)

PROPOSAL 78 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.

Remove all requirements for identification tags on traps and snares as follows:

We recommend that any requirement for use of trap ID tags be stricken from the regulations and that the Board of Game make a statement of “legislative intent” in opposition to future implementation of any regulation which would require trap ID tags.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Trap identification tags are cumbersome, ineffective and can lead to interference with lawful trapping. Regulations requiring trap ID tags should be struck from trapping regulations statewide.

Proponents of trap ID tags claim that this requirement will make trappers more honest and conscious of when and where they set traps. Their view is misguided. Once trap ID tags are required, enforcement officers feel entitled to check traps and snares for presence of the tags. In the process of handling the traps or snares, they often render the sets ineffective by disturbing the immediate area and/or contaminating the gear with human scent.

Opponents of trapping can steal tagged traps and snares and re-set them illegally; before or after legal season or in areas that are closed to trapping.

We are also concerned about the potential for uneven enforcement throughout the state. Regulations should be enforced equally in all areas.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Trappers Association (EG-C15-033)

PROPOSAL 79 - 5 AAC 92.095(a). Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.
Require traps to be checked every 24 hours as follows:

5 AAC 92.095(a)(16) is amended to read:

(16) in Unit 1(C), that portion west of Excursion Inlet and north of Icy Passage, by using [(A)] a snare with a cable diameter of 1/32 inch or larger that is set out of water, except under the terms of a registration permit;

[(B) A TRAP OR SNARE, UNLESS THE TRAP OR SNARE IS CHECKED AT LEAST ONCE EVERY 72 HOURS;]

5 AAC 92.095(a) is amended by adding a new subparagraph (21):

(21) use of a trap or snare, unless the trap or snare is checked at least once every 24 hours from the time initially set or last checked, except in the event of severe weather. Documentation is required and must include the time and date of the set, the time and date of each check, and the date and type of severe weather, if a check delay is necessary.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Alaska does not have a time limit for checking traps and snares. Lack of a requirement often results in long periods of suffering for wildlife. This proposal would mandate a statewide 24 hour time limit for checking traps and snares.

Section 5 AAC 92.095(a) of the Alaska Administrative Code addresses Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions. Paragraph (a) number (16) contains a requirement for a 72 hour time limit for checking traps. However, the requirement applies only to Unit 1(C), that portion west of Excursion Inlet and north of Icy Passage and 72 hours is widely considered an excessive period for an animal to suffer.

This proposal would remove the requirement from number (16) and add a new number (21) mandating a statewide 24 hour time limit for checking traps & snares. An exception to the requirement will allow a delay beyond 24 hours for severe weather like extreme cold, blizzard or windstorm, but the date and nature of the weather must be documented. Dictionary definitions of severe include harsh, extreme, grave, and critical.

Mandating a statewide 24 hour time limit to check traps and snares will accomplish many important objectives.

In considering the requirement 72, 48, and 24 hours were evaluated. More than half of all states require that traps be checked at least once every 24 hours (or "daily"). Alaska has unique issues, but certainly a 24 hour time limit to check traps will greatly reduce wildlife suffering and weather within 24 hours is far more predictable than for longer periods.

Animals are not always killed instantly when trapped. Wildlife can suffer for long periods of time before the trapper returns to the location. This can affect the quality of the desired pelt as well as imparting unnecessary suffering for animals.

The trapped animal will also be at risk of predation the longer it remains trapped which can lead to dangerous situations for trappers and others. People that may be in the area for non-related reasons can be subjected to a dangerous encounter with predators attracted by the trapped animal or possibly endangered by the trapped animal itself.

Traps and snares are indiscriminate. Trapped wildlife could have young present, or nearby. Returning to the trap site within 24 hours will give a trapper a chance to report the presence of any young that could be saved. For many wildlife species, young will not survive unless the mother is there to care for them. Eliminating the mother by indiscriminately trapping her, means her young will likely not survive and numbers will be depleted in an area for future use. Non-targeted species can become trapped. Checking traps within 24 hours would enhance the chances of survival for non-target wildlife species that have been entangled in traps. Such wildlife may be able to be released or sent to a licensed wildlife rehabilitator for medical treatment. Juneau had an instance in December of 2014 involving a bald eagle that became trapped. A local hiker happened to stumble upon the injured animal and got the bird to the local wildlife rehabilitator. Unfortunately, the bird's injuries were so severe, the animal needed to be euthanized. Domestic animals, most often dogs, are often caught in traps. Mandating a 24 hour time limit to check traps could be the difference between life and death for a wandering family pet that has become entangled in a trap or snare.

Alaska trapper organizations, animal welfare groups, and wildlife advocates were invited to review and make suggestions on this proposal. Trapper organizations did not respond. All other responders pressed for a 24 hour limit to check traps, given the predictable amount of suffering being too great over a longer period. One reviewer noted that research biologists frequently check their traps every 12 hours so that animals are not subject to suffering.

Alaska is well known for its precious wildlife. Many visit Alaska JUST to catch a glimpse of a bear, wolf, moose, goat, otter, marmot, and so on. Others move here to live amongst all of the amazing wildlife we are fortunate to have in this great state. It is imperative that we treat our wildlife with as much respect as possible. Mandating a 24 hour limit to check traps and snares will limit wildlife suffering, keep humans safe, and help with the indiscriminate nature of these traps, reducing deaths of young, non-target species, and domestic animals.

PROPOSED BY: Michelle Anderson and Patricia O'Brien (EG-C15-096)

PROPOSAL 80 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions. Move trapping away from cities with a population of 1,000 or more as follows:

5 AAC 92.095 is amended by adding new paragraphs (c) and (d) to read:

(c) In a city with a population of 1,000 or more, unless the city has a more restrictive ordinance, a person may not place a trap or a snare within

(1) one-quarter mile of a publicly maintained road; or

(2) 200 feet of a publicly maintained trail.

(d) Except within a community with a more restrictive ordinance, a person may not place a trap or a snare within one mile of a

- (1) house or other permanent dwelling, except that a trap or snare may be placed within one mile of a cabin, if the cabin is on the opposite side of a major river system, or the cabin is owned by the trapper for use as a trapping cabin;**
- (2) business; or**
- (3) school; or**
- (4) a developed campground or developed recreational facility.**

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Move trapping away from population centers. Address limiting the location of traps and snares in relation to roads, publicly maintained trails, and other locations where people gather.

The ADF&G trapping regulation booklet, page six, contains this advice: Act responsibly as a trapper and conservationist by trapping in ways to minimize conflict between trapping and other users, e.g. avoid high recreational use areas. Avoid situations where you might catch a domestic dog or cat, such as near homes, or trails frequently used by hikers, skijorers, dog mushers, or other people.

Those conflicts occur frequently. Some are covered in news media, and resentment by the majority of users (non-trappers) has been building in community after community.

Safety for humans, pets, and other non-targeted species is of major concern to the public. In one example two dogs were caught in traps near a high use trail. An excessive amount of bait had been set out. The dog owner was a strong man. He stated that even in following directions provided by a Wildlife Trooper via phone, the traps were extremely difficult to open. Clearly a child or small person would not have been able to open those traps. Similar incidents abound, including pet deaths and fear of walking on popular trails because of traps and snares. It is time for the Board of Game to address this issue.

This proposal would move trapping away from all communities with a population of 1,000 or more. Unless a local ordinance is more restrictive, 27 Alaska communities would have the safeguards offered in this proposal and smaller communities would have protections for home, schools, and recreation sites.

Trap or snare placement at least 200 feet off a publicly maintained trail is less than the 250 feet that failed in the last regulatory round. The average length of a person's stride is a little more than five feet. That means trap placement will be about 40 paces off the trail. That distance is also reasonable to expect a pet to be within voice control.

The model and precedent for these regulations is in 5 AAC 92.044(b)(5) related to hunting bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Those regulations appropriately address public safety. Informal agreements with trapper associations are not adequate. The public deserves the assurance that only regulations and enforcement provide. While the Alaska Trapper's Code of Ethics does not address the concerns of other user groups, support of these measures by trappers would help ease the conflict. The Board of Game would gain esteem for addressing an issue of deep concern from the public at large.

PROPOSED BY: Michelle Anderson and Patricia O'Brien (EG-C15-097)

PROPOSAL 81 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions. Define the term underwater for the purposes of allowing furbearers to be harvested with underwater traps or snares as follows:

5 AAC 92.095 (new section):

In this section, “underwater traps and snares” means the trap or snare must be set below the waterline and a portion the trap or snare must be in the water.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? There is some confusion among trappers and enforcement regarding what constitutes underwater traps and snares. The purpose of this proposal is to make clear the board’s intent for allowing the harvest of furbearers during certain seasons to be taken only by underwater traps and snares. In lieu of a definition for underwater, the department has used the word “submerged” in the trapping regulations, which leads the public to believe the entire trap or snare is required to be under the surface of the water.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game at the request of the Board of Game
(HQ-C15-159)

Licenses, Tags, Harvest Tickets & Reports

PROPOSAL 82 - 5 AAC 92.012. Licenses and tags. Amend the requirement to fix a big game locking tag as follows:

2015–2016 Alaska Hunting Regulations, page 10:

If it stated "The tag must be locked on the animal prior to leaving the kill site," this would simplify and clarify the requirement.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The requirement to immediately place the locking tag on the animal immediately after the kill is difficult if not impossible to do. Several minutes if not hours may elapse before reaching the animal. On a sheep or goat several hours are required for skinning and butchering before you get to a logical place to attach the locking tag, i.e. in the skull plate. Since the meat must be salvaged, you could put the tag on the meat but that is not the best way because usually the meat is consumed or sent out before the horns.

PROPOSED BY: Bobby Graham (EG-C15-018)

PROPOSAL 83 - 5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets and reports. Eliminate the use of harvest tickets in any hunt requiring a metal locking tag as follows:

5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets and reports.

...

(m) Harvest tickets are not required in any hunt in which a metal locking tag is required. Hunters must submit an online report to the department within a specified amount of time. (recommend 10–30 days from date of kill or end of season)

Hunters must attach the metal locking tag to the animal before leaving the site of the kill.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Harvest ticket citations are by far the most common “wildlife violation” in Alaska. Most of these violations are to people who simply forgot to notch their harvest ticket, not people intentionally trying to over harvest game.

Justification:

- #1 Harvest tickets are redundant in hunts where locking tags are required.
- #2 Online reporting has become mainstream and is simple.
- #3 Printing harvest reports and tickets are not necessary in these cases.
- #4 This method has worked reasonably well for brown bears statewide for decades.

PROPOSED BY: Aaron Bloomquist (EG-C15-119)

PROPOSAL 84 - 5 AAC 92.012(b). Licenses and tags. Clarify the inspection requirements for licenses, harvest tickets, and permits as follows:

Change 5 AAC 92.012(b) to read:

All persons engaged in the act of hunting, trapping or in possession of game may not refuse to present the appropriate license, tag, permit, stamp or game in possession upon request from a peace officer of the state or designated employee of the department. Peace officers of the state and designated employees of the department may also inspect shotguns for compliance with waterfowl regulations.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Violation of our civil liberties. The Alaska Constitution grants us protection of unwarranted searches and seizures. In Article 1 sec. 3 and sec. 7 and sec. 14. Also AS 16.05.180 says each peace officer designated in AS 16.05.150 may without a warrant search anything or place if the search is reasonable or is not protected from searches and seizures without warrant within the meaning of art. I, Sec. 14, Alaska State Constitution, which specifically enumerates "persons, houses and other property, papers and effects." However, before a search without warrant is made, a signed written statement by the person making the search shall be submitted to the person in control of the property or object to be searched, stating the reason the search is being conducted. A written receipt shall be given by the person conducting the search for property which is taken as a result of the search. The enumeration of specific things does not limit the meaning of words in nature.

We realize hunting and trapping are regulated activities. But operating a motor vehicle is also regulated activity. A peace officer of the state cannot stop you, as a primary reason, just to see if you have a valid driver's license. Nor do you have to allow him to search your vehicle without a warrant. But officers can always ask.

The current language in regulation is, "no person may refuse to present for inspection any license or tag, any game, or apparatus designed to be, and capable of being, used to take game." This allows law enforcement to ask for licenses, tags, or permits at any time or anywhere. This also allows those same persons to inspect all apparatuses any time or anywhere. We can only conclude that apparatuses are vehicles, ATV's, boats, firearms and so on (i.e. personal property). We believe 5 AAC 92.012 (b) is not supported by statute. In fact the statute that gives this regulation authority 16.05.330 (a) says: "Except as otherwise permitted in this chapter, without having the appropriate license or tag in actual possession, a person may not engage in (2) hunting, trapping or fur dealing." So you must possess licenses and tags while engaged in hunting or trapping. The statute also says nothing about inspecting. But we may assume the intent of the statute gives law enforcement the ability to check licenses or tags while engaged in hunting or trapping, but it says nothing about apparatuses. This regulation needs to be amended.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee (EG-C15-052)

PROPOSAL 85 - 5 AAC 92.010(g). Harvest tickets and reports. Remove the exception for harvest tickets and reports for caribou as follows:

Delete the exception in 5 AAC 92.010(g) that allows the harvest of caribou without requiring a harvest ticket or harvest report for residents residing north of the Yukon River. All persons hunting caribou north of the Yukon River must have a harvest ticket in possession and have obtained a harvest report.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Both the Western Arctic and the Teshekpuk caribou herds are in decline. Alaska's State Constitution Article VIII, Section 4 Sustained-yield requires the ADF&G to manage the herd on a sustainable basis. Of the three major known factors, weather conditions, habitat, and predation, limiting the herds' size, only harvest by predators can be regulated. Accurate harvest data is essential in order for the Board of Game to make sound decisions regarding caribou bag limits on herds in steep decline. There is a lack of accurate resident caribou harvest reporting north of the Yukon River. Requiring residents living north of the Yukon River to register with ADF&G does not provide accurate caribou harvest data.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Outdoor Council (EG-C15-072)

PROPOSAL 86 - 5 AAC 92.010(h). Harvest tickets and reports. Remove the exception to harvest tickets and reports for sheep as follows:

Delete the exception in 5 AAC 92.010(h) that allows hunting of Dall sheep in the Gates of the Arctic National Park without possessing a harvest ticket or obtaining a harvest report. Accurate sheep harvest data gathered from mandatory harvest tickets and reports is essential for managing game populations that are declining rapidly.

Since moose populations are currently not in peril within the Gates of the Arctic National Park, the Alaska Outdoor Council cannot make the same argument to remove the harvest ticket/report exception for moose on grounds of conservation concerns, but if the Board of Game should choose to delete the entire section (h) of 5 AAC 92.010 that would be fine.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Dall sheep populations are also in decline in the Western Brooks Range. The Alaska Board of Game closed Dall sheep hunting to all hunters in Units 23 and 26A west of the Etivluk River drainage during their spring 2015 meeting. The Gates of the Arctic National Park is considering taking over Dall sheep management and allocation due to declining sheep populations. Accurate sheep harvest is critical in order for the ADF&G to manage the sheep herds on the sustained-yield bases as required by state law Alaska Statute 16.05.255. Regulations of the Board of Game; management requirements.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Outdoor Council (EG-C15-073)

Off Road Vehicle (ORV) Policy

PROPOSAL 87 - 5 AAC 92.004(a)(4). Policy for off-road vehicle use for hunting and transporting game. Prohibit the Board of Game from adopting regulations restricting the use of off-road vehicles for declining quality of an outdoor experience as follows:

Amend 5 AAC 92.004(a)(4) Policy for off-road vehicle use for hunting and transporting game by adding: "The Board of Game may not restrict off-road vehicles used to harvest or transport identified big game prey populations due to a perceived decline in the quality of the outdoor experience."

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Board members' personal perceptions of what a "quality outdoor experience" is while gathering a wild food harvest should not be an obstacle to meeting harvest objectives set by the Board of Game. Alaska Statute 16.05.255(f) states:

"The Board of Game may not significantly reduce the taking of an identified big game prey population by adopting regulations relating to restrictions on harvest or access to the population, or to management of the population by customary adjustments in seasons, bag limits, open and closed areas, methods and means, or by other customary means authorized under (a) of this section, unless the board has adopted regulations, or has scheduled for adoption at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the board regulations, that provide for intensive management to increase the take of the population for human harvest consistent with (e) of this section. This subsection does not apply if the board

(1) determines that intensive management would be

(A) ineffective, based on scientific information;

(B) inappropriate due to land ownership patterns; or

(C) against the best interest of subsistence uses; or

(2) declares that a biological emergency exists and takes immediate action to protect or maintain the big game prey population in conjunction with the scheduling for adoption of those regulations that are necessary to implement (e) of this section."

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Outdoor Council

(EG-C15-120)

Miscellaneous Permits

PROPOSAL 88 - 5 AAC 92.029. Permit for possessing live game. Add sugar gliders to the list of animals allowed to be sold and possessed without a permit as follows:

Sugar glider species (*Petaurus breviceps*) has been added to the Alaska Board of Game “clean list” of animals legally recognized as pets.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? I would like the sugar glider species *Petaurus breviceps* added to the clean list.

What is a sugar glider? The sugar glider (*Petaurus breviceps*) is a small, omnivorous, arboreal, and nocturnal gliding possum belonging to the marsupial infraclass. They have very similar appearance and habits to the flying squirrel, but are not closely related. Sugar gliders are characterized by their gliding membrane, known as the patagium, which extends from their forelegs to hindlegs. Gliding serves as an efficient means of both locating food and evading predators. They are covered in soft, pale grey to brown fur, which is lighter in color on their underside. The sugar glider is endemic to mainland Australia and New Guinea and its surrounding islands; and was introduced to Tasmania in 1835.

Where are they native? Sugar gliders are native to the treetops of Australia, Tasmania, Indonesia, and Papua-New Guinea. The International Union for Conservation of Nature gives the *Petaurus breviceps* its Least Concern rating and there are no conservation efforts in any of their native lands due to their abundance in the wild. They tend to make their homes in the hollows of trees located in the canopy of their native lands.

Compare to animals already on the “clean” list. This animal is unique and has no equivalent on the clean list. The introduction of this animal to Alaska brings no new diseases or problems that aren’t already represented by other animals already on the clean list.

Already present in Alaska. While doing research for this proposal, I contacted quite a few of the veterinarians in the Anchorage and Mat-Su communities. All but two had current sugar glider patients. Sugar gliders are already present in Alaska.

Breeding: Sugar gliders mostly breed once, sometimes twice in a year usually resulting in a single joey. This occurs between August and December. There are no recorded instances of a Sugar glider breeding outside of its species resulting in offspring.

Why “should” we allow them? This is an opportunity to add an animal to the clean list with minimal risk. The risks associated with the introduction of sugar gliders to Alaska are significantly lower than animals that have already been introduced through the clean list. These are becoming very popular pets with a nonexistent possibility of a population establishing in the wild.

Why “shouldn’t” we be concerned? Any and all concerns with sugar gliders are already represented by other animals on the clean list. Other significant reasons are listed below.

1. Is it capable of surviving in the wild in Alaska? No, for a couple of reasons: Sugar gliders would not be able to survive in any part of Alaska that hits freezing or below. They are not hibernating animals and they start minimizing activity and grouping together to help conserve heat beginning at about 50 degrees. Sugar gliders are extremely social animals. In the wild, they are typically found in groups of 15 to 30. Solo sugar gliders kept in captivity have shown a deterioration in behavior including self-mutilating and have even died from health conditions developed as a result of loneliness.

2. Is it capable of causing a genetic alteration of a species that is indigenous to Alaska? No, as a marsupial, it has very specific breeding requirements. Gestation is 16 days while the other 60 days of development occur in the mother's pouch. The only North American marsupial is the opossum, of which none are native to Alaska and cross-breeding wouldn't be possible.

3. Is it capable of causing a significant reduction in the population of a species that is indigenous to Alaska? No, sugar gliders cannot survive in the Alaskan climate. Therefore cannot generate the numbers to be a contributing factor in the reduction of any indigenous population. They are small, a little bigger than a hamster, so they tend to fall toward the bottom of the food chain.

4. Is it capable of transmitting a disease to a species that is indigenous to Alaska? A very few reports of laboratory-confirmed cases of human salmonellosis associated with exposure to sugar gliders have been described. There have also been a couple of cases of leptospirosis transfer to humans attributed to sugar gliders. This is with over 20 years of data since sugar gliders started being utilized as pets in the United States. Both of these are much more commonly found in animals already on the clean list such as dogs, birds, cattle, swine, lizards, rodents and turtles. Both salmonella and leptospirosis are prevented by good cage cleaning practices.

This is the information I found while researching zoonoses and zoological transfer. While no species to species transfer was listed, it is fair to extrapolate that if these can be transferred to people, they can also be transferred to other animals. Again, as stated previously, both of these pathogens are much more commonly found in animals already on the clean list than in sugar gliders.

5. Does it otherwise present a threat to the health or population of a species that is indigenous to Alaska? No. I believe all concerns were addressed in previous questions.

References:

Brust, D. (n.d.). What Every Veterinarian Should Know About Sugar Gliders. Retrieved June 24, 2015, from http://www.sugargliderinfo.org/wp-content/uploads/gre_fc_pdf/exotic-dvm-11-3-complete.pdf

Corriveau, L. (n.d.). Sugar Gliders. Retrieved June 24, 2015, from [https://www.vet.purdue.edu/vth/files/documents/Sugar Gliders.pdf](https://www.vet.purdue.edu/vth/files/documents/Sugar%20Gliders.pdf)

GliderVet #3: Gut Loading, Glider "Love Bites", Transferable Diseases. (2002). Retrieved June 23, 2015, from <http://www.sugar-gliders.com/glidervet-3.htm>

Margulies, E. (2010, February 4). Zoonosis. Retrieved June 24, 2015, from <http://www.sugarglider.com/gliderpedia/index.asp?Zoonosis>

Pignon, C., & Mayer, J. (n.d.). Zoonoses of Ferrets, Hedgehogs, and Sugar Gliders. Retrieved June 24, 2015, from http://www.academia.edu/9818248/Zoonoses_of_Ferrets_Hedgehogs_and_Sugar_Gliders

STATE RESTRICTIONS. (n.d.). Retrieved June 24, 2015, from <http://www.angelfire.com/nb/sugarglider/stateres.html>

(2014). Statewide Regulations, Cycle A Schedule – March 14-18, 2014 [Radio series episode]. In *Board of Game*. Juneau:

Sugar Glider Health Issues. (2009). Retrieved June 24, 2015, from <http://www.exoticnutrition.com/suglheis.html>

Sugar Gliders. (n.d.). Retrieved June 24, 2015, from <http://avianandexotic.com/mammals/care-of-sugar-gliders/>

Sugar glider. (2015, June 16). Retrieved June 24, 2015, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sugar_glider

What Every Veterinarian Should Know. (n.d.). Retrieved June 24, 2015.

Wildlife Queensland - Sugar Glider. (2013). Retrieved June 24, 2015, from http://www.wildlife.org.au/wildlife/speciesprofile/mammals/gliders/sugar_glider.html

PROPOSED BY: John Hammonds (EG-C15-127)

PROPOSAL 89 - 5 AAC 92.029. Permit for possessing live game. Add sugar gliders to the list of animals allowed to be sold and possessed without a permit as follows:

Add sugar gliders (*Petauru brevieps*) to the list at 5 AAC 92.029(b).

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Adoption of sugar gliders (*Petauru brevieps*) to the list of animals allowed to be possessed, imported, exported, bought, sold or traded without a permit from the Department of Fish and Game.

Why: Due to the Animal Welfare Act, the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) and Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service regulate the licensing and breeders of sugar gliders in the United States. They are animals that cannot survive unless in a sub tropic environment. They are not a threat to wildlife or living in Alaska environment. It is too cold and more importantly Alaska does not support its natural food, eucalyptus. They do not carry any diseases that cats, dogs, cattle and other animal species not required to get a permit to enter Alaska already can potentially carry into the state of Alaska. I would personally like to become a licensed USDA breeder and feel that the state of Alaska is prohibiting me from doing so with the USDA is already controlling these animals in America.

PROPOSED BY: Deanna Thornell (EG-C15-082)

PROPOSAL 90 - 5 AAC 92.029. Permit for possessing live game. Eliminate domestic sheep (*Ovis aries*) and goats (*Capra hircus*) from the “Clean List” and require a permit for possession with stipulations if located within 15 air miles of all sheep habitat as follows:

(b) **Domestic sheep and goats will be removed from the “Clean List” regulation.**

Any person in possession of domestic sheep (*ovis*) or goats (*capra*) must obtain a permit from the department within one year of implementation of this section. Animals located within 15 air miles of Dall sheep habitat must be contained within a Department approved facility (double fence, etc.) and certified disease free when testing becomes available. Animals located more than 15 miles from Dall sheep habitat will be issued a permit without stipulation online.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Domestic sheep and goats have been proven to carry diseases that are devastating to wild sheep populations. This proposal will be a good start to prevent the spread of disease into wild sheep populations. Hobby farming is growing rapidly in Alaska including areas that would be considered Dall sheep habitat. Entire populations of bighorn sheep are presently being eradicated due to these unintentional disease transmissions.

Justification:

#1 We have a constitutional mandate to manage for sustained yield, this includes doing what we can to maintain healthy native wildlife populations.

#2 Online permitting has become mainstream and is simple.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wild Sheep Foundation (HQ-C15-128)

PROPOSAL 91 - 5 AAC 92.029(d)(2). Permit for possessing live game. Include cow in the definition of feral game as follows:

92.029(d) Under this section, and in accordance with the definition of “game” in AS 16.05.940 (which includes feral domestic animals), a

...

(2) musk oxen, bison, **cow**, or reindeer that is lawfully owned, or an elk held under a valid game mammal farming license, that is not confined or is not confined under positive control is feral unless the animal is a free-ranging animal on a state or federal grazing lease; however,

...

(C) any free-ranging musk oxen, bison, **cow**, reindeer, or elk for which ownership cannot be demonstrated is presumed to be game;

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Year-round open hunt to eradicate the non-indigenous species on our lands. I would like the Board of Game to adopt regulations to allow hunting of feral cows, such as those on Baldy Mountain Unit 14A. I also would like the board to consider adding a regulation for feral cow statewide.

PROPOSED BY: Sean Lund (EG-C15-039)

PROPOSAL 92 - 5 AAC 92.037. Permits for falconry. Modify the allocation provisions for nonresident falconry permits as follows:

5 AAC 92.037. Permits for falconry:

...(g) The taking, transporting, or possessing a raptor for falconry by a nonresident is allowed under the following conditions: (1) a valid **state falconry** permit and a valid, current nonresident hunting and trapping license is required for submitting an application, taking, transporting, possessing, and transferring a raptor to another state's falconry program; (2) the nontransferable permit will be issued under standards, procedures and conditions set out in the Alaska Falconry Manual No. 9, dated July 1, 2012; that manual, including its conditions related to nonresident take, is hereby adopted by reference; (3) take is limited to nonresidents who are citizens of the United States; (4) only the raptor species listed under (f) of this section are eligible for nonresident take; (5) **Harvest dates, harvest species and bag limits are the same as resident falconers**; [up to five permits for taking, transporting, or possessing a raptor for falconry by a nonresident shall be issued annually by the department; (6) a targeted hunt system will be used to determine permit winners if the number of applicants exceeds the number of permits available; (7) take is limited to one passage, hatching-year raptor; (8) the annual nonresident season for acquiring a passage raptor is from August 15–October 31;] (6) the department shall specify other permit conditions as required to be consistent with the federal falconry laws and regulations, Alaska Falconry Manual, and export requirements; (7) the department may, in its discretion **based on justifiable state or public interests through the least prejudicial means available**, establish additional permit conditions necessary to administer this program; (8) the department may, in its discretion **based on justifiable state or public interests through the least prejudicial means available**, close areas for nonresident take; (9) if live birds or mammals are to be imported to assist with trapping raptors, all federal and state import requirements shall be met; including the requirements of 5 AAC 92.029; deleterious exotic wildlife and species not listed in 5 AAC 92.029(b) may not be imported to Alaska for use in trapping raptors; resident pigeons and starlings, if used as lure birds, shall not be released into the wild; (10) permits are nontransferable.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? This proposal is a request to modify existing Alaska provisions to allow nonresidents the same rights to harvest falconry raptors as residents. The purpose of this proposed rule change is to ensure reasonable access to a healthy resource, and thus be in harmony with the Privileges and Immunities Clause (U.S. Constitution, Article IV, Section 2, Clause 1), as it will allow for equal opportunity for all interested parties.

In 2011 the American Falconry Conservancy (AFC) drafted a proposal (P40) with the assistance of several Alaska falconers to allow nonresident take of raptors, and we submitted the proposal to the Alaska Board of Game (board). During the 2012 statewide meetings cycle, the board received a substantial amount of testimony and comment on the proposal. The science- and legal-based testimony reasoned that the Alaska raptor resource was healthy, and that there was no justification for not allowing non-resident take of raptors. Testimony included Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) summaries of raptor numbers, the manner in which USFWS derived their conservative 5% take levels, the support of both resident and nonresident falconers, the concerns of a few Alaska resident falconers, and discussions on all of the concerns.

At the January 2012 meetings, the board decided to defer their decision on P40 until the 2014 cycle.

During the 2014 cycle, the board resumed their discussions on non-resident take of raptors (P40 renumbered P174) and adopted ultra conservative provisions in order to provide time to create administrative procedures. The board allowed for the issuance of five non-resident take permits annually and placed a tight restriction on the take season, especially for peregrines. Federally, Alaska peregrines may only be taken as juveniles during a season that ends on September 31, and the Alaska provisions do not allow non-residents to take peregrines until September 15. This allows nonresidents only a two-week window to harvest peregrines.

Additionally, despite ADF&G's recommendation to allow seven nonresident permits annually, including eyasses (See P174 A (RC72) of the March 2014 board meetings), and the board's decision to allow five nonresident permits, ADF&G limited their permit issuance to only three in 2014. It was noted by ADF&G that their original seven-permit limit was based on a percentage of what Alaska resident falconers harvest, not on resource sustainability.

In 2015, 21 nonresident applications were received for the three permits which clearly shows a demand greater than what was approved and well below the most conservative sustainable use principles. Supreme Court decisions have upheld that absent any compelling public or government interest there is no justification in restricting nonresidents more than residents.

PROPOSED BY: American Falconry Conservancy (EG-C15-067)

PROPOSAL 93 - 5 AAC 92.037. Permits for falconry. For nonresidents, allow the take of eyas raptors, increase the allocation for falconry permits, and lengthen the season as follows:

5 AAC 92.037. Permits for falconry.

(g) The taking, transporting, or possessing a raptor for falconry by a nonresident is allowed under the following conditions:

...

(5) up to **10** [5] permits for taking, transporting, possessing a raptor for falconry by a nonresident shall be issued annually by the department;

...

(8) the annual nonresident season for acquiring a **eyas or passage** [PASSAGE] raptor is from **May 15–October 31** [AUGUST 15–OCTOBER 31].

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Allow for a nonresident take of eyas raptors. Increase the number of permits from five to ten annually. This year there were 23 applicants for the three permits issued. Of the ten permits available only five should be issued for the take of large falcons (i.e. peregrine and gyrfalcons).

PROPOSED BY: Donald Fox (EG-C15-104)

PROPOSAL 94 - 5 AAC 92.033. Permit for scientific, education, propagative, or public safety purposes; and 92.047. Permit for using radio telemetry equipment. Require the implementation of state wildlife plans before issuing permits for education or telemetry as follows:

Add a section to 5 AAC 92.033 and 92.047 to read:

No permits for use of wildlife for science or telemetry shall be issued until and unless the agency, organization or educational unit agrees in writing to fully implement or allow the state to implement all state approved wildlife plans, conditions and regulations for a game management unit or subunit. This section shall apply to all state or private lands and federal lands where those uses are identified by ANILCA.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Federal agencies choose to refuse to recognize the state authority for wildlife management, planning and regulations on land(s) identified under ANILCA for the specified use of hunting, fishing and trapping. Even “federally qualified” rural Alaskans are restricted or have been eliminated from these historic activities. The state needs to take action to clearly demonstrate the federal abuse. The proposed action would help to build a record and bring attention to the problem.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee (EG-C15-059)

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)

AC Jurisdiction for Antlerless Moose Seasons

PROPOSAL 109 - 5 AAC 98.005. Areas of jurisdiction for antlerless moose seasons. Add Units 7, 15, and 14C to the Seward Advisory Committee’s jurisdiction for authorizing antlerless moose hunts as follows:

Restore the antlerless moose hunt jurisdiction to the Seward AC for the following Units: 7, 15 and 14C (twenty mile).

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The Seward AC historically has had the jurisdiction to comment on antlerless moose hunts in Units 7, 15 and 14C (twenty mile). Recently this authority was reduced considerably.

PROPOSED BY: Seward Fish and Game Advisory Committee (EG-C15-006)

PROPOSAL 110 - 5 AAC 98.005. Areas of jurisdiction for antlerless moose seasons. Add Units 13 and 16 to the Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee’s jurisdiction for authorizing antlerless moose hunts as follows:

5 AAC 97.005. Areas of Jurisdiction for Fish & Game Advisory Committees: As it pertains to 5 AAC 92.450, the Mat Valley AC will have jurisdiction in Game Management Units 13 and 16 in addition to Unit 14 for matters that pertain to authorization for antlerless moose hunts.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Per authority vested in 5 AAC 97.005, Areas of Jurisdiction for Fish & Game Advisory Committees, as it pertains to 5 AAC 92.450, the Mat Valley AC would like to broaden the scope of their jurisdiction to include authorization of antlerless moose hunts in Unit 13 and Unit 16; this is in addition to the existing jurisdiction in Unit 14.

The Matanuska Valley includes portions of Units 13 and 16. The Mat Valley AC is one of the most active AC's in this area, holding regular meetings with substantial public participation. Participation by both local AC members and the public frequently engage in discussion regarding Units 13 and 16, and this AC is the most likely AC to comment on proposals regarding these units.

For years the Mat Valley AC has weighed in on proposals for both of these game management units. A substantial number of the hunters in both Units 13 and 16 come from the Matanuska Valley.

If this proposal is not adopted hunters in the area who use the Mat Valley AC as a conduit to the Board of Game will be denied a voice in hunting regulations.

PROPOSED BY: Mat Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee (EG-C15-030)

Game Management Units

PROPOSAL 111 - 5 AAC 92.450(16). Description of game management units. Move Kalgin Island from Unit 16 to Unit 15 as follows:

Remove Kalgin Island from Unit 16B and include it within the boundaries of Unit 15B.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Kalgin is a 23 mi² island that lies in Cook Inlet approximately 15 miles to the west-southwest of Kenai, and six miles southeast of the mouth of the Drift River. Moose were introduced to the island in the late-1950s to provide additional hunting opportunities and has become a popular moose hunting destination for residents of the Kenai Peninsula.

To manage the resource most effectively, the department recommends that Kalgin Island be administered from within Unit 15. Strong weather patterns in November when surveys occur often make access from the Palmer Department of Fish and Game office difficult. Managing Kalgin Island from Unit 15 will greatly reduce administrative costs associated with surveying the island and biologists in Unit 15 have easier, more rapid access to the island than those in Unit 16.

This proposal does not seek to alter hunting opportunity on Kalgin Island, and the intent of the proposal is not to change the subsistence designation of the moose population, even though Unit 15B is a nonsubsistence area. Adoption of this proposal is recommended to improve the department's ability to manage the population and to regulate the population within population objectives established to provide adequate moose hunting opportunity in the future. If this proposal is adopted, additional action will be needed by the Joint Boards of Fish and Game to reaffirm the subsistence designation for moose on Kalgin Island. The department will continue to offer liberal moose hunting opportunity to meet resource users' needs.

Turnover and irregular activity from advisory committees with jurisdiction over Kalgin Island has made it difficult to consistently obtain the necessary reauthorization votes for antlerless hunts. Antlerless hunts on Kalgin Island provide additional mortality on this predator-free island to reduce the moose population below carrying capacity thereby preventing the degradation of habitat leading to starvation.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-160)

PROPOSAL 112 - 5 AAC 92.450. Description of Game Management Units. Divide Unit 2 into two subunits as follows:

Divide Unit 2 into two subunits, with the adjoining boundary in a relative east-west direction on the latitude 55 degrees 15'00" North, to establish a different wildlife management policy for the lower portion of Unit 2. This would allow more opportunity in an area less populated with little or no road access from the outside.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Dividing Unit 2 into two will help with the management of wolves in the area. The lower portion of Prince of Wales is not a populated region, and hunting and trapping there is pretty much transcendent. If divided into two subunits, a much more liberal harvest season for wolves and other species could occur.

PROPOSED BY: Robert Jahnke

(EG-C15-027)

Antlerless Moose and Tag Fee Reauthorizations

PROPOSAL 113 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 1C as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(1)		
...		
Unit 1(C), Berners Bay drainages	Sept. 15—Oct. 15 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15—Oct. 15
1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 permits may be issued		
...		
Unit 1(C), that portion west of Excursion Inlet and north of Icy Passage		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
...		
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 100 permits may be issued	Nov. 10—Dec. 10 (General hunt only)	Nov. 10—Dec. 10

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?

Berners Bay The Berners Bay (Unit 1C) strategic moose management plan calls for a post-hunt population of 90 moose based on the area’s estimated carrying capacity. ADF&G has been successful at maintaining the Berners Bay moose population close to the post-hunt population objective by implementing both bull and cow hunts.

From 1998–2006, the number of drawing permits for Berners Bay moose has ranged annually from 10 bull permits and 10 antlerless permits, to 7 bull permits and no antlerless permits. The average annual harvest of bulls during this period was 7, while in years when antlerless permits were issued the cow harvest averaged 4 annually. Although the department has had authorization to issue up to 30 total permits annually, over the past 10 years no more than 20 permits have been issued during any one year. As a result of the severe winter weather and associated population declines, no Berners Bay moose permits were issued from 2007 to 2013.

The number of drawing permits issued annually for Berners Bay is based on the number of moose observed during fall aerial surveys. The mean number of moose observed during aerial surveys conducted from 1990 to 2006 was 77 (range: 59–108). As a result of series of severe winters in 2006–07, 2007–08 and 2008–09 and associated population declines, the number of moose observed during replicate surveys conducted from 2007 to 2009 ranged from 33–62. Surveys conducted in 2010 and 2011 yielded counts of 73 moose including 10 calves each year. In 2012, under ideal survey conditions, a total of 102 moose were observed (21 bulls, 81 cows, and 14 calves). Based on the 2012 survey results, adjusted for sightability, the Berners Bay moose population was estimated at 113 ± 11 . In 2013, under less than ideal survey conditions, a total of 73 moose were observed (18 bulls, 47 cows, and 8 calves). Based on the 2013 survey results adjusted for sightability, the Berners Bay moose population was estimated at 90 ± 13 . During the most recent survey conducted in early 2014, a total of 105 moose were observed (22 bulls, 52 cows, 24 calves, and 7 unknown). Based on the 2014 survey results, the Berners Bay moose population is estimated at 109 ± 6 . While the Berners Bay moose population is not increasing rapidly, the population now exceeds the department's population and bull:cow management objectives.

A relatively small number of bull permits (5) were issued for fall 2014, as will be the case in fall 2015. The department would like to retain the ability to implement an antlerless hunt should the moose population or habitat conditions warrant this management activity.

Gustavus The Gustavus moose population (Unit 1C) increased rapidly from just a few animals in the 1980's and 1990's before eventually peaking at 404 moose in 2003. In 2002 the department estimated that the density of moose on winter range at Gustavus exceeded 5 moose per km², despite the fact that only a small portion of the area consisted of productive winter range (abundant stands of willow). Due to concerns about excessive moose numbers in Gustavus, the department initiated spring browse utilization surveys in 1999 and determined that 85–95% of the current annual growth of available willow twigs had been utilized by moose.

Due to department concerns about high moose numbers and excessive browse utilization in Gustavus, the Board first authorized an antlerless hunt for this area in fall 2000. From 2002 to 2008, hunters harvested from 11 to 67 antlerless moose annually depending on the number of permits issued. No hunt was held in fall 2007 due to high winter-related moose mortalities. No antlerless hunts have been held in the Gustavus area since 2009.

The objective of antlerless moose hunts in Gustavus is to maintain the moose population on winter range to levels commensurate with habitat capability. Based on aerial survey data, corrected for sightability, the current management strategy has been successful at maintaining

moose numbers at appropriate levels. From 2000–2009 aerial surveys yielded counts ranging from 207 to 404 moose. Surveys conducted in 2010, 2011 and 2012 yielded counts of 165, 136 and 274 moose, respectively. Based on aerial survey results corrected for sightability the moose population in the Gustavus area was estimated at 317±37 in 2012. In 2013, under favorable survey conditions, 186 moose were observed (25 bulls, 121 cows, and 40 calves). Based on the survey results, and corrected for sightability, the moose population was estimate at 323±87 in 2013. In 2014, with poor late-season survey conditions, a total of 91 moose (24 cows, 12 calves, and 55 unknown adults) were observed. Based on the survey results corrected for sightability, the moose population was estimated at 244±98. Exceptionally mild winter weather proved beneficial for moose movements and at the time of the survey several radio collared animals had already transitioned to forested summer ranges outside the survey area.

In 2008, Gustavus calf survival decreased to less than 10%. Surveys conducted from 2009 to 2012 indicate that calf survival had increased (range: 18%–37%). The moose calf survival estimate for 2013 was 21% (2014 data not yet available). From 2004–2013 the estimated annual survival rate for adult females was 89%. Given increased calf survival and stable adult female survival the potential exists for the Gustavus moose population to increase rapidly.

The Gustavus moose population is now at a level the department believes is commensurate with the amount of available winter habitat. While we currently have no plans to implement an antlerless hunt in 2015, the department believes it is important to retain the ability to implement an antlerless hunt should the moose population in the Gustavus area increase to a point detrimental to available habitat.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-139)

PROPOSAL 114 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(3). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 5A, Nunatak Bench as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(3) Unit 5(A), that portion south of Wrangell - Saint Elias National Park, north and east of Russell and Nunatak Fiords, and east of the east side of East Nunatak Glacier to the Canadian Border	Nov. 15—Feb. 15	Nov. 15—Feb. 15

(Nunatak Bench)

1 moose by registration
permit only; up to 5
moose may be taken

...

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The Nunatak Bench (Unit 5A) hunt area is surrounded by isolating features such as fiords and glaciers, which restrict immigration and emigration to and from adjacent moose populations to some extent. Because it is essentially an isolated moose population, we manage the Nunatak Bench moose population separately from moose populations in the remainder of Unit 5A. Because of the areas isolated nature and relatively low moose habitat capability, we have typically maximized hunting opportunity on the Nunatak Bench using an either sex hunt with a longer and later occurring season (November 15–February 15) in order to maintain the moose population at a level appropriate for the amount of available habitat. The either sex hunt strategy accommodates the timing of this hunt given that much of the hunt period occurs post antler drop making it difficult to differentiate between the sexes.

The Nunatak Bench strategic moose management plan calls for a post-hunt population of no more than 50 moose. During an aerial survey of the Nunatak Bench conducted in 2001, a total of 52 moose were observed, after which time the moose population declined. From 2005–2011 (no survey in 2010) the number of moose observed ranged from 11 to 14, with only 1 to 2 calves observed on any given flight. Due to the area’s remoteness, the limited availability of pilots and aircraft, and inclement winter weather, no aerial moose surveys have been conducted at Nunatak Bench since 2011. The observed decline in moose numbers may be due in part to the 68 foot rise in water level that flooded the area in 2003 when the advancing Hubbard Glacier created an ice dam that eventually gave way flooding and eliminating willow stands. Moose have the ability to emigrate from the area and may have abandoned Nunatak Bench due to the lack of available forage. Anecdotal reports from hunters suggest the presence of wolves may also have contributed to low moose numbers in the area.

From 1997–2004 an average of 12 either sex permits were issued annually, and on average only about four people actually hunt. During this period a total of 15 moose were harvested (9 bulls, 6 cows) for an average annual harvest of approximately 2 moose. No permits have been issued, and no moose have been harvested in the area since 2004.

As of our last survey in 2011, moose had yet to recolonize the Nunatak Bench, and it is unknown if moose numbers will increase sufficiently in the near-term to provide hunting opportunity. Although we do not believe the Nunatak Bench currently supports enough moose to allow for a sustainable harvest, the department would like to retain the ability to implement an antlerless hunt in the event the population increases to a level capable of providing a harvestable surplus. The department plans to conduct aerial surveys of the Nunatak Bench when conditions allow, and will allow a harvest when the survey counts reach or exceed 25 moose.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-140)

PROPOSAL 115 - 5 AAC 085.045(a)(4). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6C as follows:

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

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The department recommends reauthorizing the state antlerless hunt as a back up to the federal subsistence hunt. Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. The population objective is 400-500 moose. A population estimate completed during February 2014 yielded an estimate of 600 moose, 25% of which were calves. Because the available antlerless harvest quota in Unit 6C is currently harvested under a federal subsistence season administered by the U. S. Forest Service, we have not held the antlerless hunt since the 1999-2000 season. Continuation of the antlerless hunts will be necessary to restrain the growth of this population beyond what the habitat can support.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-141)

PROPOSAL 116 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(5). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Units 7 and 14C as follows:

Units and Bag Limits (5)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
... Unit 7, the Placer River drainages, and that portion of the Placer Creek (Bear Valley) drainage		

outside the Portage
Glacier Closed Area, and
that portion of Unit 14(C)
within the Twentymile
River drainage

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Aug. 20—Oct. 10
(General hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Aug. 20—Oct. 10

...

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. The harvest of antlerless moose provides the department with a management tool to maintain the number of moose in the Twentymile/Portage/Placer area at a population level low enough to reduce over-browsing of winter habitat, moose-vehicle collisions, and starvation during severe winters. The moose population will be healthier and more productive due to decreased stress levels associated with winter food shortages.

The moose population in the Twentymile/Portage/Placer area has a history of rapid increase following mild winters, and sharp reductions during severe winters. In 2009, antlerless permits were issued for the first time since 2004. Thirty antlerless permits (in addition to 40 bull permits) were issued for 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2014, and 20 antlerless permits (in addition to 25 bull permits) were issued for 2012 and 2013. Harvests for 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014 were 15 bulls and 15 cows, 19 bulls and 8 cows, 12 bulls and 7 cows, 10 bulls and 7 cows and 17 bulls and 10 respectively. A November 2013 aerial composition count of moose in the Twentymile, Portage, and Placer river drainages found 155 moose with a bull:cow ratio of 23 bulls per 100 cows and a calf:cow ratio of 27 calves per 100 cows.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-142)

PROPOSAL 117 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 14C as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12) ... Unit 14(C), Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER) Management Area	Day after Labor Day —Mar 31 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day —Mar 31
1 moose by regulatory year by drawing permit, and by muzzleloading blackpowder rifle or bow and arrow only; up to 185 permits may be issued		
Unit 14(C), that portion known as the Birchwood Management Area	Day after Labor Day —Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day —Sept. 30
1 moose by drawing permit, by bow and arrow only; up to 25 permits may be issued		
Unit 14(C), that portion known as the Anchorage Management Area	Day after Labor Day —Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only, and by bow and arrow, shotgun, or muzzleloader only; up to 50 permits may be issued		
Unit 14(C), that portion of the Ship Creek drainage upstream of the Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER) Management Area		
1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 50 permits may be issued; or	Day after Labor Day —Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day —Sept. 30

1 bull by registration permit only	Oct. 1—Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	Oct. 1—Nov. 30
------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	----------------

...

Remainder of Unit 14(C)

1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:

1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or	Day after Labor Day —Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day —Sept. 30
--	--	-------------------------------

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits may be issued; or	Day after Labor Day —Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season
---	--	----------------

1 bull by drawing permit only, by bow and arrow only; up to 10 permits may be issued	Oct. 20—Nov. 15	No open season
--	-----------------	----------------

...

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually. Adoption of this proposal is necessary for the hunts to continue. The harvest of antlerless moose provides the department with a management tool to maintain the number of moose in Unit 14C at the desired population objective (1500 moose). At this population level we have seen reductions in over-browsing of winter habitat, moose-vehicle collisions, moose-human conflicts in urban areas, and starvation during severe winters. At this level, the moose population will be healthier due to decreased stress levels associated with winter food shortages.

Moose in Unit 14C are managed intensively for a population objective of 1500–1800 moose and an annual harvest objective of 90–270 moose (5AAC 92.108). In 2013, we estimated a moose population of approximately 1533 moose in Unit 14C from a combination of population census, composition surveys and extrapolation to unsurveyed areas. At this population level, we have experienced a decline in human-moose conflicts and decreased winter mortalities. Harvesting cow moose is paramount to maintaining the population at the low end of the objective while providing harvest opportunity.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-143)

PROPOSAL 118 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(13). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 15C as follows:

Units and Bag Limits (13)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
Unit 15(C), that portion south of the south fork of the Anchor River and northwest of Kachemak Bay		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with spike or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or	Sept. 1—Sept. 25 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; the taking of calves, and females accompanied by calves, is prohibited; up to 100 permits may be issued in combination with the nonresident drawing hunt; or	Oct. 20—Nov. 20	
1 moose by targeted permit only,	Oct. 15—Mar. 31	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or		Sept. 1—Sept. 25
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; the taking of calves, and females accompanied by calves, is prohibited; up to 100 permits may be issued in combination with the resident drawing hunt		Oct. 20—Nov. 20
Remainder of Unit 15(C)		

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1—Sept. 25
(General hunt only)

1 moose by targeted permit only,

Oct. 15—Mar. 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1—Sept. 25

...

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. This hunt was developed at the March 2015 Board of Game meeting. The purpose of this hunt is to allow for the harvest of cow and calf moose along the Sterling Highway in Unit 15C during the winter months if they pose a threat to highway vehicles. The department will decide when and where permits will be issued during the hunt period. The hunt is administered through a registration permit and up to 100 moose may be taken. The number of permits issue each year will depend on conditions and it is possible no permits will be issued some years.

In February 2013, moose population estimate for Unit 15C was 2554-3855 (95% CI) which is well within the Intensive Management population objective (2500–3500). During recent years calf:cow ratios in areas surveyed in Unit 15C have increased since 2012 (15 calves:100 cows in 2012, 26 calves:100 cows in 2013, and 31 calves:100 cows in 2014). The department recommends taking these moose that would have had a high likelihood of being hit by vehicles if not harvested. We recommend reauthorization of the hunt.

The Homer benchland in Unit 15C often holds high moose densities in winters when deep snow pushes the moose down into human populated areas. Even without deep snow, moose die due to malnutrition and negative interactions with humans occur as moose become more aggressive in their search for food around human residences.

In February 2013, 1218 moose were counted during a population survey in the northern portion of unit 15C, of which 13.7% were calves (19 calves:100 cows). November 2013 composition counts for the area affected by this hunt provided ratios of 19 bulls:100 cows and 44 calves:100 cows. This area was not surveyed in 2014 due to lack of snow, however, calf:cow ratios in other areas surveyed in 15C have increased since 2012 (15 calves:100 cows in 2012, 23 calves:100 cows in 2013, and 31 calves:100 cows in 2014). Fifty permits were issued in each year since 2002 resulting in an average harvest of 22 cows per year. We recommend reauthorization of the antlerless hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-C15-144)

PROPOSAL 119 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(11). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 13 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits (11)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 13 1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
...		
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 200 permits may be issued; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf	Oct. 1—Oct. 31 Mar. 1—Mar. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season
...		

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the board. The current regulation allows hunters to take a limited number of cows in specific areas to keep the population within objectives.

This Unit 13 antlerless hunt was initially adopted in March 2011, and the first Unit 13 antlerless hunt under this regulation took place in September 2012. The hunt was modified when the Board of Game adopted an October and March season during the February 2013 board meeting.

Since the inception of this hunt, the department has issued 10 permits annually for a hunt in Unit 13A. The department intentionally limited the number of permits issued annually to gain public support for the hunt, even though a higher rate of cow harvest was desirable from to regulate the moose population within objectives. After considering a proposal during the 2015 Board of Game meeting, which was submitted by the public to increase the number of cow permits issued annually, the board directed the department to issue a sufficient number of permits to allow the harvest of up to one percent of the cow population, when the moose population is above the midpoint of the population objective for the subunit.

Moose in Unit 13 have generally increased at a rate of 3–5% per year in the intensive wolf management area during the past 10 years. The current population objective for Unit 13A is 3,500–4,200, and the population was estimated to include 4,020 in 2013. The number of cows in western Unit 13A is expected to continue increasing, and the antlerless hunt in western Unit 13A is necessary to slow the growth of this population and to keep it within the intensive management objectives. The additional harvest provided by the hunt will also assist in achieving the harvest

objectives for the population. No additional antlerless opportunities in other portions of Unit 13 are recommended at this time.

If this antlerless moose hunting opportunity is not reauthorized in Unit 13, the intensive management program and objectives will likely need to be restructured to maintain the moose population within a population size range that does not result in nutritional limitations for the moose and to achieve the harvest objectives recommended by the public, advisory committees, and the board.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-145)

PROPOSAL 120 - 5 AAC 84.045(a)(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Units 14A and 14B as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
Unit 14(A)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
...		
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 1000 antlerless moose permits may be issued	Aug. 20—Sept. 25 (General hunt only) Nov. 1—Dec. 15 (General hunt only)	No open season
...		
1 moose by targeted permit only; and by shotgun or archery only; up to 200 permits may be issued	Winter season to be announced (General hunt only)	No open season
Unit 14(B)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
...		
1 moose by targeted permit only; and by shotgun or archery only; up to 100	Winter season to be announced (General hunt only)	No open season

permits may be issued

...

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the board. There are two types of antlerless moose hunts in the Mat-Su Valley, a drawing permit hunt used to regulate growth of the moose population in Unit 14A and targeted hunts used to mitigate public safety concerns in Units 14A and 14B.

Moose surveys conducted in November 2013 resulted in an estimate of 8,500 moose in Unit 14A with a bull ratio of 21 bulls:100 cows and a calf ratio of 45 calves:100 cows. This estimate was greater than the post-hunt objective of 6,000–6,500 moose and greater than the 2011 survey estimate of 8,000 moose.

Based on current projections, the Unit 14A moose population is expected to grow and continue to exceed population objectives. If the density of moose is allowed to increase, we anticipate an increase the number of moose-human conflicts, and moose may experience nutritional stress as the population nears carrying capacity. Cow harvests are warranted to control the moose population’s growth and recommended as a way to provide additional moose hunting opportunity in the Mat-Su Valley.

The targeted moose hunts in Units 14A and 14B are an effective tool to address public safety concerns related to moose-vehicle collision and nuisance management issues. Moose-vehicle collisions result in property damage and may result in human injury or death. An average of 266 moose per year were killed in the Mat-Su Valley area during the last few years of average snowfall and substantially more were killed during higher snowfall years. ADF&G also receives periodic complaints from the public about crop depredation and aggressive behavior that can be mitigated by this hunt structure.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-146)

PROPOSAL 121 - 5 AAC 085.045(a)(14). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
Reauthorize the antlerless moose season on Kalgin Island in Unit 16B as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(14)		
Unit 16(B), Kalgin Island 1 moose per regulatory year, by registration permit only	Aug. 20—Sept. 20	Aug. 20—Sept. 20

...

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the board. The current regulation for hunting moose on Kalgin Island in Unit 16B allows hunters to antlerless moose with the goal of reducing the population to the management objective.

In response to concerns that the moose population on Kalgin Island had exceeded the island's carrying capacity and due to deteriorating habitat conditions, the board established a drawing permit hunt for antlerless moose in 1995. In a further attempt to reduce the number of moose on the island, the board established a registration hunt for any moose in 1999. Despite these measures to reduce moose numbers, moose remain abundant on the island and continue to exceed the management objective.

During the most recent moose survey, department staff counted 104 moose on Kalgin Island in December 2012. This count exceeded the population objective of 20–40 moose.

The "any moose" registration hunt is recommended to provide additional mortality on this predator-free island population. A registration hunt also allows the department to continue gathering biological information from specimens provided by successful hunters. The difficult hunting conditions and limited access will minimize the danger of over-harvest.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-147)

PROPOSAL 122 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(15). Hunting Seasons and Bag Limits for Moose.
Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 17A as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(15)		
Unit 17(A)		
Up to 2 moose per regulatory year only as follows:		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull by registration permit only; or	Aug. 25—Sept. 20 (Subsistence hunt only)	
1 antlered bull by registration permit; during the period Dec. 1 – Last day of Feb. a season of up to 31 days may be announced	Winter Season to be Announced by Emergency Order (Subsistence hunt only)	

by emergency order; or

1 antlerless moose by registration permit; during the period Dec. 1 –Last day of Feb. a season of up to 31 days may be announced by emergency order;

Winter Season to be Announced by Emergency Order (Subsistence hunt only)

...

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the board. The board adopted an antlerless moose hunt in Unit 17A in support of the Unit 17A Moose Management Plan, which was modified during a meeting of the Unit 17A Moose Management Planning Group in December 2012. The planning group consists of entities interested in the management of this moose population and includes representatives from the Bristol Bay Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, the Nushagak and Togiak Fish and Game Advisory Committees, the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge, and the ADF&G Unit 17 management office.

According to the third goal of the revised Unit 17A Moose Management plan, antlerless moose hunting opportunity can be offered when the population is above 600 moose and increasing. The revised plan also recommends that a bag limit of up to two moose when the population exceeds 1,200 moose.

Based on the most recent surveys, there were 1,166 moose in Unit 17A during March 2011. Since then the reproductive indices from a sample of radio collared animals indicates this herd is still growing and is probably above 1,200 moose. The bag limit of two moose and antlerless harvest opportunity provides a mechanism to limit population growth and allows hunters to harvest surplus animals.

The moose population in subunit 17A is growing and can sustain additional harvest; however, the objectives for this population include allowing it to expand into neighboring areas as well as provide for additional harvest opportunity. The population is currently contributing to the growth of moose populations, especially to the north and west.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-148)

PROPOSAL 123 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20A as follows:

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

(18)

Unit 20(A), the
Ferry Trail
Management Area,
Wood River
Controlled Use
Area, and the
Yanert Controlled
Use Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1—Sept. 25
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by
drawing permit only; up
to 2,000 permits may
be issued in combination
with the Remainder of Unit
20(A); a person may not
take a cow accompanied
by a calf; or

Aug. 15—Nov. 15
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by
registration permit only;
a person may not take
a cow accompanied
by a calf; or

Oct. 1—Feb. 28
(General hunt only)

1 bull by drawing permit
only; up to 1,000 permits
may be issued in combi-
nation with the Remainder
of Unit 20(A); or

Sept. 1—Sept. 25
(General hunt only)

1 bull by drawing
permit only; by
muzzleloader only;
up to 75 permits
may be issued in
combination with
nonresidents in
Unit 20(A); or

Nov. 1—Nov. 30
(General hunt only)

1 moose by targeted permit only; by shotgun or bow and arrow only; up to 100 permits may be issued

Season to be announced by emergency order (General hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1—Sept. 25

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side, by drawing permit only; by muzzleloader only; up to 75 permits may be issued in combination with residents in Unit 20(A);

Nov. 1—Nov. 30

Remainder of Unit 20(A)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1—Sept. 25

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 2,000 permits may be issued in combination with Unit 20(A), the Ferry Trail Management Area, Wood River Controlled Use Area, and the Yanert Controlled Use Area; a person may not take a cow accompanied

Aug. 15—Nov. 15 (General hunt only)

by a calf; or

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or

Aug. 25—Feb. 28

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 1,000 permits may be issued in combination with Unit 20(A), the Ferry Trail Management Area, Wood River Controlled Use Area, and the Yanert Controlled Use Area; or

Sept. 1—Sept. 25

1 moose by targeted permit only; by shotgun or bow and arrow only; up to 100 permits may be issued

Season to be announced by emergency order (General hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1—Sept. 25

...

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. The purpose of antlerless moose hunts in Unit 20A is to regulate population growth, to meet the Intensive Management (IM) mandate for high levels of harvest, to provide subsistence hunters with a reasonable opportunity for success in obtaining moose for subsistence uses in Unit 20A outside the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence Area (part of the western Tanana Flats), and to use the targeted hunt as a tool to manage moose-vehicle collision and nuisance situations. Overall, the goal is to protect the health and habitat of the moose population over the long term and to provide for a wide range of public uses and benefits.

This reauthorization will allow the department to manage the moose population at the optimum level (i.e., in concert with the available habitat). Additional hunting opportunity will be provided and harvest will remain as high by utilizing a harvestable surplus of antlerless moose. The antlerless harvest will help in meeting IM harvest objectives without reducing bull-to-cow ratios to low levels. Meat and subsistence hunters will benefit from the opportunity to harvest cow

moose. The moose populations will benefit by having moose density compatible with the habitat. Motorists and residents may benefit from reduced moose–vehicle collisions and moose–human conflicts.

The current objective is to maintain moose numbers within the IM population objective of 12,000–15,000 moose (the IM population objective adopted by the board in 2012). The Unit 20A population was estimated at 8,678–11,633 moose (90% confidence interval) in 2013. As a result, the antlerless hunts were suspended during RY14. Additionally, because the department was unable to conduct a population estimate in 2014 due to poor survey conditions, the antlerless hunts will also be suspended in RY15. However, this high-density moose population continues to experience density-dependent effects, including low productivity and relatively light calf weights. The department plans to conduct a population estimate in 2015 and, if the population estimate exceeds 12,000 moose, the antlerless hunts may need to be reinstated in RY16 to regulate population growth.

If antlerless moose hunts are not reauthorized, the department will lose the ability to regulate this moose population. Opportunity to hunt a harvestable surplus of cow moose will be lost, and our ability to meet IM harvest objectives will be compromised. Subsistence hunters in the portion of Unit 20A outside the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence Area (part of the western Tanana Flats) may not have a reasonable opportunity to pursue moose for subsistence uses.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-150)

PROPOSAL 124 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20B as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(18)		
...		
Unit 20(B), that portion within Creamer’s refuge		
1 bull with spike-fork or greater antlers, by bow and arrow only; or	Sept. 1—Sept. 30 (General hunt only) Nov. 21—Nov. 27 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1—Sept. 30 Nov. 21—Nov. 27
1 antlerless moose by bow and arrow only, by	Sept. 1—Nov. 27 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1—Nov. 27

drawing permit only; up to 150 bow and arrow permits may be issued in the Fairbanks Management Area; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area; or

1 antlerless moose by muzzleloader by drawing permit only; up to 10 permits may be issued; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area

Unit 20(B), remainder of the Fairbanks Management Area

1 bull with spike-fork or greater antlers, by bow and arrow only; or

1 antlerless moose by bow and arrow only, by drawing permit only; up to 150 bow and arrow permits may be issued in the Fairbanks Management Area; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area; or

1 moose by targeted permit only; by shotgun or

Dec. 1—Jan. 31
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1—Sept. 30
(General hunt only)
Nov. 21—Nov. 27
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1—Nov. 27
(General hunt only)

Season to be announced
by emergency order

Dec. 1—Jan. 31

Sept. 1—Sept. 30
Nov. 21—Nov. 27

Sept. 1—Nov. 27

No open season.

bow and arrow only; up to 100 permits may be issued

(General hunt only)

Unit 20(B), that portion within the Minto Flats Management Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull; or

Aug. 21—Aug. 27
(Subsistence hunt only)

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

Sept. 8—Sept. 25

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only

Oct. 15—Feb. 28
(Subsistence hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only; up to 8 permits may be issued

Sept. 8—Sept. 25

Unit 20(B), the drainage of the Middle Fork of the Chena River

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 300 permits may be issued; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or

Aug. 15—Nov. 15
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied

Oct. 1—Feb. 28
(General hunt only)

No open season.

by a calf; or		
1 bull; or	Sept. 1—Sept. 25	Sept. 1—Sept. 25
1 bull, by bow and arrow only; or	Sept. 26—Sept. 30	Sept. 26—Sept. 30
1 bull by drawing permit only; by muzzleloader only; up to 60 permits may be issued in combination with the hunt in the Salcha River drainage upstream from and including Goose Creek, and the hunt in the Salcha River drainage downstream of Goose Creek and upstream from and including Butte Creek; or	Nov. 10—Dec. 10 (General hunt only)	No open season.
beginning July 1, 2015, 1 bull by registration permit only; by muzzleloader only, in the Salcha River drainage upstream from and including Butte Creek	Nov. 10—Dec. 10 (General hunt only)	No open season.
Unit 20(B), that portion of the Salcha River drainage upstream from and including Goose Creek		
1 bull; or	Sept. 1—Sept. 25	Sept. 1—Sept. 25
1 bull, by bow and arrow only;	Sept. 26—Sept. 30	Sept. 26—Sept. 30
1 bull by drawing permit only; by muzzleloader only; up to 60 permits may be issued in combination with the hunt in the Middle Fork of the Chena River, and the	Nov. 10—Dec. 10 (General hunt only)	No open season.

hunt in the Salcha River drainage downstream of Goose Creek and upstream from and including Butte Creek; or

beginning July 1, 2015, 1 bull by registration permit only; by muzzleloader only, in the Salcha River drainage downstream of Goose Creek and upstream from and including Butte Creek;

Nov. 10—Dec. 10
(General hunt only)

No open season.

Unit 20(B), that portion of the Salcha River drainage downstream of Goose Creek and upstream from and including Butte Creek

1 bull; or

Sept. 1—Sept. 20

Sept. 5—Sept. 20

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 1,500 permits may be issued in combination with the hunt in the Remainder of Unit 20(B); a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or

Aug. 15—Nov. 15
(General hunt only)

No open season.

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or

Oct. 1—Feb. 28
(General hunt only)

1 moose by targeted permit only; by shotgun or bow and arrow only; up to 100 permits may be issued; or

Season to be announced by emergency order
(General hunt only)

No open season.

1 bull by drawing permit only; by

Nov. 10—Dec. 10
(General hunt only)

No open season.

muzzleloader only; up to 60 permits may be issued in combination with the hunt in the drainage of the Middle Fork of the Chena River and the hunt in the Salcha River drainage upstream from and including Goose Creek; or

beginning July 1, 2015, 1 bull by registration permit only; by muzzleloader only, in the drainage of the Middle Fork of the Chena River and in the Salcha River drainage upstream from and including Goose Creek;

Nov. 10—Dec. 10
(General hunt only)

No open season.

Unit 20(B), that portion southeast of the Moose Creek dike within one-half mile of each side of the Richardson highway

1 bull; or

Sept. 1—Sept. 20

Sept. 5—Sept. 20

1 moose by drawing permit only; by bow and arrow or muzzleloader only; up to 100 permits may be issued; or

Sept. 16—Feb. 28
(General hunt only)

No open season.

1 moose by targeted permit only; by shotgun or bow and arrow only; up to 100 permits may be issued

Season to be announced by emergency order
(General hunt only)

No open season.

Remainder of Unit 20(B)

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; by youth hunt only; up

Aug. 5—Aug. 14

No open season.

to 200 permits may be issued;
or

1 bull; or	Sept. 1—Sept. 20	Sept. 5—Sept. 20
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 1,500 permits may be issued in the Remainder of Unit 20(B); a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Aug. 15—Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	No open season.
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Oct. 1—Feb. 28 (General hunt only)	
1 moose by targeted permit only; by shotgun or bow and arrow only; up to 100 permits may be issued	Season to be announced by emergency order (General hunt only)	No open season.
...		

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. Our goal in Unit 20B is to provide for a wide range of public uses and benefits and to protect the health and habitat of moose populations. Antlerless hunts are important for improving or maintaining the ability of moose habitat to support current populations. They also help regulate moose population growth, help to meet Intensive Management (IM) objectives for high levels of harvest, and provide subsistence hunters with a reasonable opportunity to pursue moose for subsistence uses without reducing bull-to-cow ratios.

If antlerless moose hunts are not reauthorized, the moose population may increase to unacceptable levels or may need reduction when new data are available and analyzed. Opportunity to hunt a harvestable surplus of cow moose will be lost, and our ability to meet IM harvest objectives will be compromised. Subsistence hunters in the portion of Unit 20B outside the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence Area may not have a reasonable opportunity to pursue moose for subsistence uses.

This reauthorization of antlerless moose hunts will likely improve or maintain the ability of moose habitat to support the current moose population. Hunting opportunity and harvest will increase and allow the department to manage these moose populations at optimum levels. The additional harvest will help in meeting IM harvest objectives. It will also allow hunters to harvest

moose toward meeting the IM harvest objective without reducing bull-to-cow ratios to low levels. Meat and subsistence hunters will benefit from the opportunity to harvest cow moose. Moose populations will benefit by having moose densities compatible with their habitat. Motorists and residents may benefit from reduced moose–vehicle collisions and moose–human conflicts.

Fairbanks Management Area (FMA) — The purpose of this antlerless hunt is to regulate population growth in the FMA and potentially reduce moose–vehicle collisions and nuisance moose problems.

The number of moose–vehicle collisions in the FMA is high and poses significant safety risks to motorists. In addition, moose nuisance issues continue to place significant demands on property owners. To increase hunting opportunity and harvest and to reduce moose–vehicle collisions, the department incrementally increased the number of drawing permits for antlerless moose in the FMA during RY99–RY10. Moose–vehicle collisions and moose nuisance problems declined during RY06–RY14, presumably, in part due to the consistent antlerless moose harvests during RY09–RY14.

Minto Flats Management Area (MFMA) — The primary purpose of this antlerless hunt is to provide a reasonable opportunity for subsistence uses and to regulate the moose population in the MFMA.

The MFMA moose density was high in 2010 (4.1 moose/mi²). In order to reduce the moose population, harvest of antlerless moose during RY12 and RY13 was about 2.5% of the population. The fall 2013 estimate shows a more sustainable density in the MFMA (2013 = 2.6 moose/mi²). Therefore, to stabilize this population, the antlerless harvest has been reduced to about 1% of the total population to maintain the current population size.

Targeted Hunt – The purpose of the targeted hunt is to allow the public to harvest moose that are causing a nuisance or public safety issue. These permits are used sparingly but allow the public to harvest the moose instead of the department just dispatching them.

Unit 20B, drainage of the Middle Fork of the Chena River and the Remainder of Unit 20B — The antlerless moose harvest in this area is designed to regulate the moose population in this portion of Unit 20B and to help meet the IM harvest objectives for Unit 20B. The 2013 population estimate (14,057 moose) indicates the population declined from the 2009 estimate (20,173 moose) and is now at a more appropriate level for the habitat. The antlerless harvest goal will be approximately 1% of the total population to maintain the level of the population estimate.

To mitigate hunter conflicts, we spread hunters out over space and time. Each of 16 hunt areas has permits in four time periods: two before the general hunt, one during, and one after. The earliest of the four hunts is a youth hunt that gives hunting opportunity prior to the start of school. Spreading these hunts out over time maintains a few hunters during each season in each permit area, yet is expected to achieve a harvest of approximately 100 cows.

Finally, extensive burns in northcentral Unit 20B will provide excellent habitat in the future. With improving habitat, continued high predator harvest, and relatively mild winters, we can expect continued high productivity and survival of moose, along with increased yield.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-151)

PROPOSAL 125 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20D as follows:

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

(18)

...

Unit 20(D), that portion lying west of the west bank of the Johnson River and south of the north bank of the Tanana River, except the Delta Junction Management Area and the Bison Range Controlled Use Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1—Sept. 15
(General hunt only)

1 bull by drawing permit; or

Sept. 1—Sept. 15
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 1,000 permits may be issued in combination with that portion in the Delta Junction Management Area; a person may not

Oct. 10—Nov. 25
(General hunt only)

take a calf or a cow
accompanied by a calf; or

1 antlerless moose by
registration permit only;
a person may not take a
calf or a cow accompanied
by a calf

Oct. 10—Nov. 25
(General hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 5—Sept. 15

Unit 20(D), that portion
within the Bison Range
Controlled Use Area

1 bull with spike-fork or
50-inch antlers or antlers
with 4 or more brow
tines on one side; or 1
antlerless moose, per
lifetime of a hunter, by youth
hunt drawing permit only; up
to 10 permits may be issued;
a person may not take a
calf or a cow accompanied
by a calf

Sept. 1—Sept. 30
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1—Sept. 30

Unit 20(D), that portion within
the Delta Junction Management Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose every four regulatory
years by drawing permit only,
a person may not take a calf or a
cow accompanied by a calf; or

Sept. 1—Sept. 15
(General hunt only)

1 bull with spike-fork or
50-inch antlers or antlers
with 4 or more brow tines on
one side by drawing permit
only; up to 30 permits may be
issued; or

Sept. 1—Sept. 15
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 1,000 permits may be issued in combination with that portion lying west of the west bank of the Johnson River and south of the north bank of the Tanana River; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf; or

Oct. 10—Nov. 25
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf

Oct. 10—Nov. 25
(General hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose every four regulatory years by drawing permit only, a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf; or

Sept. 1—Sept. 15

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only; up to 30 permits may be issued

Sept. 1—Sept. 15

...

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The Board of Game must annually reauthorize antlerless moose hunting seasons in Unit 20D. Our goal is to provide for a wide range of public uses and benefits, and to protect the health and habitat of moose populations. Antlerless hunts are important for improving or maintaining the ability of moose habitat to support current populations. They also help regulate moose population growth and help to meet Intensive Management (IM) objectives for high levels of harvest.

The goals of the Unit 20D antlerless moose hunts are to stabilize population growth and to address concerns about range degradation, reduced nutritional condition, and reduced reproductive success, as well as to provide youth and disabled veteran hunting opportunity. Most of these goals are being met. Moose density was reduced from 5.6 moose/mi² (pre-antlerless hunts) to 3.2 moose/mi² (post-antlerless hunts). Overwinter browse utilization decreased from

25% in 2007 to 15% in 2010. The average weight of nine-month-old calves increased from 340 lbs. in 2010 to 366 lbs. in 2012 (K. Seaton, ADF&G, unpublished data, Fairbanks).

The Unit 20D moose population has great potential for growth due to the extensive agricultural land and burns and high predator harvest. If antlerless moose hunts are not reauthorized, the moose population may increase to unacceptable levels or may need reduction when new data are available and analyzed. Opportunity to hunt a harvestable surplus of cow moose will be lost, and our ability to meet IM harvest objectives will be compromised.

Reauthorization of Unit 20D antlerless moose hunts will likely improve or maintain the ability of moose habitat to support the current moose population. Hunting opportunity and harvest will increase and allow the department to manage these moose populations at optimum levels. The additional harvest will help in meeting IM harvest objectives without reducing bull-to-cow ratios to low levels. Meat hunters may benefit from the opportunity to harvest cow moose. Moose populations will benefit by having moose densities compatible with their habitat. Motorists and residents may benefit from reduced moose-vehicle collisions and moose-human conflicts.

With the exception of the Bison Range Controlled Use Area, antlerless permits have not been issued since fall 2009. However, antlerless moose will be part of the bag limit for the Delta Junction Management Area Disabled Veterans moose hunt beginning in fall 2015. Future antlerless hunts are likely needed to maintain the population at the optimal density and will contribute toward meeting the IM harvest objective of 500-700 moose. These permits will be issued only if additional harvest is needed in specific areas to maintain optimal moose densities.

Antlerless moose hunts in Unit 20D and their effect on moose density and population growth will continue to be evaluated. Future antlerless moose hunts will be implemented as needed based on evaluation of three indices of density-dependent moose nutritional conditions in relation to changes in moose density: biomass removal of current annual growth on winter browse, proportion of females with twin calves, and late-winter calf weights. During the 2015 season we have no plans to issue permits for antlerless moose hunting in Unit 20D, except for a total of 16 permits for which antlerless moose (except a cow accompanied by a calf or a calf) are part of the legal bag limit in the Bison Range Controlled Use Area and the Disabled Veteran moose hunts.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-152)

PROPOSAL 126 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(16). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Remainder of Unit 18 as follows:

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

(16)

PROPOSAL 127 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(21). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 23 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(21)		
Unit 23, that portion north of and including the Singoalik River drainage		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 moose by registration permit only; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from Nov. 1–Dec. 31; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf; or	July 1—Dec. 31	
1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side	Sept. 1—Sept. 20	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only; up to 125 permits may be issued in all of Unit 23		Sept. 1—Sept. 20
Remainder of Unit 23		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 moose by registration permit only; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from Nov. 1 - Dec. 31; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Aug. 1—Dec. 31	
1 bull with 50-inch antlers	Sept. 1—Sept. 20	

or antlers with 4 or more
brow tines on one side

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or
antlers with 4 or more brow
tines on one side by drawing
permit only; up to 125 permits
may be issued in all of Unit 23

Sept. 1—Sept. 20

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Moose abundance in Unit 23 has a long period and pattern of low density in large portions of Unit 23. As a result, in November 2003 the Board of Game restricted moose hunting for resident and nonresident hunters. These restrictions substantially shortened the resident antlerless moose season and limited the harvest of antlerless moose to hunters who register for registration permit hunt RM880. The resident registration hunt was implemented as a way to retain antlerless opportunity through substantially shortened seasons that limited antlerless harvest to the months of November and December. Since RY2004 there have been no further changes to moose hunting seasons in Unit 23 and antlerless seasons have been reauthorized annually.

Historically, the reported harvest of antlerless (cow) moose has been low throughout Unit 23 despite liberal antlerless seasons. We do not think maintaining an antlerless season during November and December, when moose harvests tend to be very low, will cause overharvest of the cow portion of the Unit 23 moose populations.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-155)

PROPOSAL 128 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(24). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the western portion of Unit 26A as follows:

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

(24)

...

Unit 26(A), that portion west of
156° 00' W. longitude and
excluding the Colville River
drainage.

1 moose; a person may

July 1—Sept. 14

No open season.

not take a calf or a cow
accompanied by a calf

...

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? To be retained, the antlerless moose season in the portion of Unit 26A west of 156° 00' W longitude and excluding the Colville drainage must be reauthorized annually.

The western portion of Unit 26A north of the Colville drainage is somewhat unique in relation to the presence of moose and the unit-wide population. The distribution in this area is very sparse due to minimal habitat in the coastal plain to attract moose. However, each year a small number of bulls and barren cows arrive in this area as they disperse away from the major river drainages in the central and southern parts of the unit. So far, the marginal habitat in this portion of Unit 26A has not allowed moose to colonize or become established in this area. The only moose found in this area appear to have originated from distant locations as they exhibit seasonal movements. The low numbers of moose that disperse to this hunt area provide the only opportunities for harvest in the northwestern portion of Unit 26A.

Even though the Unit 26A moose population is currently low and has experienced a substantial decline since 2011, the number of dispersing cow moose that could be harvested under the proposed antlerless reauthorization is very small and will have very little impact on the size and status of the Unit 26A population. To date, after several years of hunting opportunity in this area, two antlerless moose have been harvested: one cow in 2006, and one in 2008. Due to low harvest rates, we recommend reauthorization of the antlerless moose season in this area.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-156)

PROPOSAL 129 - 5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemption. Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemptions for the Central/Southwest Region as follows:

5AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemption

(a) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in the following units:

- (1) Unit 11;
- (2) Units 13 and 16(A);
- (3) Unit 16(B) and 17;

...

(11) Unit 9, within the following areas, unless a smaller area is defined by the department in an applicable permit:

(A) Unit 9(B), within five miles of the communities of Port Alsworth, Nondalton, Iliamna, Newhalen, Pile Bay, Pedro Bay, Pope Vanoy Landing, Kakhonak, Igiugig, and Levelock;

(B) Unit 9(C), within five miles of the communities of King Salmon, Naknek, and South Naknek;

(C) Unit 9(D), within five miles of the communities of Cold Bay, King Cove, Sand Point, and Nelson Lagoon;

(D) Unit 9(E), within five miles of the communities of Egegik, Pilot Point, Ugashik, Port Heiden, Port Moller, Chignik Lake, Chignik Lagoon, Chignik Bay, Perryville, and Ivanof Bay;

(12) Unit 10, within three miles of the community of False Pass, unless a smaller area is defined by the department in an applicable permit.

(b) In addition to the units as specified in (a) of this section, if a hunter obtains a subsistence registration permit before hunting, that hunter is not required to obtain a resident tag to take a brown bear in the following units:

(1) Unit 9(B);

(2) Unit 9(E), that portion including all drainages that drain into the Pacific Ocean between Cape Kumliun and the border of Unit 9(D) and Unit 9(E);

(3) Unit 17;

...

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Brown bear tag fee exemptions must be reauthorized annually or the fee will be automatically reinstated.

General Season Hunts: The board liberalized brown bear hunting regulations including the tag fee exemption to increase the harvest of brown bears in Units 11, 13, and 16 during the March 2003 Board of Game meeting and in Unit 17 during the March 2011 Board of Game meeting. The tag fee exemption in these units provides greater opportunity to harvest of brown bears by allowing opportunistic.

The board also exempted brown bear tag fees for bear hunts near communities in Unit 9 to address public safety concerns in communities during the board meeting in March 2011. Brown bears are abundant in Unit 9 and are managed as a trophy species. Brown bears are frequently observed in communities where they destroy property in search of food or garbage and occasionally kill pets. The liberalized bear seasons and bag limits adopted along with the elimination of the tag fee were intended to allow people to take bears before they destroy property, to promote a greater acceptance of the unit's bear population, and to resolve some of the compliance issues associated with the take of bears in defense of life or property.

Subsistence Brown Bear Hunts: The board waived the brown bear tag fee requirement for subsistence brown bear hunts in Unit 17 and portions of Unit 9. Subsistence brown bear harvest rates are low and well within sustainable limits. Exempting the resident tag fee has not caused an increase in subsistence harvest in these units. Continuation of the exemption accommodates cultural and traditional uses of brown bears in these units and provides an alternative for hunters who take brown bears primarily for their meat.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-C15-149)

PROPOSAL 130 - 5 AAC 92.015(a)(4). Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize resident grizzly bear tag fee exemptions throughout Interior and Eastern Arctic Alaska as follows:

(a) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in the following units:

...

(4) Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26(B), and 26(C)

...

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Resident brown bear tag fees were put in place statewide during the mid-1970s to discourage incidental harvest, elevate the status of brown and grizzly bears to trophies, and to provide revenue. Today, Region III populations are healthy, grizzly bears are highly regarded as trophies, and revenue can be generated from non-tag fee sources. The Board of Game must annually reauthorize all resident tag fee exemptions. Reauthorizing these tag fee exemptions will allow residents who are unable to purchase the \$25 tag before hunting, due to lack of vendors or economic reasons, to opportunistically and legally harvest grizzly bears.

Eliminating all resident grizzly bear tag fees throughout Interior and Eastern Arctic Alaska (Region III) simplifies regulations, increases resident hunter opportunity, and is not likely to cause declines in these grizzly bear populations. This reauthorization would assist with our objective of managing Region III grizzly bear populations for hunter opportunity and would continue to allow hunters to take grizzlies opportunistically. During regulatory years 2006–2009, 35% of grizzlies harvested by resident hunters in Region III were taken incidentally to other activities (compared to 4% incidental take in regions I and II and 17% statewide).

We estimate that a kill rate of at least 6%, composed primarily of males, is sustainable. Human-caused mortality in most of Region III has been consistently less than 6% of the population. Where harvests are elevated (i.e. Units 20D, 20B, 20A, and portions of 26B), grizzly populations are managed through changes in seasons and bag limits. Resident tag fees that were in place prior to 2010 appeared to have no effect on harvest in these areas.

As part of this request to reauthorize exemption of grizzly tag fee throughout Region III, we recommend that the board, at a minimum, continue to reauthorize the tag fee exemptions for subsistence registration permit hunts in Units 19A and 19B (downstream of and including the Aniak River drainage), 21D, and 24.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-153)

PROPOSAL 131 - 5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize the current resident tag fee exemptions for brown bear in Units 18, 22, 23 and 26A as follows:

(a) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in the following units:

...

(4) Units... 26;

...

(8) Unit 22;

(9) Unit 23;

...
(13) Unit 18;
...

(b) In addition to the units as specified in (a) of this section, if a hunter obtains a subsistence registration permit before hunting, that hunter is not required to obtain a resident tag to take a brown bear in the following units:

...
(4) Unit 18;
...
(7) Unit 22;
(8) Unit 23;
...
(10) Unit 26(A).

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The Board of Game must reauthorize brown bear tag fee exemptions annually or the fee automatically becomes reinstated. We recommend continuing resident tag fee exemptions for the general season and subsistence season hunts in Region V (Units 18, 22, 23, and 26A).

General Season Hunts: Reauthorizations are needed for: Unit 18, where the tag fee has been exempted for 4 years; Unit 22, where the tag fee has been exempted for 14 years; Unit 23, where the tag fee has been exempted for nine years; and Unit 26A, where the tag fee has been exempted for four years. Tag fee exemptions are desired to allow: 1) incremental increase in annual harvest, 2) opportunistic harvest by resident hunters, and 3) harvest by a wide range of users. Increased harvest is allowable because portions of these units have high bear populations.

General season brown bear harvest rates are within sustained yield limits and previous exemptions of the resident tag fee have not caused dramatic or unexpected increases in overall harvest. In Units 18 and 26A, tag exemptions were authorized for RY2012 and harvest has remained within sustained yield and continues to be similar to the preceding ten-year period. In Unit 22, the 14-year tag-free period for residents has had an average annual harvest of 50 brown bears (range 41–63 bears). In Unit 23, general harvests have been increasing slowly since 1961 primarily in response to increases in human population rather than regulatory changes, although harvests are annually quite variable due to effects of weather on hunting conditions. Harvest data for Unit 23 show no trend in the sex ratio, age or size of bears harvested under all types of hunts.

Subsistence Season Hunts: Reauthorizations are needed for Units 18, 22, 23, and 26A where brown bear subsistence hunt requirements include: 1) registration permit, 2) tag fee exemption, 3) salvaging meat for human consumption, 4) no use of aircraft in Units 22, 23 and 26A, 5) no sealing requirement unless hide and skull are removed from subsistence hunt area, and 6) if sealing is required, the skin of the head and front claws must be removed and retained by ADF&G at the time of sealing. Continuing the tag fee exemption helps facilitate participation in the associated brown bear harvest programs maintained by ADF&G for subsistence hunts.

In all units, subsistence brown bear harvest rates are low and well within sustained yield limits and exempting the resident tag fee has not caused an increase in subsistence harvest. In Unit 18, we estimate 1–3 bears are taken annually in subsistence hunts. In Unit 22, subsistence harvest by permit is quite low, averaging less than one bear per year (less than 1% of the total brown bear harvest). In Unit 23, subsistence permit harvest is less than five bears annually since 1992 (less than 10% of the total brown bear harvest). In Unit 26A, between one and five bears are taken annually by subsistence hunters.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-C15-157)

Regional and Multiple Units

Note: The following proposals were submitted to the Board of Game as Agenda Change Requests which were accepted during the August 7, 2015 board meeting.

PROPOSAL 132 - 5 AAC 85.070(5). Hunting season and bag limits for unclassified game.
Modify the hunting season for snowy owls as follows:

5 AAC 85.070(5) Snowy Owl

Units 17, 18, 22, 23, and 26 Residents: September 1–April 1
Nonresidents: No open season

No limit; however, a bird may be taken only if used for food or clothing, and no bird or part of a bird may be sold or offered for sale.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The Department of Fish and Game has determined that it is no longer legal, under Federal Regulations 50 CFR part 20.132, to allow for the harvest of snowy owl on a “no closed season” basis. Following amendments to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act in 1997, a regulated spring/summer subsistence season for the harvest of migratory birds was established in 2003 in portions of rural Alaska. From April 2 to August 31 federal regulations allowed the harvest of cormorants to only permanent residents of areas included in the spring/summer subsistence harvest. This is an update to state of Alaska regulations so they comply with federal regulations enacted in 2003.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ACR-C15-08)

PROPOSAL 133 - 5 AAC 85.070(3). Hunting season and bag limits for unclassified game.
Modify the hunting season for cormorants as follows:

85.070(3) Cormorants (Pelagic and Double-crested cormorants only)

Units 6, 8, 10, 17, 18, 22, 23 Residents: September 1–April 1
Nonresidents: No open season

No limit; however, a bird may be taken only if used for food or clothing, and no bird or part of a bird may be sold or offered for sale.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The Department of Fish and Game has determined that it is no longer legal, under Federal Regulations 50 CFR part 20.132, to allow for the harvest of cormorants on a “no closed season” basis. Following amendments to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act in 1997, a regulated spring/summer subsistence season for the harvest of migratory birds was established in 2003 in portions of rural Alaska. From April 2 to August 31 federal regulations allowed the harvest of cormorants to only permanent residents of areas

included in the spring/summer subsistence harvest. This is an update to state of Alaska regulations so they comply with federal regulations enacted in 2003.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ACR-C15-09)

PROPOSAL 134 - 5 AAC 85.025(15). Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Increase the bag limits for Mulchatna caribou in Units 17, 18, 19A & 19B, and 9A & 9C as follows:

Liberalize the bag limit for Mulchatna caribou to two caribou from August 1–March 31 in Units 17 and 9B and August 1–March 15 in Units 18, 19A&B, and 9A&C.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(3)		
Unit 9(A) and that portion of Unit 9(C) within the Alagnak River drainage		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 2 caribou by registration permit; [HOWEVER, NO MORE THAN 1 BULL MAY BE TAKEN AND NO MORE THAN 1 CARIBOU MAY BE TAKEN FROM AUG. 1 - JAN. 31]	Aug. 1—Mar. 15	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		No open season.
Unit 9(B)		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 2 caribou by registration permit; [HOWEVER, NO MORE THAN 1 BULL MAY BE TAKEN AND NO MORE THAN 1 CARIBOU MAY BE TAKEN FROM AUG. 1 - JAN. 31]	Aug. 1—Mar. 31	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		No open season.
...		

(12)

Unit 17(A), all drainages
that terminate east
of Right Hand Point

RESIDENT HUNTERS:
2 caribou may be taken
during the season to be
announced by emergency
order by registration permit
only

(Season to be
announced)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

Remainder of Unit 17(A)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:
2 caribou by registration
permit only; [HOWEVER, NO
MORE THAN 1 BULL MAY BE
TAKEN AND NO MORE THAN 1
CARIBOU MAY BE TAKEN
FROM AUG. 1 - JAN. 31]

Aug. 1—Mar. 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

Unit 17(B), that portion in
the Unit 17(B) Nonresident
Closed Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:
2 caribou by registration
permit only; [HOWEVER, NO
MORE THAN 1 BULL MAY BE
TAKEN AND NO MORE THAN 1
CARIBOU MAY BE TAKEN
FROM AUG. 1 - JAN. 31]

Aug. 1—Mar. 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

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

Lake Aleknagik, Agulowak River,
Lake Nerka, and the Agulukpak
River

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

2 caribou by registration
permit only; [HOWEVER, NO
MORE THAN 1 BULL MAY BE
TAKEN AND NO MORE THAN 1
CARIBOU MAY BE TAKEN
FROM AUG. 1 - JAN. 31]

Aug. 1—Mar. 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

Remainder of Unit 17(C)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

2 caribou may be taken
during the season to be
announced by emergency
order by registration permit
only

(Season to be
announced)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

(13)

Unit 18

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

2 caribou by registration
permit only; [HOWEVER, NO
MORE THAN 1 BULL MAY BE
TAKEN AND NO MORE THAN 1
CARIBOU MAY BE TAKEN
FROM AUG. 1 - JAN. 31]

Aug. 1—Mar. 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

(14)

Unit 19(A), that portion within
the Lime Village Management
Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

2 caribou by registration permit only; [HOWEVER, NO MORE THAN 1 BULL MAY BE TAKEN AND NO MORE THAN 1 CARIBOU MAY BE TAKEN FROM AUG. 1 - JAN. 31]

Aug. 1—Mar. 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

Units 19(A) and 19(B) within the Nonresident Closed Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

2 caribou by registration permit only; [HOWEVER, NO MORE THAN 1 BULL MAY BE TAKEN AND NO MORE THAN 1 CARIBOU MAY BE TAKEN FROM AUG. 1 - JAN. 31]

Aug. 1—Mar. 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

Remainder of Units 19(A) and 19(B)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

2 caribou by registration permit only; [HOWEVER, NO MORE THAN 1 BULL MAY BE TAKEN AND NO MORE THAN 1 CARIBOU MAY BE TAKEN FROM AUG. 1 - JAN. 31]

Aug. 1—Mar. 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The Mulchatna caribou herd ranges across game management Units 17A, B, and C, 18, 19A and B, and 9A, B, and C. During the mid-1990s this Mulchatna herd reached a peak population size of 200,000 caribou and had a bag limit of five caribou per year. However, since that time, the herd has declined and is now estimated to contain approximately 26,000 animals. During the decline, hunting restrictions were progressively implemented through a hunting closure for nonresidents and reduced seasons and bag limits for resident hunters.

The current resident-only season is open from August 1–March 31 in Units 17 and 19B, and from August 1–March 15 in the remainder of the hunt area (Units 18, 19A and B, and 9A and C).

The bag limit is two caribou; however, only one can be a bull, and only one can be harvested from August 1–January 31.

The current bag limit, which was designed to limit bull harvests, was established in 2007 at a time when the bull:cow ratio estimates were consistently below the management objective. However, the restrictions are no longer necessary. During the fall 2014 composition surveys the Mulchatna herd achieved the objective of 35 bulls:100 cows, suggesting that we no longer need to limit hunters to a single bull caribou. Additionally the reported caribou harvest is well below what we consider sustainable for this herd while allowing herd growth. It is no longer necessary to limit hunters to a single bull or restrict the bag limit to a single caribou from August 10–January 31.

Changing the bag limit to allow hunters to take two caribou of either sex and removing the restriction that only allows the harvest of 1 caribou prior to January 31 will simplify the caribou regulations. The bag limit increase is also thought to be sustainable based on the most current information about the Mulchatna herd.

During the August 2015 Board of Game teleconference to discuss Agenda Change Requests, the discussion of Mulchatna herd hunting opportunities included nonresident hunting opportunity. The board has determined there are subsistence uses of the herd, and has found the amount reasonably necessary for subsistence uses is 2,100–2,400 caribou.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ACR-C15-10)

PROPOSAL 135 - 5 AAC 85.020(a)(20). Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.
 Increase the number of nonresident drawing permits for brown bear in the Remainder of Unit 22 as follows:

The affected nonresident hunt is DB690 covering the combination of Units 22D and 22E.

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

(20)

...

Remainder of Unit 22

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bear every regulatory year
 by registration permit only

Aug. 1—May 31
 (Subsistence hunt only)

1 bear every regulatory year

Aug. 1—May 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bear every regulatory year by drawing permit only; up to **21** [12] permits may be issued

Aug. 1—May 31

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Increase the number of nonresident drawing permits in the Remainder of Unit 22 where drawing permit hunt DB690 is fully subscribed and additional harvest of brown bears is sustainable. The nonresident hunt in Remainder of Unit 22 is currently managed by issuing 12 permits with a bag limit of one bear every regulatory year during a continuous season from August 1 to May 31 in the combined hunt area of Units 22D and 22E. This proposal changes the number of nonresident permits to 21, an increase of nine permits or an additional 75% above the current number of permits.

The average annual reported bear harvest in Units 22D and 22E by residents and nonresidents is 20 bears per year (range 12–26). Residents harvested 75% of the bears (n=259) and nonresidents harvested 25% of the bears (n=88). The average annual nonresident harvest of brown bears by drawing permit DB690 permit from RY1998 to RY2014 was five bears per year (range 2–8). The DB690 drawing brown bear permit hunt has been fully subscribed since RY2010, and increasing the number of DB690 permits will allow additional opportunity to hunt brown bears.

Since 1997 the Board of Game has incrementally liberalized Unit 22 brown bear regulations through increased bag limits, lengthened seasons, and elimination of the resident tag fee. The liberalized Unit 22 brown bear regulations produced a 74% increase in brown bear harvest. Between RY1990–RY1997 the average annual Unit 22 reported harvest was 54 bears, and between RY1998–RY2014 the average annual Unit 22 reported harvest was 94 bears.

Similar changes were observed in Unit 22D where harvest increased 89%. Between RY1990–RY1997 the average annual reported harvest was 9 bears, and between RY1998–RY2014 the average annual reported harvest was 17 bears. In Unit 22E the average annual harvest increased 67% as a result of liberalized regulations. Between RY1990–RY1997 the average annual reported harvest was 3 bears, and between RY1998–RY2014 the average annual reported harvest was 5 bears.

The department does not have a population estimate of brown bears in Unit 22. However, during this period of liberalized harvests, the reported harvest in Units 22D and 22E remained consistent with the management goal of maintaining a 3-year mean annual reported harvest of at least 50% boars. Sealing records of bears harvested in Units 22D and 22E indicate 56% (n=42 boars) and 77% (n=17 boars) of bears taken between RY1990 and RY1997 were boars, respectively; and 62% (n=178 boars) and 78% (n=65 boars) of bears taken between RY1998 and RY2014 were boars, respectively. Based on the above indices the department believes the brown bear population in Units 22D and 22E can support additional sustainable harvest through an increase in the number of nonresident drawing permits.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(ACR-C15-11)

PROPOSAL 136 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(14). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Establish winter draw and registration hunts for moose in Unit 16B as follows:

Establish winter draw and registration hunts for one bull moose in Unit 16B to supplement the existing hunt structure when the harvestable portion of the moose population is greater than 240 moose.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(14)		
...		
Remainder of Unit 16(B)		
1 bull per regulatory year, only as follows:		
RESIDENT HUNTERS		
...		
If the harvestable portion is greater than 240 moose:		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or	Aug. 20—Sept. 20	
1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 75 percent of the combined drawing permits in the area may be issued to non- youth hunters; up to 300 permits may be issued; provided that the harvestable portion is greater than 310 moose; or	Aug. 20—Sept. 20 (general hunt only)	
1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 25 percent of the combined drawing permits in the area may be issued to youth hunters; up to 100 permits; or	Aug. 20—Sept. 20 Nov. 15—Dec. 15 (general hunt only)	

may be issued; provided that the harvestable portion is greater than 310 moose; or

1 bull by registration permit only; or

Dec. 15—Last Day of February

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 500 permits may be issued; or

Dec. 15—Last Day of February

1 bull by Tier II subsistence hunting permit only; up to 260 permits may be issued

Dec. 15—Mar. 31
(Subsistence hunt only)

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? This proposal liberalizes winter moose hunting opportunity in Unit 16B to provide additional harvest opportunities for resident hunters. The proposal recommends using a combination of registration and drawing permit hunts to distribute hunting pressure for bulls throughout the unit.

The majority of the new hunting opportunity would be offered through an open registration hunt. Drawing permit hunts would only be offered in areas where the harvest could not be regulated using an open registration permit hunt due to the amount of participation and interest. Additionally, the board may also want to consider increasing the number of Tier II permits that may be issued to increase harvest opportunity or establishing an antlerless moose hunt in portions of the unit where the moose population exceeds management objectives.

The moose population in the unit has increased slowly as a result of intensive management activities and restricted harvest opportunities. The population is currently estimated to contain 7,400 moose, which is above the mid-point of the population objective (7,000 moose), and the department estimates that there is a surplus of approximately 600–700 bulls unit-wide. However, moose harvests remain below the intensive management objectives, despite liberalizations in fall hunting opportunity that have occurred since 2009. Between 2009 and 2013 hunters harvested an average of 199 moose compared to the mainland harvest objective of 310–600. The amount reasonably necessary for subsistence in Unit 16B north of the Beluga River of 160–180 moose (hunts TM565 and TM567). The amount reasonably necessary for subsistence in 16B south of the Beluga River and north of Redoubt Bay is 29–37 (hunt TM569).

Table. Population size and composition of the moose population in Unit 16B relative to management objectives based on the most recent survey results.

Survey Unit	IM Population Objective proportional to area (midpoint)	Moose Population Estimate	Percent Recovery to Objective Midpoint	Bull:100 Cow Ratio
16(B)-North	1,820–2,100 (1,960)	1,587	81%	60
16(B)-Middle	3,120–3,600 (3,360)	3,458	103%	46
16(B)-South	1,560–1,800 (1,680)	2,372	141%	52
Unit 16(B)	6,500–7,500 (7,000)	7,418	106%	

Two new draw hunt opportunities (DM540 & YM541) were implemented in 2014 to provide additional hunting opportunity and increase moose harvests. While these hunts appear to be increasing the total harvest for the unit (234 moose harvested in 2014), the drawing permit requirement places a restriction on who has the ability to participate in these hunts, and some drawing permits issued are not utilized. During 2014, only 27% of the drawing permits issued were used by hunters.

To meet the mid-point of the harvest objective, hunters will need to harvest an additional 120–150 moose each year. This amount of additional harvest is sustainable if the harvest is distributed among all segments of the moose population in Unit 16B. While the liberalization of the existing general season and drawing permit hunts could be used to increase harvest, liberalizing fall hunting opportunities will not distribute the harvest to segments of the moose population that reside in relatively inaccessible areas, which is necessary to achieve the harvest and keep it within sustainable limits. During winters with normal amounts of snow accumulation, segments of the moose population migrate from higher elevation terrain and become more accessible to hunters. This movement, combined with the ability of hunters to use snowmachines to access hunt areas, makes a winter hunt the best option for achieving the harvest objective in Unit 16B.

The additional winter hunting opportunity proposed will allow the harvest to reach the harvest objective, and the permit requirements will allow managers to monitor and distribute the harvest. Stable weather patterns in winter provide hunters access to subpopulations of seasonally-migratory moose that may not be available during the fall hunting season. Because the distribution of moose and comparatively restrictive access limit fall harvests, the department believes that liberalized winter hunting opportunities are needed to achieve the harvest objective.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ACR-C15-12)

PROPOSAL 137 - 5 AAC 92.108. Identified big game prey populations and objectives. Modify the Intensive Management population and harvest objectives for moose in Unit 20A as follows:

This proposal would set the population and harvest objectives at levels that population and harvest parameters suggest are more in line with the carrying capacity of the habitat and sustainable harvest over the long term.

Population	Finding	Population Objective	Harvest Objective
Moose			
...			
GMU 20(A)	Positive	<u>10,000–12,000</u> [12,000–15,000]	<u>500–720</u> [900–1,100]
...			

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? During deliberations of the Feasibility Assessment for Maintaining or Increasing Sustainable Harvest of Moose in Game Management Unit 20A (Unit 20A Feasibility Assessment) at the February 2015 Board of Game (board) meeting in Wasilla, the board directed the department to provide an updated Unit 20A Feasibility Assessment in 2016 and recommended that the Intensive Management (IM) population and harvest objectives for moose in Unit 20A be revisited at that time. The current IM population and harvest objectives are 12,000–15,000 and 900–1,100 moose, respectively.

We recommend the IM population objective be changed back to 10,000–12,000 moose, the population objective prior to 2012. The number of moose in Unit 20A was estimated at 17,768 ($\pm 13\%$ @ 90% Confidence Interval [CI]) in 2003. Research indicated this high-density moose population was experiencing density-dependent effects, including low productivity, relatively light calf weights, and high removal rates of winter forage. The objective beginning in regulatory year 2004–2005 (RY04) was to reduce moose numbers to the population objective of 10,000–12,000 and stabilize the population at that level, unless indicators of moose condition showed signs of improvement at higher densities. The Unit 20A population was estimated at 12,193 ($\pm 13\%$ @ 90% CI) moose in 2012 and at that lower population level, we had not detected any improvements in the nutritional status of the moose population based on annual twinning rates.

In 2013, the Unit 20A population was estimated at 10,156 ($\pm 11\%$ @ 90% CI) moose, although we speculate that that estimate may have been biased low due to poor sightability. Unfortunately, we were unable to conduct a population estimate in 2014 due to the lack of sufficient snow. At this lower population level, we have detected only minor improvements in the nutritional status of the moose population (i.e., 5%–6% increases in body mass of 10-month old females). If nutritional status does not show further improvement, the department proposes to stabilize the

population at 10,000–12,000 moose, while continuing to monitor nutritional status. Overall, our goal is to sustain the health and habitat of the moose population over the long term.

We also recommend lowering the harvest objective from 900–1,100 moose (~9% harvest rate) to 500–720 moose (5%–6% harvest rate). We observed a population decline during RY03–RY06 with reported harvest rates of 6%–8% and predict population stability at reported harvest rates of 5%–6% (harvest rates of males at 4%–5% and females 1%–2%).

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ACR-C15-13)

ADDENDUM

Additional Proposals

The following proposal was submitted prior to the proposal deadline but was inadvertently excluded from the proposal book. It is scheduled for consideration by the Board of Game at the Statewide Regulations meeting in March 2016.

PROPOSAL 138 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Change nonresident, general sheep hunts on state and BLM lands to drawing permit hunts.

We again ask the board to first deal with the unlimited guide numbers and unlimited nonresident opportunity across the state, as a first attempt to conserve sheep, reduce crowding and conflicts, before also limiting resident opportunities. Do not go back on your words and your testimony over the years about what is really causing the bulk of our problems. Harken back to the words of the current chairman who represented the board before the legislature in 2013 and said: *“And we have two major concerns ... one is conservation of the resource and the 2nd concern the Board of Game has – and we’ve addressed this quite a bit – is crowding. And we feel that under the current system where there is no limit to the number of guides that can operate on state and BLM-managed lands, this has resulted in some fairly heavy generally localized overharvest of game and certainly crowding.”*

“And here's something else that I'm really concerned about. Is that, there's a difference in having guides competing with guides, that's one issue, but the way I look at it as a BOG member, and a real state's rights sort of guy, is that this really puts a lot of competition on residents. Because guides are well equipped, they have large camps, wall tents, a string of horses, aircraft, they're set up, I mean this is their business. For your average hunter that goes in there for a long weekend or a week or whatever, those guys, those residents have a tough time dealing and getting game in places where you have a lot of guide competition.” – Board of Game Chairman Ted Spraker, House Resources Committee hearing, March 11, 2013

We don't believe resident sheep hunters currently need to be limited further in any way. That very well may need to happen down the line in some areas, and as our primary concern is the sheep resource we would support some limits on resident opportunity should the need arise. Let's deal with the primary known problems and issues first. As the executive director of the Alaska Professional Hunters Association wrote to the Palin administration back in 2008: "Currently, overcrowding of guides on state lands combined with decreasing wildlife populations is stimulating social disorder between hunter user groups and biological harm to our wildlife which leads to establishment of the restrictive drawing permit hunts." That statement has been echoed by the board ever since.

We propose that all current general season nonresident sheep hunts move to draw-only hunts statewide, excluding USF&WS & NPS lands. That's a first step to determine outcomes for the sheep resource, the crowding issues and conflicts, and whether or not it induces resident hunters to again hunt in areas they have abandoned due to these issues.

We understand the impacts this has on individual guides and their business model and stability, but the bottom line is that there is just no other way around these kind of limits being placed on nonresident sheep hunters (and thus guides).

We are willing to support a higher allocation level than others who have proposed similar nonresident limits. We are not beholden to some strict, low nonresident allocation levels. Currently, nonresident guided sheep hunters take 40% of the total statewide sheep harvest. We can support nonresident allocation levels set so in no subunit on state or BLM lands does nonresident guided

harvest exceed 30% of the total harvest. These types of decisions and allocation levels are best decided on a subunit by subunit basis across the state by the board with input from ADF&G biologists and managers.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Known sheep conservation concerns and negative impacts to resident sheep hunters identified by the Alaska Board of Game and the big game guide industry regarding unlimited big game guide numbers in conjunction with unlimited nonresident sheep hunting opportunities.

For nearly ten years the Alaska Board of Game and the big game guide industry has been aware of, identified, and spoken publicly on the record about their concerns surrounding unlimited big game guiding on state and BLM lands, especially as it relates to Dall sheep conservation and sheep hunting. The board has also publicly testified before the legislature about the negative impacts unlimited guides along with unlimited nonresident sheep hunting opportunity has had, and is having, on the sheep resource and on resident sheep hunters.

The board's (and the guide industry's) preferred solution to these known problems was a state-sanctioned and state-run "Guide Concession Program" (GCP) that would limit the number of big game guides that could operate on state and BLM lands. Limiting the number of guides would also thus limit the number of nonresident sheep hunters who are required by law to hire a guide.

The GCP went through years of contentious hearings and meetings and was never authorized by the 1 legislature and is likely to never come about. When the public continued to submit proposals to the board asking them to use their authority to take care of these known problems by limiting all nonresident sheep hunting opportunity to draw-only hunts, the board backtracked on previous statements and public testimony and claimed they needed more study on the issue.

After more study and more meetings, the board then did something quite extraordinary; as a body they created their own board-generated sheep proposal that included options to limit resident sheep hunting opportunity that were never before submitted by the public or the guide industry. The board now alludes that if any changes are to be made, there should be a "shared burden" among all user groups. It's like the boards' previous statements and testimony over the years never happened.

Alaska Backcountry Hunters & Anglers has been heavily involved in sheep issues over the years, with proposals to the board along with oral testimony and written comments. We have attended and spoken before Advisory Committee meetings and Big Game Commercial Services Board meetings. All along we have tried to work with the guide industry and guides and AC members and the boards for a workable and fair compromise concerning nonresident allocation levels.

We have continually stated that our primary concern was the sheep resource and that our secondary concern was the fear of losing yet more resident sheep hunting opportunity (as happened in subunits 13D/14A) due to these known issues and problems with unlimited guides and unlimited nonresident sheep hunting opportunity.

We attended the sheep "town hall" meeting in Wasilla in February 2015 with some 167 members of the public present, many of whom stood up to speak to the crowd and the board. There was broad disagreement on solutions to the problems but there was one thing every single person agreed on: sheep populations were down.

The Alaska Department of Fish & Game, in their oral reports at sheep meetings and in their sheep report also stated that sheep populations over the past four decades have diminished. At the same time, nonresident sheep hunter numbers have remained flat, while resident sheep hunter numbers have dropped.

If this problem is not solved, there will be continued localized diminished populations of full-curl rams that threaten population sustainability and resident general open season sheep hunting opportunities, continued user conflicts and crowding, and continued inequitable nonresident sheep harvest rates in some areas.

This proposal addresses improving the quality of the resource harvested. By limiting nonresident sheep hunting opportunities statewide we thus limit the number of guides they must hire, thereby reducing total sheep harvests, better conserving sheep populations, as well as improving the quality of sheep hunts for both guided and unguided hunters by reducing crowding and conflicts afield.

Those who will benefit from this proposal will be ALL those who put the resource first and wish to see our sheep populations conserved and sustained. All resident hunters who want to see their general open season sheep hunting opportunities retained. All guided nonresident hunters who don't want to compete with so many other guided hunters and who favor a more quality sheep hunt.

Those who will suffer will be some guides who will suffer monetarily because of the lower number of nonresident clients. Division of Wildlife Conservation funding would decrease because of a decrease in nonresident sheep tags being sold, and some local economies could see a decrease in nonresident hunting-related tourism, but it's important to emphasize that these same things would happen if the proposed Guide Concession Program, which the board supported, was implemented. Nonresident sheep hunters would lose the guarantee to be able to hunt Dall sheep in Alaska, and would have to take their chances with a draw-only hunt.

Other solutions considered: Continuing to wait for the proposed Guide Concession Program to be implemented. Rejected because we have already waited too long for this proposed concession program to be implemented, and it now appears it will never come about.

Only making some of the known problem areas of the state draw-only for nonresidents. This was rejected because it has the potential to spread the problems to the areas still open to general season nonresident sheep hunting.

Various kinds of limits on resident sheep hunting opportunity statewide in areas still open to general season hunt opportunity, in conjunction with our proposed solution. Rejected because we don't believe we need that at this time, but our primary concern is sheep conservation so that sheep hunting by all can continue, and we do believe it is important that resident sheep hunters are fully cognizant this may be necessary down the line.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Chapter Backcountry Hunters & Anglers (HQ-C15-168)
