

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

REVIEWER LETTER

DEAR REVIEWER:

January, 2007

The Alaska Board of Game will consider the attached book of regulatory proposals at its Spring, 2007 meeting to be held March 2-12, at the Coast International Inn in Anchorage, Alaska. The proposals generally concern changes to the regulations governing hunting and the use of game in the Southcentral and Southwest Regions. Members of the public, organizations, advisory committees, and staff submitted these proposals, which 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 or letters in square brackets [XXXX] are deletions from the regulation text.

You are encouraged to read all proposals presented in this book. Some regulations have statewide application and some regulations may affect other regions of the state. Also, some proposals recommend changes to multiple areas or regions.

The proposals are set forth in the Table of Contents, which is not in roadmap order for the meeting. Prior to the meeting, the board will generate and make available to the public the order of proposals to be deliberated by the board, also known as the "roadmap." 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.

After reviewing the proposals, please send written comments to:

ATTN: BOG COMMENTS
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Boards Support Section
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, AK 99811-5526
Fax: 907-465-6094

Public comment, in combination with Advisory Committee comments and department staff presentations, provide the Board of Game with useful biological and socioeconomic data to form decisions. Comments may be submitted at any time until the public testimony period for that proposal and/or its subject matter is closed at the meeting and the board begins deliberations. As a practical matter, you are encouraged to mail or fax your written comments to the above Juneau address no later than 5:00 p.m. on Friday, February 16, 2007 to ensure inclusion in the board workbook. All comments received after that time will be presented to board members at the time

of the meeting, but may not be printed in the board workbook. Written comments will also be accepted during the board meeting and public testimony during the public testimony portion of the meeting is always appreciated. Written comments become public documents.

When providing written comments on the proposals in this proposal book, please consider the following tips to help ensure board members and the public more fully understand recommendations to the board:

Timely Submission: Submit written comments by fax or mail at least two weeks prior to the meeting. Comments received at least two weeks prior to the meeting are printed and cross referenced in the board members' workbooks. Written comments received after the two-week period will be included in the workbooks as "late comments" and are not cross referenced. Materials received during the meeting also are not cross referenced. If you provide written comments during a board meeting, submit 20 copies to Board Support Section staff, who will distribute your written comments to board members. If including graphs or charts, please indicate the source.

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). This will help ensure written comments are correctly noted for the board members. If the comments support a modification in the proposal, please indicate "support as amended" and provide a preferred amendment in writing.

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 or opposition of the proposal. Board actions are based on a complete review of the facts involved in each proposal, not a mere 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 advisory committee minutes along with the majority recommendation. The board benefits greatly from understanding the pro and cons of each issue. A brief description consisting of a couple of sentences is sufficient.

Write Clearly: Comments will be photocopied so please use 8 1/2" x 11" paper and leave reasonable margins on all sides, allowing for hole punches. 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 in attendance (e.g., 12 of 15 members) and indicate represented interests such as subsistence, guides, trappers, hunters, wildlife viewers, etc.

Pertinent policies and findings, proposals, written comment deadlines, meeting calendars and notices for the Board of Game meetings are posted on the Board Support website at <http://www.boards.adfg.state.ak.us/>.

A tentative agenda for the March, 2007 Board of Game meeting is shown on page xi. A roadmap detailing the tentative order in which proposals will be made available in February, 2007 at <http://www.boards.adfg.state.ak.us/> . During the meeting, a recorded telephone message will provide current updates on the board's agenda and schedule. Dial (800) 764-8901 (in Juneau, call 465-8901).

If you are a person with a disability needing special accommodations in order to comment on the proposed regulations should contact the Boards Support Section at (907) 465-4110 no later than February 23, 2007 to make any necessary arrangements.

Kristy Tibbles, Executive Director
Alaska Board of Game
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
(907) 465-4110

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
 SPRING 2007 PROPOSAL BOOK
 SOUTHCENTRAL AND SOUTHWEST REGIONS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page Number
Reviewer Letter.....	i - iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
Tentative Meeting Schedule	v
Board of Game Meeting Cycle	vi
Board of Game Membership Roster	viii
Boards Support Section Staff.....	ix
Guidelines for Public and Advisory Committee Testimony.....	x
Draft Agenda.....	xi
Proposals.....	1-198

PROPOSAL TOPICS

PAGE NUMBER

Trapping.....	1-8
Bison	8
Black Bear.....	9-18
Brown Bear	18-68
Caribou.....	69-81
Deer.....	81-82
Elk.....	82-85
Goat.....	85-92
Moose.....	93-148
Dall Sheep.....	149-159
Wolf	159-171
Small Game Hunting.....	172-174
Statewide Regulations.....	174-198

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
Tentative Meeting Schedule
2007/2008 Cycle
Updated November, 2006

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>Location</u>
Arctic and Western Region	November 9 - 12, 2007 <i>Proposal Deadline: August 17, 2007</i> <i>Written Comments: October 26, 2007</i>	Bethel
Statewide Regulations Cycle B	January 25 - 28, 2008 <i>Proposal Deadline: November 9, 2007</i> <i>Written Comments: January 11, 2008</i>	Anchorage
Interior Region	February 29 - March 10, 2008 <i>Proposal Deadline: December 7, 2008</i> <i>Written Comments: February 15, 2008</i>	Fairbanks

For more information about the Board of Game, contact:

ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
Boards Support Section
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, AK 99811-5526
PHONE: (907) 465-4110 FAX: (907) 465-6094

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
MEETING CYCLE**

The board meeting cycle generally occurs from October through March. The board considers changes to regulations on a region-based schedule. Each region will be discussed on a two-year cycle. When the regional area is 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)
- Wolf Control Implementation Plans
- Bag Limit for Brown Bears
- Areas Closed To Hunting
- Closures and Restrictions in State Game Refuges
- Management Areas
- Controlled Use Areas
- Areas Closed To Trapping

Regulations specific to an area (e.g., Permits for Access to Round Island) will be taken up when the board is scheduled to consider regulations in that region.

Proposals for changes to regulations pertaining to reauthorization of antlerless moose hunts, 5 AAC 85.045, and brown bear tag fee exemptions, 5 AAC 92.015, will be taken up annually, at spring meetings.

The Board of Game does not consider proposals to statewide regulations in every meeting cycle. Instead, the Board of Game reviews statewide regulations on a four-year cycle, distributed between fall meetings, every other year. The list of statewide regulations and the associated "Cycle A" and "Cycle B" meeting schedule is set forth on the next page of this publication.

<u>Regulations for:</u>	<u>Will be considered:</u>		
SOUTHEAST REGION	Fall 2008	Fall 2010	Fall 2012
Game Management Units: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5			
SOUTHCENTRAL & SOUTHWEST REGIONS	Spring 2007	Spring 2009	Spring 2011
Game Management Units: 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17			
All GMUs: Brown Bear Tag Fees Reauthorization of Antlerless Moose Hunts			
ARCTIC AND WESTERN REGIONS	Fall 2007	Fall 2009	Fall 2011
Game Management Units: 18, 22, 23, 26A			
INTERIOR REGION	Spring 2008	Spring 2010	Spring 2012
Game Management Units: 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, 26C			
All GMUs: Brown Bear Tag Fees Reauthorization of Antlerless Moose Hunts			

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME STATEWIDE REGULATIONS SCHEDULE
STATEWIDE REGULATIONS: 5 AAC 92**

CYCLE “A” : Winter 2010, 2014, 2018, 2022

- .001 Application of this Chapter
- .002 Liability for Violations
- .003 Hunter Education and Orientation Requirements
- .004 Policy for Off-Road Vehicle Use for Hunting and Transporting Game
- .005 Policy for Changing Board Agenda
- .010 Harvest Tickets and Reports
- .011 Taking of Game by Proxy
- .012 Licenses and Tags
- .013 Migratory bird hunting guide services
- .018 Waterfowl Conservation Tag
- .019 Taking of Big Game for Certain Religious Ceremonies
- .020 Application of Permit Regulations and Permit Reports
- .025 Permit for Exporting a Raw Skin
- .027 Permit for Exporting Big Game Trophies
- .028 Aviculture Permits
- .029 Permit for Possessing Live Game
- .030 Possession of wolf hybrid prohibited
- .031 Permit for Selling Skins and Trophies
- .033 Permit for Sci., Ed., Propagative, or Public Safety Purposes
- .034 Permit to Take Game for Cultural Purposes
- .039 Permit for Taking Wolves Using Aircraft
- .047 Permit for Using Radio Telemetry Equipment
- .104 Authorization for Methods and Means Disability Exemptions
- .106 Intensive Management of Identified Big Game Prey Populations
- .110 Control of predation by wolves
- .115 Control of predation by bears
- .165 Sealing of Bear Skins and Skulls
- .170 Sealing of Marten, Lynx, Beaver, Otter, Wolf, and Wolverine
- .171 Sealing of Dall sheep horns
- .200 Purchase and Sale of Game
- .210 Game as Animal Food or Bait
- .220 Salvage of Game Meat, Furs, and Hides
- .230 Feeding of Game
- .250 Transfer of Muskoxen for Sci. and Ed. Purposes
- .450 Description of Game Management Units
- .990 Definitions

CYCLE “B” : Winter 2008, 2012, 2016, 2020.

- .009 Obstruction or hindrance of lawful hunting or trapping
- .035 Permit for Temporary Commercial Use of Live Game
- .037 Permit for Falconry
- .040 Permit for Taking of Furbearers with Game Meat
- .041 Permit to Take Beavers to Control Damage to Property
- .043 Permit for Capturing Wild Furbearers for Fur Farming
- .044 Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures
- .049 Permits, Permit Procedures, and Permit Conditions
- .050 Required Permit Hunt Conditions and Procedures
- .051 Discretionary Trapping Permit Conditions & Procedures
- .052 Discretionary Permit Hunt Conditions and Procedures
- .062 Priority for Subsistence Hunting; Tier II Permits
- .068 Permit Conditions for Hunting Black Bear with Dogs
- .070 Tier II Subsistence Hunting Permit Point System
- .075 Lawful Methods of Taking Game
- .080 Unlawful Methods of Taking Game; Exceptions
- .085 Unlawful Methods of Taking Big Game; Exceptions
- .090 Unlawful Methods of Taking Fur Animals
- .095 Unlawful Methods of Taking Furbearers; Exceptions
- .100 Unlawful Methods of Hunting Waterfowl, Snipe, Crane
- .130 Restriction to Bag Limit
- .135 Transfer of Possession
- .140 Unlawful Possession or Transportation of Game
- .150 Evidence of Sex and Identity
- .160 Marked or Tagged Game
- .260 Taking Cub Bears & Female Bears with Cubs Prohibited
- .400 Emergency Taking of Game
- .410 Taking Game in Defense of Life or Property
- .420 Taking nuisance wildlife

Updated 9/11/06

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

Revised December, 2006

MEMBER'S NAME AND ADDRESS	TERM EXPIRES
Ron Somerville, Chairman 4506 Robbie Road Juneau, Alaska 99802	3/1/2008
Cliff Judkins, Vice Chairman PO Box 874124 Wasilla, Alaska 99687	3/1/2009
Ben Grussendorf 1221 Halibut Point Rd. Sitka, AK 99835	3/1/2007
Richard Burley 1165 Coppet Street Fairbanks, Alaska 99709	3/1/2009
Ted Spraker 49230 Victoria Ave. Soldotna, Alaska 99669	3/1/2008
Paul Johnson PO Box 329 Unalakleet, AK 99684	3/1/2008
Bob Bell 801 West Fireweed Lane Anchorage, AK 99503	3/1/2007

Alaska Board of Game members may also be reached at:
ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
Boards Support Section
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, AK 99811-5526
PHONE: (907) 465-4110 FAX: (907) 465-6094

Boards Support Section
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
1255 West 8th Street
PO Box 115526
Juneau, AK 99811-5526
(907) 465-4110
(907) 465-6094 Fax

HEADQUARTERS

Board of Fisheries

Jim Marcotte, Exec. Director II 465-6095

Gerry Bigelow, Pub. Tech. II 465-6097

Board of Game

Kristy Tibbles, Executive Director I 465-6098

Scott Crass, Pub. Specialist II 465-4046

Olivia Orsborn, Administrative Manager 465-6096

Lindsay Terry, Administrative Clerk III 465-4110

REGIONAL OFFICES

Arctic Region

Charlie Gregg

PO Box 689

Kotzebue, AK 99752

Phone: (907) 442-1717

Fax: (907) 442-2420

Southeast Region

Gerry Bigelow

PO Box 115526

Juneau, AK 99811-5526

Phone: (907) 465-6097

Fax: (907) 465-6094

Interior Region

Rita St. Louis

1300 College Road

Fairbanks, AK 99701-1599

Phone: (907) 459-7263

Fax: (907) 459-7258

Southeast Region

Scott Crass

PO Box 115526

Juneau, AK 99811-5526

Phone: (907) 465-4046

Fax: (907) 465-6094

Southcentral Region

Sherry Wright

333 Raspberry Road

Anchorage, AK 99518-1599

Phone: (907) 267-2354

Fax: (907) 267-2489

Southwest Region

Joe Chythlook

PO Box 1030

Dillingham, AK 99576

Phone: (907) 842-5142

Fax: (907) 842-5514

For updated information on the progress of an ongoing Board of Fisheries or Board of Game meeting, call: Juneau 465-8901; outside Juneau 1-800-764-8901

Website address: <http://www.boards.adfg.state.ak.us/>

Alaska Board of Game
GUIDELINES
FOR
PUBLIC TESTIMONY
&
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 the staff; and **submit with your blue testimony 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 chairman 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 advisory committee), you only need to turn in one sign-up card, listing each group you will be representing. 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, whether you testify for yourself or on behalf of an organization. The board chairman will announce the length of time for testimony at the beginning of the meeting.

Advisory Committee representatives are usually allowed 15 minutes to testify, and should restrict testimony to relating what occurred at the advisory committee meeting(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.

PLEASE NOTE: The time limit on testimony does NOT include questions the board members may have for you.

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
Southcentral and Southwest Regions
March 2-12, 2007
Coast International Inn
3450 Aviation Avenue, Anchorage, AK
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. Persons wishing to testify must sign-up by the deadline. Public testimony will continue until those present at the meeting are heard; the board will continue working through its agenda immediately upon conclusion of public testimony. The following time blocks are only an estimate. Updated agendas will be posted in the meeting room, or call 1-800-764-8901 for a recorded message on daily progression through the meeting.

Friday, March 2, 8:30 AM

OPENING BUSINESS

Call to Order; Introductions of Board Members and Staff

Board Member Ethics Disclosures

Purpose of Meeting (overview)

STAFF AND OTHER REPORTS

PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY: (Upon conclusion of staff reports.)

Saturday, March 3, 8:30 AM

PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY Continued

DEADLINE FOR SIGN-UP TO TESTIFY will be announced at the meeting.

Public testimony will continue until persons who have signed up before the deadline, and who are present when called by the Chairman to testify, are heard.

Sunday, March 4 – Monday, March 5, 8:30 AM

PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY Continued

BOARD DELIBERATIONS (Upon conclusion of public testimony)

Tuesday, March 6 through Monday, March 12

BOARD DELIBERATIONS

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, including Petitions, Findings, Resolutions, Letters, Other
ADJOURN

SPECIAL NOTES

A. This agenda is TENTATIVE and subject to change during the meeting. A list of staff reports and a roadmap will be available at the meeting. Scheduled updates will be available on the board's recorded message phone. Phone Number: 1-800-764-8901; in Juneau call 465-8901.

B. Advisory Committee representatives may present their reports either at the beginning or end of the "Oral Public Testimony." The committee representative should notify the Board Support Staff whether they prefer to present their report at the beginning or end of the public testimony period.

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 February 23, 2007 to make any necessary arrangements.

PROPOSAL 1 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer Trapping. Amend the regulation as follows:

Align the beaver trapping season in Unit 11 with Unit 13 to September 25th to May 31st.

ISSUE: Beaver trapping in Unit 11 with Unit 13.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status Quo

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers in Unit 11 and 13

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Tok / Nabesna Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-004)

PROPOSAL 2 - 5 AAC 92.530. Management Areas. Amend this regulation as follows:

Close Unit 14C to trapping beaver, except that you may trap beaver in the drainages of: Glacier Creek, Kern Creek, Peterson Creek, the Twenty Mile River, and the Knik River drainage outside of Chugach State Park, the Fort Richardson Management Area including Elmendorf Air Force Base and the Birchwood Management Area outside of Beach Lake Park.

ISSUE: The Birchwood Management Area has many beaver colonies. The season has been closed for several years; hence, the beaver population has grown to a state of over population. The food supply of trees for the beavers has dwindled, thus the beavers have had to move to other creeks to find food.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This problem will spread to other places leaving the landscape scarred.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? With fewer beaver there will be less fighting over territories and therefore fewer bitten beaver. With a managed beaver population the chance for disease is less likely.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The beaver population will be healthier and trappers will be able to harvest a healthier renewable natural resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People that like to watch the beaver will see fewer beaver, but healthier beaver.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There were no other solutions I considered.

PROPOSED BY: Sandie Gilliland (HQ-07S-G-137)

PROPOSAL 3 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Amend the regulations as follows:

Extend the coyote trapping season in all southcentral units to match that of wolf.

ISSUE: Over abundance of coyote and short season which leads to incidental trapping of coyote.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Coyote will continue to erode against predator management.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Allow greater utilization of abundant resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers and predator callers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-070)

PROPOSAL 4 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Amend the regulation as follows:

Open trapping season for lynx in Units 11 and 13 to November 10 – February 15.

ISSUE: Incidental taking of lynx.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Lynx will be caught inadvertently in fox and wolf sets. This causes loss to the trapper who must turn them in. It is not cost effective to set exclusively for lynx in December.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Trappers can harvest lynx at the same time as fox, wolf and wolverine. No improvement in the quality of the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo; rejected because Fish and Game has the powers to make in season adjustments to the season already, as far as restricting the seasons.

PROPOSED BY: Paxson Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-048)

PROPOSAL 5 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Amend the regulation as follows:

In Units 11 and 13, change the season dates for trapping lynx to November 10 – February 28.

ISSUE: Lengthen the lynx trapping season from November 10 – February 28. Lynx populations in most areas of Units 11 and 13 are on the increase, along with and following the snowshoe hares. Since these cycles happen quite fast and the trapping regulations only come up for review every two years, proper harvest and management must “look ahead” in order to best regulate this resource. Many trappers already have to wait until December 1 to set trap lines this winter, because lynx are the most abundant furbearer, even though other species are open November 10. But since most trappers do not want to take any furbearer out of season, they are forced to curtail other legal trapping activities in order to avoid catching lynx too early.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? An abundant furbearer population will be underutilized, plus other legal trapping endeavors are compromised and complicated in trying to keep lynx out of sets intended for other species that have open seasons in November and February. In the next few years, this problem will be greatly multiplied if action is not taken on this now. This also aligns the lynx-furbearer/lynx-fur animal seasons and aligns lynx trapping seasons with other furbearers, making enforcement easier and better.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by increasing trapping opportunities during years of rising lynx populations. Reduces the otherwise difficult and dangerous need to release early or late caught lynx, which results in most cases of the animal losing toes or a foot, making its survival more difficult. Also, in February, the ordeal of being caught and released may interfere with breeding activities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All lynx trappers would benefit by having a longer trapping season and having the burden removed of releasing out-of-season lynx caught in other traps.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Copper Basin Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-044)

PROPOSAL 6 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Amend the regulation as follows:

Extend the martin trapping season in Unit 14B to February 28 like it is in other Units 6, 9, 11, 13, 17 which will also encourage wolf trapping.

ISSUE: Too short of a trapping season for martin in Unit 14B.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There is an abundance of habitat and martin in Unit 14B. The moose population is in decline. More trappers will continue trapping for wolves if martin is also available.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers who wish to stay in the field longer.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anti-trappers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-077)

PROPOSAL 7 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping: Amend the regulation as follows:

Change the Unit 16A marten trapping season to November 10 through January 31.

ISSUE: I would like to see marten season in unit 16A extended to January 31. Marten are plentiful and there is no need for such a short season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Trappers will miss opportunities to catch plentiful marten.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Jean Hartman (HQ-07S-G-134)

PROPOSAL 8 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Amend the regulation as follows:

Change the limit for muskrat from two to “no limit” in Unit 17 to bring the limit in line with the remainder of the state, and extend the season end date to March 31.

ISSUE: Unnecessarily restrictive season and bag limit for muskrat in Unit 17. Current season is from November 10 to February 28 with a seasonal limit of two.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? When more than two muskrat are trapped incidentally by trappers targeting other furbearers, they are of no value wasted.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, if more than two muskrat are harvested by and individual they can be sold and not wasted. Muskrat numbers remain low in Unit 17 however, I do not anticipate an increase in muskrat trapping efforts in response to this regulation change due to their low density and value.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Change the season to end June 10 as in most units, but population remains low, so season could remain somewhat conservative for protection during the spring open water season.

PROPOSED BY: Craig Schwanke (HQ-07S-G-020)

PROPOSAL 9 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Amend the wolverine trapping season as follows:

In Unit 11 and 13, lengthen the wolverine trapping season dates to November 10 – February 28.

ISSUE: Wolverine populations have rebounded well from declines seen 15-20 years ago in most areas of Units 11 and 13; many believe as a result of the end of land and shoot practices. Extending the season into February allows trappers to continue trapping most furbearers into this portion of the winter, without the added burden of trying to keep wolverines out of traps intended for other species, as wolverines are next to impossible to release once caught, especially in wolf traps. Also, many remote areas cannot be accessed by trappers until later in the season due to snow conditions and river barriers, depriving them of the chance for any harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? An abundant furbearer population will be underutilized, and other legal trapping activities will be complicated and compromised in trying to keep from catching wolverines in sets intended for species that have an open season during February.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It would be very dangerous, if not impossible to release a wolverine from a trap. It would be far better to align the trapping seasons and avoid the danger and trauma that the resource and trapper would be subjected to.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All trappers would benefit from a longer season and having the burden removed of dealing with out-of-season wolverines caught in other traps.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Copper Basin Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-045)

PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 84.270(14) Furbearer trapping. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

The wolverine trapping season shall run concurrently with lynx trapping season in Unit 14A. The wolverine trapping season would be December 15th – January 31st through 2009.

ISSUE: Incidental/illegal take of lynx in wolverine sets outside the lynx trapping season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Incidental lynx will continue to be caught in wolverine sets outside of the established lynx season, thereby adversely affecting the lynx population in Unit 14A.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This proposal would eliminate incidental catch of lynx in wolverine sets outside of established lynx trapping seasons.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers will benefit by being able to legally retain any Lynx taken in Wolverine sets. Wildlife enforcement officers will find it easier to enforce trapping regulations. Department biologists will benefit by receiving more accurate lynx harvest data.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trappers will be giving up approximately 35 days of wolverine trapping season in Unit 14A. Trapping efforts for wolverine in Unit 14A have traditionally been low. The high number to date was in the 2005/2006 season with five taken. Reducing the season length should have a minimal effect on a minimal number of trappers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Shortening the wolverine season in 14A, while not having it coincide directly with the lynx season. Rejected this idea as it did not protect lynx from becoming incidental catches in wolverine sets outside the lynx season.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-024)

PROPOSAL 11 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Amend the regulation as follows:

Open a wolverine trapping season in Unit 15C to run concurrently with the lynx season as follows:

December 15 through January 31; bag limit of two.

ISSUE: Open wolverine trapping in areas within Chugach State Park, Unit 14C, which is currently open to trapping other furbearers. Chugach lynx season is closed; the wolverine would be too.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Trapping opportunity will continue to be lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, there is no biological reason for this area to be closed.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Trappers Association, Southcentral Chapter; Lynn Keogh (HQ-07S-G-057)

PROPOSAL 12 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.

Amend the regulation as follows:

For Unit 13A, no trapping is allowed within ¼ mile on either side of the 20 mile, Lake Louise road system.

ISSUE: Close trapping within ¼ mile on both sides the entire maintained 20 miles of the Lake Louise road system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continuation of personal pets will be killed; hobby trapping is too easy and is taking a toll on local harvests.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The hobby trapper will have to work a little harder to get a quota that is of the local harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The local trapper will be able to maintain the harvest quota better. The annual harvest will be more stable and guarantee a good survival rate.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The hobby or weekend trapper will lose only a tiny percentage of their undetermined annual quota in not having this easy access.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Putting up signs that get removed indiscriminately, enforcement is too costly to maintain checks along the road.

PROPOSED BY: Kenneth Soldin (HQ-07S-G-136)

PROPOSAL 13 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.

Amend the regulation as follows:

In Units 7 and 14, a person shall not set a 330 conibear, a similar large quick killing trap, a snare having a cable diameter of 3/32 or larger, or leg hold trap (unless the leg hold is enclosed in a box or similar enclosure) within fifty (50) yards of a publicly maintained parking area or a publicly maintained trail.

ISSUE: Conflicts between trapper and non-consumptive users reduce the enjoyment of Alaska’s public lands for some, and should be minimized. One particular problem that should be minimized is the conflict between pet owners and trappers.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Conflicts will continue and probably increase in number.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal concerns conflicts between different user groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Responsible trappers and recreational users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Irresponsible trappers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A proposal banning all trapping within 50 yards of heavily used recreational trails was also considered. Banning all trapping is probably unnecessary if the purpose is to guarantee that pets are not killed on publicly maintained hiking trails. A larger buffer zone was also considered, but pet owners should not allow their pets to roam freely through the backcountry because free ranging pets can harm wildlife.

PROPOSED BY: Kneeland Taylor (HQ-07S-G-068)

PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 92.029(d). Permit for possessing live game; and 5 AAC 85.010. Hunting seasons and bag limits for bison: Amend the regulations as follows:

Any feral bison for which ownership cannot be established through a clearly visible permanent brand, ear tag or owner’s mark on the body of the animal.

Unit 8 bison...no limit...no closed season.

ISSUE: Feral, free ranging bison are increasing in number within Unit 8. They are presumed to be game under 5AAC 92.029(d)2(C) and should have a season adopted to allow opportunities to control their expansion into public lands within Unit 8.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Escaped bison have the potential to be very destructive to public lands within Unit 8 and have the potential for establishing a non-native, wild herd. Bison are known to be destructive and potentially dangerous to their environment and users of it.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Currently this game resource is not harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users of public lands in areas being habituated by these feral animals.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Private ranchers currently utilizing public lands for the grazing of bison in Unit 8.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Fencing of the grazing lease. Denies open access to public lands.

PROPOSED BY: Robert Swanson (HQ-07S-G-026)

PROPOSAL 15 - 5 AAC 85.015 Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear. Amend the regulation as follows:

Align the registration black bear seasons for the upper and lower Eagle River Valley areas to end June 30 to provide for a longer period to hunt black bears in the spring. Change the regulatory for the upper Eagle River boundary hunt to “upstream of the Dishwater Creek Drainage” and keep all other language the same and all other parts of 14C to June 30.

ISSUE: Align the registration black bear seasons in the Eagle River Valley and allow for a longer period to hunt black bears in the spring, and also to align the hunting area for bears and Dall sheep in the upper Eagle River Valley so that both are essentially the same.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo, low harvest of bears, less opportunity to hunt, more bears wandering out of Eagle River Valley and into populated areas where they become a nuisance and are often killed by homeowners and or department staff. Contrary to some, the committee does not feel this is a “garbage” bear problem, we feel this is a wildlife population growing out of control with no real predators other than man. If nothing is done to increase the harvest, it is only a matter of time before other game populations (moose calves, Dall sheep and goats) may suffer due to bear predation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Hunters utilizing Eagle River Valley and the surrounding mountains to hunt bears can do so in conditions that is more conducive to harvest, especially when there is a late spring. Bears have become a problem in Eagle River and are seen more and more by property owners most often in a negative stance. Expanding the local area to hunt bears and extending the end date would be an additional chance to harvest black bears in an area that needs to have more black bears harvested.

This proposal adds 15 more days of hunting in the upper Eagle River Boundary; 30 days on the lower Eagle River Valley, and extends the actual hunting area on upper valley to include Dishwater Creek which is currently open to rifle hunters who draw that area’s sheep tag. This area change merely makes the hunting areas for sheep and black bear “the same” on the upper Eagle River northern boundary. The current regulation for bear hunting starts at Icicle Creek and there is no biological reason to have two different hunting boundaries that are within one mile of each other.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Black bear hunters using Eagle River for their hunting area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nature viewers may have a few less bears to see on their nature walks, however since Eagle River trails are now closed mostly in late August and September due to bear activity it is possible that these trails may be able to remain open if there are fewer bears encroaching in those zones, and this could actually create more viewing opportunities for other wildlife. It’s a win, win situation.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The committee considered eliminating the ¼ mile Crow Creek Trail Restriction, however, we feel that every user group should be represented and as such it is important to remember this when trying to change regulations.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-073)

PROPOSAL 16 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear. Amend the regulation as follows:

Raise the bag limit to three bear a year and change to a no closed season in all of Unit 14.

ISSUE: The black bear bag limit for Units 14A and 14C is only one while most of southcentral is three.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Under utilization of resources and bears will continue to over populate, forcing some bears into urban areas. Black bears are abundant.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who wish to hunt bear in more units or wish to harvest more bears.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anti-hunting people.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-076)

PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Amend the regulation as follows:

Change the Unit 16A and Unit 13 (except Denali State Park) bear baiting season to April 15 – June 30.

ISSUE: In heavy snow years or years with a late spring, bears are not active around baits until late May or early June, so much of the open baiting season is over before bears become active around baits.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued nonalignment of season and actual bear activity.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who bait black bears in Unit 16A and Unit 13.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: George Faerber (HQ-07S-G-045)

PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Amend the regulation as follows:

Change the bait station limit from two to four, and delete the requirement that “only the person who registers the site may transport bait or otherwise maintain it.” Hunting buddies who also have registered bait stations should be allowed to help each other and or handicapped persons. Change the requirement to allow bait stations “within 100 yards of” between railroad and the Unit 14 shorelines.

ISSUE: Current ungulate populations are low due in large part to predation by black bears and some excessive requirements discourage black bear baiters from participating in units that have way too many black bear.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose and other ungulate numbers will stay low and/or continue to decline if predation by black bears continues at its current level.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Reducing predation will help the depleted moose and other ungulate population to recover.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters and all sportsmen and wildlife enthusiasts who are frustrated with the current low moose and other ungulate populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People and groups who oppose hunting and human involvement in wildlife management.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Wayne Kubat (HQ-07S-G-063)

PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Amend the regulation as follows:

Lengthen the bear baiting season for Unit 14A and 14B to July 15th.

ISSUE: Not enough bears will be harvested in a spring that has excessive winter snow fall remaining, prohibiting hunters to set up and maintain bait stations. After heavy snow years bears, tend to come out of the den later, leaving less time to hunt, which in turn compresses the hunting time available to a smaller time frame.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Extending the season provides more bear hunting opportunities, and reduces bear numbers thereby enhancing the survival rate of moose calves.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Outdoor enthusiasts interested in promoting moose calf recruitment by harvesting more bears, and hunters who enjoy bear hunting over bait.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who would like to eliminate bear hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Extending the season to year round. Unlikely to be accepted by the department.

PROPOSED BY: Scott Butler (SC-07S-G-023)

PROPOSAL 20 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Amend the regulation as follows:

The black bear baiting requirements in Unit 14 shall read: Black bear stations may be accessed during open bear baiting seasons, and black bears may be taken at those bait sites the same day you have flown provided you are 300 ft from the airplane.

ISSUE: Alaskan pilots are not allowed to hunt bears over bait the same day they are airborne. It serves no unfair advantage over the animal for a bear hunter to fly the same day he/she hunts over bait, and therefore should be removed from the “no hunt same day airborne” rules in the regulations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The black bear population will continue to receive excessive hunting pressure only near the few road systems that we have, while more rural, remote areas will never get hunted.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal provides more bear hunting opportunities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Any bear hunters with access to an airplane.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: (SC-07S-G-021)

PROPOSAL 21 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Amend the regulation as follows:

In Unit 14B, allow black bear baiting from April 15 to June 30 and August 10 to October 15.

ISSUE: Current moose populations in Unit 14B are almost half of the minimum population objective.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose and other ungulate numbers will stay low and/or continue to decline if bear predation continues at its current level.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Reducing predation by black bears will help the depleted 14B moose and other ungulate populations to recover.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters and all sportsmen and wildlife enthusiasts who are frustrated with the current low moose and other ungulate populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People and groups who oppose hunting and human involvement in wildlife management.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Wayne Kubat (HQ-07S-G-066)

PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear and 5 AAC 92.260. Taking cub bears and female bears with cubs prohibited. Amend the regulations as follows:

In the Unit 16 predator control area, a legal black bear is “any bear”.

ISSUE: Non-biologically sound bear harvest strategies. In Alaska we do not allow the harvest of bear sows accompanied by cubs and bear cubs even when our objectives are to reduce bear populations in certain game management units. After consulting the 2006-2007 Alaska Hunting Regulations booklet, it can be found that all other big game species are treated differently. Caribou cows accompanied by calves and calves are legal to harvest in much of the state. Cow moose accompanied by calves are legal to harvest in areas open to cow moose hunting. Bull calves are legal to harvest in areas open to “any bull moose” hunting. In many areas of the state open to “any deer” hunting, does accompanied by fawns and fawns are legal to harvest. In areas open to “bucks only,” male fawns are legal to harvest. In goat hunts in many areas of the state female goats accompanied by kids and kids are legal to harvest. In other areas harvesting nannies accompanied by kids is prohibited, however harvesting kids is still legal. In bison hunts open to “any bison,” cows accompanied by calves and calves are legal to harvest. It goes on and on.

Young beavers like young brown bears spend two years with their mothers before going off on their own. Actually, beaver mothers are generally carrying one year old and two year old beavers at any given time. However, beaver mothers and kids are all legal to harvest. What I take from this is that biologically sound management allows for these harvest strategies. I ask myself, “why, especially when we are trying to reduce bear populations in certain areas of the state, do we treat bear different than any other species in the state”. Is the restriction on harvesting bear sows accompanied by cubs and cubs a political regulation or a regulation based on sound wildlife management. Apparently the harvesting of the female and young of the year component is a biologically sound wildlife management harvest strategy for all other wildlife in Alaska.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If harvest of sows accompanied by cubs and cubs is not allowed in areas where bear population reductions are desired, management objectives of reducing bear populations will be more difficult (if not impossible) to achieve.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters and meat bear hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Black bear viewers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: David McHoes

(HQ-07S-G-033)

PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear, and 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend the regulations as follows:

The Wolverine Creek Management Committee (WCMC) is proposing an extension of the closure for hunting brown and black bear in Unit 16B, the specific part of Redoubt Bay Critical Habitat Area surrounding Wolverine Creek to November 15. The WCMC would also like to request an extension of the closed area to go three miles from the mouth of Wolverine Creek so as to include areas where tourist activities are active. It is important to note that this area would include the shoreline around Big River Lake where Martin Lake drains into Big River and back to the northwest by Fischer Falls and then around the lake back to Wolverine Creek. It is critical that this area not include the north fork of Big River Lake or the south fork of Big River Lake as these are areas that are hunted and do not conflict with the different user groups. The extension should cover the shoreline surrounding the portion of Big River Lake that non-hunting tourist activities are engaged in.

ISSUE: The Wolverine Creek Management Committee and employees of the Department of Fish and Game have concluded a more reasonable time for hunting black and brown bear to begin would be November 16. This would allow this critical resource time to blend back into its natural environment without the potential of mortality from hunting. Habituated bears are and potentially can be hunted during the tourist season. These habituated bears need a longer buffer zone in the absence of human presence. Currently tourism operations continue past the closure of September 15.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If nothing is changed to accommodate resident habituated bears they will be hunted and killed. The current date of September 16 as the start of the hunting season allows for hunting while businesses and private users are still engaged in tourist activities. There must be a more realistic buffer in place for habituated bears who have been at this time, September 16, accustomed to seeing and being in the presence of people for four and one half months without issue or concern. Ignoring this issue will allow a valuable natural resource to be exposed to unfair and unexpected mortality. In addition a critical economic resource for local businesses made up of but not limited to local guides, outfitters, and lodges will be ruined.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Without the question, Wolverine Creek within the Redoubt Bay Critical Habitat Area is one of the fastest growing tourist destinations in Alaska to view brown bears, averaging close to 10,000 visitors per year as recorded by the department over the last five years. The resource here is the bears as they are the main attraction at Wolverine Creek. It is obvious that the hunting of brown bears in this area while the tourist season is still active will destroy the natural resource and drastically affect the multimillion dollar tourist industry that has evolved around the management of the resource. Clearly the quality of the resource will directly benefit from a greater chance for survival. In addition a natural positive consequence of this survival of females and sub-adult bears is that more bears successfully can reach adult size and migrate to the traditional areas outside of the suggested closure, where larger bears are

typically found. In all the three major components that make this area special all benefit tremendously. Sow and sub-adult bears survival in the designated area is unimpeded by hunters. Tourists and thus the businesses associated with tourism have a safer and greater quality experience, and lastly hunters have more bears potentially reaching trophy size.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The benefactors are across the board. The tourists who can continue to view bears unimpeded by hunters in their presence will continue to support local businesses. The private individuals who bring their family and friends can also enjoy the continued bear viewing. The bears of course are also given a fair chance to acclimate to the environment with out the presence of hunters.

Hunters will have access to less habituated bears. The revenues from tourist activities will continue to migrate though the local economy in the form of license fees, permitting fees, lodging, guide services, the list goes on and on.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Our Charter, the Wolverine Creek Management Committee was established to protect, preserve, and maximize the potential of experience in this area. It is our duty to do everything within our power to support, promote, and protect this area. If this extension is passed it should affect a very small percentage of the population. The area is known to have an abundance of sows and sub-adult bears. Hunters hunting this area are likely to find just these types of bears as opposed to trophy brown bears. This would compromise this specific group in this area during this time period. As we are a committee made up of many hunters and hunting guides we took this into great consideration and so long as the north and south forks of Big River are left open we concluded this will have little impact on us as hunters and as outfitters and guides.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered extending the distance of the closure beyond the grass flats surrounding the lake but recognized the areas importance as an outlet for bear hunters and as an important resource for guide and outfitters businesses.

PROPOSED BY: Wolverine Creek Management Committee (HQ-07S-G-081)

PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Amend the regulation as follows:

In the remainder of Unit 16A, not in the Unit 16 predator control plan, allow black bear baiting from April 15 to June 30 and August 10 to October 15.

ISSUE: Current moose populations in Unit 16A are less than half of the minimum population objective.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose and other ungulate numbers will stay low and/or continue to decline if bear predation continues at its current level.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Reducing predation will help the depleted 16A moose populations to recover.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters and all sportsmen and wildlife enthusiasts who are frustrated with the current low moose populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People and groups who oppose hunting and human involvement in wildlife management.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Wayne Kubat (HQ-07S-G-064)

PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear. Amend the regulation as follows:

Unit 16, predator control area, black bear bait open season:
August 1 – October 15
April 15 – June 30

ISSUE: Fall black bear bait season opens too late for pre-hunt baiting. The best time to hunt black bears along rivers and streams in the unit is from August 10 – 30 while streams are full of dying salmon. Black bears tend to move to berries in September.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Less bears will be harvested and more moose calves will likely be consumed by black bears.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Black bear hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Open entire year. Have no idea if this would increase harvest.

PROPOSED BY: David McHoes (HQ-07S-G-032)

PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Amend the regulation as follows:

Eliminate the restriction on baiting within ¼ mile of Susitna River in Unit 16A from the mouth of the Yentna River to mouth of Chulitna River.

ISSUE: Unnecessary ¼ mile closure along the Susitna River. This restriction, when it was proposed, was to prevent conflict with king salmon fishermen. Any stream within this area where there could be a potential conflict is already closed to baiting because of close proximity to cabins or houses. Example: Dëshka River, Rabbideaux and Trapper Creeks.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? An unnecessary burden will continue to be placed on those baiting along the Susitna River.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, being able to harvest bears closer to river would enable hunters to more easily move their bears to the boat, resulting in cleaner game meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those baiting bears along portions of Susitna River.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: George Faerber (HQ-07S-G-044)

PROPOSAL 27 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Amend the regulation as follows:

For the Southcentral region units, a person other than the permit holder may place bait at the station if they have written permission from the permit holder. The permit holder is still responsible for clean up.

ISSUE: Not allowing other persons to bait at your permit stations without being in violations, limits used by friends, and family members.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Violations could be issued for no legitimate reason.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Black bear hunters, friends and family members.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: James Howell (HQ-07S-G-019)

PROPOSAL 28 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Amend the regulation for the southcentral and southwest region units as follows:

Delete this restriction: [ONLY THE PERSON WHO REGISTERS THE SITE MAY TRANSPORT BAIT TO OR THERWISE MAINTAIN THE SITE.]

ISSUE: New restrictions in the 2006-2007 regulations book prevents elderly or physically handicapped persons from being helped to maintain their bait sites. It also prevents friends from enjoying baiting activities together.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A restriction with no legitimate purpose will continue to put hardships on people baiting bears.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Elderly or handicapped persons and friends wanting to enjoy baiting activities together.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: George Faerber (HQ-07S-G-043)

PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Amend the regulation for the southcentral and southwest region units as follows:

You may place bait at only two bait stations at a time, except licensed guides may place bait at up to six bait stations within their valid guide use area.

ISSUE: Guides being restricted to only two active bait sites. Anyone familiar with the real circumstances of baiting knows it is not practical to change bait locations during the limited black bear baiting season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Guides will continue to concentrate hunting pressure in small areas.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, regulation change would spread hunting pressure over a larger area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Guides, clients, and bear baiters in general.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: George Faerber (HQ-07S-G-046)

PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC. 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bears. Amend this regulation as follows:

Convert the current brown bear registration hunt on the Kenai Peninsula to a drawing hunt.

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

Unit 7

1 bear every 4 regulatory years by <u>drawing</u> [REGISTRATION] permit only; <u>up to 50 permits may be issued</u>	<u>Oct. 1-Nov. 30</u> <u>Apr. 1-Jun. 15</u> [OCT. 15-OCT. 31] (General hunt only)	<u>No open Season</u> <u>No open Season</u> [OCT.-15-OCT. 31]
---	--	---

Unit 15

1 bear every 4 regulatory years by <u>drawing</u> [REGISTRATION] permit only; <u>up to 50 permits may be issued</u>	<u>Oct. 1-Nov. 30</u> <u>Apr. 1-Jun. 15</u> [OCT. 15-OCT. 31] (General hunt only)	<u>No open Season</u> <u>No open Season</u> [OCT.-15-OCT. 31]
---	--	---

ISSUE: One of the current management objectives for Kenai Peninsula brown bears is that human caused mortalities not exceed 20 total bears of which no more than eight can be females older than one year, averaged over the most recent three year period. Because the number of human-caused brown bear mortalities prior to the season opening date are high, it is difficult to manage the brown bear registration hunt (RB 160). Hunters are limited to a very short season when it does open, and hunter satisfaction is low. The last time RB 160 opened was during 2004. There were 254 permits issued and the season was closed by emergency order after two days. The department would like to restructure the brown bear hunt in a way that would allow a hunt to take place and encourage local participation while maintaining the current management objectives and a stable brown bear population.

We propose replacing the existing registration hunt with a set of drawing hunts for separate areas on the Kenai Peninsula. The number of permits would be allocated to these areas based on desired harvest levels and bear mortalities from other sources. Hunters would be encouraged to take bears close to human population centers to reduce nuisance complaints and negative bear-human interactions. Consequently, the nonresident season has also been proposed to be closed. This hunt is not expected to be the high quality experience of other guided hunts. This change is not expected to affect much opportunity since only five nonresidents have participated in brown bear hunting on the Kenai since 1995.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? When the current registration hunt does occur, it is likely that it will only be open for a brief period. Hunter satisfaction will be low and the opportunity to plan a quality hunt in advance will be compromised. From the management perspective, it will be difficult to provide a quality opportunity while controlling harvest numbers and location.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The hunting public, the brown bear resource, and area wildlife management staff.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There will be a loss of opportunity to hunt brown bears for those who do not draw a permit.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Limit the number of registration permits issued. Issue registration permits from the Soldotna office only. Limiting the hunt area. Have scheduled dates within the current season dates where the season closes for several days so we can assess harvest, and reopen the hunt if we still have harvest opportunity (ex. three days on, four days off,

three days on, four days off, three days on.). Combinations of the above solutions were also considered. These were rejected because of the complexity involved with conducting a hunt under these limitations. Also, they do not address the issue of being able to plan a hunt well in advance, or the issue of a short season.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-90)

PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend the regulation as follows:

In Unit 7 - one bear: Bear must be taken within one mile of the nearest residence between mile zero and mile 37 of the Seward Highway, April 15 to June 30, muzzleloader, shotgun, archery only.

ISSUE: There are too many problem brown bears in the Seward Highway corridor from mile zero to mile 37. Many are killed or wounded in defense of life or property situations in the spring and summer, or there is no hunting for brown bears in the fall. Unit 7 quota is linked to Unit 15.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be more bears shot in defense of life or property situations. There will continue to be more threats from bears to the people, animals and property in the area. There will be fewer moose and black bears. There will never be a hunting season.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? There could be a brown bear season again. The quota of bears would not all be shot by troopers and home owners in the affected area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters, home owners and Fish and Wildlife Troopers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Fred Moore (HQ-07S-G-133)

PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 85.020 Hunting Seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend this regulation as follows:

In Unit 7 change the regulations to one brown bear by drawing permit only; ten permits will be issued. This permit hunt will be allowed regardless of the number of bear taken in defense of life or property. The season will be from January 1 to May 31 and September 1 to December 31.

ISSUE: Brown bear hunting in Unit 7.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The already low numbers of moose will continue to decline due, in part, to the large numbers of brown bear in Unit 7. Before 1960 there were few brown bear and no wolves, now there are substantial numbers of both. The number of bears killed in defense of life and property (DLP) will continue to rise. In the 1990s the DLP

average was 2.5 bears per year on the Kenai Peninsula. The DLP number this year is 28. Some of these brown bear were hit by vehicles. More people will be mauled or killed by Kenai brown bear.

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

Yes, Unit 7 has large trophy sized Brown bear, equal in size to Kodiak and Alaska Peninsula bear. The key to this drawing proposal is that the drawing permit holders will have ample time to hunt and it will reduce the number of hunters. This will improve the quality of brown bear taken with more large boars harvested and fewer sows.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local charter planes, restaurants and motels. There will be fewer problems brown bear in Unit 7. The local moose population will also benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Seward Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-007)

PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend the regulation as follows:

For the Unit 8 registration bear hunt area on Kodiak, include all drainages into Chiniak, Antone Larsen, and northeast Ugak (east of Saltery drainage) Bays.

ISSUE: Change the boundary between the registration and drawing brown bear hunt areas in Unit 8 so that they conform to ridge top boundaries rather than a straight line that is hard to find in the field. This divide will essentially be the same as the current line, but will make it easier for hunters and enforcement officers to tell if they are in a legal area. It would also conform to the way the other Unit 8 bear hunt boundaries area drawn.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bear hunters will continue to be unsure of where the arbitrary straight line on a map is on the ground, and will have a greater chance of making a mistake when they shoot a bear near the boundary.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS

PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The change would have little impact on the bear harvest, but it would increase the quality of the hunt by making it easier for hunters to know where they were allowed to hunt. This is especially important in this area because it is the only place where someone who is not drawn can have a chance to hunt a Kodiak bear, so there are up to 300 hunters a year who go into this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who participate in the registration hunt and enforcement officers who work in the area, and the hunters who are drawn for the adjacent drawing hunt areas (areas 27 and 28).

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who target the portion of Lake Creek drainage near Saltery Lake and a portion of Elbow Creek which are currently in the registration area but would be changed to the adjacent drawing hunt area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Altering the dividing line so that the Lake Creek drainage stayed in the registration area. This was rejected because it could not be accomplished with an easy ridge top divide without including most of Saltery Lake, and bears regularly move into and out of Lake Creek within the Saltery drainage.

PROPOSED BY: Roland Ruoss (SC-07S-G-051)

PROPOSAL 34 - 5 AAC 92.061(5). Special provisions for Unit 8 brown bear permit hunts.
Amend the regulation as follows:

Repeal the regulation that penalizes guides when one of their clients kills a female bear in southwest Kodiak.

ISSUE: In 1994 the board responded to department concerns of declining brown bear population on the southwest part of Kodiak Island by passing a regulation that restricted the take of female bears. If a guided nonresident hunter killed a female bear with a skull that was not at least 9 inches wide or 15 inches long, the department eliminated a nonresident permit from that area during the next season. The department now believes that the bear population has rebounded sufficiently to allow additional female harvest. We would like to see this occur by eliminating the skull/sex restrictions in the area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Guides will continue to be penalized when their clients shoot female brown bears, even when there is no longer a biological reason to be so conservative.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Recent research indicates that there can be an increase in the harvest of female brown bears in southwest Kodiak without jeopardizing the quality of the hunt or the bear population. This proposal would do that in a way that would balance the interest of hunters and the needs of the bears.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Guides who make a mistake in identifying male and female bears for their clients, and those that have clients who would prefer to shoot a female bear either because of hide quality of their physical inability to get into a position to seek and shoot a male bear.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who wish to see the increased harvest achieved by increasing the number of permits in the area while retaining the skull/sex restrictions.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Retaining this regulation and increasing the number of permits in some of the areas. This was rejected because the department does not want to see a dramatic increase in the number of bears harvested from the area, and says that big increases in the male harvest could reduce trophy quality. We also did not want to see more hunters a field, because that would increase crowding in the areas.

PROPOSED BY: Oliver Holm (SC-07S-G-082)

PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 92.132. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bears; and 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions: Amend the regulation as follows:

Any brown bear wounded and not recovered in Unit 8 is considered “taken” by the hunter. The hunter must validate his permit and will not be eligible for another bear during that season. Wounded is defined as any blood or sign of being hit by a hunting projectile.

ISSUE: A clean kill is the goal of a skillful hunter. When an animal is wounded, the code of ethics mandates that that animal is now the focus of the hunt. This is the hallmark of quality sportsmen, and Kodiak bear hunts are considered one of the premier hunts in the world. We feel that if a Kodiak bear is wounded it should be considered the same as a bear that is killed (filling the bag limit of the hunter).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued unaccounted harvest of brown bears in Unit 8.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposed change will improve the quality of the hunter and hunting experience for the Kodiak bears. There will also be a more accurate account of wounding loss and harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who respect the sport of hunting and the bears they pursue. Harvest data will more accurately reflect actual number of bears taken.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who wish to continue to hunt after wounding a bear.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Including other coastal units (Units 6, 7, 9, 10, 15) so that all of the Gulf of Alaska would be included (Unit 1-5 already has this regulation). This was rejected as we wanted the local Advisory Committees to make recommendations for their own areas.

PROPOSED BY: Kodiak Unified Brown Bear Subcommittee (SC-07S-G-086)

PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC 85.020 Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.
Amend the regulation as follows:

In Unit 9B, open the brown bear hunting season every spring and fall; allow one bear harvest for residents and nonresidents.

ISSUE: Align brown bear season to Unit 17 for residents and non-residents. In Unit 9B west of Kvichak River and Lake Iliamna to the New Halen River up to Lake Clark.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Over population of brown bears is leading to high mortality of moose calves in Unit 9B.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lake Iliamna Advisory Committee (HQ-07S-G-013)

PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.

Amend the regulation as follows:

In Unit 9B, allow one brown bear every year as it is allowed in Unit 17.

ISSUE: Align brown bear bag limit to Unit 17, area west of the Kvichak River, Lake Iliamna, to the New Halen River up to Lake Clark in Unit 9B.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lake Iliamna Advisory Committee (HQ-07S-G-014)

PROPOSAL 38 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend

the regulation as follows:

Establish a drawing season in Unit 9C with the number of bears taken restricted to a reasonable number. The current harvest objective is in the neighborhood of 15-19 bears, given the high numbers of bears taken in the past two seasons (two times the objective) this number should possibly be even lower, giving this population of bears a chance to recover.

ISSUE: A change in the brown bear season from general season to a drawing season in the Katmai Preserve (UCUs 0702 and 0703) within Unit 9C.

The harvest of brown bear within this area has far exceeded the harvest objective for the past two hunts – regulatory year 2003 and 2005. This area is being over harvested effecting not only the bear population in this area but in the adjoining McNeil Sanctuary. The increased popularity of the area is creating a situation in which the area is being grossly over harvested two, times the current objective.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This population of bears can not sustain the current hunting pressure without being adversely effected. The decline in the number of bears in this area, especially large adult males, is noticeable and is reflected in the hunt statistics.

This affects not only the quality of the hunt in this area but the quality of the bear viewing a concurrent and viable commercial and recreational use of this population of bears.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS

PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If harvest is restricted in this area it will improve the quality of the hunt as well as the quality of bear viewing in the Katmai Preserve as well as the adjoining McNeil Sanctuary. It will give the population a chance to recover; numbers will increase in general and more balanced ratio of sexes and ages of bears within the general population will occur. This will enhance the quality of the bear viewing and will increase the hunters probability of harvesting larger trophy bears.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All will benefit, non-consumptive and consumptive users alike.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There will be less hunting opportunity so the indiscriminant hunter who does not care what size or sex trophy he/she takes away will suffer, however it will make the quality of the hunt for those drawn a quality experience.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Closure of area to hunting.

PROPOSED BY: Ken and Chris Day

(HQ-07S-G-084)

PROPOSAL 39 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend the regulation as follows:

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

ISSUE: Throughout September and October, sport fishermen and bear-viewers heavily use the Katmai Preserve. Late in the fall, spawning salmon are most plentiful on these shallow creeks and bears congregate there in high numbers. Brown bear hunting is an incompatible concurrent use during this period. The reasons for incompatibility include 1) unsafe conditions for firing high powered rifles among recreational users 2) killing and removing bears while viewers, photographers and anglers are watching.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Other recreationalists will be threatened or even injured by rifle fire.

The image of bear hunting, if not hunting in general, will be tarnished by concurrent uses. Imagine photographs published on the internet of bear fishing idly in a pristine Alaska stream in the proximity of a fisherman or group of bear viewers, followed by the same bear's death by gunshot, trophy photographs of the proud hunter – skinning, a headless, skinless human-like carcass laying on the tundra beside the stream.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS

PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Hunting, sport fishing/bear viewing are not compatible activities. To shoot a bear in the presence of fishermen or viewers is not what the sport hunter expects or wants; to have gunfire and animals being harvested in their presence are not what the recreational user expects or wants. To temporally separate these very different activities would

improve the quality of experience for all parties utilizing the resource as well as addressing safety concerns.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

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

PROPOSED BY: Ken and Chris Day (HQ-07S-G-085)

PROPOSAL 40 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend these regulations as follows:

Close the season for brown bear harvest in Unit 9C as follows: the drainages of Funnel Creek, Moraine Creek and Battle Creek from their headwaters to their outflows into Kukaklek Lake.

ISSUE: We have been watching and photographing brown bears in this area for the past five years. The first year we saw more than 40 bears in an eight-hour period. These were a mixture of females, sows with cubs, juveniles, and big boars. In subsequent years, we have seen fewer and fewer bears, particularly cubs and big boars. The summer of 2004, we saw approximately fifteen bears during a twelve hour period and having to walk a wide area to spot them. When we first started our trips to this area, the average number of bears taken was in the seven to eight per season. The harvest of seven to eight brown bears per season reflects the historical take for this area. According to Alaska Department of Fish and Game harvest data for the 2003-2004 seasons, thirty-four bears (27 males and 7 females) were taken in this area of Unit 9C. This does not include the bears that were wantonly killed and left. During a trip to the same area in July 2006, we saw approximately 20 bears, only one of which was a boar. The harvest continues to be abnormally high.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This is an outstanding area for bear viewing and photography. On our trips, we have met individuals and families from across the country and from other parts of the world that have come to see the marvelous Alaska brown bear in their natural setting. We can attest to how exciting it is, even for Alaskans, to see numbers of brown bears of all ages chasing salmon in these streams. We can only imagine the thrill it must be for non-Alaskans. If the harvest is not drastically reduced, the brown bears will no longer provide the great attraction for photographers and tourist. We have recommended bear viewing trips to a number of our friends and family. If the quality of these trips continues to be diminished, we will be reluctant to continue to make trips to this area and to urge other people to spend their cash this way. The loss of tourist dollars to Alaska will be significant. This is money that stays in the state.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quality of brown bear viewing will be greatly improved.

It will also enhance the viewing in the McNeil Sanctuary since the bears move back and forth between these areas. Because of their McNeil experiences and being in close proximity with trophy trout fishermen, these brown bear are acclimated to human presence. Killing a bear that is conditioned to human activity does not qualify as “fair chase” nor is it what a hunter should want or expect. As photographers and wildlife viewers, it is important to be able to see animals ranging from cubs to big adults of both sexes. The value of this extraordinarily high quality viewing area is hard to overestimate. If these three drainages are protected, they will provide increasing and renewable income for Alaskans and provide delight to an incalculable number of visitors.

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? As an alternative, we considered recommending that the annual harvest of brown bears be reduced to no more than seven to eight per year, and also to delay the start of the season to the middle October. We rejected these because the brown bear population needs time to recuperate after several years of over-harvest. We also reject it because the monetary value of this resource is much greater alive and healthy than as a trophy.

PROPOSED BY: Jules and Peg Tileston (HQ-07S-G-087)

PROPOSAL 41 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend the regulation as follows:

Remainder of Unit 9C: **Closed to hunting**

At a point where studies are completed and the National Park Service, in cooperation with the state, has determined necessary population levels (including age and sex classifications) and those levels have been achieved, some level of sustainable hunt that still meets the federal mandate to provide for “high concentrations” of brown bears could be allowed under a draw permit process,

ISSUE: The current regulation for Unit 9C for lands outside of the Naknek River drainage establishes an October 1 to October 21 (odd years only) and May 10 – May 25 (even years only) season for brown bear hunting. Part of Unit 9C includes Katmai National Preserve and the Funnel, Moraine, and Battle Creek drainages. While hunting is permitted within national preserves under the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980, ANILCA also provided that the National Park Service provide for “high concentrations of brown/grizzly bears” in Katmai National Park and Preserve.

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

The concern is that too many Katmai Preserve bears are being harvested to meet the congressional mandate in ANILCA of providing for “high concentrations” of brown bears. In addition, the impact of this harvest on the age distribution, as well as the overall populations numbers, is at odds with the National Park Organic Act and with direction in Chapter Four of the National Park Management Policies that, in part, directs the Park Service to “strive to understand, maintain, restore and protect the inherent integrity of the natural resources...”

Research has shown many of these bears spend part of the year in protected areas in Katmai National Park, Kamishak Special Use Area, McNeil River State Game Sanctuary, and McNeil River State Game Refuge where hunting is currently prohibited. Not only is the population of brown bears in Katmai Preserve being hunted beyond a sustainable level, but the hunting itself is unethical because these are habituated bears. Every year thousands of visitors and Alaskans alike observe bears at close proximity in this area, habituating these bears to close human presence.

The hunt in this area needs to be shortened to drop the harvest numbers back into the range established by department biologists. In looking at the harvest success rates over the past few hunts, dropping the fall hunt all-together and only providing for a May 10 to May 25 hunt in even years only could be an avenue to restoring a hunting level that does not conflict with the federal mandate of “high concentrations.”

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

At risk here is one of the world’s premier brown bear viewing areas. Because of the lack of vegetation, this area provides a unique opportunity to observe brown bears in their natural habitat. These bears become habituated to human observation and the result is bear viewing unlike anywhere else in the world. This is exemplified by the volume of people who utilize bear viewing guides each summer and pay significant money to observe these bears. The close proximity of these bears to Alaska’s major population centers and the protected status of McNeil and Katmai bears has created a unique bear watching opportunity that provides jobs and a good source of income to bear viewing guides living on the Kenai Peninsula, King Salmon, and Kodiak. One study commissioned by the University of Alaska’s Institute for Social and Economic Research found that visitors to Alaska who include a brown bear viewing experience spend almost twice as much on their vacation as the average visitor and those persons coming to

Alaska specifically to view brown bears spend more than 2.5 times as much. The study further documented that one operator in Homer directly generates almost 1.5 million in visitor spending.

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

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

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

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

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

PROPOSED BY: Jim Stratton, National Parks Conservation Association (SC-07S-G-052)

PROPOSAL 42 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend these regulations as follows:

The remainder of Unit 9C: **For both residents and nonresidents, the open season is May 10 to May 25 (even years only).**

ISSUE: The current regulation for Unit 9C for lands outside of the Naknek River drainage establishes an October 1 to October 21 (odd years only) and May 10 – May 25 (even years only) season for brown bear hunting. Part of Unit 9C includes Katmai National Preserve and the Funnel, Moraine, and Battle Creek drainages. While hunting is permitted within national preserves under the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980, ANILCA also provided that the National Park Service provide for “high concentrations of brown/grizzly bears” in Katmai National Park and Preserve.

Since the current regulation was expanded in 1999 to include a longer season, the number of brown bears harvested within Katmai National Preserve has steadily, and since 2003,

significantly increased. Department biologist, as recent as 2003, state that a sustainable harvest of brown bears in Katmai Preserve is “seven to nine bears per calendar year (i.e. about 16 per open regulatory year”). In the 2003/2004 regulatory year, 42 bears were harvested in this area. In the 2005/2006 regulatory year, 35 bears were harvested. This does not include bears taken for subsistence purposes, poached, or in defense of life and property. Because this is a trophy hunt, big male bears make up the majority of those harvested.

The concern is that too many Katmai Preserve bears are being harvested to meet the congressional mandate in ANILCA of providing for “high concentrations” of brown bears. In addition, the impact of this harvest on the age distribution, as well as the overall populations numbers, is at odds with the National Park Organic Act and with direction in Chapter Four of the National Park Management Policies that, in part, directs the Park Service to “strive to understand, maintain, restore and protect the inherent integrity of the natural resources...”

Research has shown many of these bears spend part of the year in protected areas in Katmai National Park, Kamishak Special Use Area, McNeil River State Game Sanctuary, and McNeil River State Game Refuge where hunting is currently prohibited. Not only is the population of brown bears in Katmai Preserve being hunted beyond a sustainable level, but the hunting itself is unethical because these are habituated bears. Every year thousands of visitors and Alaskans alike observe bears at close proximity in this area, habituating these bears to close human presence.

The hunt in this area needs to be shortened to drop the harvest numbers back into the range established by department biologist. In looking at the harvest success rates over the past few hunts, dropping the fall hunt all-together and only providing for a May 10 to May 25 hunt in even years only could be an avenue to restoring a hunting level that does not conflict with the federal mandate of “high concentrations.”

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

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

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The bear population will increase. The National Park Service will benefit from being able to meet its Congressional mandate. The State of Alaska will benefit by being seen as cooperating with the federal government over how to sustain a hunt in an area with a specific population directive from Congress. Visitors and residents alike will benefit by the return to historic brown bear population numbers giving unsurpassed brown bear viewing experiences found no where else in the world. The opportunity to view bears at historic population levels will continue to be an economic benefit to gateway communities on the Kenai Peninsula, Anchorage, and Kodiak.

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There are several suggested ways to address the current overharvest of brown bears in Katmai Preserve. It is hoped the Board of Game will recognize there is a conflict with federal legislation that is impacting not only the brown bear population, but also the economic opportunities and the ability of residents and nonresidents alike to view and appreciate these bears in their natural habitat. The board needs to take this problem seriously and address how it can be fixed. Suggestions include closing the area until the population rebounds, shortening the season, and going to a draw hunt or, as this proposal suggests, a spring hunt only.

PROPOSED BY: Jim Stratton, National Parks Conservation Association (SC-07S-G-053)

PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting.

Amend the regulation as follows to prohibit brown bear hunting:

[THROUGH JUNE 30, 2007] that portion of Unit 9, extending south and east of McNeil River State Game Sanctuary to the boundary of Katmai National Park and Preserve and including any state land within the boundaries of Katmai National Park and Preserve is closed to brown bear hunting.

ISSUE: Leave the language as the status quo and do not open to brown bear hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If brown bear hunting is again allowed in this area, false perceptions however unwarranted will be reinforced, resulting in potential loss of hunting opportunities in other areas. The credibility of Alaska's bear management and allocation system should not be jeopardized for the sake of the limited amount of hunting opportunity this regulation would afford.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Remains the same.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Non-hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Considered registration or limited drawing hunt. Rejected for concerns regarding public perception of management programs.

PROPOSED BY: The Alaska Professional Hunters Association Inc. (HQ-07S-G-083)

PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 92.510(9)(C). Areas closed to hunting. Amend the regulation as follows:

Reinstate the current brown bear hunting closure that is set to expire on July 1, 2007, for the following area: That portion of Unit 9 extending south and east of McNeil River State Game Sanctuary to the boundary of Katmai National Park and Preserve, and including any state land within the boundaries of Katmai National Park and Preserve, is closed to brown bear hunting.

These areas should remain closed to hunting and no reopening of these areas should be considered by the Board of Game for a period of not less than ten years.

ISSUE: Opening this very small area, 115 square miles, of state lands surrounded by the worlds two most well known brown bear sanctuaries, McNeil River State Game Sanctuary and Katmai National Park and Preserve, that were established by the state and federal governments to protect bear populations has the potential to negatively impact these world famous bear whose numbers may be in decline. According to the most recent report “Status of brown bears and other natural resources in the McNeil River State Game Sanctuary and Refuge” dated January 2006, “the numbers of bears at McNeil River have declined significantly since 1998 and have fallen below the level identified by sanctuary managers where it may effect the quality of the bear-viewing program.” One possible cause is a “low return” of chum salmon. Another possible cause could be the “affects of the brown bear harvest outside the sanctuary on bear us at McNeil River. Harvest levels have increased above historic levels since the 1999 regulatory year,” according to the report. Additionally in March 2005 the department recommended the “Status Quo.”

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting in these areas could result in further decline in the number of bears at the McNeil River State Game Sanctuary. The value of these areas to wildlife viewers will be lost since they stem from the fact that the brown bear population is not hunted.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The product produced by maintaining this closure is a continued quality wildlife viewing experience, which translates into millions of dollars of tourism revenue for the local economy of Homer, Kenai Peninsula Borough and the State of Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The local economy of Homer, tourism operators and wildlife viewers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There will be a small decrease in opportunity for hunters, however this area has been closed to hunting since 1986, so the overall effect is no net loss of current hunting opportunities. Alaska has plenty of places where brown bears can be hunted without involving lands surrounding the McNeil River State Game Sanctuary.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Dave Bachrach (SC-07S-G-027)

PROPOSAL 45 - 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting. Amend the regulation as follows:

No hunting of brown bears in the Unit 9, Katmai National Preserve east of Kukaklek and Nonvianuk Lakes, as well as in the remainder of their currently protected range, including the Kamishak Special Use Area.

ISSUE: About 100 brown bears make up the world famous McNeil River bear population. For the past three decades it has provided what has been considered to be the ultimate in safe close viewing experience. The quality of the viewing experience depends on a mix of high bear numbers and the availability of some bears that are accustomed to close viewing. These bears are highly vulnerable to being shot. Hunting has been banned for decades in all of the McNeil bear range; except for that which occurs inside Katmai National Preserve. In recent years there has been a decline in numbers of McNeil bears seen at McNeil River falls, the primary bear viewing location. The two factors thought to be contributing to the decline are over hunting and a reduction of fish numbers at the falls. Hunting of McNeil River bears inside Katmai National Preserve should be eliminated, and no plans to allow hunting of McNeil bears in other parts of their range should be allowed to go forward.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The quality of the bear viewing experience at McNeil River Falls may continue to decline.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Viewing of McNeil is a very important resource to the State of Alaska. It's cumulative value runs into the millions of dollars. The McNeil bears are important not just economically. They have touched literally millions of people through viewing them, documentary specials, viewing on the web, books and articles written about them. By adopting this proposal the quality of bear viewing at McNeil will be increased, and the Board of Game will do much to change the belief that it is interested in only about advancing hunting and trapping opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bear viewers, Alaska tourism, hunters who believe the quality of bear viewing at McNeil is worthy of increased protection, and the vast numbers of people who support their belief.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? During the March 2005 Board of Game meeting numerous hunters testified in person and in writing that the McNeil bears should be fully protected because of the unique experience they provide. A state-wide 2005 Dittman Research Corporation conducted survey also indicated that the majority of hunters as well as most voters favored increased protection for the McNeil bears. There area approximately 30,000 to 40,000 brown bears in Alaska, most of which are available to hunters. The McNeil bear population numbers

fewer than 100 individuals. Closing bear hunting on that portion of Katmai National Preserve where McNeil bears range would be insignificant.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Paul Joslin

(SC-07S-G-084)

PROPOSAL 46 - 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting. Rewrite 5 AAC 92.510 (9) (c) to reinstate the closure as follows:

[**THROUGH JUNE 30, 2007,**] that portion of Unit 9 extending south and east of McNeil River State Game Sanctuary to the boundary of Katmai National Park and Preserve, and including any state land within the boundaries of Katmai National Park and Preserve, is closed to brown bear hunting;

ISSUE: Reinstate the closure of brown bear hunting within the Kamishak Special Use Area that includes lands within Katmai National Park and Lands between McNeil River State Game Sanctuary and Katmai National Park.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Kamishak Special Use Area is two separate pieces of land: one is located between the McNeil River State Game Sanctuary and Katmai National Park and the other is located adjacent to and just east of McNeil River State Game Sanctuary within the boundaries of Katmai National Park. McNeil River State Game Sanctuary, the Kamishak Special Use Area, Katmai National Park and Preserve, and the surrounding land comprise some of the world’s premier brown bear viewing sites, drawing visitors from all over the world to observe brown bears in their natural environment. Research has shown that brown bears move freely throughout this checkerboard of land ownerships. The close proximity of these bears to Alaska’s major population centers and the protected status of McNeil and Katmai bears have created a unique bear viewing opportunity that provides jobs and a good source of income to bear viewing guides living on the Kenai Peninsula, King Salmon, and Kodiak. One study commissioned by the University of Alaska’s Institute for Social and Economical Research found that visitors to Alaska who include a brown bear viewing experience in their itinerary spend almost twice as much on their vacation as the average visitor and those persons coming to Alaska specifically to view brown bears spend more than 2.5 times as much. The study further documented that one operator in Homer directly generates almost 1.5 million in visitor spending.

Recognizing the importance of the brown bear population in the larger, contiguous area and the important role in preserving that contiguous population provided by the Kamishak Special Use Area, the Board of Game determined that the Kamishak Special Use Area should be closed to hunting in 1985.

At the March 2005 Board of Game meeting, this hunting closure was removed effective July 1, 2007 and the first hunt in this area in 22 years will likely start in October 2007. If this hunt is implemented, it will likely contribute to the ongoing decline in brown bear abundance at McNeil River that, according to the latest McNeil River status report from the department, started in 1998. In addition to a general population decline, this hunt for trophy brown bears targets big males which will further negatively alter the population composition by removing the older male bears. Knowingly contributing to the McNeil River population decline may be in conflict with Alaska Statute 16.20.162 which established the purposes of the sanctuary to include providing

permanent protection for brown bears and maintaining the unique bear viewing opportunities at McNeil River.

Should this hunt move forward, it will be seen as a hunt on McNeil bears and the resulting opposition from bear viewing economic interests and the general public will shine a negative light on the Board of Game, the Department of Fish and Game, and the State of Alaska. In recognition of the historical closure in this area to support this population of brown bears that are habituated to being viewed by people, the hunting closure should be reinstated.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This product in this area is bear viewing, an activity enjoyed by thousands and generating millions of dollars for the local economy. Sustaining the current hunting closure in this area maintains the quality of the brown bear resource for all users to continue viewing brown bears in their natural environment in one of the most unique and popular brown bear viewing areas in the world.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone will benefit. The existing integrity of McNeil and Katmai will be maintained, local bear viewing businesses will thrive, visitors to Alaska and Alaskans alike will continue to view this unique population of brown bears at natural population levels. This solution will also enhance the reputations of the Board of Game, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and the State of Alaska for their support of small businesses and encouraging entrepreneurial opportunities for wildlife viewing. Hunters will benefit greatly from this action by being credited with acknowledging the unique value this area holds and the State of Alaska will be acknowledged as responsibly managing its wildlife resources in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. This area has been closed to hunting since 1985, almost 22 years, so there is no change to the status quo.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The Kamishak Special Use Area lies mostly within the congressionally authorized boundary of Katmai National Park. The National Park Service could acquire these lands from the State of Alaska in a land exchange or purchase and they would then become covered by federal regulations that prohibit hunting in a national park. However, in conversations with State of Alaska land managers, they are not interested in pursuing a land exchange at this time, preferring to continue to hold those lands for the state. In addition, land exchanges are extremely time consuming and expansive and take a very focused effort by all interested parties. In today's environment, the State of Alaska is very much focused on other land management issues, such as finalizing statehood entitlement and pursuing the state's many oil, gas, and mineral opportunities. Land exchanges of any kind, anywhere are almost non-existent. Given the state's apparent lack of interest in a trade, a trade option is not a viable solution.

PROPOSED BY: Jim Stratton, National Parks Conservation Association (SC-07S-G-054)

PROPOSAL 47 - 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting. Amend the regulation as follows:

Do not remove the buffer zones in Unit 9; adjacent to the McNeil River State Game Sanctuary. The buffer zones were established to protect the bears from hunters while feeding in the sanctuary.

ISSUE: The buffer zones adjacent to the McNeil River State Game Sanctuary would not be changed. If big game hunting is to expand in Alaska to back country areas where the animals are not accustomed to humans should be used or opened up. The McNeil River bears are almost tame.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The bear population will be severely reduced and Alaska's image will be tarnished with the tourist population worldwide. The bear viewing revenue will drop significantly.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the bear population will increase and state tourist revenues will increase much more than it would from hunting permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All the residents of Alaska and the nonresidents who do not hunt bear.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Only those.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Solutions that decrease potential state revenues, tarnish Alaska's image and decrease the bear population have been rejected.

PROPOSED BY: John F. Klein Jr. and Sara M. Reid (HQ-07S-G-021)

PROPOSAL 48 - 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting. Amend the regulation as follows:

Eliminate the words "through June 30, 2007," from the beginning of the regulation under 5 AAC 92.510 (9)(c). This would reinstate a hunting closure for the Kamishak Special Use Area.

ISSUE: Reinstate the brown bear hunting closure for the Kamishak Special Use Area located adjacent to Katmai National Park and the McNeil River State Game Sanctuary.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Kamishak Special Use Area, McNeil River State Game Sanctuary, and Katmai National Park and Preserve are adjacent to one another and provide critical habitat for a population of brown bears that knows no political boundaries and moves freely between these conservation areas. Katmai National Park, McNeil River State Game Sanctuary, and McNeil River State Game Refuge are closed to bear hunting and the Kamishak Special Use Area has been closed to bear hunting by the Board of Game since 1985, creating a protected area for brown bears among these differing land management designations. Brown bears in these protected areas have drawn bear viewers from all over the world and have spawned a very healthy and successful economic opportunity for Alaskan businesses to share these bears with visitors in a close and unique setting.

The 1985 hunting closure was removed in 2005 by the Board of Game effective July 1, 2007. The first hunt would occur in fall 2007. Hunting these brown bears for the first time in almost 22 years would create a public relations black-eye for the State of Alaska. Research has shown that McNeil River bears use land in the Kamishak Special Use Area and the State would not benefit in the court of public opinion for allowing McNeil bears to be hunted. These bears have been habituated by years of close human presence by bear viewers visiting the McNeil Sanctuary, McNeil Refuge, and areas inside Katmai National Preserve. They are accustomed to seeing

people and have lost their natural fear of humans. Opening the Kamishak Special Use Area to bear hunting creates an unethical hunting situation. I believe if this hunt moves forward, it will create negative publicity for the Board of Game, the department and the State of Alaska and could potentially impact the state's tourism industry.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal perpetuates the existing brown bear hunting closure that has been in existence since 1985. The brown bear resource in the area is sustained and the quality of the bear viewing is protected. This proposal would also support small businesses in the region that provide visitor services to bear viewers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone wins by maintaining the closure. McNeil bears are not hunted when they travel outside of McNeil to the south and east. Visitors to the State of Alaska and Alaskans that enjoy bear viewing will continue to have a healthy population of brown bears to observe. Bear viewing businesses that provide transportation and guides will continue to prosper and the communities on the Kenai Peninsula, primarily Homer, that provide a gateway to these world-class bear viewing areas will continue to benefit from bear viewers needing lodging, food, gas, and gifts to take back home. The State of Alaska benefits for being seen as recognizing this unique bear viewing opportunity and protecting it. And the department and the Board of Game avoid a black eye for supporting a hunt on habituated McNeil bears that will be perceived as unsportsmanlike and unfair.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Not a soul. This area has been closed to hunting for over 21 years.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Frank Mullen (HQ-07S-G-054)

PROPOSAL 49 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend the regulation as follows:

Unit 9(D), south and west of a line from Moffett Point to the eastern side of the eastern entrance of Kinzarof Lagoon, and north of a line from the base of Cape Glazenap to Frosty Peak to the mouth of Old Man's Lagoon one bear every four regulatory years by registration permit only (**permits available in Cold Bay August 15 to September 15 in odd years and April 1 to April 30 in even years**); the season will be closed by emergency order when the allowable harvest is reached (**maximum of eight per regulatory year and four per season**). October 1 – October 21 (odd years only) and May 10 – May 25 (even years only).

ISSUE: Unlimited harvest of brown bear in the 9(D) road hunt. Last spring season rather than a two bear limit (four per regulatory year) as in past years it was open until closed by the game manager. Five bear were taken off the road hunt including two lactating females. Increased activity associated with prolonged opening also resulted in an increase of impacts to other non-consumptive users of the road system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unlimited harvest of brown bear would impact the Cold Bay resident's enjoyment of seeing bears, increased potential to remove productive females, the main users of the road system, from the population and increased conflicts with non-consumptive activities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Harvest in line with population fluctuations but reduce excessive harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local rural residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A limited number of local rural residents, non-local residents and non-residents.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Limit maximum harvest to four per regulatory year. This will not allow for fluctuations in the population.

PROPOSED BY: John T. Maxwell (HQ-07S-G-015)

PROPOSAL 50 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend the regulation as follows:

In Unit 9D, keep the limit of two bears as in the past for the Cold Bay road hunt.

ISSUE: The Cold Bay brown bear road hunt has worked very well in the 27 years I have lived here (limit of two).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Out of town hunters are running out of hunting area and are pressuring the Izenbeck staff for a larger amount of bears they can kill. Wildlife viewers coming here want to see bears.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alan Ellis (HQ-07S-G-055)

PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend the regulation as follows:

Modify the regulation for Unit 10 as follows:

- 1) Separate the resident and nonresident brown bear permit allocation in the Unimak drawing, giving 40 percent to nonresidents.
- 2) A guide operating on Unimak for brown bear hunts would only be allowed to submit as many clients as there are nonresident permits available for that area. For example: If there where two nonresident permits available, each registered guide could only submit two hunters.

ISSUE: There is no nonresident brown bear permit allocation. Nonresident and residents compete for the same available permits with most each year going to nonresidents. If they had a nonresident and resident allocations, both would have a fair opportunity for these highly prized permits. I would recommend 40 percent of permits going to nonresidents. This would allow commercial operators to continue and allow residents an opportunity to draw without being in competition with the large commercial brown bear guiding operations on Unimak Island.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Commercial operations will dominate over the Alaskan residents permit chances.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal enhances allocation opportunity for both residents and nonresidents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters and smaller guiding operations. It is a win, win for all user groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? If this proposal is not adopted, resident brown bear hunters who want to hunt this area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Don Schwandt (HQ-07S-G-086)

PROPOSAL52 - 5 AAC 92.XXX. Special provisions for Unit 10 brown bear permit hunts.
Create a new regulation as follows:

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

Drawing permits for nonresident hunters which include the following conditions:

- a. A percentage of the permits allocated to nonresident.
- b. A signed and dated guide-client agreement must be on file in the area department office at time of drawing application deadline.
- c. The guide on the agreement must be registered in Unit 10 prior to the drawing application deadline.
- d. A guide may not submit more nonresident applications than there are permits available for nonresidents in the drawing.
- e. An alternate list will be established that represents the unsuccessful drawing applicants in the order that they were selected in the drawing.

ISSUE: I began hunting Unimak Island professionally in 1995 when I became one of two big game services providers permitted by the Izembek Refuge. Since that time, with 15 permits available yearly, I have had three of my nonresident clients draw tags in 11 years. I turned down one nonresident permit holder who intended to hunt with his own non-permitted guide as it violated my refuge permit guidelines. I have been contacted by and guided three residents who

chose to hire a guide for Unimak at a much reduced rate. The other 159 plus permits issued in the last 11 years have been utilized by the one other big game service provider; resident hunters; or have gone unutilized due to hunter cancellation. Historically residents have drawn slightly better than half of the 15 permits each year. I have a following of prospective bear clients that could have filled the other six bear tags each year if they could successfully get drawn. All but three of the nonresident drawing application winners have been clients of the other permitted guide on the refuge in the last 11 years. I have not had one client draw in the last five years.

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

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

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

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

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

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A). The destiny of this highly sought after big game permit will be in the hands of the out-of-state booking agencies, premier drawing application service providers, and the guides who adhere to the big box marketing philosophy of flooding the drawing system to gain control of the access to a public recreational resource. B). The number of permits that could go unused, due to the lack of safeguards in the present system adversely impacts the harvest goals of the service and department. If a successful applicant, either a hunter or anti-hunter, does not use the permit they have drawn, that permit has no chance of being hunted under the current system. C). The guide who wants to have control of his own marketing, wants the personal contact with his prospective clients, and does not want to flood drawings will suffer adverse consequences in his business and will be displaced by not turning his marketing over to big-box drawing application services. His distinct and different service will not be available to the public due to years of his clients being outnumbered and

unable to draw. An emergency exists for the displaced permitted guide and for the refuge who stated it was in their best interest and the public's best interest to have these two distinctly different permitted operators. The refuge can not allocate permit access, only the Board of Game has that authority.

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

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

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

With a system that requires 1.) a guide-client agreement with a guide who is registered and committed in the Unit and 2.) who is restricted to submitting only as many applicants as there are permits available in the drawing; the nonresident hunters will benefit in multiple ways. First they will have more opportunity to interface with their actual guide rather than an out-of-state, multi level, big-box marketing agency. Second, their guide will be assured to have experience and knowledge of the area he is applying for as "prospecting" in the drawings by guides will be eliminated. Third, nonresident hunters who are submitted in the drawing will have better odds to draw a permit.

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Big box booking agents, premier drawing application services and guides who compete by flooding drawings to gain an advantage. Speculating guides who bounce from area to area depending on where their hunters draw, and who try to cut last minute deals with private land owners and/or permitted guides on the refuge. During my permitted time on Unimak I have witnessed different guides submitting names for this drawing, and I am sure there are more that I am not privy to. The guides “prospecting” for a client, that have nothing invested in this guide use area are competing for permits. They have nothing to loose if they do not draw; but when they do draw, they create conflicts and create pressure for the permitted guides to joint-venture with them, in violation of their refuge permits. These prospecting speculators will suffer, as they will not be able to operate in their usual and accustomed way.

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

PROPOSED BY: Tim Booch (HQ-07S-G-056)

PROPOSAL 53 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend these regulation as follows:

Unit 11, north of Nabesna Road: One bear every regulatory year...No closed season.
Remainder of Unit 11: One bear every regulatory year...August 10 – June 15.

ISSUE: This area is a moose calving area for the southeast portion of Unit 13C. This area also has a major problem of bears entering cabins; sometimes even when people are home. All through the month of June and early July, bears are killing moose calves along the Slana River and lower Suslota Creek area. Currently, these bears can not be killed after June 15 if they are not on the Unit 11 side of the Slana River and South of Suslota Creek. Fishermen at the mouth of Ahtell Creek see bear on a regular basis during this time and can not take any action after June 15. The community of South Slana has a history of bear problems from May through October. From June 15 through August 8 nothing can be done about a problem bear without going through the hassle of DLP protocol.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose and moose hunters will benefit from this change, as well as home owners in South Slana.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer from this change.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Changing the boundary of Unit 13 to include this area, but rejected since this would allow federal subsistence hunting of caribou in an area where Nelchina animals and the few remaining Mentasta animal are both present. Also considered changing the season for all of Unit 11 which is also acceptable

PROPOSED BY: Wayne Shafer (HQ-07S-G-017)

PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend the regulation to provide the following:

Allow Alaska residents to take nonresidents grizzly bear hunting in Unit 13, even if they are outside of the 2nd degree of kinship. Alaska residents can accompany up to two nonresident grizzly bear hunters in Unit 13 annually under a temporary guide license issued by the department. The license will list names and addresses of the hunters to be guided, the license number and the game and area to be hunted. This would not be a professional guide license and recipients of the resident guide license are not allowed to receive compensation for guide services.

An example of this program can be found on the Wyoming Game and Fish webpage: “Wyoming law requires all nonresidents who hunt in wilderness areas to have guides; however the law allows any Wyoming resident who holds a valid big or trophy game license to take up to two nonresidents into wilderness areas. The resident guide license is free and can be obtained from game wardens and at G&F regional offices. The license will list names and addresses of the hunter to be guided, the license number and the game and area to be hunted. This is not a professional guide license and recipients of the resident guide license are not allowed to receive compensation for guide services. The intent of the resident guide law is to allow Wyoming resident to take nonresident friends and relatives hunting in wilderness areas without that person having to hire a professional guide”.

ISSUE: Current state law allows Alaska residents to take nonresidents moose or caribou hunting, but not grizzly bear hunting, but there is no reason for the discrepancy.

Unit 13 is intensively managed for moose, though bear predation on moose calves is still excessive. Liberal harvest regulations have not increased grizzly harvest enough to reduce bear numbers. The department did a survey that showed that Alaskan resident do not want to kill more than one bear in Unit 13. Nonresident would take bears, but the high cost of guides at \$10,000 a hunt, precludes most nonresidents. Also, because Unit 13 is considered to be in the coastal brown bear category by Boone and Crockett (though these bears are nothing of coastal caliber), nonresidents do not have much incentive to pay an arm and a leg to hunt here.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued high moose calf mortality because bear harvests are not high enough to drop the bear population.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? By allowing nonresidents who want to take a bear, but cannot afford a guided hunt and do not have family in Alaska (within 2nd degree of kinship), the sport take of grizzlies here will increase. Fair chase bear hunting methods and means will still be employed, and the quality of the hunt experience remains.

Also, grizzly would essentially be the only big game animal a resident could hunt in this unit with a nonresident friend (black bear is open, but there are very few found throughout the unit). Moose and caribou seasons are currently closed to nonresidents in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nonresidents wanting to take a bear but cannot afford a guide, and moose hunters who want to take a moose in Unit 13 will benefit. Alaska residents who would like to take a nonresident friend or extended family member bear hunting would benefit.

Eventually, if nonresidents are able to take enough bears and help reduce the bear population, subsequent increased moose numbers may translate into more opportunity for everyone, and maybe even reestablishment of a nonresident moose season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Individuals seeking to take a trophy quality grizzly in Unit 13 can still hire a guide, which should ensure them a higher success rate.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No guide requirement at all for bears in Unit 13.

PROPOSED BY: Larry St.Amand (HQ-07S-G-069)

PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend the regulation as follows:

[UNIT 13E WITHIN DENALI STATE PARK: ONE BEAR EVERY FOUR REGULATORY YEARS AUGUST 10 – JUNE 15]

Unit 13: One bear every regulatory year, no closed season.

ISSUE: Align Denali State Park brown bear regulations with remainder of Unit 13.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Abundant brown bear population in the Denali State Park will continue to be under harvested.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters wanting to harvest bears within the Denali State Park and residents of the area with bear problems.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anti-hunters who do not want bears harvested.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-063)

PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear; and 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Amend the regulations as follows:

Brown bear may be harvested with the use of registered black bear bait stations within Unit 13 predator control areas.

ISSUE: Allow the harvest of brown bear over black bear bait stations within predator control areas in Unit 13.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Brown bears will continue to be under harvested, a large contributor to moose predation, and a danger at bait stations.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, bears will be harvested in a controlled situation increasing success.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans who wish to harvest more moose, brown bears, and black bears safely.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who are against bear baiting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Statewide brown bear baiting, same day airborne brown bear baiting.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-071)

PROPOSAL 57 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Two bears may be taken in Unit 13E every regulatory year; no closed season.

ISSUE: In Unit 13E there has been no significant increase in brown/grizzly bear harvest since going to a “no closed season.” There has been no noticeable decrease in the bear population. We suggest allowing two bears every regulatory year, as it is in place in other units.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Brown/grizzly bear populations will remain the same. The moose herd will not recover.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose, moose hunters, and bear hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None,

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Denali Advisory Committee. (SC-07S-G-011)

PROPOSAL 58 - 5 AAC 92.990(a)(12) Definitions. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Allow the taking of any brown/grizzly bear in Unit 13.

ISSUE: Grizzly bear predation on moose and caribou

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The decline of moose and caribou will continue due to predation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposal would go a long way to put more game on the tables of the users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People that need game to feed their families.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-029)

PROPOSAL 59 - 5 AAC 92.031. Permit for selling skins, skulls, and trophies. Amend the regulation as follows:

In the predator control areas of Units 13 and 16, the sale of raw and tanned black bear hides and skulls is allowed. Resale of unaltered (other than tanning) black bear hides and cleaned and bleached skulls by licensed fur dealers is allowed.

ISSUE: Selling dirty, smelly, cumbersome raw bear hides to the general public is difficult. Selling tanned hides to consumers is easier and a much more transportable product. Selling raw hides to a licensed fur dealer who could then resell could make marketing a lot easier.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The incentive to harvest bears for sale in predator control areas will not be effective.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Allowing the sale of tanned hides makes for a much nicer product.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The moose calves in predator control areas and bear hunters trying to recover cost of removing over abundant predators.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Change regulation statewide, however this would be out of cycle.

PROPOSAL 60 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend the regulation as follows:

Establish a permit hunt in Unit 14C, September 1 through May 31 each year, intended to remove 30-50 brown bears from Unit 14C until the population is back under control. The hunt should open immediately upon approval by the Board of Game. No limits in size or age of bears taken.

ISSUE: There has been an explosion in the brown bear population in the Anchorage Bowl and surrounding area over the last several years. It has been over 20 years since the last brown bear hunt in Unit 14C and the old, large adults are pushing the young and sows with cubs into contact with humans.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Someone will get hurt. Property will get destroyed as it has in Bird in early August when brown bears killed livestock. Eventually, local fishermen and property owners will take matters into their own hands and remove the excess bears illegally.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by reducing the numbers of brown bears so that they are no longer forced into extensive contact with humans.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local fishermen, property owners, parents of small children, and homeowners in Anchorage, along Turnagain Arm, Girdwood and Eagle River.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Non-consumptive users and the area biologists who have not removed brown bears from human contact before they have become habituated to humans.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Brown bears can be tranquilized and removed, but most other units in Alaska have an overabundance of brown bears also.

PROPOSAL 61 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend these regulations as follows:

The proposed change would create a new spring and fall brown/grizzly bear season by drawing permit in Unit 14C, Chugach State Park management areas. This new drawing permit hunt would fall into the spring drawing permit supplement cycle for bear. The proposed Unit 14C brown/grizzly bear draw permits would include the following conditions:

- a. One bear every four regulatory years by drawing permit.
- b. An alternate list would be established that represents the unsuccessful drawing applicants in the order that they were selected in the drawing. If a permit is not utilized through the alternate list it becomes available over the counter through registration after four working days from the time notice was given from the last alternate on a first come first serve basis.

ISSUE: The proposal change would create a new spring and fall brown/grizzly drawing permit seasons in Unit 14C.

In the last five years, I and other users have seen a major increase in the Unit 14C brown/grizzly bear populations. Currently there is no draw permit or open season for brown/grizzly bear in Unit 14C, Chugach State Park management areas. With the significant increase in bear numbers, a drawing permit season could and needs to be created for a spring and fall bear hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Without changes, bear numbers will go up and the possibility for human conflict will increase. Hunters will be denied a hunting opportunity of this stable population of this prized big game animal.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Having this permit system will provide managers another tool for managing the bear populations from year to year, and to maintain a healthy sustainable population for all user groups to take advantage of each year. Additionally, it will help provide a quality of experience and enhanced safety for all. With the quickly growing bear population it would help keep the populations at desired levels and possible bears being killed from defense of life and property.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Also, those that want to leave it the way it is.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered and researched the other drawing areas in Alaska, but I believe the Unit 14C sheep drawing permit method is best for this unit.

PROPOSED BY: Don Schwandt (HQ-07S-G-075)

PROPOSAL 62 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.

Open a drawing hunt in Chugach State Park Management Area, Unit 14C, September 1 through October 30, issue not less than one and not more than 15 per year. This bear hunt is not to count toward the one every four years bag limit, but one a year.

ISSUE: Over abundance of brown bear near and in Anchorage causing a safety issue and under utilization of the resource.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bears will continue to become habituated to man and we might have a tragedy.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The bear and those who use the trails are less likely to come in conflict if bears fear man as they should.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to hunting and those who illegally feed the bears.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Asking the department to kill more bears.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-075)

PROPOSAL 63 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend the regulation as follows:

For Unit 15, change the allowable mortality of bears from 20 to 50 annually. The 20 bear number comes from a faulty and totally discounted population estimate from years ago.

ISSUE: Too many brown bears on the Kenai Peninsula with no hunting have resulted in an increase in defense of life and property situations and bear encounter incidences. Also, predation has had an effect on the moose population. Hunters would like more moose for harvesting; not for bear predation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bear encounters, including defense of life and property situations will remain high or even increase. Our Advisory Committee predicted an increase in such encounters and the department data clearly shows we were correct. Since 2000, the defense of life and property situations have increased dramatically. Also, many hunters are reporting low numbers of moose. Predation will remain a huge factor if no bear hunting is allowed.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? With a resulting decrease in defense of life and property situations and encounters, brown bears would not be looked upon as a scourge. Also, moose calf predation should decrease.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents who have bear problems and hunters who would like to see more moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who like to see bears even if they are causing havoc to others.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Central Peninsula Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-056)

PROPOSAL 64 - 5 AAC 85.020 Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Amend the regulation as follows:

In Unit 15, there will be a brown bear hunt from April 25 through May 10. A maximum of 25 brown bears may be taken.

ISSUE: No spring brown bear hunt on the peninsula.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Opportunity is lost to hunt brown bear early.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Persons who favor an early hunt. Moose population as there would be a reduction in the blossoming brown bear population. People who are forced to kill brown bear in defense of life or property situations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who have a perception of a low brown bear population on the Kenai Peninsula.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Central Peninsula Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-058)

PROPOSAL 65 - 5 AAC 92.410. Taking game in defense of life or property. Amend the regulation as follows:

Any person who is carrying a firearm while sport fishing the Kenai and Russian Rivers, is required to have a valid hunting license. In addition to having a hunting license, a certification program for all hunters is required.

ISSUE: The carrying of firearms while sport fishing. The increased numbers of bear encounters and bear shootings in the past several years on the Kenai River and the Russian River. I do not want to put any person in harms way, in terms of bear protection. I understand the necessity of a firearm in the field for the “what ifs”. The solution that seems to make the most sense would be having some sort of control over who carried firearms and their experience/education. I grew up in New York State. The hunting regulations require all hunters to go thru a hunter’s certification program prior to being able to apply for a hunting license.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Russian River and the Kenai River is some of the most popular sport fishing areas in the state and draw a very large crowd. There is also a significant bear population that uses this resource. This has lead to an increase of fishermen carrying firearms for protection. The main concern I have is the unnecessary shooting of bears in these areas. This can lead to injured bears that will become unpredictable and would increase the chance of mauling. The final concern would be overall firearm safety. The chance of someone using a firearm to defend themselves against a bear and the amount of people located on the river is a disaster waiting to happen. The chances of a person not knowing what is beyond where they are shooting and hitting another person is a possibility that would have dire consequences.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Overall public safety would be increased if these changes were put in place. This would be achieved by the increase in knowledge of those who are carrying firearms in the field.

With more knowledgeable hunters/fishermen, the reduction in bear shootings could be reduced. This would also lead to the reduction in the potential in wounded bears that could harm others that are in the area at the time.

This would also help increase the revenue to the state through the sales of additional hunting licenses and the required hunter’s certification course.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The beneficiary of this solution is anyone who uses the outdoors in Alaska. The more awareness the person has with a firearm, the better off the public will be.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The people who feel they are suffering most due to this would be those who feel it is their right to carry firearms and to protect themselves from harm.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? One of my thoughts was to not allow the carrying of firearms in areas that are heavily fished and have a high bear concentration. I feel this maybe a bit on the drastic side. I do not want to put someone in harms way, I agree that firearms in the field have their place. Removing them completely would solve the problem outright, but I would have some guilt if someone was mauled because they weren't able to carry protection.

PROPOSED BY: Christian Ornt (HQ-07S-G-135)

PROPOSAL 66 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear; and 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Amend the regulations as follows:

Hunters may take brown/grizzly bears over legal restricted bait stations using any legal weapon of choice in Units 14 and 16.

ISSUE: Relieve restrictions on legal methods to harvest brown/grizzly bears in Unit 14 and Unit 16.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Brown/grizzly harvest will remain under the Department's harvest goals for these game management units.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal allows more hunting opportunities, while hunting over bait, of a plentiful resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sportsmen and Sportswomen who want to have another method available to harvest brown/grizzly bear.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who don't approve of bear hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Scott Butler (SC-07S-G-020)

PROPOSAL 67 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear; 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemptions; 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions; and 92.132. Bag limit for brown bears. Amend these regulations as follows:

Provide the following for the remainder of Unit 16A, not in the Unit 16 predator control plan:

1. A two brown bear per regulatory year bag limit with no resident tag fee.
2. Extend brown bear season to August 10 to June 30 (June is needed to help target calf killers and the August portion to allow early moose hunters to also harvest bears).

3. Allow someone to harvest one bear in 16A without counting towards the one bear per year or one bear every four years harvest in other more restrictive units. (Someone might have a chance to harvest a smaller bear in 16A but will not because they plan to hunt for larger bear in a one bear unit that same regulatory year).
4. Allow hunters to move a gut pile that they legally acquired personally or with a hunting partner, to the nearest suitable cover and hunt over it without a bear baiting permit.

ISSUE: Current moose populations in Unit 16A are less than half of the minimum population objective.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose and other ungulate numbers will stay low and/or continue to decline if bear predation continues at its current level.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Reducing predation will help the depleted 16A moose populations to recover.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters and all sportsmen and wildlife enthusiasts who are frustrated with the current low moose and other ungulate populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People and groups who oppose hunting and human involvement in wildlife management.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Maybe one grizzly bear per year instead of two would be acceptable, but two is preferred because some hunters might be interested in harvesting additional bears to help ungulates recover. Maybe exclude the portion of 16A in Denali State Park.

PROPOSED BY: Wayne Kubat (HQ-07S-G-065)

PROPOSAL 68 - - 5 AAC 85.050. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear; 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions; and 5 AAC 92.200. Purchase and sale of game. Amend the regulations as follows:

Allow brown bear to be taken over bait in Unit 16B, April 15 through June 30, two bear per year, and allow the sale of hides and skulls.

ISSUE:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Less moose.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Moose calf, no one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSAL 69 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.

Amend the regulation as follows:

Allow baited brown bear hunting with bow and arrow in Unit 16B, June 1 – June 30.

ISSUE: Reduce brown bear numbers in predator control area in Unit 16B.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Increased number of brown bear in the predator control area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Brown bear need to be reduced to help recover the moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters, bow hunters, infirmed and aged hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Two bear limit ineffective; fall baited black bear ineffective.

PROPOSAL 70 - 5 AAC 92.115 Control of predation by bears. Amend this regulation as follows:

Update the existing regulation to include bear predation control within the current predation control plan. The Unit 16 Wolf Predation Control Plan 5 AAC 92.125 (d) shall be amended to include control of brown and black bears to achieve intensive management population and harvest objectives for moose as follows:

(d) **Unit 16 Predation Control Area:** the Unit 16 Predation Control Area is established, which is focused primarily on mainland Unit 16B, and consists of all lands within the mainland portion of Unit 16B and that portion of Unit 16A west of a line beginning at the confluence of the Yentna and Susitna Rivers, then northerly along the western bank of the Susitna River to the confluence with the Dëshka River, then northerly to 61° 48.80' N. lat., 150° 21.77' W. long., then west to 62° 01.47' N. lat., 150° 24.06' W. long., then north to the northern end of Trapper Lake at 62° 01.47' N. lat., 150° 16.67' W. long., then west to 62° 01.47' N. lat., 150° 24.06' W. long., then north to 62° 09.65' N. lat., 150° 24.06' W. long., then west to the southwestern end of Amber Lake at 62° 09.65' N. lat., 150° 33.42' W. long., then north to 62° 18.03' N. lat., 150° 33.42' W. long., then west to 62° 18.03' N. lat., 150° 51.04' W. long., then north to 62° 27.97' N. lat., 150° 51.04' W. long., then west to the Denali National Park boundary at 62° 27.97' N. lat., 151° 09.22' W. long., encompassing approximately 11,105 square miles; this predator control program does not apply within National Park Service lands unless approved by the federal agencies; notwithstanding any other provision in this title, and based on the following information **contained in this section** the commissioner or the commissioner's designee may conduct a wolf population reduction or wolf population regulation program in the Unit 16

Predation Control Area, and conduct a black bear and brown bear population reduction or black bear and brown bear population regulation program in the Unit 16 Predation Control Area:

(1) the discussion of wildlife population and human use information is as follows:

(A) prey population information is as follows:

(i) the moose population for mainland Unit 16B was estimated in fall 2005 to be 3,193 - 3,951 moose, based on aerial surveys in 2003 - 2005 in the Unit; this population is composed of subpopulations that reside wholly in the Unit; however, a subpopulation from the flanks of Mount Yenlo and in the upper Lake Creek drainage mixes in winter with moose from Unit 16A in the Kahiltna River drainage, and a subpopulation from the flanks of Mount Susitna and the drainages of Alexander Creek and lower Yentna River winters with moose from Units 14A, 14B, and 16A in the lower Yentna and Susitna Rivers;

(ii) habitat does not appear to be limiting the moose population, or a factor in calf survival, and is not expected to limit the moose population at objective levels; while the majority of the Unit is covered with mature forests, moose habitat has changed little since the high moose densities of the early 1980s; prescribed burning has been the only economically viable option for improving moose habitat and opportunities to conduct controlled burns are limited by climate, access, and privately-owned lands with structures dispersed throughout the Unit; the minimum moose density objective is 1.0 moose per square mile for mainland Unit 16B based on the intensive management objective of 6,500 - 7,500 moose; there are approximately 6,500 square miles of available moose habitat; presently, mainland Unit 16B moose population estimates place the moose density at .55 moose per square mile;

(iii) the age structure of the population is believed to have shifted towards the older age classes in the 1990's as the moose population declined; the number of spike-fork bulls estimated in the mainland Unit 16B survey data from 1999 - 2005, which is approximately the same as the number of yearling bulls in the population, showed ratios of three to eight yearling bulls to 100 cows; assuming these numbers to be half of the year's cohort, this indicates an approximate recruitment rate of 6 - 16 percent; given estimated moose mortality rates in the mainland Unit 16B population, the decline in numbers and lack of recovery is expected to continue without active predation control activities;

(iv) the bull-to-cow moose ratio for mainland Unit 16B in fall 2003 - 2005 was estimated to be 23 - 35 bulls per 100 cows; this is similar to average bull-to-cow ratios of 24[:] - 44 observed in the Unit in the mid-1990s; thus, the herd is presently above the management objective for this parameter;

(v) limited flights to count newborn calves and natality data from radio collared moose indicated that 80 percent of adult cows gave birth, with 50 percent of these having twins; together, these data indicated a birth rate of 122 calves per 100 cows;

(vi) the calf-to-cow moose ratio during fall moose surveys from 2003 to 2005 ranged between 14 and 23 calves per 100 cows, with estimated over-winter calf mortality of 40 percent, resulting in a recruitment rate of 8 - 14 moose per 100 cows; information collected from radio collared moose in December following parturition indicate a calf survival rate of eight percent and a calf-to-cow ratio of 10:100, which is lower than the ratio of 14 calves per 100 cows counted during the November survey of the population in the study area; the reason for the difference between natality and recruitment appears to be largely due to predation;

(vii) the current harvestable surplus for 2006 is estimated to be 140 bulls, well under the minimum of 199 - 227 harvestable moose needed to meet the amount necessary for subsistence; this number is a reflection of the overall decline of the moose population even though bull-to-cow ratios have been consistently at or above objective; as a result, the moose herd has provided only limited resident-only harvest for several years;

(viii) the intensive management population objective established by the board for the mainland Unit 16B moose population is 6,500 - 7,500 moose, and the intensive management harvest objective is 310 - 600 moose;

(ix) the decline in the mainland Unit 16B moose population is attributed to poor calf survival, high adult mortality, and the inability of the population to recover from the impacts of recurring deep snow winters; snow depths below the 1,000-foot elevation have exceeded 35 inches in 21 of 35 winters; the mainland Unit 16B moose population is considered to be reduced substantially from the early 1980s when estimates ranged from 8,500 - 10,000 moose, and is currently at about half of the intensive management population objective;

(x) without an effective [WOLF] predation control program, moose in the mainland Unit 16B are likely to persist at low numbers or continue to decline; results from moose mortality studies, and predator and prey studies, conducted throughout Alaska and similar areas in Canada indicate that reducing the number of wolves **and bears** in Unit 16B can reasonably be expected to increase survival of cal[f]yes as well as older moose, particularly yearlings;

(B) the human use information for prey population is as follows:

(i) reported subsistence harvest has varied from 30 to over 120 moose, and some additional subsistence harvest occurs within the general fall hunting season when one is held; during the regulatory year 2003 - 2004, Tier II subsistence harvest was 80 moose; in regulatory year 2004 - 2005 the subsistence harvest was 79 moose;

(ii) high demand for subsistence moose is demonstrated by the 900 - 1,100 applicants who annually apply for the 260 Tier II permits available for mainland Unit 16B; additional subsistence demand exists within the Unit and is captured by the limited general resident-only hunting opportunity that has occurred in September in recent years;

(iii) all general season and fall Tier II moose bag limits were reduced in 1993 to one bull with a spike or fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with three or more brow tines on one side; nonresident moose hunting opportunity was first reduced to a portion of Unit 16B in 1993 and completely eliminated in 2001; all general season hunting was closed in 2001 and 2002 and only a limited Tier I subsistence (resident-only) season was allowed in 2003 - 2005; the average general season harvest was 388 from 1983 - 1989 and declined to 168 from 1990 - 1999; recent resident-only seasons in 2003 and 2004 produced 83 and 84 bulls, respectively; in 2005, 61 bulls were reported harvested;

(iv) there is a small, limited demand for moose to provide for rural federal subsistence hunting on federal lands within mainland Unit 16B; there is some interest in moose for viewing opportunities in portions of the Unit where guides and other operations provide services that promote wildlife viewing;

(v) it is unlikely that the demand in mainland Unit 16B for moose for subsistence and general hunting opportunity will decline; given the increasing human population in the nearby

Anchorage and Matanuska-Susitna Valley areas, as well as historic local subsistence use, it is probable that demand will match any increase in harvestable surplus gained through active management of the moose herd;

(C) the predator population information is as follows:

(i) the fall 2005 wolf population in mainland Unit 16B was estimated to be 85 - 114 wolves in 10 - 12 different packs; a density of approximately 0.82 - 1.1 wolves per 100 square miles; **the spring 2003 population estimate for black bears in Unit 16B was 1183-2402; the estimate for brown bears in Unit 16B was 681-1254;**

(ii) habitat carrying capacity for wolves **and bears** is dependant on prey **and food** availability and competition from other predators[, SUCH AS BROWN AND BLACK BEARS]; carrying capacity for wolves **and bears** in mainland Unit 16B has not been determined; however, harvest from sealing records, supplemented by reports from trappers, [AND] hunters, **and others** have indicated that the wolf population had increased **and the black bear and brown bear populations had stabilized or increased;** the average annual harvest from sealing records **for wolves** during 1984 - 1988 was 6.6 wolves compared to a single year harvest in 2002 - 2003 of 60 wolves; **the average annual harvest from sealing records of black bears during 1990-1994 was 85.6 compared to 124.6 during 2000-2004; the average annual harvest from sealing records of brown bears during 1990-1994 was 50.6 compared to 83.2 during 2000-2004;**

(iii) in mainland Unit 16B, the current wolf-to-moose ratio is between 28 and 46 moose per wolf; the pre-control estimated ratio for 2003 was as low as 17:1; historically, estimates have ranged as high as 250 moose per wolf in this Unit;

(iv) alternate prey include caribou, sheep, beaver, and hare; for most wolves in mainland Unit 16B, there are few options for alternate prey; small populations of caribou and sheep exist in the higher elevations of the western side of the Unit; however, pack territorial structure probably prohibits most wolves from accessing this resource, thus, limiting them to smaller prey such as beaver and hare; **black and brown bears typically feed on salmon when available and forage on a variety of vegetation throughout the summer and fall; moose and caribou calves are often prey during the spring when inexperience with predators and limited mobility makes them particularly vulnerable; the limited numbers and distribution of caribou make them unavailable to most predation in mainland Unit 16B; brown bears also take black bears as prey and this has been reported in numerous observations by hunters, trappers and others in mainland Unit 16B;**

(v) the number of moose that are killed by wolves in any given year in this area is highly dependent on the depth of winter snowfall, competition with other predators, and the abundance of alternate prey; in Alaska and areas of Canada where moose are the primary prey of wolves, studies documented kill rates ranging from four to seven moose per wolf per winter; using this range with our current population estimate of wolves in mainland Unit 16B, wolves are estimated to be capable of taking between 340 and 798 moose per winter; **research elsewhere in Alaska has indicated that up to 52 percent of neonate moose calves were killed by brown bears; other research has shown significant increases in calf survival following black bear removal and/or population reduction;**

(vi) mortality factors affecting wolves in mainland Unit 16B include human harvest, other wolves, and disease; harvest of wolves in the Unit has increased from a low of two wolves in the

winter of 1990 - 1991 to 50 wolves in the winter of 2003 - 2004; the total wolf take for 2004 - 2005 was 115 wolves, with 91 of those wolves taken in the predator control program that was initiated in January 2005;

(vii) it is the intent of this plan to maintain wolves **and bears** as part of the ecosystem within the geographical area described for the plan; however, studies in Alaska and elsewhere have repeatedly concluded that large, annual reductions in wolf populations are required to reduce wolf population levels and predation on their prey; wolf harvest objectives in mainland Unit 16B have been set in order to achieve a reduction of at least 60 - 80 percent of the pre-control wolf population estimate of 175 - 180 wolves; to achieve the desired reduction in wolf predation, but ensure that wolves persist within the plan area, the wolf population objective for mainland Unit 16B is set at between 22 and 45 wolves; **reductions in brown and black bear populations that have resulted in increased calf survival have been shown in other parts of Alaska and Canada; harvest objectives for black and brown bears in mainland Unit 16B were set with consideration for achieving lower populations of both species and reducing predation on moose calves;**

(viii) without a predation[OR] control program in the mainland Unit 16B, it can be expected that the wolf, **black bear, and brown bear** populations will increase to numbers at high levels; current trends in fuel prices, low fur prices, and low quality of wolf pelts in the Unit due to the louse infestation, have resulted in a decrease in the **wolf** hunting and trapping effort in the area; thus, removing the major cause of wolf mortality; **difficult access, thick cover, and the availability of other bear hunting opportunities have resulted in an inability to meet harvest objectives in the general season;** continuing the predator control program **and expanding it to include bears** is expected to reduce the [WOLF] **predator** populations **and subsequently allow the moose population to increase** toward the intensive management population objective;

(D) the human use information for predator population is as follows:

(i) annual harvest of wolves **in mainland Unit 16B** with a firearm, excluding same-day-airborne take, has been highly variable since the early 1980s and has ranged from 0 - 27 wolves; since 2000, firearms have accounted for an average of 19 wolves annually, or 36 percent of the harvest; harvest of wolves with the use of a snare or trap has similarly been highly variable and has ranged from 1 - 48; since 2000, traps and snares have accounted for 23 wolves annually, or 44 percent of the harvest;

(ii) mainland Unit 16B receives less trapping pressure than some other areas of the state; the hunter harvest of wolves has always been opportunistic, and is difficult to predict; the trapper harvest of wolves is limited by the number of trappers willing to spend the time targeting this furbearer amidst variable winter travel conditions; winters have begun later, and have been highly variable in temperature and snowfall in recent years creating hazardous conditions for winter hunters and trappers; in addition to open creeks and regular overflow, many large rivers in the area have stayed open until late-winter, or even year-round, completely eliminated trapping pressure from remote areas of the Unit;

(iii) most Unit 16B trappers will continue to pursue wolves in the Unit regardless of same-day-airborne wolf control efforts; trappers in the Unit pursue many different furbearers and do not consider the control program a detriment to their opportunities; if the wolf control program were

to be discontinued trapper harvest would likely increase to some extent; hunters that take wolves in mainland Unit 16B do so opportunistically and would not be seriously affected by the status of the wolf control program;

(iv) annual harvest of black bears in mainland Unit 16B has been variable but consistently below the objective of a minimum harvest of 225 bears; average annual harvest 1980-1989 was 103.0, from 1990-1999 it was 92.0, and from 2000-2004 it was 124.6; annual harvest of brown bears in mainland Unit 16B has increased but has not reached the objective of allowing human use to result in a 3-year average harvest of 28 females older than 2 years; from 2002-2004 the average was 23.3; since 1961, the only harvest years reported with greater than 27 females taken was in 1985 and 2000 with 30 females reported for both years;

(v) most Unit 16B bear hunters will continue to hunt bears in the Unit regardless of bear control efforts; in fact, many hunters have reported hunting in the unit due to recently increased opportunities to take black and brown bears;

(2) the predator and prey population levels and population objectives, and the basis for those objectives, are as follows:

(A) the fall 2005 moose population was estimated to be 3,193 - 3,951 moose, compared to the intensive management objective of 6,500 - 7,500 moose; the intensive management objective was developed by the board based on historical moose population size and trends, habitat condition, sustainable harvest levels, and human use;

(B) the pre-control population of wolves in the fall of 2003 was 160 - 220 wolves; studies in Alaska and elsewhere have repeatedly concluded that large, annual reductions of wolves are required to diminish wolf population levels and predation by wolves on their prey; consistent with scientific studies and department experience, the objective of this plan is to substantially reduce wolf numbers compared to the pre-control level in order to relieve predation pressure on moose and allow for improved recruitment to the moose population; this plan also has as a goal to maintain wolves as part of the natural ecosystem within the described geographic area; to achieve the desired reduction in wolf predation, but ensure that wolves persist within the plan area, the wolf population in mainland Unit 16B will be reduced to no fewer than 22 wolves;

(C) the spring (late winter) wolf population objective for Unit 16B was set at 22 - 45 wolves based on prior estimates of the wolf population size in the area when the moose population achieved high densities in the past;

(D) in 2003 the brown bear population for mainland 16 (B) was 681 – 1254 bears; the black bear population for mainland 16 (B) was 1183 – 2402; significant reductions in the brown bear population would reduce the amount of predation on moose while being consistent with the management goal of reaching a desirable predator/prey ratio by causing the brown bear population to decline; the human-use objective for black bear in Unit 16 (B) was for a 3-year average annual harvest of greater than 225 bears with greater than 30 percent being female; the average annual harvest for 16B between 2002 and 2005 was 129 bears and the average annual percentage of females was 26.2 percent;

(E) based on research in Alaska and Canada, a 60 percent reduction in the brown bear population within the predation control area specified in this program is expected to result in an increase in moose survival; to achieve the desired reduction in bear predation, but ensure that bears persist within the predation control area, the minimum brown bear population objective for the control area is 272 brown bears, the minimum black bear population objective for the control area is 473 black bears, which represents 60 percent reduction from the pre-control minimum estimated population of 681 brown bears and 1183 black bears, respectively;

(3) the justifications for predator control implementation plan are as follows:

(A) the board determined that the moose population in mainland Unit 16B is important for providing high levels of human consumptive use; the board established objectives for population size and annual sustained harvest of moose is consistent with multiple use and principles of sound conservation and management of habitat and all wildlife species in the area; the objectives of the predation control program are to halt the decline of the moose population within the predation control area and to increase the fall (post-hunt) moose population to the intensive management objective of 6,500 - 7,500 moose, providing a sustainable annual harvest of 310 - 600 moose;

(B) the population objectives for moose in mainland Unit 16B are not being met, largely due to high predator numbers and the inability of the moose population to recover given the high predation rates;

(C) a reduction in [WOLF] **predator** numbers, [IN CONJUNCTION WITH A REDUCTION IN BEAR NUMBERS THROUGH LIBERALIZED BEAR HUNTING OPPORTUNITIES,] is necessary to enhance survival of mainland Unit 16B moose, to halt the population decline, and to achieve population objectives in the [WOLF] predation control area; during the 1970s and 1980s, same-day-airborne hunting of wolves by the public, at little or no cost to the department, effectively kept the wolf population at levels well below present levels, **both black and brown bear densities were low**, and moose populations were increasing or stable; trapper and hunter harvests in the last 10 years have averaged less than 2.5 wolves per trapper and hunter;

(D) moose population objectives are not being met although trapper and hunter harvests of wolves **and harvests of black and brown bears** have increased over the last 10 years for mainland Unit 16B; maximum harvest opportunity appears to have been provided although the wolf numbers have been above the population objective since the early 1990s; the current spring population objective in the control area is 22 - 45 wolves in 3 - 5 packs, and the fall 2005 wolf population estimate is 85 - 114 wolves in 10 - 12 packs; **the current spring population objective in the control area is 473 black bears and 272 brown bears;**

(E) previous programs utilizing same-day-airborne hunting of wolves effectively kept the wolf population at levels well below present levels, and moose populations were increasing or stable; airplane-based control of wolf populations is necessary to reduce numbers over short periods of time and allows for a more timely recovery of the moose population; during moderate to severe winters wolves and moose congregate in river corridors; expansion of the control program into Unit 16(A) is necessary to effectively reduce wolves that occupy these corridors;

(F) multiple measures have been taken to improve survival of moose within mainland Unit 16B; general predator hunting and wolf trapping seasons alone have failed to result in sufficient reductions of predators and increased numbers of moose; liberalization of seasons, bag limits, and other restrictions on harvest for bears and wolves have shown no detectable effect on the moose population in the Unit; currently there is a year-round season for black bear with a three bear limit and no tag required for brown bear with a two bear limit;

(G) presently known alternatives to predator control for reducing the number of predators are ineffective, impractical, or uneconomical in the Unit 16B situation; hunting and trapping conducted under authority of ordinary hunting and trapping seasons and bag limits is not an effective reduction technique in sparsely populated areas such as Unit 16B; numbers of hunters and trappers are relatively low and so far have been unsuccessful in increasing the harvest of wolves **or bears** to the extent of having a positive effect on the moose population; the inherent wariness of wolves, difficult access, and relatively poor pelt prices also explain low harvest rates; application of the most common sterilization techniques, including surgery, implants, or inoculation, are not effective reduction techniques because they require immobilization of individual predators, which is extremely expensive in remote areas; relocation of wolves **or bears** is impractical because it is expensive and it is very difficult to find publicly acceptable places for relocated [WOLVES] **predators**; habitat manipulation is ineffective because it may improve the birth rate of moose in certain circumstances, but it is poor survival, not poor birth rate that keeps moose populations low in rural areas of mainland Alaska; supplemental feeding of wolves and bears as an alternative to predator control has improved moose calf survival in experiments; however, large numbers of moose carcasses are not available for this kind of effort and transporting them to remote areas of Alaska is not practical; stocking of moose is impractical because of capturing and moving expenses; any of the alternatives to a [WOLF] predation control program are not likely to be effective in achieving the desired level of predator harvest;

(4) the permissible methods and means used to take [WOLVES] **predators** are as follows:

(A) hunting and trapping of wolves by the public in [MAINLAND UNIT 16B] **the unit 16 predation control area** during the term of the program will occur as provided in the hunting and trapping regulations set out elsewhere in this title, including use of motorized vehicles as provided in 5 AAC [92.080](#);

(B) the commissioner may issue public aerial shooting permits or public land and shoot permits as a method of wolf removal under [AS 16.05.783](#);

(C) hunting of black and brown bears by the public in the unit 16 predation control area during the term of the program will occur as provided in the hunting regulations set out elsewhere in this title, including use of motorized vehicles as provided in 5 AAC 92.080;

(D) the commissioner may reduce the black and brown bear populations within the Unit 16 predation control area by means and direction included in the Board of Game Bear Conservation and Management Policy (2006-164-BOG), dated May 14, 2006, and incorporated by reference;

(5) the anticipated time frame and schedule for update and reevaluation are as follows:

(A) for up to five years beginning on July 1, [2003] **2007**, the commissioner may reduce the wolf, **black and brown bear** populations in [UNIT 16B] **the Unit 16 predation control area;**

(B) annually, the department shall to the extent practicable, provide to the board at the board's spring board meeting, a report of program activities conducted during the preceding 12 months, including implementation activities, the status of moose, [AND] wolf, **and bear** populations, and recommendations for changes, if necessary, to achieve the objectives of the plan;

(6) other specifications that the board considers necessary are as follows:

(A) the commissioner will suspend [WOLF] **predator** control activities

(i) when wolf inventories or accumulated information from permittees indicate the need to avoid reducing wolf numbers below the management objective of 22 - 45 wolves specified in this subsection;

(ii) when spring conditions deteriorate to make wolf control operations infeasible; or

(iii) no later than April 30 in any regulatory year;

(iv) when black bear population inventories or accumulated information from permittees indicate the need to avoid numbers below the management objective of 473 black bears specified in this subsection;

(v) when brown bear population inventories or accumulated information from permittees indicate the need to avoid numbers below the management objective of 272 brown bears specified in this subsection;

(B) [wolf] **predator** control activities will be terminated

(i) when prey population management objectives are attained; or

(ii) upon expiration of the period during which the commissioner is authorized to reduce predator numbers in the predator control plan area;

(C) the commissioner will annually close wolf hunting and trapping seasons **and bear hunting seasons** as appropriate to ensure that the minimum [WOLF] population objectives [IS] **are** met.

ISSUE: Moose population and harvest objectives for Unit 16B have not been met for several years and are below intensive management objectives. Department research conducted since 2004 has shown that brown bears, black bears, and wolves are important predators of moose calves and may be limiting the potential for population recovery in the area. A wolf control program is currently in progress and wolf numbers have been reduced. Recent changes in the season and bag limits for brown and black bears in the area have not resulted in a significant increase in the number of bears taken and have not impacted the bear populations. A control program is needed to help reduce the number of bears and rebuild the moose population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Rebuilding of the moose population in the area to meet population and harvest objectives may be delayed or may not happen if bear numbers are not reduced.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Quality of the resource harvested will not change.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Consumptive users of moose and individuals who enjoy seeing moose will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who object to predator control measures to increase prey populations will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Increased season and bag limits have been considered but are unlikely to result in a decrease in the bear population.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game at the request of the Board of Game (HQ-07S-G-102)

PROPOSAL 71 - 5 AAC 92.125 Predator Control Areas Implementation Plans.

The Board of Game, in May, 2006, directed the department to come up with a bear control plan for the Unit 16 predator control area for the March 2007 Region II meeting. We encourage the inclusion of the following methods and means into that plan. Since the current plan for wolves is also up for review, some suggestions for wolves are included as well.

1. A two brown bear per regulatory year bag limit with no resident tag fee, and doesn't count towards the one bear every four years bag limit in other units.
2. Extend brown bear season to June 30th from May 31st to target calf killers.
3. April 15th to June 30th and August 10th to October 15th bear baiting season from registered bait stations for both brown and black bears.
4. Same day airborne bear baiting (brown and black) from April 15th through June 20th and August 10th through October 15th,
5. Change bait station from two to four
6. Only require a 100 yard buffer from the current river corridors instead of ¼ mile.
7. Modify the current requirement that only the bait station registrant can haul bait or maintain the site, to allow for registrants of other stations to help out as well.
8. Allow bear baiting within one mile of cabins if the cabin is on the opposite side of a major river system (Yenta, Skwentna, Susitna, Kahiltna, ect.) from the bear baiting station and other permit conditions are met.
9. Don't prevent someone who has already taken a bear (black or brown) from taking one in a more restrictive unit.
10. Allow the pursuit of wolves and bears on snow machines.
11. Allow hunters to move a gut pile that they legally acquired personally or with a hunting partner, to the nearest suitable cover and hunt over it without a bear baiting permit.
12. Allow same day airborne black bear hunting
13. Allow the sale of black and brown bear parts.
14. Allow trapping of black and brown bears.
15. Redefine a cub grizzly bear to match the definition for black bear or a bear in it's first year of life.
16. Strive for a 35 calves per hundred cows goal in Unit 16.
17. Strive for a minimum 40 percent black bear reduction
18. No closed hunting season on wolves.

ISSUE: Current moose populations in Unit 16B and 16A are less than half of the minimum population objective for those units. 16B has experienced a 20 plus year declining trend, and the 16A moose population has been declining for years as well.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose and other ungulate numbers will stay low and/or continue to decline if predation continues at current levels.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Reducing predation on moose will help the depleted Unit 16 moose and other ungulate populations to recover.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters and all sportsmen and wildlife enthusiasts who are frustrated with the current low moose and other ungulate populations in Unit 16.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People and groups who oppose hunting and human involvement in wildlife management.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We've tried to include every viable option so that the board and the department have the tools necessary to help Unit 16 moose and other ungulate populations recover in a timely manner. Some of these suggestions may seem drastic but not when you consider the fact that Unit 16B moose have experienced a 20-year declining trend and the unit has almost one bear and/or wolf for each moose.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee. (SC-07S-G-030)

PROPOSAL 72 - 5 AAC. 92.015 Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemptions for Region II.

- (a) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in the following units:
 - (1) Unit 11;
 - (2) Unit 13, that portion outside of Denali State Park;
 - (3) Unit 16(B);
- (b) In addition to the units as specified in (a) of this section, if a hunter obtains a subsistence registration permit before hunting, that hunter is not required to obtain a resident tag to take a brown bear in the following units:
 - (1) Unit 9(B);
 - (2) Unit 9(E), that portion including all drainages that drain into the Pacific Ocean between Cape Kumliun and the border of Unit 9(D) and Unit 9(E);
 - (3) Unit 17

ISSUE: Brown bear tag fee exemptions must be reauthorized annually.

The board has liberalized Region II brown bear hunting regulations in some areas including the tag fee exemption to increase the harvest of brown bears. In addition brown bear tags are not required for subsistence brown bear hunting in parts of Unit 9 and Unit 17. Continuation of the exemption is necessary to encourage hunters to take brown bears in these units.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the board does not reauthorize the tag fee exemption the fee will be reinstated and hunters will not be able to legally harvest a bear unless they had purchased the tag. This action may reduce the incidental harvest of bears by other hunters (i.e. sheep and moose hunters) and direct potential brown bear hunters to other units.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The goal by both the board and the department is to increase the harvest of brown bears to decrease the predation on moose calves. A tag fee exemption will help to achieve this goal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who incidentally encounter bears in these units that may be interested in harvesting one.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-127)

PROPOSAL 73 – 5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Amend this regulation as follows.

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

(a) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in the following units:

- ...
- (8) Unit 22;
- (9) Unit 23;

(b) In addition to the units as specified in (a) of this section, if a hunter obtains a subsistence registration permit before hunting, that hunter is not required to obtain a resident tag to take a brown bear in the following units:

- ...
- (4) Unit 18;
- ...
- (7) Unit 22;
- (8) Unit 23;
- ...
- (10) Unit 26(A).

ISSUE: The Board must reauthorize brown bear tag fee exemptions annually or the fee automatically becomes reinstated. We recommend continuing resident tag fee exemptions for the general season and subsistence season hunts in Region 5 (Units 18, 22, 23, and 26A).

General Season Hunts: Reauthorizations are needed for: Unit 22, where the tag fee has been exempted for six years, and Unit 23, where the tag fee has been exempted for two years. Tag fee exemptions are desired to allow: 1) incremental increase in annual harvest, 2) opportunistic harvest by resident hunters, and 3) harvest by a wide range of users. Increased harvest is allowable because portions of these units have high bear populations.

General season brown bear harvest rates are within sustained yield limits and exempting the resident tag fee has not caused dramatic or unexpected increases in overall harvest. In Unit 22, during the tag-free period resident harvest has increased slightly to a three-year average annual harvest of 89 bears, although during this period other regulatory changes were implemented and contributed to increased harvest. In Unit 23, general harvests have increased slowly since 1961 although there has been substantial annual variability in harvest levels. The increasing trend in overall harvest is probably most influenced by the increasing human population in Alaska rather than the result of regulatory changes. Annual variability in harvests is probably most affected by weather. Harvest data for Unit 23 show no trend in the sex ratio 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 the department at the time of sealing. Continuing the tag fee exemption helps facilitate participation in the associated brown bear harvest programs maintained by the department for subsistence hunts.

In all 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, five bears have been reported harvested during the previous 10-year period and this is less than one percent of the total brown bear harvest in the unit. In Unit 23, since 1992 an average of five bears are harvested annually and this is less than ten percent of the total brown bear harvest. In Unit 26A, very few bears are taken annually by subsistence hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The tag fee exemption will lapse and hunters will be required to purchase \$25 tags for general season and subsistence hunts in the 2006-2007 regulatory year. The brown bear harvest will decline.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents who are reluctant or unable to purchase the \$25 tag before hunting will be able to opportunistically and legally harvest a brown bear.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-104)

PROPOSAL 74 – 5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize the current resident tag fee exemptions for general season brown bear in Units 19A, 19D, 20D, 20E (that portion outside of Yukon–Charley Rivers National Preserve), 21B, 21D, 21E, 25C, and 25D; and reauthorize the current subsistence registration permit tag fee exemptions for brown bear in Units 19A and 19B (downstream of and including the Aniak River drainage), 21D, and 24.

5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemptions.

(a) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in the following units:

- ...
- (4) Unit 19(A) and Unit 19(D);
- (5) Unit 20(D);
- (6) Unit 20(E), that portion outside of Yukon–Charley Rivers National Preserve;
- (7) Unit 21(B), Unit 21(D), and Unit 21(E);
- ...
- (10) Unit 25(C) and Unit 25(D).

(b) In addition to the units as specified in (a) of this section, if a hunter obtains a subsistence registration permit before hunting, that hunter is not required to obtain a resident tag to take a brown bear in the following units:

- ...
- (5) Units 19(A) and 19(B), that portion downstream of and including the Aniak River drainage;
- (6) Unit 21(D);
- ...
- (9) Unit 24;
- ...

ISSUE: The board must reauthorize brown bear tag fee exemptions annually or the fee automatically becomes reinstated. We recommend continuing resident tag fee exemptions in Region III for the general season in Units 19A, 19D, 20D, 20E (outside of Yukon–Charley Rivers National Preserve), 21B, 21D, 21E, 25C and 25D and subsistence season hunts in Units 19A and 19B (downstream of and including the Aniak River drainage), 21D, and 24.

General Season Hunts. Annual reauthorizations are needed for:

Unit 19A. The brown bear tag and fee requirement for Unit 19A was eliminated by the Board of Game beginning in regulatory year 2006–2007 (RY06, which begins 1 July 2006 and ends 30 June 2007). Adoption of this proposal was meant to increase brown bear harvest to benefit moose calf survival consistent with the Central Kuskokwim Moose Management Plan. The difficulty in obtaining brown bear tags from area license vendors was also considered when this requirement was waived. The number of bears taken since this requirement was waived is not yet available.

Unit 19D. The brown bear tag and fee requirement for Unit 19D was eliminated by the Board of Game beginning in RY98 to increase the harvest of brown bear to benefit moose calf survival. Calf mortality studies in Unit 19D indicate brown bears are a significant predator on moose calves. Prior to the tag fee exemption, reported harvest of brown bears averaged 2 bears/year for RY91–RY97. Since the exemption was implemented reported harvest increased to an average of 4.5 bears/year for RY98–RY05. The estimated population in Unit 19D is 165 bears (13 bears/1000 mi²), based on extrapolation of estimates obtained in other areas. The tag fee

exemption appears to have increased brown bear harvest, however it is still below levels required to significantly reduce the effect of brown bear predation on moose calf survival.

Unit 20D. The tag fee exemption was implemented in 1995 for portions of Unit 20D primarily to increase the harvest of brown bears to reduce predation on moose and caribou calves. The tag fee exemption was expanded to all of Unit 20D in 2003. Current Unit 20D brown bear hunting regulations include an August 10–June 30 hunting season with a bag limit of 1 bear/year.

The current Unit 20D brown bear harvest objective adopted by the board in March 1995 is 5–15 bears/year. Harvest has increased since the tag fee exemption was first implemented in a portion of Unit 20D in 1995, and mean annual human-caused brown bear mortality from both hunting and nonhunting is within the harvest objective, and has averaged 10 bears/year, since tag fees were eliminated unit wide. Much of the increase was in the southwest portion of 20D where mortality of brown bears killed in defense of life and property and kill of nuisance bears in the vicinity of Delta Junction is significant.

Unit 20E. The current tag fee exemption in Unit 20E, excluding Yukon–Charley Rivers National Preserve, was implemented in RY02 to help reduce the brown bear population because of concern about bear predation on moose calves. The brown bear population in Unit 20E was estimated at 475–550 in 2002. Harvest averaged 15 bears per year during RY92–RY01, prior to the tag fee exemption, and 16 bears during RY02–RY05. Harvest is below a level that would significantly reduce the effect of brown bear predation on moose calf survival.

Unit 21B. The tag fee in Unit 21B was exempted beginning RY04, reinstated in RY05, then exempted again in RY06. This tag fee exemption was intended to increase bear harvest because the bear population is believed to be high and can likely support additional take. Before the tag fee exemption, the ten-year mean reported harvest was 0.4 bears (RY94–RY03). The RY04 harvest was 1 male bear. The RY05 harvest was zero. In combination with Units 21C and 21D, a conservative harvest of 25 bears is likely sustainable. Demand for brown bears is low. Hunting success is also low due to dense forested habitat in most of the area.

Unit 21D. The tag fee in Unit 21D has been exempted since RY04. This tag fee exemption is desired to allow an increase in harvest because the bear population can likely support additional take. Before the tag fee exemption, the five-year mean reported harvest was 5.6 bears (RY99–RY03) and the sex ratio of the harvest was 79 percent males:21 percent females. Although the RY04 harvest was only 2 male bears, the spring 2005 was 5 bears (60 percent males). A conservative harvest of 23 bears is likely sustainable. Demand for brown bears is low. Hunting success is also low due to dense forested habitat in most of the area.

Unit 21E. The brown bear tag and fee requirement for Unit 21E was eliminated by the Board of Game beginning in RY06 to increase the harvest of brown bear to benefit moose calf survival consistent with the Yukon–Innoko Moose Management Plan. The difficulty in obtaining brown bear tags from area license vendors was also considered when this requirement was waived. The number of bears taken since this requirement was waived is not yet available.

Unit 25C. The Unit 25C brown bear tag and fee requirement was eliminated by the board beginning in RY06 to increase the harvest of brown bear to benefit calf survival of the Fortymile caribou herd. Mean harvest RY01 through RY05 was four bears with 68 percent being males. The estimated allowable harvest for Unit 25C is 6 bears with a minimum of 55 percent males. The number of bears taken since this requirement was waived is not yet available.

Unit 25D. The Unit 25D brown bear tag and fee requirement was eliminated by the board beginning in RY98. The board has identified the moose population in Unit 25D as important for providing high levels of human consumption. The tag fee exemption was intended to increase harvest reporting and to increase harvest of brown bear to benefit moose calf and adult survival. Prior to the exemption, relatively few local residents purchased a tag because they generally do not hunt specifically for brown bears. However, some brown bears are taken incidental to encounters in or near communities or fishing and hunting camps. Calf mortality studies in interior Alaska, including Unit 25D, indicate brown bears are often an important predator on moose calves. Prior to the tag fee exemption, annual reported harvest was 0–5 bears. During RY98–RY05, annual reported harvest was 0–10 bears. The tag fee exemption appears to have increased reporting and may have increased the harvest. Unreported harvest is probably higher than reported, but total harvest is likely below a level that would significantly reduce the effect of brown bear predation on moose calf survival.

Subsistence Hunts. Annual reauthorizations are needed for:

Units 19A and 19B, that portion downstream of and including the Aniak River drainage and Units 21D and 24. In these units, this tag fee exemption is part of a registration permit hunt created after the Western Alaska Brown Bear Management Area was eliminated in RY04 to continue to allow subsistence use of brown bears for food. Twelve permits were issued in RY05 and in RY06. No bears were reported harvested in Units 19A and 19B, and two bears were reported taken in Unit 24. Harvest rates are low, are well within sustained yield limits, and exempting the resident tag fee has not caused an increase in subsistence take, and allows residents to continue to follow traditional beliefs regarding proper treatment of bear skulls that are inconsistent with our normal sealing requirements.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Additional brown bear harvest for the benefit of moose and caribou calf survival will not occur and subsistence users will find it more difficult to harvest bears for food.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents who are reluctant or unable to purchase the \$25 tag before hunting will be able to opportunistically and legally harvest a brown bear.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who feel brown bears should not be harvested to benefit moose and caribou calf survival or to provide food for subsistence hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-128)

PROPOSAL 75- 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Amend the regulation as follows:

In Unit 7: North of the Sterling Highway and west of the Seward Highway,
One caribou.....August 10 – [DECEMBER 31] **September 20.**

Or one bull by registration permit available in Anchorage, Soldotna, or Homer beginning October 3. Season:..... October 20 – November 30.

ISSUE: Because the drawing permit system limits the number of hunters, the number of available permits should be maximized. This proposal will increase the amount of permits available. The late registration hunt offers other hunters the opportunity who were not successful in the drawing hunt process. This is similar to what is now offered for most goat hunts. It would be up to the discretion of the area biologist to determine the number of new registration hunts offered.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All caribou hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who waited until December to hunt. It should be noted that the Chugach National Forest Service is in the process of establishing a “Kenai Winter Access Draft EIS” that may affect access in the region of the hunts for motorized use (snow-machine). The Forest Service “preferred alternative” establishes a “season on/season off (no motorized use) alternating year use. Offering hunts in December may not be reasonable and historically has not been very productive.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Offer an additional bow and arrow only drawing hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Cooper Landing Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-047)

PROPOSAL 76 --5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou, and 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Amend the regulations to provide the following:

Change hunting regulations for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd in Units 9A, 9B, that portion of 9C within the Alagnak River drainage, and 17. Under this proposal, bag limits would be reduced to one caribou per regulatory year, with bulls only prior to December 31, and antlerless caribou only after January 1, and same day airborne hunting would no longer be allowed in Units 9B, 17B, and 17C.

5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. (a) ...

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
Unit 9(A) and that portion of Unit 9 (C) within the Alagnak River drainage		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: <u>1 bull; or</u>	Aug. 1 – <u>Dec. 31</u> [MAR. 31]	
<u>1 antlerless</u> caribou	<u>Jan 1 – Mar 15</u>	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull		<u>Aug. 15 – Sept. 30</u> [AUG 1 – MAR 31]
Unit 9(B)		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: <u>1 bull; or</u>	Aug. 1 – <u>Dec. 31</u> [Mar. 15]	
<u>1 antlerless caribou</u> [3 CARIBOU; HOWEVER, NO MORE THAN 1 CARIBOU MAY BE TAKEN FROM AUG. 1 THROUGH NOV. 30]	<u>Jan 1 – Mar 15</u>	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 <u>bull</u> [CARIBOU]		<u>Aug. 15 – Sept. 30</u> [AUG 1 – Sept. 30]
...		
Remainder of Unit 17(A)		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: <u>1 bull; or</u>	Aug. 1 – <u>Dec. 31</u> [Mar. 15]	
<u>1 antlerless caribou</u> [3 CARIBOU; HOWEVER, NO MORE THAN 1 CARIBOU MAY BE TAKEN FROM AUG. 1 THROUGH NOV. 30]	<u>Jan 1 – Mar 15</u>	

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season

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

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull; or

Aug. 1 – **Dec. 31**
[Mar. 15]

1 antlerless caribou

Jan 1 – Mar 15

[3 CARIBOU;
HOWEVER, NO MORE
THAN 1 CARIBOU
MAY BE TAKEN FROM
AUG. 1 THROUGH NOV. 30]

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

No open season.

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

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull; or

Aug. 1 – **Dec. 31**
[Mar. 15]

1 antlerless caribou

Jan 1 – Mar 15

[3 CARIBOU;
HOWEVER, NO MORE
THAN 1 CARIBOU
MAY BE TAKEN FROM
AUG. 1 THROUGH NOV. 30]

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 **bull** [CARIBOU]

Aug. 15 – Sept. 30
[AUG 1 – Sept 30]

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

...

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

...

(D) taking caribou [FROM JANUARY 1 THROUGH MARCH 15, IN UNITS 9(B), 17(B), AND THAT PORTION OF 17(C) EAST OF THE NUSHAGAK RIVER, AND] 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; or

...

ISSUE: Recent surveys of the Mulchatna caribou herd indicate that the population has continued to decline and is well below management objectives. In March 2005 the board of Game reduced hunting opportunities throughout the range of the Mulchatna caribou herd upon recommendations by the department because of the continued decline in this population. The department had not completed an aerial census prior to that meeting and was unaware of the magnitude of the decline. Photos from the 2006 census are still being counted and the preliminary estimate is now less than 50,000 animals. The department feels that it is important to further reduce the take of female caribou. The board will also need to consider whether the adjusted seasons provide reasonable opportunity for subsistence harvest.

When the Mulchatna caribou herd was above objectives (note: the early objectives were for 25,000 caribou and 35 bulls:100 cows) and growing the board approved liberal bag limits and long seasons to allow hunters the opportunity to take surplus animals. On January 13, 1995 same day airborne take of caribou was allowed. The ability to take caribou Same Day Airborne should be removed since surplus animals are no longer available.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The herd would continue to decline. By applying this conservative management strategy the Department hopes the decline will not be as great and that hunting opportunity will be maintained as much as possible.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters should benefit over the long term if these regulatory changes succeed to reduce or stop the decline of this herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Resident hunters from southcentral Alaska will likely feel the effects of the proposed changes through reduced opportunity.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? More severe cuts to seasons or even closures were considered, however the Department feels these were not necessary now.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-92)

PROPOSAL 77 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou.

Amend the regulation as follows:

Shorten the caribou seasons for nonresidents in Units 9B and 17B from August 1 – September 30 to September 1 – September 30.

ISSUE: It is difficult for locals to harvest caribou in 9B from August 1 until freeze up because of the hunting pressure in the Nushagak Hills (17B) when caribou are migrating south.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Locals will continue to have difficulty harvesting caribou during the fall.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Randy Alvarez (HQ-07S-G-009)

PROPOSAL 78 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Amend the regulation as follows:

One caribou bull for resident or nonresident hunters from August 15 to September 15 in Units 9B and 17B. After September 15, resident hunters may harvest five cow caribou, nonresident hunters one cow caribou.

ISSUE: Too many caribou bulls are being taken out of what remains of the Mulchatna caribou herd.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The big bull population has already been decimated, it will only get worse. There are too many bulls being taken.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it gives the bigger bulls a chance to live and breed, producing more big bulls.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters should benefit eventually, as bigger bulls should be produced.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides, air taxis will loose business and nonresident hunters will not be able to shoot bulls.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close to nonresident hunters completely.

PROPOSED BY: Sean Montgomery and George Hornberger (HQ-07S-G-131)

PROPOSAL 79 - 5AAC 85.025(4). Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou.

This proposal establishes a Tier I registration hunt for residents, restricts the harvest to bulls, and eliminates the nonresidents season in Unit 9D.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open season
	(4)	
Unit 9(D)		

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull[; OR

Aug. 10-Sept. 30

1 ANTLERLESS CARIBOU]

Nov. 15-Mar. 31

by registration permit

only

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

[1 BULL]

No open season

[SEPT. 1-SEPT. 30

(ODD YEARS ONLY)

SEPT. 1-OCT. 10

(EVEN YEARS ONLY)]

ISSUE: The Southern Alaska Peninsula caribou (SAP) herd in Unit 9D has continued to decline from a recent peak of 4,100 caribou in 2002. During the winter of 2005, US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) biologists counted 1,651 caribou. The decline of the population is attributed to low calf recruitment observed in Unit 9D over the past five years (16, 8, 7, 6 and 1 calves: 100 cows in the fall of 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006 respectively). This proposal establishes a Tier I registration hunt for residents, restricts the harvest to bulls, and eliminates the nonresidents season in Unit 9D.

A cooperative, interagency (ADF&G and FWS) management plan was adopted in April 1994 for the SAP herd and Unimak caribou herd. This plan has the following population and management objectives:

1. Sustain a combined population size of 4000–5000 animals
2. Maintain a fall bull:cow ratio of 20–40:100
3. Discontinue harvest when the herds are below 2500 animals
4. Provide limited harvest of bulls when the herds exceeds 2500 animals as long as there are at least 20 bulls:100 cows
5. Phase in cow harvests when the populations reach 3500. If the populations reach 4000, harvests will be increased to prevent further growth.

The FWS – Izembek National Wildlife Refuge staff coordinate the annual population trend surveys and ADF&G follow-up with sex and age composition surveys. The combined population size of the SAP herd and the Unimak caribou herds is 2,660 according to FWS counts. Based on the current management plan a complete hunting closure will be triggered if the combined population sizes fall below 2,500 caribou. Both FWS and ADF&G are working on new management plans that separate the SAP herd from the Unimak herds and sets individual objectives. This proposal provides recommendations based on objectives from both versions.

Low calf recruitment over the past five years has been insufficient to offset adult mortality and has likely altered the population age structure sufficiently to prolong recovery of this herd. Survey results suggests a declining trend in the bull/cow ratio, but require additional surveys to confirm the current ratio. The significant reduction in the harvestable surplus make it necessary to restrict hunting opportunity and remove all potential for cow harvest. Elimination of the non-resident season and the establishment of a Tier I registration hunt will provide Alaskan residents the limited opportunity provided by this herd.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the population continues to decline, further restrictions in seasons and bag limits will be required, resulting in a loss of caribou hunting opportunity in Unit 9D for residents and nonresidents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskan Residents

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident Hunters

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Replace the one bull bag limit with one bull in the fall season and one antlerless caribou during the late winter. The intent of both options is to focus harvest on bulls however the preferred option was based on local public input.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and US Fish and Wildlife Service – Izembek National Wildlife (HQ-07S-G-91)

PROPOSAL 80 - 5 AAC 92.085(8)(D). Unlawful methods of taking big game; exception.

Amend the regulation as follows:

No same day airborne hunting of caribou at any time in Units 9B and 17B.

ISSUE: Same day airborne hunting of caribou in Units 9B and 17B.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Same day airborne hunters will continue to slaughter all small bands of caribou that are left in 9B and 17B. Pretty soon they will all be gone.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The caribou will be able to regenerate their herds with so many of them not being killed.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The caribou population will benefit since there won't be people in airplanes landing and slaughtering them.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer. Same day airborne hunters can pitch a tent like the rest of us do.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There are no other solutions, same day airborne hunting must end now.

PROPOSED BY: John Adcox, Sean Montgomery and George Hornberger (HQ-07S-G-0130)

PROPOSAL 81 - 5 AAC 85.025 Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Amend the regulation as follows:

Unit 10 Aleutian Islands:

Adak: Six cow caribou every regulatory year – no closed season.

One bull caribou every regulatory year – September 10 – December 31.

ISSUE: Adak's caribou were introduced to the island in the 1950's. There are no predatory animals on Adak. Up until the Navy base closed in the 1990's the caribou population was kept in check by the rather large population of military personnel based on Adak. After the base

closed the caribou population rapidly increased from several hundred animals in the late 80's to approximately 3000 animals as of August 2005, (USFWS helicopter survey).

Hunter access to Adak was very limited from the time the base closed until April 2004, at which time Alaska Airlines began regularly scheduled flight to Adak twice a week. Adak has now been discovered by sport hunters. I began guiding caribou hunters on Adak in the fall of 2005. Through 2005, Adak saw probably no more than a few dozen off-island hunters a year, and consequently the trophy quality of the caribou on Adak was very good. It is important to keep in mind that it is the unique trophy potential that draws hunters all the way to Adak.

The past year (2006) Adak saw a huge increase in the number of off-island hunters, and the local resident population has increased substantially resulting in more local hunting pressure. I know of at least 170 hunters (almost all non-resident) who utilized the commercial services of either a guide or a transporter. There were probably at least an equal number of hunters who went to Adak to hunt on their own, not using any commercial service providers. I estimate that roughly 300 hunters went to Adak this year to hunt caribou. This number does not include local hunters from Adak. This is a ratio of about one hunter per 10 caribou; I would guess that is probably the highest ratio of hunters to caribou anywhere in Alaska. In addition, Adak is a geographically small area which makes it easy to locate the caribou.

The challenge with managing Adak's caribou is to encourage, and possibly increase the harvest of cows, while at the same time limiting the harvest of bulls in order to maintain the great trophy potential that Adak possesses. If the trophy quality is not available then hunters will not have the incentive to go through the trouble of traveling all the way to Adak to hunt caribou, thereby resulting in an even greater and damaging caribou population increase.

It would also be beneficial if the non-resident tag requirement for the harvest of cow caribou was removed provided that the hunter had acquired a tag for the taking of a bull. However, it is my understanding the board does not have the authority to waive the tag requirement, but that will have to be done by the legislature. Perhaps this issue could be pursued further.

It might be successfully argued that there could be no bag limit on the number of cows taken. However, I have seen that a no bag limit regulation has created an attitude among many people that results in wanton waste. Some people think that no bag limit indicates that the state and other authorities do not really have an interest in these caribou. This line of thinking leads to a lackadaisical attitude towards the resource that causes many people to salvage just the back straps and quarters. (at best).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Overall health of the caribou population, trophy hunters, meat hunters, local services, guides and transporters, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game by non-resident license and tag revenue.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who are currently committing wanton waste of caribou, illegal, unlicensed guides, transporters, "consultants" who are exploiting Adak's trophy reputation for their short-term economic gain. I met one such outfit from Utah that was

operating on Adak this past July and August, who by their own admission had “booked” 48 hunters. They had no licenses of any kind whatsoever.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Mark Wagner (HQ-07S-G-040)

PROPOSAL 82 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou.

Amend the regulation as follows:

The Tier II hunt in Unit 13 should be a drawing permit hunt and no longer a Tier II drawing system or issue.

ISSUE: The Tier II (TC566) subsistence system has outlived its purpose. Many of the Tier II hunters, who commonly use expensive motor homes, ATVs, 4x4s, etc. to hunt, should not be considered as subsistence hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The system will continue to be abused. People not really needing a caribou to live on still get that privilege; other hunters will have no hunt opportunity.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Caribou hunters statewide who would have a chance to receive a permit and hunt in Unit 13.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A handful of true subsistence hunters who may not be successful in a drawing for permits.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Ken Weimer (HQ-07S-G-023)

PROPOSAL 83 - 5 AAC 85.025(a). Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou; and 5 AAC 85.045(a). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend these regulations to provide the following:

Create seasons and bag limits for moose and caribou in Unit 13 under a community harvest permit. This is a housekeeping proposal as a result of Board of Game action that established a community harvest area.

5 AAC 85.025 (a) Hunting seasons and bag limits for Caribou

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(8) Unit 13 1 caribou per regulatory year by Tier II permit only; up to 10,000 permits may be issued; the commissioner shall close the season by emergency order when up to 5,000 caribou have been taken by Tier II hunters, <u>or</u>	Aug. 10-Sept. 20 (Subsistence hunt only) Oct. 21-Mar. 31 (Subsistence hunt only)	No open season.
<u>1 caribou per community harvest report by community harvest permit</u>	<u>Aug. 10 – Sept. 20 (Subsistence hunt only)</u> <u>Oct. 21 – Mar. 31 (Subsistence hunt only)</u>	

5 AAC 85.045 (a) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(11) Unit 13 1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 bull by Tier II subsistence hunting permit; up to 150 permits be issued; <u>or</u>	Aug. 15-Aug. 31 (Subsistence hunt only)	No open season.
<u>1 bull per community harvest report by community harvest permit; or</u>	<u>Aug. 15 – Aug. 31 (Subsistence hunt only)</u>	
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more	Sept. 1-Sept. 20	No open season.

brow tines on one side; or

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side per community harvest report by community harvest permit

Sept. 1 – Sept. 20 (General hunt only)

...

ISSUE: At the October 2006 Board of Game meeting, Unit 13 was established as a community harvest area to recognize traditional community harvest patterns for moose and caribou. Traditional patterns often included a few hunters harvesting for many people. This regulation would provide for that opportunity.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People who wish to have an animal harvested for them, but do not qualify under proxy requirements.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents who do not generally hunt, or cannot hunt due to disabilities, who utilize wild game meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-093)

PROPOSAL 84 - 5 AAC 92.011 Taking of game by proxy. Amend this regulation to provide the following.

Family members may proxy hunt for beneficiaries with Unit 13 Tier II caribou permits.

ISSUE: Only Tier II caribou permit holders may hunt by proxy for other Tier II permit holders discriminating against families whose elders are the only ones who receive the permits. They may have no one to hunt for them.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Loss of tradition and culture and passing on knowledge and skills through direct practice and sharing.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Family members take better care of the meat than non-family members.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskan hunters and families with time honored traditions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: J. Marie Gore

(SC-07S-G-033)

This proposal was approved by the board at the March 2006 meeting.

PROPOSAL 85 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Increase the nonresident bag limit for caribou in Unit 23, the Western Arctic Herd:

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

(18)

Unit 23

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

5 caribou per day; however, cow caribou may not be taken
May 16-June 30

July 1-June 30

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

2 [1] caribou; however, cow caribou may not be taken May 16-June 30

July 1-June 30

ISSUE: The nonresident bag limit for caribou was decreased from five caribou to one by the Board of Game at the March 2006 meeting as part of an effort to address user conflicts and crowding issues in Unit 23. In addition to the decrease in bag limit, the board requested increased law enforcement by the Department of Public Safety and imposed stricter salvage and hunter education requirements for all hunters. During testimony at the May 2006 meeting, the board heard guide and transporter concerns that the bag limit reduction would greatly impact existing bookings, and the board provided one additional year with a bag limit of two caribou. Recent reports by the both the Department of Fish and Game and the Public Safety have indicated that the board's changes have positively impacted this past hunting season. The board requested a proposal be submitted for the March 2007 to consider whether further adjustments to the bag limit if necessary.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nonresident hunters may be diverted to other areas of the state to hunt caribou which may have a negative impact on other, smaller caribou herds and create crowding issues in those areas.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS

PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Hunters will have received additional education on local issues.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nonresident hunters, and the guiding and transporting industry.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Provided that continued enforcement, hunter education and salvage requirements are maintained, no one should suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Maintain the status quo

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Board of Game (HQ-07S-G-079)

PROPOSAL 86 - 5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer. Amend this regulation as follows:

Allow the harvest of one deer per year for nonresidents in Unit 6D (Prince William Sound.)

ISSUE: Increasing pressure from nonresident hunters and non-regulated transporters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Local hunters will have a harder time meeting their subsistence needs.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents of Prince William Sound.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Transporters who cater to nonresidents.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The committee discussed the proposal, eliminating nonresident hunters altogether, and petitioning the Federal Subsistence Board for a deer hunt for rural residents only. We decided this approach was the appropriate one at this time. Understanding there are some local guides/transporters who work well with the communities of P.W.S. and this would allow them to continue to maintain those relationships. This proposal would eliminate major competition for deer as a major subsistence food source for local residents. Small skffs are the major mode of transportation, and depending on weather, sometimes cannot travel great distances to harvest deer. This proposal will allow more area with less competition for local hunters.

PROPOSED BY: Copper River / Prince William Sound Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-014)

PROPOSAL 87 – 5 AAC 92.010 (f). Harvest tickets and reports. Amend this regulation as follows:

- (f) For deer, a person may not hunt deer, except in a permit hunt, unless the person has in possession a deer harvest ticket. In Units 1 – [5] **6, and 8** a person must
- (1) have in possession that person's unused deer harvest tickets while hunting deer; and
 - (2) validate the deer harvest tickets in sequential order, beginning with harvest ticket number one.

ISSUE: The board requires deer hunters in Units 1-5 to carry unused deer harvest tickets when hunting and to validate harvest tickets in sequential order. This regulation should also include Units 6 and 8 for consistency and to facilitate enforcement of deer harvest limits in Prince William Sound and Kodiak.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Units 6 and 8 will not be consistent with Southeast Alaska and enforcement of harvest limits of deer will be impaired in Prince William Sound and Kodiak Island.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone as deer harvest limits will be more readily enforceable in Prince William Sound and Kodiak, and the deer harvest ticket regulations will be consistent in all areas open to deer hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Leave Units 6 and 8 inconsistent with other deer hunting areas in the state and allow a diminished enforcement capability for deer harvest limits in Prince William Sound and Kodiak to remain.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Public Safety and Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-099)

PROPOSAL 88 - 5 AAC 85.035. Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk.

Amend the regulation as follows:

Harvest only spike or five point and larger elk in Unit 8.

ISSUE: Antler size on bull elk on Raspberry and Afognak Islands.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Decreased herd size.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. There should be a better breeding stock, improved herd size and it will create a trophy bull resource, drawing non-resident and resident hunters from all over.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There could be a slight time lag in harvesting bulls with the permits as issued but the overall benefits will increase quality breeding bulls, herd size and all hunters plus and economic benefit to Alaska.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lee Robbins (HQ-07S-G-030)

PROPOSAL 89 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.

Amend the regulation as follows:

Add to the current regulations for Units 1-5 and Unit 6D so that the new regulation would read “no shooting big game from boats in Units 1-5 or shooting deer/bear from boats in Unit 6D unless you have obtained a disabilities permit.”

ISSUE: Shooting deer from boats in Unit 6D western Prince William Sound.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Deer populations will decline due to increased hunting pressure during the time deer are herded up on beaches after heavy snow.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It will reduce the amount of deer killed from beaches during the late season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All fair chase hunters and hunters that hunt the early part of the season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Looked at reducing bag limits, but the real solution is curtail shooting deer from boats in the late season when the deer are herded up on the beaches during heavy snow.

PROPOSED BY: Mike Dehlbom (HQ-07S-G-036)

PROPOSAL 90 - 5 AAC 85.035. Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk and 92.085.

Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Amend the regulations as follows:

Unit 8, Kodiak Island: Harvest ticket is required, no closed season, no bag limit, same day airborne hunting allowed.

Note: This proposed regulation is identical to a current regulation pertaining to hunting of caribou (feral reindeer) in Unit 8.

ISSUE: The current regulation for harvest of nonnative wild elk on Kodiak Island affords a recreational sport hunter an opportunity to harvest on animal between October 23 and November 30. Because this regulation restricts the timing and amount of potential elk harvest, it (and other factors discussed below) facilitates survival of elk that immigrate to Kodiak Island from nearby Afognak and Raspberry Islands. As a result, a self-sustaining elk population will eventually establish, increase, and disperse throughout Kodiak Island. In our opinion, such an outcome should be prevented to conserve Kodiak brown bear and other wildlife and habitat resources on Kodiak Island including Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge. Therefore the current regulation pertaining to elk harvest should be revised to maximize elk hunting opportunity on Kodiak Island and thereby minimize the possibility of elk colonization.

Current distribution of wild elk in the Kodiak Archipelago includes Afognak, Raspberry, and possibly, Kodiak Island. Archipelago elk populations, totaling about 1,000 animals, have been managed to provide hunting opportunities for many years. Periodically, elk have been observed on northeastern Kodiak Island. All of these animals are thought to have immigrated (via

swimming) from nearby Afognak and Raspberry Islands. Based on the number and frequency of elk sightings, the department concluded that a small elk population had possibly established on northeastern Kodiak Island in recent years (Federal Aid report, Elk, Unit 8, 2001-03). A subsequent department report indicated that more elk showed up on Kodiak Island in 2004 and that hunters harvested two bulls. The department has characterized the likely effect of the current elk hunting regulation on Kodiak Island as follows: "...not [to] encourage expansion of elk range onto Kodiak, but at the same time not prevent it". In contrast, the department apparently supports elimination of caribou (feral reindeer) from Kodiak Island; a hunter can harvest an unlimited number of animals at any time of the year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wild elk would eventually colonize Kodiak Island. Probability of successful colonization would be facilitated by elk dispersal tendencies combined with the island's close proximity to a healthy elk population; the extensive availability of highly suitable, rugged, and remote elk habitat; the low density of the coastally based human population and concentration of fall hunting activity in uplands adjacent to the coast; and current restrictions on recreational sport hunting of elk. Under this regulation, hunters would harvest a few elk that immigrated to northeastern Kodiak Island where most people live and where bear hunting activity is concentrated. If the elk occurred in a group, as is often the case, some animals would be harvested but some would not due to restrictions on season and bag limit. Elk that immigrated outside of the current 39-day fall hunting season would disperse to more remote regions of the island, dramatically increasing the probability that they would elude people, including hunters, for years. Consequently, most elk that immigrated to Kodiak Island would survive and thrive.

Colonization of Kodiak Refuge by elk would run counter to refuge purposes and Fish and Wildlife Service policy. Specifically, the refuge was established to conserve wildlife populations and habitats in their natural diversity. Policy, which is based on the Refuge Improvement Act of 1997, dictates that refuges will not willingly allow or promote new introductions of nonnative plants and animals. Because elk are nonnative, their establishment on the refuge would be incompatible with refuge purposes and inconsistent with Service policy. As the elk population increased, the potential for conflict with refuge purposes and Service policy would increase; quality of bear habitat would diminish due to elk usage; and some bears would be routinely killed by elk hunters in defense-of-life-or-property incidents. For details on these concerns see the discussion below.

As and elk population expanded on Kodiak Island, it would be increasingly valued as a public hunting resource. Correspondingly, hunter-bear conflicts would increase, primarily because some hunters may contest Kodiak brown bears that lay claim on a harvested elk or elk meat cached near their camps. Such confrontations are a primary cause of defense-of-life-or-property (DLP) bear kills in the Kodiak Archipelago. For example, of the 25 DLP bear kills recorded on Afognak Island between 1980-2000, 17 were hunter-related and five of these involved elk hunters. The DLP rate associated with elk hunting on Kodiak Island would eventually exceed the rate of Afognak Island because it supports a higher bear density and, consequently, a higher potential for hunter-bear confrontation.

Sustained extensive browsing by a large population of nonnative elk would reduce the availability of berry-producing shrubs essential to the welfare of Kodiak brown bear (e.g., red elderberry, salmonberry). The relative importance of these shrubs is indicated by the consistent and prominent influence their berries exert on the seasonal foraging behavior and distribution of bears.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS

PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Adoption of this proposal would prevent colonization of elk on Kodiak Island including Kodiak Refuge. Prevention would maintain the integrity of native habitats and populations of wildlife such as Kodiak brown bear. Specifically, elk would not adversely affect Kodiak brown bear by competing with them for preferred forage, and no bears would be killed in DLP incidents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident of the Kodiak Archipelago, Alaskans, and the American public. All of these groups have a stake because of the values they derive from current elk-free resources on Kodiak Island, and because a combination of state and federal public land dominate the island area. Prevention of elk colonization on Kodiak Island is not only consistent with sound, science-based policy; it also meets obligations for wise management of wildlife and land resources held in the public trust.

Implementation of this proposal would benefit management of public wildlife and habitat resources on Kodiak Refuge. Specifically, the Fish and Wildlife Service would not have to concern itself with compatibility and consistency issues associated with elk colonization. Instead, the Service and the Department could continue to focus their limited resources on maintaining highly productive habitats, as well as healthy populations of Kodiak brown bear and other wildlife, on Kodiak Refuge.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some elk hunters who advocate expansion of elk range, population, and hunting opportunities. Unfortunately, successful colonization of Kodiak Island by elk would result in unacceptable tradeoffs including, ultimately, reductions in bear hunting opportunities. Such reductions would occur when elk competition diminished the quality and availability of forage resources available to bear, and when bear harvest quota was reduced to offset DLP bear kills associated with elk hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? One option considered would have the resource agencies, not hunters, responsible for killing any wild elk that showed up on Kodiak Island. Provided additional funds, the department and its cooperators, such as the Fish and Wildlife Service, could conduct routine surveillance missions. Any elk observed would be killed by means of ground or aircraft-based shooting by appropriately qualified personnel. This option was rejected because the public would view it as unacceptable, especially when a more reasonable option was available. Specifically, a prevention objective could be achieved by the public (hunters) for the agencies, as stated in this proposal. State agencies consistently and effectively use public hunting as a primary tool in support of wildlife population management on private and public lands throughout the United States. Moreover, public hunting would be the most cost-efficient means to accomplish a prevention objective, mainly because costs would be borne by many private hunters instead of the government agencies.

PROPOSED BY: Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (HQ-07S-G-140)

PROPOSAL 91 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Amend the regulation as follows:

In Unit 8, make the Kodiak goat registration permits (RG 471-479) available in Kodiak and Anchorage during the open season.

ISSUE: The goat population on Kodiak is very large and growing and some Alaska residents are being excluded.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaska residents living in areas other than Kodiak will continue to be excluded from obtaining a tag without spending a lot of time and money going to the island before the season.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaskans who do not live on remote Kodiak.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Residents of Kodiak villages may encounter more competition on goat hunts.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Make all Kodiak goat hunts registration permits.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-064)

PROPOSAL 92 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat.

Amend the regulation as follows:

Allow hunting for mountain goat on Broward Ridge in Unit 6A, with a quota of five.

ISSUE: Increase mountain goat hunting opportunity where the population is thriving.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Abundant resource is not being utilized.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It will provide statistical information.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Mountain goat hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Youth hunt.

PROPOSED BY: James Howell (HQ-07S-G-002)

PROPOSAL 93 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Amend the regulation as follows:

Change the bag limit for mountain goats on the Kenai Peninsula (Units 7 and 15) to one billy every year or one nanny every three regulatory years.

ISSUE: In 2006, no registration hunts for mountain goats opened on the Kenai Peninsula for the first time in over 20 years. The taking of female mountain goats decreases the hunt quota twice as much as the taking of a male goat. There would be more hunting opportunity through greater drawing and registration permits, if the proportion of nannies in the harvest decreased.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The status quo would guarantee decreasing hunting opportunities for goats on the Kenai Peninsula. The Kenai goat population is decreasing. Even though the proportion of females in the harvest is less than the male proportion, the female harvest influences the quota more than the male harvest because each female counts as two goats in calculation the harvest quota. The permit allocation will continue to decrease if nothing is done.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Forcing hunters to educate themselves on distinguishing the sex of a goat by having a more restrictive bag limit for females will ultimately help the resource. Mountain goats have the slowest reproductive rate of all Alaskan ungulates yet they are the only ungulate that does not have some level of hunt restriction on females. Fewer females taken will not only increase permit numbers and allow more registration hunts to open, but it also reduces the chance of negatively impacting small populations` by focusing hunting pressure on males. Taking even a few adult females from small populations can be unstable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All those who want additional opportunity to hunt goats and wish to maximize herd productivity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who do not educate themselves on distinguishing the sex of a goat before they hunt. Many Southcentral residents hunt goats every year through registration hunts. These hunters may loose opportunities to hunt every year if they take a nanny.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? If a hunter takes a nanny, they are unable to apply for another drawing/registration permit for three years. Although the department could devise a way to monitor this with time, the bag limit change would require less department staff time to monitor.

PROPOSED BY: Dave Lyon (HQ-07S-G-051)

PROPOSAL 94 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting Seasons and bag limits for goat. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Change the goat season in Unit 13D to September 1 through September 30.

ISSUE: The current hunt takes place August 19 to September 20. Goat hides during this time period are of poor quality due to the summer weather.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to harvest goats with poor quality hides.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, a later hunting period would allow goats to increase fur quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Goat hunters

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Matching the hunting season with Unit 6D. Weather north of Thompson Pass becomes very poor after September.

PROPOSED BY: David Armstrong (SC-07S-G-009)

PROPOSAL 95 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limit for goat. Amend the regulation as follows:

Create a separate hunt (RG 580) to include the area of 13D south of the Uranatina River, east of a line running from the south fork of the Uranatina River thru the pass along the eastern most tributary on the north side of the Tiekel River, up the second eastern most tributary on the south side of the Tiekel River, extending to the Chugach National Forest boundary and along this line to the Unit 13 boundary. This area is currently included in DG719.

Unit 13D: One goat by drawing permitAugust 10 – September 20.
One goat by registration permit.....August 10 – October 31.
Remainder of Unit 13:.....No open season.

ISSUE: This area of Unit 13D has had little if any harvest in the last ten years of goats under the current draw tag (DG719) although there is a very healthy population. This area is very difficult to access. The terrain and weather is some of the worst in Alaska. This area is below Wood Canyon on the Copper River. The rest of the draw area is much easier to access by the Richardson Highway, airstrips in the Chugach Range and Klutina Road and Lake. This area would be able to sustain a reasonable harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Brave souls willing to navigate the Copper River south of Wood Canyon and climb thousands of vertical feet through dense alder jungle will continue to be neglected the opportunity to easily obtain a tag to hunt this under utilized resource.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the resource will be harvested unlike the current situation where there is virtually no harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone willing to make an effort to hunt in this harsh environment.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Third 13D drawing hunt not needed, many people will apply not knowing what they are getting into. Separate registration area. May attract many people to a “new” registration hunt for a few years that will mostly be unsuccessful due to conditions. Status quo – the worst option, the resource will continue to be untapped.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-062)

PROPOSAL 96 - 5 AAC 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures.

Amend the regulation to provide for the following:

In Unit 14C, a registered big game guide or their assistant guide may bring in a client’s license, tags and hunting contract to sign for a pick up of the hunter’s registration permit from a department office. The guide shoulders the responsibility of relaying the applicable rules and restrictions to the client, as the guide is already responsible to see that the hunt is carried out in a legal and ethical manor.

ISSUE: Goat hunters for Unit 14C have to personally pick up a registration permit at the department office before the hunt. If the hunt opens on a Monday or Tuesday (or Wednesday as it follows Labor Day Holiday) out of state hunters have to fly in by Thursday night/Friday morning to get their permits, up to five or six days before the season. We attempt to fly the goat hunters into the field at least two days before the season begins to take advantage of weather, as that time of year has a lot of VFR conditions.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Out of state hunters will often have to arrive way before time to fly into the hunt in order to secure their registration permit; and the guide must be available early to assist, house and feed the client.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposed regulation change would have no effect on the quality of the resource harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All guided goat hunters in 14C.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The regulation should have no adverse effects.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Permits could be made available on line, as in other hunts, but the applicable hunt restrictions/regulations would not be signed for.

PROPOSED BY: Loren J. Karro (HQ-07S-G-061)

PROPOSAL 97 5 AAC 85.040(7). Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Replace three registration hunts with three drawing hunts, while retaining the ability to hold short registration hunts if warranted, and establish an early-season, archery-only registration hunt for goats in Unit 14(C).

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(7)		
...		
Unit 14(A)	Sept. 1—Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1—Oct. 31
1 goat by drawing [REGISTRATION] permit		

only; **up to 50 permits may be issued**; the taking of nannies with kids is prohibited

Unit 14(C)[, EAST FORK OF THE EKLUTNA RIVER DRAINAGE, EAGLE RIVER DRAINAGE, BIRD CREEK DRAINAGE, AND GLACIER CREEK DRAINAGE]

1 goat by drawing permit only; up to **150** [40] permits may be issued; the taking of nannies with kids is prohibited; **or**

Sept. 1—Oct. 31
[DAY AFTER LABOR DAY—OCT. 15]
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1—Oct. 31
[DAY AFTER LABOR DAY—OCT. 15]

[REMAINDER OF UNIT 14(C)]

1 goat by registration permit only; however, goats may be taken from **Aug. 16** [OCT.] through **Aug. 31** [OCT.] by bow and arrow only; the taking of nannies with kids is prohibited

Aug. 16—Nov. 30
[SEPT. 1—OCT. 31]
(General hunt only)

Aug. 16—Nov. 30
[SEPT. 1—OCT. 31]

ISSUE: The Kenai Peninsula adopted a drawing/registration permit system for goats which entails beginning with a drawing hunt, waiting two weeks after that hunt closes to determine how many goats are still available for harvest, then issuing registration permits to take the remaining harvest quota. This system has made Unit 14 goat hunts more attractive, because anyone can register to hunt, until the harvest quota is met, and guide/outfitters can bring in clients without drawing permits. Consequently, the number of hunters, especially guided hunters, has increased in Unit 14. Harvest quotas are being met and sometimes exceeded well before the season ends. Hunters are complaining that the registration goat hunts have unpredictably short seasons.

In six of the last ten years the number of goats taken in RG 866 has exceeded the harvest quota. There is no limit on the number of registration permits that can be given out and hunters often get registration permits for RG 866 to coincide with their sheep hunt. As a result it is difficult to control the number of hunters in the field and the hunt must be closed relatively early in the season by emergency order because the quota is reached or surpassed so quickly. Changing RG 866 to a draw hunt will reduce the likelihood of the quota being exceeded.

This proposal will radically restructure goat hunting opportunities in Unit 14. First, the three registration hunts currently open to rifle hunting—14A (RG866), Twentymile River (RG868), and Lake George (RG869)—will become drawing hunts. The Unit 14(A) and 14(C) hunts are managed by two area offices; therefore, the number of drawing permits will be determined by individual hunt area with up to 50 permits in Unit 14(A) and up to 150 permits in Unit 14(C). The 150 permits are for all Unit 14(C) goat drawing hunts; however, only about 100 permits will be issued until goat population counts are conducted and drawing hunt success rates are

determined. Second, the existing Unit 14(C) drawing goat hunt season dates will be lengthened slightly to match the new drawing hunts, although drawing hunts in popular hiking areas (e.g., Bird and Glacier Creek drainages) may still open on the day after Labor Day to avoid conflicts with non-hunters. Third, the existing late-season registration archery hunts for goats in Unit 14(C) will be shifted from October 16-31 to August 16-31. Finally, we propose retaining the ability to issue registration goat hunt permits if the drawing permit hunt quota is not met. These permits could be issued after the drawing permit season ends (i.e., November 1-30).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More hunters and guide-outfitters will be attracted to the Unit 14 registration goat hunts, resulting in overcrowding, earlier emergency closures, and hunter dissatisfaction.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Hunters competing for limited quotas in an overcrowded registration permit system are more likely to take long shots. Some hunters prefer to harvest goats in late October and November when their winter pelage is in prime condition.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Archery hunters, who will be able to hunt before rifle hunters with little impact. Hunters who are selected for drawing permits, especially nonresident hunters who will be able to make plans and purchase tickets for a guaranteed hunt. Guide-outfitters, who will be able to schedule goat hunts in Unit 14. Local hunters who are willing to goat hunt at short notice, especially in November, but perhaps in September through October as well. All hunters who desire a more predictable goat hunting season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Goat hunters, especially local hunters, who have been willing and able to hunt early in the season, with the expectation that the hunts would be closed early by emergency order.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Retaining late-season archery hunts; however, these would be pushed back into November, which would greatly limit participation. Eliminating registration hunts; however, these provide more flexibility for managers, allow more goats to be taken when conditions warrant, and favor local hunters, especially if opened at short notice and for relatively short periods.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-94)

PROPOSAL 98 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat: Amend the regulation as follows:

For Unit 14C mountain goat hunting, include the following conditions:

An alternate list would be established that represents the unsuccessful drawing applicants in the order that they were selected in the drawing. If a permit is not utilized through the alternate list it becomes available over the counter through registration after four working days from the time notice was given from the last alternate on a first come first serve basis.

ISSUE: Amend the 14C mountain goat hunting regulations by establishing an alternate list.

Unit 14C mountain goat drawing permits are in high demand and numerous permits don't get used by the successful applicants each year, so these permits don't go unused. An alternate list

needs to be established just like the one that is currently in place for the Kodiak brown bear draw areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Some of these highly prized Unit 14C mountain goat permits will continue to go unused each year.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Having this year requirement in place will help give more hunters an opportunity at this highly sought after resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users that want to hunt mountain goats in Unit 14C

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There are no other solutions I found to consider at this time.

PROPOSED BY: Don Schwandt (HQ-07S-G-074)

PROPOSAL 99 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Amend the regulation as follows:

Abolish the Tier II goat hunts in Unit 15C and make them drawing hunts with the number of permits to be determined by the department.

ISSUE: Reassess the Tier II goat hunts, TG364 and TG365. Few of the permit winners have a historical subsistence use of the area. The area should be open to both residents and non-residents under a drawing permit. Having a block of non-resident permits, like what is done if Kodiak for brown bears would allow the native corporations to work with guides to bring in money to the community by allowing guided hunts on their land as well as selling land access permits to resident hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Individuals without a historic use of the resource will be allowed to hunt the area and other residents and non-residents are unnecessarily excluded.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This would create a more equitable hunt that would support the community and potentially allow for more hunting opportunity and a greater sustainable harvest from this increasing goat population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident and non-resident hunters who would apply for a drawing permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Tier II permit winners who have learned to use the system for their benefit in getting a goat permit.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Have the hunt be managed through a registration where permits can only be picked up at the village where the hunt is (like on Kodiak) or permits

can be picked up at the Homer department office if the hunter shows the proper land access permits.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Coastal Hunters – Charles Paul Brand (HQ-07S-G-047)

PROPOSAL 100 --5 AAC 085.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in Berners Bay.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(1)		
...		
Unit 1(C), Berners Bay drain- Oct.15 ages	Sept. 15–Oct.15 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15–
1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 permits may be issued		
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the board. The Berners Bay strategic moose management plan calls for a post-hunt count of 90 moose, based on the estimated moose carrying capacity of this area. Alaska Department of Fish and Game has been very successful at maintaining this population level through the harvest of both bull and cow moose. Restricting the harvest to bull moose could disrupt this balance.

The number of moose counted during the fall aerial surveys determines the number of drawing permits issued. Aerial counts during 1990–2005 have ranged from a high of 107 moose in 1999 to a low of 59 in 2002. The mean annual count during this period has been 77 moose. During 1998–2006, the number of drawing permits issued by the department for this herd has ranged from ten bull permits and ten antlerless permits to seven bull permits and zero antlerless permits. The average annual harvest of bull moose during this period has been seven, and the cow harvest has been five. There were no antlerless moose permits issued during 2003-2005 due to low moose counts in 2001 and 2002. However, the most recent aerial surveys in fall 2004 and fall 2005 revealed 86 and 92 moose respectively, so we again issued antlerless permits (2) during fall 2006. Although we have the latitude of issuing up to 30 permits, at present we will likely restrict the harvest to 5-10 bulls and 0-7 antlerless moose unless an increasing trend in moose numbers is detected.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population could increase and exceed the carrying capacity of the habitat. The Berners Bay moose harvest will be restricted to bulls thereby limiting opportunity for hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will have more opportunity to hunt moose. The moose population will benefit from either-sex harvests that will balance the herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-107)

PROPOSAL 101 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in the Gustavus area.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(1)		
...		
Unit 1(C), that portion west of Excursion Inlet and north of Icy Passage		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 bull by registration permit only; or	Sept. 15–Oct. 15 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15–Oct. 15
1 antlerless moose	Nov. 10–Dec. 10	Nov. 10–Dec. 10
by drawing permit only; up to 100 permits may be issued	(General hunt only)	

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the board. The Gustavus moose population, Unit 1C, increased rapidly from just a few animals during the 1980’s to a count of 185 animals in 1998, to a subsequent count of 404 animals in 2003. By 2002 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game estimated the winter range moose density at Gustavus exceeded 5 moose per km², with only a small portion of that area being productive winter range as identified by abundant stands of willow. Because of concerns with these high moose numbers, department biologists began conducting spring browse utilization surveys in 1999, and documented 85–95

percent of the current annual growth of willow twigs available to moose had been consumed. This trend has continued to present, and department biologists are convinced this high moose population is not sustainable.

Based on the browse utilization data and overall moose densities at Gustavus, an antlerless hunt was first authorized for the Gustavus area by the board in fall 2000. Since that time, hunters have harvested 10, 30, 54 and 67 cow moose in 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005 respectively. Department biologists have been able to collect rump fat measurements as an index of body condition as well as collect pregnancy and twinning rate data from the reproductive tracts from the majority of the harvested animals. The rump fat index has been very low in comparison to similar measurements taken during early winter from moose in other populations throughout Alaska. In addition, the percent of females that were pregnant and the percent carrying twins was also below that found in many other populations, and below thresholds expected for a healthy moose population. In addition to these data collected from harvested cow moose, capture operations conducted during spring and fall from 2003 through 2006 accounted for approximately 20 cow moose per capture session being measured for rump fat and assessed for pregnancy. The rump fat indices for both pre and post winter were very low in comparison to similar measurements taken from moose in other populations throughout the state.

A cow hunt provides the tool to decrease herd productivity, and hopefully prevent over utilization of critical winter browse and an ultimate decline of the moose herd due to reduction of browse vigor.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population will continue to grow and could exceed the carrying capacity of the habitat, reducing the value of willow browse and leading to a herd decline.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will have more opportunity to hunt moose. The moose population will benefit from either-sex harvests that will balance the sex ratio of the herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-108)

PROPOSAL 102--5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season at Nunatak Bench.

Units and Bag Limits (3)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 5(A), that portion south of Wrangell-Saint Elias National Park, north and east of Russell and Nunatak	Nov. 15 - Feb. 15	Nov. 15 - Feb. 15

Fiords, and east of
the east side of East
Nunatak Glacier to
the Canadian
Border (Nunatak Bench)

1 moose by registration
permit only; up to 5
moose may be taken

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the board. The Nunatak Bench (Unit 5A) hunt area is separated from adjacent moose habitat by fiords and glaciers, allowing for little immigration or emigration by moose. Therefore the department manages this population separately from the remainder of Unit 5A, with a much longer and later running hunting season that spans the period of November 15-February 15. Because of the isolated nature of Nunatak Bench and the limited amount of moose habitat, we have traditionally allowed maximum hunter opportunity through an either sex hunt, thereby aiding in our goal of limiting herd growth to stay within the carrying capacity of this area. The either sex hunt strategy accommodates the timing of this hunt given that much of the hunt period occurs post antler drop making sex differentiation difficult.

The Nunatak Bench strategic moose management plan calls for a post-hunt population of a maximum of 50 moose. During a February 2001 survey 52 moose were counted in this area followed by 25 in December 2003. However, since that time the moose population at Nunatak Bench has declined dramatically, with counts of 14 and 11 moose in 2005 and 2006 respectively. Because of these low survey numbers, the department has closed the hunting season in this area prior to any harvest occurring during the past two years.

During 1997-2004 hunting seasons an average of twelve permits were issued while four persons actually hunted each season. An average of eight days of hunting were expended each year to kill 0-4 moose, with an average annual harvest of about 2 moose. Six cows and nine bulls made up the harvest during this period. Given the low annual harvest in this area it is unlikely the decline in moose numbers is related to the hunt. Rather, it appears to be linked to the flooding of moose habitat from the damming of the Hubbard Glacier, and likely emigration of moose from the area. Although the moose numbers at this time do not warrant a harvest, the department would like to keep this antlerless authorization active should the moose numbers again reach a harvestable level. The department will continue to monitor this moose population and again allow a harvest when the survey counts reach or exceed 25 moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The harvest of moose at Nunatak Bench will be limited to bulls without any biological reason to do so. In addition, since much of the season occurs post antler-drop restricting the harvest to bulls would make it difficult for hunters to select a legal animal. Moose habitat is not abundant in this area and if herd growth is not restricted by a limited cow harvest, carrying capacity of winter range may be exceeded.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Adopting this proposal will provide more moose hunting opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will continue to have more opportunity to hunt moose. The moose population will benefit from either-sex hunts that will help balance the herd in this area of limited moose range.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-109)

PROPOSAL 103 - 5 AAC 085.045(4). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6(A).

Seasons and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(4)		
Unit 6 (A), all drainages into the Gulf of Alaska from Cape Suckling to Palm Point		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull by registration permit only; up to 30 bulls may be taken; or	Sept. 1-Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 drawing permits may be issued	Sept. 1-Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 5 drawing permits may be issued		Sept. 1- Nov. 30
Remainder of Unit 6(A)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or	Sept. 1- Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by regis-	Nov. 15-Dec. 31	

tration permit only; up to 20
antlerless moose may be taken

(General hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1- Nov. 30

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

Nov. 15-Dec. 31

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. The department recommends continuation of the antlerless season to promote population stability. The desirable post-hunt population size in Unit 6A west of Cape Suckling is 300 to 350 moose. A census completed during February 2006 yielded a population estimate of 275 moose with 15 percent calves. The reported antlerless harvest was four during 2005 and the hunt was not open during 2006.

The desirable post-hunt population size in Unit 6A east of Cape Suckling is 300 to 350 moose. A census completed during February 2002 yielded a population estimate of 285 moose with 15 percent calves. No antlerless hunts were held because of previous poor calf survival and population level below the management objective. However, if recruitment does improve, antlerless hunts may be needed to maintain the moose population at objective levels.

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

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

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-110)

PROPOSAL 104- 5 AAC 085.045(4). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6(B).

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

(4)

...

Unit 6B

1 moose per regulatory year,
only as follows:

1 antlered moose by registration permit only; up to 30 antlered moose may be taken; or	Aug. 27- Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season
---	---	----------------

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 drawing permits may be issued for antlerless moose;	Aug. 27- Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season
--	---	----------------

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Desirable post-hunt population size is 300-350. A census completed during February 2002 resulted in a population estimate of 200 moose with 13 percent calves. Antlerless hunts have not been held during recent years because of continued poor calf survival and population level below the management objective. However, if the population increases to the desired level, antlerless hunts may be needed to maintain the population at objective levels.

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

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

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-111)

PROPOSAL 105 - 5 AAC 085.045(4). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorizes the antlerless moose season in Unit 6C.

Seasons and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(4)		
...		
Unit 6C	Sept. 1-Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season.

1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 40 permits for bulls and up to 20 permits for antlerless moose may be issued

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. The population objective is 400 moose. A census completed during February 2006 yielded an estimate of 488 moose, 20 percent 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. We recommend re-authorizing the state antlerless hunt in the event that the federal subsistence hunt is cancelled. If recruitment improves, continuation of the antlerless hunts will be necessary to hold the population at objective levels.

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

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

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-112)

PROPOSAL 106 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas.

Change the regulation so that it is similar to the 1996 regulation:

(11) Unit 6(B) Controlled Use Area:

...

(B) the area is closed to the use of airboats[ANY MOTORIZED VEHICLE] for moose hunting until after 3:00 a.m. on the day following the day which an airboat [ANY MOTORIZED VEHICLE] is used for transportation, from...

ISSUE: In 1996, the board adopted regulations prohibiting the same day use of airboats for moose hunting in Unit 6B to address issues of over harvest and the pace of harvest. In 2005, the board extended this prohibition to all motorized vehicles and vessels at the request of the local advisory committee. This later prohibition was not related to any biological problem but rather to issues between hunters using various forms of transportation to access the unit. Under the current regulation, all hunters, other than those hunting along the Copper River Highway, are, for practical purposes, required to camp out the night before hunting and have their mobility restricted in a manner inconsistent with their respective harvest potential. For example, while airboats are capable of traveling both overland and in the water, small motorized skiffs and canoes are unnecessarily restricted to a fraction of the available waterways.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to be required to spend the night each time they make a move in a motorized vehicle or vessel.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters using small motorized skiffs and canoes for transportation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Anyone can still camp out during their hunt and this proposal should not have much of an effect on the length of the season.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: George Covel (HQ-07S-G-038)

PROPOSAL 107 - 5 AAC 85.045(5). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt in portions of Units 7 and 14(C), and extend the season.

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

(5)

...

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 HUNTER:
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 - **Nov. 30**
[Oct.10]
(General hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTER:

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

Aug. 20- **Nov. 30**
[Oct.10]

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. A population peak of 333 moose in 1990 exceeded the carrying capacity of the winter range, and an aerial survey completed two years later found that many of the moose had died or emigrated. The population also declined 25 percent to 30 percent during the severe winter of 1994-95. Harvest quotas were reduced and fewer permits were issued in the late 1990s and early 2000s to allow the population to recover. No antlerless permits were issued in 2000-2003 and 2005-2006. A count in fall 2003 found 185 moose (27 bulls, 106 cows, 52 calves), which indicated an increasing population approaching the carrying capacity; therefore, 5 antlerless permits were issued in 2004. A count in late November 2004 found only 94 moose (27 bulls, 44 cows, 23 calves), which indicate heavy winter loss or emigration. During 2004, 2005, and 2006 (preliminary), hunters took eight bulls and one cow, twelve bulls, and eight bulls, respectively.

A season extension will allow the Department to issue additional permits for bulls after the rut.

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

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

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-95)

PROPOSAL108 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

Establish a bow hunting season in Unit 7 as already allowed on the Kenai Peninsula and the Mat-Su and have such a bow hunt later in the season when the weather is not as hot.

ISSUE: By placing this season after the majority of the rut is ended and most of the cows have already been bred, this would ensure the harvest would have little effect on overall moose

population. The hunt taking place when the weather is cooler would also be a benefit to the condition of the meat harvested.

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

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

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee. (SC-07S-G-061)

PROPOSAL 109 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulations so that all September resident and nonresident fall seasons are adjusted five days later than existing season date; and all December winter seasons remain the same.

- Unit 9A: One bull.....Harvest.....September 5 – September 20
- Unit 9B: Residents: One bull.....Harvest.....September 5 – September 20
or one bull (same as existing season).....December 15 – January 15
Nonresidents: One bull with 50 inch antlers or antlers with four or more brow tines on at least one sideSeptember 10 – September 20
- Unit 9C, that portion draining into the Naknek River:
Residents: One bull.....Harvest.....September 5 – September 20
or one bull (same as existing season).....December 1 – December 31
Nonresidents: One bull with 50 inch antlers with three or more brow tines on at least one side.....Harvest.....September 10 – September 20
- Remainder of Unit 9C: Residents: One bull.....September 5 – September 20
or one bull (same as existing season).....December 15 – January 15
Nonresidents: One bull with 50 inch antlers or antlers with three or more brow tines on at least one side.....September 10 – September 20
- Unit 9D: Residents only: One bull (same as existing season)
.....December 15 – January 20
- Unit 9E: Residents: One bull with spike fork or 50 inch antlers with three or more brow tines on at least one side.....September 15 – September 25
Or one bull (same as existing season).....December 1 – January 20
Nonresidents: One bull with 50 inch antlers or antlers with three or more brow tines on at least on side.....September 15 – September 25

There is no expansion of hunting seasons; only an adjustment of the season dates. This should not result in an increase in harvest due to the 50 inch minimum but will afford better opportunity to hunt selectively for old age class animals and allow for better care of meat due to cooler temperatures.

ISSUE: Current moose season dates make selective hunting of 50+ inch bulls much more difficult than a decade or more ago when these dates were established. Warmer weather during the first ten days of September is now the norm. Growth of alders and tall species of willows in succession conceals essentially inactive old age class animals making selective hunting extremely difficult. Handling of meat is much more difficult.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters seeking older age class animals will not be able to harvest the class of moose for which this season was designed. Proper handling and care of meat will continue to be more difficult due to warm temperatures. Overall harvest levels should not increase if the season change is adopted.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. As explained above, just five days adjustment means cooler temperatures and even some frost which keeps meat from sliming and there are fewer insects.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who understand the importance of hunting selectively and are committed to proper care of meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will be hurt by this proposed regulation change.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Expand or lengthen the season by five days. Rejected due to the potential for increased harvest.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Professional Hunters Association (HQ-07S-G-082)

PROPOSAL 110 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Amend the regulation as follows:

In Unit 9B, implement a non-resident closed area two miles either side on the Kvichak River and tributaries, and two miles from Lake Iliamna, New Halen River and Six Mile Lake.

ISSUE: Implementation of a two mile corridor along the Kvichak River, Iliamna Lake and tributaries to be closed to non-resident moose hunters as it is in Units 19 and 17.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Residents will continue to have difficulty harvesting moose during the fall season.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lake Iliamna Advisory Committee (HQ-07S-G-011)

PROPOSAL 111- 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

Units 9B and 17B: No open season for nonresident moose hunters; drawing permit only.

ISSUE: There are too many nonresident hunters and too many bull moose taken. Put in a permit system. Let them draw for the taking of a bull moose. Then you would have better enforcement. As it is, we do not have a big moose population any more. Put nonresident hunters on a permit system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Pretty soon, there will be no more moose.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It will reduce the number of bull moose taken.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local people would have a fair chance for subsistence hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides, air taxis and nonresident hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Guides, air taxis and nonresident hunters will try to cram in more hunters unless the permit drawing system is put in place.

PROPOSED BY: John Adcox , Sean Montgomery and George Hornberger (HQ-07S-G-132)

PROPOSAL 112 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
Amend the regulation as follows:

Close the Alagnak River in Unit 9C to nonresident moose hunters, within two miles either side of the river.

ISSUE: Implement for moose hunting in the Alagnak River (Unit 9C) a two mile corridor closed to non-residents.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Residents will continue to have difficulty harvesting moose during the fall season.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lake Iliamna Advisory Committee (HQ-07S-G-012)

PROPOSAL 113 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

Unit 11, north of Nabesna Road: One bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with four or more brow tines on at least one side.

ISSUE: There has been a large influx of displaced hunters from Unit 13 and from out of state into this area. Because of easy road access and a lesser brow tine requirement, a good number of people who hunted Unit 13 have now started hunting this relatively small area. There has also been a marked increase of individuals who are bringing their friends from out of state to hunt this same area. This is adjacent to the southern boundary of Unit 13, so there is a real possibility of under sized animals coming out of Unit 13. The trail that is the major access to the upper Suslota drainage is in Unit 13 which creates a real temptation to harvest an under sized animal since all you have to do is get the animal to the south side of Suslota Creek. There is little or no law enforcement in the area. I would like the board to make this change before it becomes completely out of control.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The people who benefit the most will be the hunters who want to see quality hunting in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The only people likely to suffer from this change are the unethical hunters that would bring out an under sized moose from Unit 13 and the nonresident friends being brought into the area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Change the boundary of Unit 13 to include this area. Rejected because this would allow federal subsistence hunting of Nelchina caribou in an area where the few remaining Mentasta caribou may be present. This would also completely eliminate all non-resident hunters.

PROPOSED BY: Wayne Shafer and Michelle Apley (HQ-07S-G-016)

PROPOSAL 114 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend this regulation as follows.

Unit 13: One bull with spike fork antlers or 50-inch antlers with 4 or more brow tines on at least one side, **by bow and arrow only**...October 15-October 31

ISSUE: Establish a bow hunting season to Unit 13, and have such a bow hunt later in the season when the weather is no as hot.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nothing.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by placing this season after the majority of the rut has ended, and most of the cows have already been bred, this would ensure the harvest would have

little effect on overall moose populations. The hunt taking place when the weather is cooler would also benefit to the condition of the meat harvested.

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Different dates, such as October 25 – November 9.

PROPOSED BY: Steve Untiet (SC-07S-G-018)

PROPOSAL 115 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

Depending on the harvestable surplus each year, eliminate the TM300 or delete the Tier I hunt from Unit 13 As we understand the law, the harvestable surplus is either above the ANS number putting us into Tier I or it is below the ANS putting us into Tier II.

ISSUE: The current regulations for moose hunting in Unit 13 are illegal as we understand the subsistence law. Currently we have a Tier II hunt and a Tier I hunt being held during the same hunting season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status Quo

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Tier I hunters if the harvestable surplus is above the ANS and Tier II hunters if below.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Most likely current TM300 permit winners unless we go to Tier II for the whole hunt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-031)

PROPOSAL 116 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(11) Hunting seasons and limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

Extend or lengthen the moose hunting season in Unit 13 to either: August 15th - September 10th or August 22 – September 10th.

ISSUE: The early Tier II moose season is held in a wet, warm August season of weather that is detrimental to meat; making it difficult the hang, retrieve, and to keep from spoiling.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Less meat for families and elders who depend on this hunt.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by giving people the opportunity to properly salvage and transport meat, and be able to hang the meat and camp in the field as is traditionally done.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? TM300 permit holders.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Change season to August 22nd to September 10th. Alternatively the same season as the regular hunt, but prefer the other solution.

PROPOSED BY: J. Marie Gore (SC-07S-G-034)

PROPOSAL 117 - 5 AAC 85.045 Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend these regulations as follows:

Eliminate the general moose hunt in Unit 13. Keep open only the Tier II Unit 13 moose season.

ISSUE: The Ahtna Tene Nene Subsistence Committee would like the board to eliminate the general hunt for moose in Unit 13. The competition and impact in Unit 13 is negatively affecting the local hunters from harvesting a moose and providing for their families.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The board needs to eliminate the general hunt for moose in Unit 13 so that subsistence needs will be met. By eliminating the general hunt in Unit 13, the subsistence users will have more of an opportunity to hunt and harvest a moose.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it improves the quality and creates more opportunity to harvest a moose in Unit 13, without so many hunters being in the field.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The subsistence users who need the meat to feed their families. This will help alleviate the competition and impact during the Unit 13 moose hunting season. There are too many hunters in the field during moose hunting season, hunting has rebounded somewhat, however, it is still comparatively low in population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The hunters who hunt under the general hunt for moose in Unit 13 may be affected, however, there are other units for them to hunt for moose. They have other hunting options available to them.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Revising the Tier II subsistence permit point system would be a solution; however, this was rejected by the board at their October 2006 meeting.

PROPOSED BY: Ahtna Tene Nene' Subsistence Committee (SC-07S-G-035)

PROPOSAL 118 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

Moose harvest tickets will be issued for either Unit 13 or statewide. A hunter with a Unit 13 harvest ticket will only be eligible to hunt moose in Unit 13.

ISSUE: Excessive moose hunting pressure in Unit 13.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Pressure on moose will continue to increase and hunt quality will deteriorate.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quality of the hunt will be improved with fewer hunters in the field.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who wish a quality hunt on the road system.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who have the time and resources to hunt many places.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? ATV restrictions, rejected because of enforcement issues and of the effect of restrictions on older hunters.

PROPOSED BY: Paxson Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-049)

PROPOSAL 119 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

Unit 13E: Nonresidents, one bull with 50 inch antlers or antlers with three or more brow tines on at least one side, September 10 – 30.

ISSUE: Lost opportunity for nonresident moose hunters, lost opportunity for moose meat consumption from residents, and lost income opportunity for registered guides.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose hunting pressure by nonresidents will loose disbursement, possibly. Moose hunting pressure by nonresidents will increase into other areas.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nonresident hunters, guides, local businesses and the State of Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: William FitzGerald (HQ-07S-G-088)

PROPOSAL 120 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose; and 5 AAC 92.530(X) Management areas. Amend the regulations as follows:

In Unit 14A, Point McKenzie, residents only, ten permits, season dates: October 1 – October 31, 2007. Eligible applicants: Youth who are 10 to 17 years old during their assigned hunt period. Each permit holder must be accompanied in the field by a licensed adult at least 21 years old. Each permit holder and adult must wear hunter orange. Hunter education requirements apply for youth permit holders.

ISSUE: In Unit 14A (DM402) a request is made to offer a youth hunt for ten cows from October 1-31. This will allow youth 10 to 17 years of age to draw a permit and hunt in the field with an adult at least 21 years old. This permit will not count against the bag limit of the accompanying adult.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Youth will have less incentive to hunt or take up the sport. Fewer youth will be interested in taking hunter education classes.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will be one step towards improving quality of the hunt for youth by offering an extended season, increased incentive to take hunter education classes, and to participate in the hunting draw process for the family.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Youth hunters who rely upon recreational opportunities for hunting and the harvest of game for their families. Families who enjoy a late season hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who are opposed to youth hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Keeping the season the same length.

PROPOSED BY: Mark Vingoe (SC-07S-G-041)

PROPOSAL 121 - 5 AAC 085.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Re-authorizes the drawing permit hunts for antlerless moose in Unit 14A.

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

Unit 14A
1 moose per regulatory year,
only as follows:

...

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 500 antlerless moose permits may be issued

Aug. 20-Sept. 25 (General hunt only)
Nov. 1 – Nov. 15 (General hunt only)

No open season

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the board. During November 2003, the subpopulation of moose in Unit 14A was surveyed and estimated at 6,564 which was slightly greater than the post-hunt objective of 6,000 – 6,500 moose. During this survey we observed 20 bulls and 29 calves:100 cows. Snow depth accumulations in the subunit during the last 3 winters were slightly above normal, however survival of calves and adults was average. The moose population in the unit is believed to be relatively unchanged since the last survey and within the population objective.

During 1999 and 2000, we issued no permits because the subpopulation estimate remained below objective levels. In 2001 we resumed the antlerless hunts because the population had recovered and actually exceeded objectives. The 14A population is now at the upper end of management objectives. Our strategy for harvesting cows from eight different permit hunt areas within the subunit was to concentrate antlerless moose permits in those areas where moose densities were highest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Portions of the Unit 14A moose subpopulation could grow beyond the ability of the habitat to sustain that population level. Increased cases of starvation, conflicts with humans and vehicle collisions will occur.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; excessively high moose density can lead to nutritionally stressed animals in the harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All who wish a healthy, productive moose population in the Matanuska-Susitna valleys, and those who wish to use antlerless moose for human consumption.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who disagree with the harvest of antlerless moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-113)

PROPOSAL 122 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

Establish an archery hunt in Unit 14A, Matanuska River north, residents only, ten permits, season October 1 – October 31, 2007.

ISSUE: In Unit 14A (DM407) a request is made to offer an archery hunt for 30 cows from October 1-31. This will allow archers an opportunity to hunt in the field after the earlier draw has closed. There is an ample supply of cows in this area. And, the percentage of archers who are successful is much lower than those who hunt with a rifle. There is a critical need for more archery seasons.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Archers will have a limited opportunity for late season hunts in the Mat-Su area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will be one step towards improving quality of the hunt for archers by offering an extended season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who rely upon recreational opportunities for hunting and the harvest of game for their families. Archers who enjoy a late season hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who opposed to archery length.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Keeping the season the same length.

PROPOSED BY: Mark Vingoe (SC-07S-G-042)

PROPOSAL 123 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

In Unit 14A: One bull with spike fork or 50 inch antlers or antlers with three or more brow tines on at least one side by bow and arrow only, October 15 – October 31.

ISSUE: Difficulty in caring for meat due to high temperatures in the current bow and arrow only season. By placing this season after the majority of the rut has ended, and most of the cows have already been bred, this will ensure the harvest would have little effect on overall moose population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The season will go on as it has with a high percentage of meat lost due to spoilage in the meat.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters who put in the time and efforts to become IBEP certified will benefit from the better conditions for meat care, the moose gene pool will benefit because fewer large bulls will be taking out of the pool prior to rut.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one is likely to suffer as this change will merely improve the quality of the hunt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Consider moving the season to the first two weeks in October. This was rejected as having too much likelihood of interfering with rut.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-065)

PROPOSAL 124 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

In Unit 14B: One bull with spike fork or 50 inch antlers or antlers with three or more brow tines on at least one side by bow and arrow only seasons

ISSUE: Difficulty in caring for meat due to high temperature in the meat. By placing this season after the majority of the rut has ended and most of the cows have already been bred, this will ensure the harvest would have little effect on overall moose population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The season will go on as it has with a high percentage of meat lost due to spoilage in the meat.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters who put in the time and efforts to become IBEP certified will benefit from the better condition for meat care. The moose gene pool will benefit because fewer large bulls will be taking out of the pool prior to rut.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one is likely to suffer, as this change will merely improve the quality of the hunt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-066)

PROPOSAL 125 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
Amend the regulation as follows:

Go back to the previous regulation for Unit 14C, allowing spike/fork or 50-inch antlers with three or more brow tines on one side. Years with over population of animals, issue “antler less only” or “any bull” when certain sexes need to be addressed.

ISSUE: Changing the area of “Ship Creek drainage above Fort Richardson” to hunting by permit only for moose has blocked anyone not drawing a permit from hunting this area at all.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A high quality hunting area will continue to be off limits for non-permit holders.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone willing to put forth the time and effort to hunt this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSAL 126 - 5AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend this regulation as follows:

Establish a registration moose hunt and reauthorize the antlerless portion of the any-moose drawing permit in the upper Ship Creek drainage in Unit 14(C).

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

(12)

...

Unit 14(C), that portion of the Ship Creek drainage upstream of the Fort Richardson

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

...

ISSUE: Moose use the upper Ship Creek drainage throughout the year. However, the highest density appears to be in fall and early winter when rutting and post-rut concentrations occur. In most years, accumulated snow packs force most of the moose out of the upper Ship Creek drainage in December. The moose move to lower elevation wintering areas on Fort Richardson, Elmendorf Air Force Base, and other portions of the Anchorage Bowl. A late November 2005 census on Fort Richardson, Elmendorf AFB and upper Ship Creek yielded a population estimate of 435 moose with a bull:cow ratio of 57 bulls per 100 cows and a calf:cow ratio of 31 calves per 100 cows. Forty antlerless permits were issued for upper Ship Creek drainage in 2003 and 2004. Legal bulls were spike-fork/50 inch/3 brow tines and the open season for cows and bulls was the day after Labor Day to September 30. Hunters took 2 cows and at least 10 bulls in 2003 and 2 cows and at least 6 bulls in 2004.

In 2005, the board created a new drawing hunt area in the upper Ship Creek valley because the previous general season spike-fork/50 inch bull hunt, with an additional 40 antlerless permits, was unable to remove enough moose to meet harvest and population objectives. A total of 40 either-sex moose drawing permits were issued in 2005 and 50 permits in 2006. Hunters took seven bulls and three cows in 2005 and eleven bulls and three cows in 2006, a slight increase in

harvest over the previous system. Although the moose population dipped below the management objective in the fall 2005, more moose should be harvested to keep the population from rebounding to a level higher than the carrying capacity. Hunters who use horses for transportation offer a solution.

There is no motorized access to most of upper Ship Creek. Hunters who hike into the hunt area are unwilling to harvest a moose many miles from the few trailheads. Before moose hunting was restricted to drawing permits, some hunters used horses to transport gear into the headwaters of Ship Creek and to bring moose out. Many of the largest bulls are found in the headwaters of Ship Creek where the vegetation is not as dense as it is downstream, allowing more spot-and-stalk hunting. Drawing permit hunts give every applicant an equal opportunity to obtain a permit; i.e., the system is not advantageous to hunters with horses who can harvest moose inaccessible to other hunters. In order to facilitate moose harvest far from the trailheads, primarily by hunters using horses, we are proposing to add a late season registration hunt for any bull. The registration hunt would be restricted to the upper end of the drainage to avoid overcrowding around the trailheads.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive. An either-sex drawing moose hunt should allow greater harvests in an area with limited access. A any-bull registration hunt should allow greater moose harvest, without overcrowding near trailheads.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters, particularly those with access to horses.

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A registration hunt after the drawing permit hunt. A registration hunt for any moose. A registration hunt for any moose conducted after the drawing permit season is unlikely to facilitate hunting in portions of the hunt area remote from trailheads and could result in overcrowded and dangerous conditions near trailheads.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-096)

PROPOSAL 127 - 5 AAC 085.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Fort Richardson Management Area in Unit 14C.

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

...

Unit 14C, Fort Richardson
Management Area

Day after Labor Day
-Mar. 31
(General hunt only)

Day after Labor Day
-Mar. 31

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

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. A late November 2005 census on Fort Richardson, Elmendorf Air Force Base, and upper Ship Creek yielded a population estimate of 435 moose with a bull:cow ratio of 57 bulls per 100 cows and a calf:cow ratio of 31 calves per 100 cows. At that time the population was below the population objective of 500 moose; however, this population has a history of rapid increase during mild winters and may have rebounded to a level closer to the population objective by fall 2006. Ten antlerless permits were issued for the fall archery and muzzle-loader hunts and 55 either-sex permits for the late hunt, for a total of 125 permits issued for all Fort Richardson hunts. Harvests for 2003, 2004, and 2005 were 21 bulls and 22 cows, 21 bulls and 14 cows, and 26 bulls and 17 cows, respectively.

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

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

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

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

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

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and U. S. Army, Fort Richardson
(HQ-07S-G-117)

PROPOSAL 128 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Anchorage Management Area in Unit 14C.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
...		
Unit 14C, that portion known as the Anchorage Management Area	Day after Labor Day -Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season
1 moose by drawing permit only, and by bow and arrow, shotgun, or muzzleloading black-powder rifle only; up to 50 permits may be issued; a person may not take an antlered bull unless it has a spike-fork antler; this hunt will be held at the department's discretion		
...		

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

The board reauthorized this hunt in 2005, and it was held for the first time since 1983. Hunters took 4fourcows in 2005 and three cows in 2006 with very little controversy. We intend to issue ten permits for this area in 2007 (five permits in two seasons). We also intend to work with the Chugach State Park staff and advisory committee to issue a small number of permits in other closed portions of Chugach State Park (e.g., McHugh Creek drainage).

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

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

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Issuing more than ten permits for the upper Campbell Creek hunt area. However, this area is heavily used by other recreationists and moose gut piles in the last two years have quickly attracted brown bears. These bears are also killing moose in the same area during the hunting season; nevertheless, it would be wise to base a decision to issue more than ten moose permits (aka gut piles) on more experience in this portion of Chugach State Park.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-118)

PROPOSAL 129 -5 AAC 085.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Birchwood Management Area and the remainder of Unit 14C.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
...		
Unit 14C, that portion known as the Birchwood Management Area	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30
1 moose by drawing permit, by bow and arrow only; up to 25 permits may be issued		
...		
Remainder of Unit 14C		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits may be issued

Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)

No open season

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually.

Birchwood Management Area – Composition counts are not flown in the Birchwood Management Area. However, we believe that a small resident population of 10-15 moose as well as an equal number of animals from Fort Richardson frequent the area. Five antlerless permits were issued in 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006. Archers took one bull in 2003, two bulls in 2004, and no moose in 2005 and 2006. Very little public land exists in this management area and most of it is city parkland closed to discharge of weapons. Large parcels of land owned by Eklutna Native Corporation could not be hunted by permittees because no access permits were issued, and this land is quickly turning into subdivisions. Despite the warning in the permit supplement that cautions hunters about the private property and low success rates, hunters are increasingly frustrated when they obtain one of these permits and cannot find a place to hunt. The one large block of public land remaining in this hunt area is Beach Lake Park, where discharge of firearms and bows is not allowed by city park ordinance. A controlled hunt could be held in Beach Lake Park if the city allowed discharge of firearms for hunting. Last year we proposed to leave the Birchwood drawing hunts in regulation, however, we told the Board we would not offer these permits until we can further explore holding a limited drawing hunt in Beach Lake Park. For the second year in a row none of the 15 permittees harvested a moose.

Remainder of Unit 14C – Composition counts are seldom flown in the remainder of Unit 14C. One hundred thirty-nine cows were counted during the fall 2001 trend counts in Knik/Hunter and Peters Creek count areas. To manage the moose population in lieu of recent trend data, the number of antlerless permits was reduced from 30 to 20 in 2000. Hunters in the Knik/Hunter Creek area took one cow in 2004, one cow in 2005, and three cows in 2006. Hunters in Peters Creek took no cows in 2004, two cows in 2005, and one cow and one bull in 2006.

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

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

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-119)

PROPOSAL 130 - 5 AAC 085.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Re-authorize the antlerless moose hunt on Elmendorf Air Force Base in Unit 14C

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

(12)

...

Unit 14C, Elmendorf Air Force Base	Day after Labor Day -Mar. 31 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Mar. 31
---------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------

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

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Moose on Elmendorf Air Force Base are part of a resident wintering population that also occupies Fort Richardson. A late November 2005 census on Ft. Richardson, Elmendorf Air Force Base and upper Ship Creek yielded a population estimate of 435 moose. During September, up to 100-150 of these moose frequent lands managed by Elmendorf. A majority of these animals move to Fort Richardson during late fall and winter, many into areas where hunting is not allowed. Because the density of hunters on Fort Richardson has reached maximum manageable levels, the Elmendorf hunt provides additional hunter opportunity and helps achieve desired harvest levels. Five antlerless, five either-sex permits, and 10 any-bull permits were issued in 2004-2006. During the 2004, 2005 and 2006 (preliminary) seasons, hunters took six bulls and three cows, nine bulls and seven cows, and seven bulls and five cows, respectively.

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

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

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

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

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

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and Elmendorf Air Force Base
(HQ-07S-G-120)

PROPOSAL 131 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

Establish a bow hunting season in Unit 14C as already allowed on the Kenai Peninsula and the Mat-Su and have such a bow hunt later in the season when the weather is not as hot

ISSUE: Placing this season after the majority of the rut has ended and most of the cows have already been bred would ensure the harvest would have little effect on overall moose population. The hunt taking place when the weather is cooler would also be a benefit to the condition of the meat harvested.

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

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

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-067)

PROPOSAL 132 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

Establish an any bull moose drawing hunt in the Anchorage Management Area, Unit 14C, which must issue at least one and not more than 15 drawing permits. The season dates would be September 1 through October 30 for shotguns or muzzle loaders.

ISSUE: Lack of opportunity and under utilization of bull moose in Anchorage Management Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued over population of moose in the Anchorage Bowl.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who wish an opportunity to hunt bull moose closer to Anchorage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who do not want moose hunted.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Open season to reduce the over population in the bowl. Rejected because it is too great of a step.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-074)

PROPOSAL 133 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Amend the regulation as follows:

Open moose hunting in Unit 15; September 1-25 each year.

ISSUE: Lack of opportunity to harvest bull moose on the Kenai Peninsula due to unreasonable hunting dates.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaskans will continue to have to travel to other parts of Alaska for quality opportunities for hunting moose.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans who wish to have bull moose more readily available due to moving the season similar to units in the interior of Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Alaskans who wish to have hunting in August when conditions are poorer for hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Taking ten days from August and adding five days in September would be reasonable due to horn restrictions.

PROPOSED BY: James Karl Johnson (HQ-07S-G-028)

PROPOSAL 134 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Amend the regulation as follows:

Open the permit area of Unit 15B to all moose hunters with the same antler restrictions as the rest of Unit 15.

ISSUE: Lack of opportunity by Alaskans to hunt in an economical way for a trophy moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The permit area between Skilak Lake and Tustumena Lake will continue to be accessible to a couple dozen hunters per year for moose. Trophy moose will continue to die of old age.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans who wish to have a quality trophy moose hunt, but not having to spend thousands of dollars to fly to some other area of Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The department will not take in revenue from all the permit application fees.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Because the area in Unit 15B is so inaccessible it will not be over hunted by hunters.

PROPOSED BY: James Karl Johnson (HQ-07S-G-029)

PROPOSAL 135 - 5 AAC 085.045(13). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area of Unit 15A.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(13)		
Unit 15A, the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area		
1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 permits for spike-fork antlered moose may be issued; or	Sept. 15-Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15- Sept. 30
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 50 permits may be issued; the taking of calves, and females accompanied by calves is prohibited	Sept. 15-Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. A joint management objective developed for the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area (SLWMA) by the Department and U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service calls for a fall population of approximately 2 moose per square mile or about 130 moose counted during the November survey. The SLWMA was last counted during December 2005 and yielded a count of 79 moose, the lowest count in over 20 years. The ratios observed were 12 bulls/100 cows and 9 calves/100 cows. Because the SLWMA is managed primarily for wildlife viewing, a second management objective requires that we maintain a minimum bull:cow ratio of 40 bulls/100 cows. The last permit hunt was held in 1999 when 40 permits were issued for antlerless and 20 for spike-fork antlered moose. The Department recommends maintaining the hunt, but not issuing permits for the fall 2007 season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The SLWMA is a wintering area for moose. In the past, during moderate to severe winters, this area supported up to 300 moose, more than twice the desired resident population size. If resident moose are allowed to increase beyond the management objective, excessive use of the habitat will occur, affecting both resident and migratory moose that depend on this area. Viewing opportunities will be adversely affected as well.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Since this is a proposal to reauthorize an existing hunt, no resource or product improvements are expected.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wildlife viewers and hunters receiving permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals opposed to hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Increase the moose carrying capacity of the area. Additional habitat enhancement is expensive and no projects are currently planned.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
(HQ-07S-G-116)

PROPOSAL 136 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose: Amend the regulation as follows:

In Unit 15B: One bull with **spike fork or** 50 inch antlers or antlers with three or more brow tines on one side; [PERMIT].....**Harvest**
[DM530/352/534/536].....**August 20** [SEPTEMBER 1] September 20.

[OR ONE BULL WITH 50 INCH ANTLERS OR ANTLERS WITH THREE OR MORE BROW TINES ON ONE SIDE BY PERMIT.....DM531/533/535/537/539.....
SEPTEMBER 26
– OCTOBER 15]

ISSUE: The Unit 15B drawing permit hunts unnecessarily limit opportunities for moose hunters. This change offers the best opportunity for all moose hunters without any negative effect to moose populations. This proposal changes the hunt from a drawing permit to a harvest and ends the late season/rut hunt. Eliminating the late season hunt (September 26 to October 15) avoids the possibility of disrupting a critical time during moose breeding. In addition the meat of a rutting bull can be of lower quality. These hunts have no biological reasoning other than being so restrictive it limits the chance of over harvest, however, this can be accomplished using the current spike fork, 50 inch, three brow tines regulation in place throughout the Kenai Peninsula. The current drawing permit hunts are trophy hunts and should not have priority. Until substantial progress is made to improve hunter opportunities and moose populations, trophy moose hunts should not be offered.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The hunts will continue to benefit few and a misuse of this resource will continue.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes: (1) This proposal includes the taking of spike/fork, an

excellent meat resource. (2) More hunters with friends and family will be given a quality hunting opportunity while maintaining good game management policy. (3) This proposal stops the taking of moose during rut, a questionable game management practice.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All moose hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Cooper Landing Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-046)

PROPOSAL 137 - 5 AAC 085.045(13). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Unit 15C.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(13)		
...		
Unit 15C, that portion south of the south fork of the Anchor River and northwest of Kachemak Bay		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or	Aug. 20-Sept. 20 (General Hunt only)	Aug. 20-Sept. 20
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; the taking of calves, and females accompanied by calves, is prohibited; up to 100 permits may be issued	Aug. 20-Sept. 20	Aug. 20-Sept. 20

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. The Homer benchland in Unit 15C often holds high moose densities in winters when deep snow at higher elevations results in moose moving to down to lowlands and into human populated areas. These deep snow winters result in a high number of moose dying due to malnutrition and increased negative interactions with humans as moose become more aggressive in their search for food around human residences.

In the fall of 2005, 441 moose were counted in the permit area and 26 percent were calves. Fifty permits were issued in each of the last five years resulting in an average harvest of 23 cows. We recommend re-authorization of the antlerless hunt and anticipate issuing 50 permits for the fall 2007 hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Deep snow winters will result in a high number of moose deaths due to malnutrition and continued conflicts between aggressive moose and humans.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? A limited antlerless moose hunt may improve overall browse quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wildlife viewers and hunters receiving permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals opposed to hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-115)

PROPOSAL 138 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

In Unit 15, place this season after the majority of the rut has ended and most of the cows have already been bred. This would ensure the harvest would have little effect on overall population, the hunt taking place when the weather is cooler would also be a benefit to the condition of the meat harvested.

ISSUE: Difficulty in caring for meat due to the high temperatures in the current bow and arrow only season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The season will go on as it has with a high percentage of meat loss due to spoilage in the heat.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters that put the time and efforts to be IBEP certified will benefit from the better condition for meat care.

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-068)

PROPOSAL 139 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

Open a drawing hunt for residents and nonresidents in Unit 16B as follows:

- September 22 – September 30
- 100 permits: 60 for resident and 40 for nonresidents
- Three brow tine/50 inch/spike-fork antler requirement

ISSUE: There is a lack of hunting opportunity for moose in Unit 16B by resident and nonresidents.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be reduced support for hunting in 16B, and reduced incidental take of brown bear/wolf in this predator control area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It allows for harvest of older bulls.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident or nonresident hunters who want an opportunity to hunt moose in 16B.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: James Howell (HQ-07S-G-001)

PROPOSAL 140 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

Allow an open harvest season in Unit 16 for moose.

ISSUE: Reopen the moose harvest in Unit 16.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? No moose hunting. In my case, an actual increase in predators because I can not take the time to bear hunt unless I can moose hunt to feed the family.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Meat hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Steve Veal (HQ-07S-G-052)

PROPOSAL 141 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend these regulations as follows:

Unit 16A: One bull with spike fork or 50 inch antlers or antlers with three or more brow tines on at least one side. August 20 – **September 15** [SEPTEMBER 30].

ISSUE: Declining moose population in Unit 16A. Season should be shortened to close on September 15 each year. The moose population in 16A is in trouble. The average number of hunters in this area for the past 11 years is 908 with a standard deviation (SD) of 85. Moose harvests have averaged 156 bulls with a SD of 26. The harvest in 2005 was more than two SD below the mean. So far as reported, the 2006 moose harvest is 84 (as of December 3, 2006). Clearly the moose harvest in this area is rapidly diminishing. While the number of hunters remains somewhat consistent the harvest has steadily declined. The majority of bulls are taken according to department figures in the period from September 20-30. This proposal will also align moose hunting season dates with others in southcentral Alaska and avoid an influx of hunters during the last two weeks as other seasons close.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bull moose harvest will continue to decline.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will be one step towards improving the future integrity of the moose population. Other measures must also be taken. Predator control and improving the quality of habitat in the area is also critical.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who rely upon recreational opportunities for hunting and the harvest of game for their families. Future hunters will benefit with a larger herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who have relied upon the last two weeks to hunt for moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Keeping the season the same length would result in continued decline. closing the season entirely may be needed in the future. Changing hunting from open harvest to a draw.

PROPOSED BY: Mark Vingoe (SC-07S-G-039)

PROPOSAL 142 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

Unit 16A: One bull with spike fork or 50 inch antlers or antlers with three or more brow tines on at least one side. Open only to resident hunters.

ISSUE: Declining moose population in Unit 16A. Nonresident season should be eliminated entirely for this area. The moose population in 16A is in trouble. The average number of hunters in this area for the past 11 years is 908 with a standard deviation of 85. Moose harvests have averaged 156 bulls with a standard deviation of 26. The harvest in 2005 was more than two of a standard deviation below the mean. So far as reported, the 2006 moose harvest is 84 (as December 3, 2006). Clearly the moose harvest in this area is rapidly diminishing. On average nonresident hunters take approximately ten percent of the total moose harvest. While the

number of hunters remains somewhat consistent the harvest has steadily declined. The majority of bulls are taken according to department figures in the period from September 20-30.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bull moose harvest will continue to decline.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will be one step towards improving the future integrity of the moose population. Other measures must also be taken. Predator control and improving the quality of browse in this area is also critical.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who rely upon recreational opportunities for hunting and the harvest of game for their families. Future hunters will benefit with a larger herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident hunters and guides who rely upon these clients.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Shortening the hunting season. Closing the season entirely – may be needed in the future. Changing hunting from open harvest to a draw.

PROPOSED BY: Mark Vingoe (SC-07S-G-040)

PROPOSAL 143 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

In Unit 16A, place this season after the majority of the rut has ended and most of the cows have already been bred. This would ensure the harvest would have little effect on overall population, the hunt taking place when the weather is cooler would also be a benefit to the condition of the meat harvested.

ISSUE: Difficulty in caring for meat due to the high temperature in the current bow and arrow only season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The season will go on as it has with high percentage of meat loss due to spoilage in the heat.

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

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-069)

PROPOSAL 144 - 5 AAC 84.045 Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Amend the regulation as follows:

Reduce the number of subsistence permits and open the hunt like normal in September.

ISSUE: The board closed the regular moose hunting and added many subsistence permits. Last year we know of three bulls taken in the regular season. Subsistence will hurt population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? No moose.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Moose are very easy to kill from a snow machine.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? It will not hurt the people who always had permits and all Alaska hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A few new subsistence permit holders.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Closing the season for a few years. Some people need the meat.

PROPOSED BY: Ron Stark, Merl Buckwalter, Everett Richmend, and Fred Smith (Alexander Creek Residents to Help Moose)

(HQ-07S-G-004)

PROPOSAL 145 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Change the regulation as follows:

Less subsistence, back to regular open season in September for moose in Unit 16B.

ISSUE: I live here. The moose no longer do. Our moose population has plummeted. More subsistence is not the answer. There is a very small harvest for the regular season and from snow machines, a large harvest for subsistence.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? All hunting will stop.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It will give moose a chance to rebuild numbers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Future generations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Very few if any.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close all together would not be fair to people who actually live here.

PROPOSED BY: Kris and Marie Draper

(HQ-07S-G-024)

PROPOSAL 146 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Change the regulation as follows:

For Unit 16B, revert back to the normal hunting season with 60 Tier II permits.

ISSUE: Tier II permits. The normal hunting season was closed and a Tier II hunting season was added in regular season with all the foliage it is harder to get a moose. This area will be overrun by snow machines.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Obvious, more moose kill.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Save some more moose, and bear and wolf problems.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Francis Buckwalter (HQ-07S-G-025)

PROPOSAL 147- 5 AAC 085.045(14). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Re-authorize the antlerless moose hunt on Kalgin Island in Unit 16B.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(14)		
...		
Unit 16B, Kalgin Island		
1 moose per regulatory year, by registration permit only	Aug. 20 - Sept. 20	Aug. 20 - Sept. 20
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually. The population objective for this predator-free, 23-mi² island is 20-40 moose a density of 1-1.75 moose/mi². Following a November 2005 survey, we counted 97 moose which is approximately 3.9 moose/mi².

Because of concerns of overpopulation and deteriorating habitat conditions, a drawing permit hunt for cows was initiated in 1995. In an attempt to reduce the population quickly, the Board established a registration hunt for any moose for the fall 1999 season. We believe that the population of moose on Kalgin Island has declined somewhat but remains above the objective of 20-40.

The "any moose" registration hunt is recommended to provide additional mortality on this predator-free island population. A registration hunt also allows the department to continue

gathering biological information from specimens provided by successful hunters. The difficult hunting conditions and limited access will minimize the danger of over harvest. Allowing the continued harvest of calves provides an additional management tool needed to reduce population productivity.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Without a liberal harvest including cows and calves, the population will continue to exceed the island's carrying capacity, resulting in habitat damage and ultimately decline in moose numbers through starvation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If the island population size is kept at or near objective levels, moose will have adequate available forage and therefore, show less sign of being nutritionally stressed.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who make the effort to get to Kalgin Island will have the opportunity to take any moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Seasonal residents of Kalgin Island have been concerned about hunters trespassing on their land and cabins. The current season dates concentrate hunter activity when most seasonal residents are present.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A general season for any moose will also work to lower moose densities, but would diminish the ability to collect biological information.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-114)

PROPOSAL 148 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Amend the regulation as follows:

For Unit 16B, apply any or all of the following:

1. Reduce the number of Tier II permits for TM567 to the 60 that were let in 2005/2006.
2. Tailor the subunit boundaries to better reflect local herd strengths, for example, if the majority of 16B moose are in the Skwentna area, then that is where subsistence permits should be let.
3. Impose the same antler restrictions on the Tier II general hunt.
4. Use area density rather than simple population numbers, which depends on the size of the subunit to determine number of permits.

ISSUE: The current method of determining the number of Tier II permits, both the formula and the subunit boundaries, needs to be modified to help reverse moose population declines in Unit 16B. The current method resulted in a 133 percent increase of permits for 2006/2007 over 2005/2006 for the TM567 hunt, yet the moose population of lower Alexander Creek in 2006 was the lowest in residents' memories back to 1975. The prevalence of Tier II kills by snow machine means that lower Alexander Creek is especially hard hit because of its proximity to the snow machine trailhead at Point Mackenzie, even though most TM567 Tier II hunters were not traditional users of lower Alexander Creek. Proposals 62 (from an individual), 81, 82, and 84 (from Mt. Yenlo Advisory Committee) for the spring 2005 board meeting all refer to declining herd populations as well as bull/cow ratios in 16A and 16B, thus migration into the lower Alexander Creek area does not seem a viable repopulation mechanism.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Population recovery of the lower Alexander Creek area will be prolonged or even prevented. The numbers of moose seen on the creek this past year was vanishingly small, and those of us who regularly hike to Mount Susitna saw very little sign away from the creek. One of my neighbors who annually climbs Mt. Susitna reported no moose on the mountain during his climb.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The objective should be to build Unit 16 herd population back to a level that can sustain general hunts as well as Tier II hunts. Closing the general hunt because of low population but then more than doubling the number or Tier II permits, for a lengthy season that allows for any bull to be taken, seems counter-intuitive to building the herd back.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All general hunters of 16B and all traditional hunters of the lower Alexander Creek whether they qualify for Tier II or not.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Tier II hunters who have to go further a field in 16B for subsistence hunt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Do away with Tier II, which is not going to happen.

PROPOSED BY: James R. Riehle (SC-07S-G-060)

PROPOSAL 149- 5 AAC 92.125. Predation Control Areas Implementation Plan. Amend the regulations as follows:

Provide a special permit for black and brown bear for predator control areas. We would suggest that residents/property owners who have been in Unit 16B for at least ten years, be allowed to take a nonresident relative or friend, black or brown bear hunting. The unit resident must be with the nonresident relative or friend at all times in the field. The resident of Unit 16B will receive no payment or gratuity. This proposal would end when department deems bears are under control.

ISSUE: Predator control of black and brown bears in Unit 16B, causing the calf survival to decrease, and to the point of closing the regular moose hunting season. And decreasing the amount of moose taken during the Tier II subsistence hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The calf survival will be less and less, the moose count will continue to go down. Filling our subsistence permits will get harder and harder. In the last few years many have not been able to get a moose during subsistence hunting, where in the past they were plentiful.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? By reducing moose predators, black and brown bear, calf survival will go up and the moose population will increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All residents and other hunters of Unit 16B would benefit by the increase of moose in the area. Subsistence users would be sure to fill their permits to feed their families. Moose calves will benefit the most.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some bear guides will protest, but only a very few utilize this area. They are not taking enough bears to increase the survival of moose calves or to increase the overall moose population. This proposal would not stop them from their guided hunts; there are plenty of bears to go around.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Tyonek Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-038)

PROPOSAL 150 5 AAC 85.045(a)(16). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 18, as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(16)		
...		
Unit 18, that portion north and west of a line from Cape Romanzof to Kusilvak Mt. to Mountain Village and excluding all Yukon River drainages upriver from Mountain Village; however, portions of this area may be closed by emergency order to the taking of calves		
1 antlered bull; or	Sept. 1-Sept. 30	Sept. 1-Sept. 30
1 antlered bull or 1 calf	Dec. 20-Jan. 10	
...		

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. The northwest portion of Unit 18, including all drainages downstream of Mountain Village on the Yukon River, has a winter hunt with a ‘calf’ bag limit that needs to be reauthorized as an ‘antlerless’ season.

In November 2005 the board established a December 20-January 10 season for an ‘antlered bull’ or a ‘calf’ in response to a rapidly growing moose population in the lower portion of the Yukon River drainage. The Lowest Yukon Census Area has shown dramatic increases in the moose population since 1988 when no moose were found in the count area. In March 2005, the census estimate for this area was: total population of 1341 moose ± 21.0 percent; density of 1.1 moose per square mile; calf ratio of 64 calves per 100 cows; and an average annual growth rate of 27 percent over the last 10 years. Composition counts in this area in November 2005 showed: 37 bulls per 100 cows; 92 calves per 100 cows; and 60 percent twinning rate. Considering growth

since the March 2005 census, the population is currently estimated at approximately 2500 moose. The estimated sustainable harvest for this portion of Unit 18 is approximately 500 moose.

When the moose population was very low and moose were colonizing the Yukon River drainage, hunting seasons were closed in response to a cooperative management process that recommended no harvest until moose populations were established. Hunting in the area below Mountain Village began in 1994 and harvests have increased steadily as moose have become more abundant. Reported harvest for this area in 2005-2006 was 97 moose in the fall hunt and 11 in the winter hunt (however, the proportion of calves is not known). For both the fall hunt and winter hunt, harvest rates are well within sustained yield limits and we recommend reauthorization of the antlerless moose hunt for this area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity for antlerless moose in portions of Unit 18 will be needlessly lost.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who wish to harvest an antlerless moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-105)

PROPOSAL 151 - 5AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunting season in Unit 20A.

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

...

(18)

Unit 20A, the Ferry Trail Management Area, Wood River Controlled Use Area, and the Yanert Controlled Use Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1 – Sept. 25
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; or Aug. 25 – Feb. 28

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 500 permits may be issued; or Sept. 1 – Sept. 25

1 bull by drawing permit only; by muzzle-loading firearms only; up to 75 permits may be issued Nov. 1 – Nov. 30

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 muzzle-loading firearms only; up to 75 permits may be issued Nov. 1 – Nov. 30

Remainder of Unit 20A

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
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; or Aug. 25 – Feb. 28
(General hunt only)

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 500 permits may be issued Sept. 1 – Sept. 25

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side Sept. 1 – Sept. 25

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. The primary justification for the Unit 20A antlerless hunts is to initially prohibit growth of the moose population and ultimately reduce the population to the desired objective of 10,000–12,000 moose. In addition, this hunt provides additional harvest opportunity which helps to meet subsistence and intensive management harvest objectives. The number of moose in Unit 20A was recently estimated at 16,000–17,000. Research indicates this moose population is experiencing density-dependent effects, including low productivity, relatively light calf weights, and high browse removal rates of winter forage. As a result, in 2004 the Board adopted a unit-

wide registration hunt for antlerless moose during September 1–December 10 (closed by Emergency Order when the desired number of antlerless moose were taken), and in 2006 expanded that hunt to August 25–February 28. In regulatory year 2005 (RY05, which begins 1 July 2005 and ends 30 June 2006).the reported harvest of antlerless moose was 692. Based on the high level of harvest and participation (over 5000 permits issued annually), this hunt has been a huge success.

Extending the antlerless hunt from September 1–December 10 to August 25–February 28 provided additional hunting opportunity and helped reduce hunter densities and crowding. Opening the antlerless season one week earlier allowed antlerless hunters to hunt under less crowded and more aesthetically pleasing conditions. Extending the season through February also increased hunting opportunity, but only in the more remote areas. The main biological issue with antlerless seasons extending beyond early December is the potential take of bulls that have dropped their antlers. However, during the RY04 and RY05 hunting seasons, quotas were met and antlerless hunts closed by December 10 in all hunt zones except Zone 5, which is in the eastcentral Tanana Flats and mountains. Therefore, extending the antlerless hunt through February will likely only affect Zone 5 where it would have little impact on bull:cow ratios (>36:100 in 2004 and 2005), but would allow for the additional antlerless harvest needed to meet harvest and population goals.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Unit 20A moose population may increase, which may result in further deterioration of the habitat and exacerbate a population decline in years with severe winter conditions. The opportunity to hunt a harvestable surplus of cow and calf moose will be lost, and subsistence needs in the western Tanana Flats and intensive management harvest objectives for Unit 20A may not be met.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, hunting opportunity and harvest will increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence hunters will benefit from the opportunity to harvest cow and calf moose in the western Tanana Flats. In the remaining antlerless hunt areas, hunters will benefit by having the opportunity to harvest cow moose for meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-121)

PROPOSAL 152 - 5AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunting season in Unit 20B.

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

...

Unit 20(B), that portion within Creamer's Refuge

1 bull with spike-fork or greater antlers by bow and arrow only; or

Sept. 1 – Sept. 30
(General hunt only)
Nov. 21 – Nov. 27
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1 – Sept. 30
Nov. 21 – Nov. 27

1 antlerless moose by bow and arrow only, by drawing permit only; up to 150 permits may be issued in the Fairbanks Management Area; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area; or

Sept. 1 – Nov. 27
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1 – Nov. 27

1 antlerless moose by muzzle-loader by drawing permit only; up to 10 permits may be issued; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area

Nov. 21 – Nov. 27

Nov. 21 – Nov. 27

Unit 20(B), remainder of the Fairbanks Management Area

1 bull with spike-fork or greater antlers by bow and arrow only; or

Sept. 1 – Sept. 30
(General hunt only)
Nov. 21 – Nov. 27
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1 – Sept. 30
Nov. 21 – Nov. 27

1 antlerless moose by bow and arrow only, by drawing permit only; up to 150 permits may be issued; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area

Sept. 1 – Nov. 27
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1 – Nov. 27

Unit 20(B), that portion within the Minto Flats Management Area

1 moose by registration permit only; or

Sept. 1 – Sept. 25
(Subsistence hunt)

No open season.

	only) Jan. 10 – Feb. 28 (Subsistence hunt only)	
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side	Sept. 11 – Sept. 25	No open season.
Unit 20(B), the drainage of the Middle Fork of the Chena River and that portion of the Salcha River drainage up- stream from and including Goose Creek	Sept. 1 – Sept. 20	Sept. 1 – Sept. 20
1 bull; or	Sept. 1 – Sept. 20	Sept. 1 – Sept. 20
1 bull, by bow and arrow only	Sept. 21 – Sept. 30	Sept. 21 – Sept. 30
Remainder of Unit 20(B)		
1 bull; or	Sept. 1 – Sept. 15	Sept. 5 – Sept. 15
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 300 permits may be issued	Sept. 1 – Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season.

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually.

Fairbanks Management Area (FMA) – The purpose of this antlerless hunt is to provide opportunity to harvest a surplus of antlerless moose in the FMA and potentially reduce moose–vehicle collisions and nuisance moose problems.

Population estimates in the FMA and adjacent areas, as well as anecdotal information, indicate high but stable moose numbers. The number of moose/vehicle collisions in the FMA is also high and continues to be a chronic problem that poses significant safety concerns to motorists. In addition, moose nuisance complaints continue to place significant demands on department staff. To increase hunting opportunity and harvest and reduce moose/vehicle collisions, the department increased the number of drawing permits for antlerless moose by archery hunting only (DM788) from 25 in 1999 to 150 in 2004. However, antlerless harvest has not increased commensurate with increases in the number of permits issued. Therefore to further increase harvest to meet management goals the board expanded the season beginning in fall 2006 from September 1–30 and November 21–27 to September 1–November 27. Harvest is regulated by the number of permits issued rather than season length. At this juncture, we do not have sufficient data to evaluate the effect of higher antlerless moose harvests on moose/vehicle collisions or moose nuisance problems.

Minto Flats Management Area (MFMA) – The primary purpose of this antlerless hunt is to provide for subsistence needs. In 2004, the board replaced the Tier II subsistence hunt TM785

(100 permits with a bag limit of “one moose” during September 1–20 and January 10–February 28) with a registration hunt (bag limit of “one moose” during September 1–25 and January 10–February 28). In addition, a 15-day general hunt (September 11–25) for bulls only with antler restrictions (spike-fork or 50” or 4 or more brow tines) provides additional hunting opportunity and to helps meet intensive management harvest objectives for Unit 20B.

Population estimation surveys indicate the moose density within the MFMA is high (>3.0 moose/ mi²). The reported harvest of antlerless moose taken during subsistence hunt TM785 averaged 24 during regulatory years (RY) 1996–2003 (a regulatory year begins 1 July and ends 30 June; e.g., RY96 = 1 July 1996 through 30 June 1997). The total reported antlerless harvest for antlerless hunts RM775 and RM785 was 32 in RY04 and 38 in RY05. This harvest of approximately one to two percent of the MFMA moose population is sustainable.

Remainder of Unit 20 – The drawing permit hunt for antlerless moose was recommended to the board in 2006 to take advantage of relatively high and increasing moose numbers in the central portion of Unit 20B. Population estimates (12,313 in 2001; 15,485 in 2003; 16,572 in 2004) and calf:cow surveys (37–42:100 in 2003–2004) suggest numbers are increasing. Moreover, moose densities are relatively high (1.0–1.8 moose/mi²) in the central portion of Unit 20B surrounding the Fairbanks area. Additional harvests of antlerless moose will curb growth of this population that is at the upper limit of the Intensive Management population objective of 12,000–15,000 moose.

In addition, mortality from vehicle and train collisions has been high. An average of about 100 moose are killed annually by motor vehicles in the FMA alone, an area of just over 300 mi² with an estimated 400–500 moose. By focusing harvest in the more heavily roaded central portion of Unit 20B, road kill may be minimized.

Finally, extensive burns in northcentral Unit 20B will provide excellent habitat in the near future. Limiting moose densities until shrubs have regenerated would benefit the moose population in the long term.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The opportunity to hunt a surplus of cow moose will be lost. In central Unit 20B and the FMA in particular, moose/vehicle collisions and nuisance moose problems will likely remain high or increase. In the MFMA, if the subsistence harvest is restricted to bulls only, the general season may have to be further restricted or eliminated to maintain the desired bull:cow ratio.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, hunting opportunity and harvest will increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence hunters benefit from the opportunity to harvest cow moose in the MFMA hunt. In the central portion of Unit 20B including the FMA, hunters benefit by having the opportunity to harvest cow moose, and urban residents may benefit from reduced moose/vehicle collisions and moose/human conflicts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-123)

PROPOSAL 153 - 5AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunting season in Unit 20D.

5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. (a) ...

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(18)		
...		
Unit 20D, that portion lying west of the west bank of the Johnson River and south of the north bank of the Tanana River, except the Delta Junction Management Area and the Bison Range Youth Hunt Management Area		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 15	
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 200 permits may be issued in combination with that portion in the Delta Junction Management Area; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf	Oct. 1 – Oct. 15	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side		Sept. 5–Sept. 15
Unit 20D, that portion within the Bison Range Youth Hunt Management Area	Sept. 1 – Sept. 30	Sept. 1 – Sept. 30
1 bull, with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or 1 antlerless moose, per lifetime of a hunter, by drawing		

permit only; up to 10 permits may be issued; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf

Unit 20D, that portion within the Delta Junction Management Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only; up to 30 permits may be issued; or

Sept. 1 – Sept. 15

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 200 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

Oct. 1 – Oct. 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only; up to 30 permits may be issued

Sept. 5–Sept. 15

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. The density of moose in that portion of Unit 20D south of the Tanana River and west of the Johnson River is high, estimated to be 3.9 moose per square mile in 2005. The unit 20D moose population is nearing its intensive management population objective of 8,000 to 10,000, with most population growth and highest densities occurring in this portion of Unit 20D. As a result, moose twinning rates are at moderately low levels and browse surveys indicate that moose are consuming moderately high quantities of browse over the winter. Reauthorization of a limited drawing permit for cow moose without calves is proposed in order to stabilize population growth in this area, and increase harvest toward the intensive management harvest objective.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population in southwest Unit 20D will continue to increase in size and may overbrowse its habitat, and the unit 20D intensive management harvest objective will not be met.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will improve the ability of moose habitat in southwest Unit 20D to support the current moose population and will also allow hunters to increase moose harvest toward meeting the Unit 20D intensive management harvest objective without further reducing the bull-to-cow ratio.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The moose population will benefit by having a moose density compatible with their habitat. Moose hunters will benefit by increasing harvest of moose from this area to meet the harvest objective.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those people that are opposed to intensive management harvest strategies.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No cow permits and higher numbers of cow permits.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-122)

PROPOSAL 154 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(20). **Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.**
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 22(C) and the remainder of Unit 22(D), as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(20)		
...		
Unit 22(C)		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull by registration permit only, or	Sept. 1-Sept. 14	
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only;	Sept. 15-Sept. 30	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by registration permit only		Sept. 1-Sept. 14
...		

Remainder of Unit 22(D)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose; however, antlerless
moose may be taken only from
Dec. 1—Dec. 31; a person may
not take a calf or a cow
accompanied by a calf; only antlered
moose may be taken from
Jan. 1—Jan. 31

Aug. 10-Sept. 14
Oct. 1-Jan. 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers
or antlers with 4 or more brow
tines on one side, by registration
permit only.

Sept. 1-Sept. 14

...

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Two areas in Unit 22 require reauthorization: Unit 22(C), and the remainder of Unit 22(D).

In October 1999, the board authorized a registration hunt for antlerless moose in Unit 22(C) and the department manages this hunt with a quota of up to 20 permits annually. The intent of the hunt is stabilization of the Unit 22(C) moose population, which is believed to be at or near carrying capacity of its winter range.

The Unit 22(C) moose population grew steadily throughout the 1990s and in spring 2001 was estimated at 557 moose which exceeds the departments' management goal of 450–525 moose. In 2004, three years after the antlerless hunt was initiated, a geo-spatial population estimation process was used to estimate the population at 530 moose with a calf:adult ratio of 23 calves:100 adults. Yearling recruitment is highest in Unit 22(C) and generally exceeds 20 percent. However, the bull:cow ratio is low, varying between 10–20 bulls:100 cows. The low bull:cow ratio makes additional bull harvest ill-advised. It appears that the antlerless hunt has helped stabilize moose numbers in Unit 22(C) and we recommend reauthorizing the antlerless moose hunt to achieve the moose population objectives for this unit.

In most other parts of Unit 22, low recruitment rates are believed to be causing moose population declines. However, in the remainder of Unit 22 (D) we recommend continued authorization of antlerless moose hunting where moose populations are stable and hunting pressure is low. This portion of Unit 22(D) is relatively remote with difficult access and these factors contribute to limited hunting pressure in the area. The estimated number of moose has been stable since 1997 and composition surveys typically show higher calf:cow and calf:adult ratios than other parts of Unit 22, except Unit 22(C). A 2006 geo-spatial population estimation process completed in Unit 22(D) Remainder estimated the population at 599 moose with a calf:adult ratio of 35 calves:100 adults. The reported cow harvest in this area has been low, averaging one cow moose per year since 1997. Village harvest survey data (collected only in 2000-2001) shows five cow moose were harvested from Unit 22(D) Remainder, which is a more realistic estimate of annual cow harvest compared to harvest ticket reports. Low harvest rates of antlerless moose support our recommendation to reauthorize antlerless moose seasons in the Remainder of Unit 22(D).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity for antlerless moose in portions of Unit 22 will be needlessly lost.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who wish to harvest an antlerless moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-126)

PROPOSAL 155- 5 AAC 85.045(a)(21). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 23, as follows:

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

(21)

Unit 23, that portion north of and including the Singoalik River drainage

RESIDENT HUNTERS: July 1 - Dec. 31

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

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: Aug. 1 - Dec. 31
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

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: Sept. 1 - Sept. 20
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

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Moose density is currently low in large portions of Unit 23. As a result, in November 2003 the board restricted moose hunting for resident and nonresident hunters. These restrictions substantially shortened the resident antlerless moose season and limited the harvest of antlerless moose to hunters who register for registration permit hunt RM880. In November 2005, the board considered public proposals and made no changes to the moose hunting seasons in Unit 23. Historically, the reported harvest of cow moose has been low throughout Unit 23 despite liberal antlerless seasons. We do not think maintaining an antlerless season will endanger Unit 23 moose populations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity will be needlessly lost.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters who need to harvest an antlerless moose when caribou or other game is unavailable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-125)

PROPOSAL 156 5 AAC 85.045(a)(24). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 26(A), as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(24)		
Unit 26(A), that portion in the Colville River drainage upstream from and including the Anaktuvuk River drainage		
1 bull; or	Aug. 1 – Sept. 14	No open season.
1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 40 permits may be issued; or	Sept. 1 – Sept. 14	No open season.
1 moose; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf.	Feb. 15 – Apr. 15	No open season.
Unit 26(A), that portion west of 156° 00' W. longitude excluding the Colville River drainage		
1 moose; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf.	July 1 – Sept. 14	No open season.

...

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Two areas in Unit 26(A) are considered by this proposal: 1) the Colville River drainage upstream from and including the Anaktuvuk River drainage, and 2) the portion of Unit 26(A) west of 156 00' W longitude and north of the Colville drainage.

Within the 'upstream' portion of the Colville River drainage, a winter hunt was established by the board in November 2005 and opened in the 2005-2006 regulatory year to provide more hunting opportunity in an area where the moose population is increasing in Unit 26(A). Since most bull moose shed their antlers before the established season opening of February 15, the bag limit for this hunt is one moose, except a calf or cow accompanied by a calf may not be taken. In this antlerless hunt area, the moose population is currently increasing and five cows were harvested during the 2006 winter hunt. A similar harvest is anticipated for the current regulatory year (2007 hunt in progress February 15-April 15). Low harvests of antlerless moose (<10 per

year) in the Colville River drainage should not limit the growth of the population and we recommend reauthorization of the antlerless moose season in this area.

The portion of Unit 26(A) west of 156 00' W longitude and north of the Colville drainage has a sparse distribution of moose. Each year a small percentage of moose (primarily bulls and cows without calves) disperse away from the major river drainages and across the coastal plain. These moose provide the only opportunities for harvest in the northwestern portion of Unit 26(A). Overall, the moose population in the unit is increasing and the small number of cow moose that disperse and could be harvested under this reauthorization proposal will have very little impact on the growth of the population. During the 2005 hunting season there was one reported harvest of a cow moose in this area, which supports our assessment that an antlerless season would have little impact on the moose population. We recommend reauthorization of the antlerless moose season in this portion of Unit 26(A).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity will be needlessly lost.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters who need to harvest an antlerless moose when caribou or other game is unavailable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-124)

PROPOSAL 157 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.

Amend the regulation as follow:

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

ISSUE: The use of electronic moose calls.

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

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

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

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No.

PROPOSAL 158 5 AAC 85.055 (a) Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall Sheep.

Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Create new Dall sheep drawing hunt areas within Units 13D and 14A, Chugach Mountains.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(4)		
...		
<u>Unit 13D, that portion west of Tazlina Lake and Tazlina Glacier</u>	<u>Aug. 10 – Sept. 20</u>	<u>Aug. 10 – Sept. 20</u>
<u>1 ram by drawing permit only; up to 50 permits may be issued</u>		
<u>Unit 13D, that portion east of Tazlina Lake and Tazlina Glacier to the Richardson Highway</u>	<u>Aug. 10 – Sept. 20</u>	<u>Aug. 10 – Sept. 20</u>
<u>1 ram with full curl horn or larger by drawing permit only; up to 130 permits may be issued</u>		
<u>Unit 14(A), south and east of the Matanuska River</u>	<u>Aug. 10 – Sept. 20</u>	<u>Aug. 10 – Sept. 20</u>
<u>1 ram by drawing permit only; up to 100 permits may be issued</u>		
Remainder of Unit 7, Unit 9, remainder of Unit 13, <u>remainder of</u> Unit 14(A), Unit 14(B), remainder of Unit 15, and Units 16 and 19	Aug. 10 - Sept. 20	Aug. 10 - Sept. 20
1 ram with full curl horn or larger		
....		

ISSUE: Between 2003 and 2006 sheep numbers declined in central Unit 13D (35 percent reduction in total number of rams observed during survey flights). Because the number of hunters in the field has not changed, there has been increasing competition for a limited number of rams in the last few years.

There have been concerns expressed by resident hunters, guides, and transporters in both Units 13D and 14A about increasing competition and fewer available legal rams due to a variety of factors. Given the proximity of these areas to each other, and to Anchorage, if hunt changes are made in one subunit, additional sheep hunting pressure would be expected in the adjacent subunit.

Sheep hunting quality has not been addressed outside Unit 14C since the creation of the Tok Management Area in 1974 and the Delta Management Area in 1978. Considering that general hunt areas within the Chugach Mountains have a high percentage of nonresident sheep hunters, compared to mountain ranges further away from Anchorage, this area is of particular concern. The excessive hunting pressure in this range is likely due to the easy access to the area (short drive / flight from Anchorage), and the lower costs of guiding hunters in this area versus going further from Anchorage. Additionally, the Chugach Mountains are known to produce heavy-horned Dall sheep rams that score well in Boone and Crockett Club and Pope and Young Club scoring. These issues, among others, have caused increasing conflicts between guides, Anchorage/Mat-Su based transporters, and local transporters who have been using the same area for years.

The full-curl regulation has been relied upon for sheep conservation for nearly two decades in this area. However, it may not be the best management strategy. If only a small percentage of all full-curl rams are harvested annually, there should be no biological impact to the population. However, if a large percentage of all legal rams are harvested each year, hunting could be affecting the genetic structure of the population. Conceptually, the fast growing rams and those with large horn genetics are taken out of the population as soon as they are legal and may not get to breed. Conversely, slow growing rams and/or those with poor horn genetics may breed for many years before they are harvested or die naturally. The level of contribution of horn size attributes passed on by ewes, as far as Dall sheep are concerned, has yet to be documented. Nevertheless, the principles of conservation genetics should be considered in modern sheep harvest management.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If these areas are left open under a general season, sheep hunting pressure will likely rise. It is our experience that resident hunters generally research hunt areas more thoroughly in terms of sheep population and hunter trends before making a decision to hunt in a particular area. Nonresidents however, often spend more time researching which guide to hunt with and many guides have hunters booked several years in advance. We believe this difference has led to the trend in residency of sheep hunters in the Chugach portion of 14A, where the resident numbers have declined, and the nonresident numbers have increased. Under current general season regulations, we believe this trend will spread to Unit 13D.

If the current hunting pressure continues, particularly in the face of declining sheep numbers, these populations could be negatively impacted genetically, and the slower growing rams with smaller horns may end up being the norm. Hunters have already complained that many rams in the open areas of the Chugach Mountains are not harvested and are dying of old age because they are less than full-curl though older than eight years of age (a risk many hunters are not

willing to take since sealing requirements were passed). This trend will likely spread to Unit 13D if hunt pressure is not minimized.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS

PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; the opportunity to regulate the hunter numbers through drawing permit numbers, seasons, and hunt areas will provide more options for managers. Hunt quality as well as trophy potential of the resource are expected to improve.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters with permits will benefit. Many hunters have already made the decision to only hunt sheep when they draw a permit because of a desire for high hunt quality. All hunters will have more opportunity to draw a sheep permit if new areas are added. The resident hunters who have already stopped hunting these areas due to overcrowding will also benefit from a drawing hunt.

In addition to the areas being less crowded, hunters in the any ram areas would not have to worry about closely judging the horns. Some hunters would be happy taking a ¾ or 7/8 curl ram. If the liberal ram harvest regulations help to improve sheep conservation and the number of large trophy rams in the long-run, then all sheep hunters will benefit from this change in how we manage Dall sheep. This type of liberalized management strategy has been reported to be successful in recent years with Bighorn sheep management in Nevada, Wyoming, and Colorado.

Under an ‘any ram’ regulation, theoretically, hunters would never leave a sublegal ram out in the field, and enforcement officers would spend less time investigating allegations of sublegal harvests and wastage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The resident hunters who travel to these areas to hunt regularly under the general season, and others who are unable to draw a permit to hunt sheep in one of these areas. Many resident hunters like to hunt the same area year after year because of the familiarity they build up, and this would cause them to either hunt elsewhere, or not to hunt. Some of these hunters may turn to other drawing hunts, and some will hunt other general hunt areas.

Guides who use these areas will also have difficulty offering future-booked clients a place to hunt sheep. Most of these hunters would apply for the drawing hunts, though some would not draw. These hunters would have to research other hunt opportunities. Competition may also increase clients.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? One option for overcrowding due to aircraft supported hunting has been to limit the use of aircraft during all or a portion of the hunt. These areas however are almost entirely fly-in. Particularly for Unit 13D, the best sheep country is not accessible without aircraft, so an aircraft limitation would not work in this area.

Another option is to create a drawing permit for non-residents in these areas to limit the guide pressure, and to leave the area open under the general season to resident hunters. The success rates among non-resident hunters are much higher than the average resident hunter, therefore regulation of non-residents would have a much larger impact on the sheep population than regulation of residents. Any differential management such as this however, would be an allocation issue. Additionally, this option does not address the issue of overcrowding, or of multiple transporters dropping multiple hunters at the same strips.

PROPOSAL 159- 5 AAC 85.055(7). Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Amend this regulation as follows:

Change from full-curl ram/ewe drawing hunts to any-sheep drawing hunts in Unit 14(C).

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(7)		
Unit 14(C), the Eklutna Lake Management Area 1 sheep by drawing permit only; by; bow and arrow only; up to 35 permits will be issued	Day after Labor Day --Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day --Oct. 31
Remainder of Unit 14(C)		
1 sheep [RAM WITH FULL-CURL HORN OR LARGER OR 1 EWE] by drawing permit only; up to 300 [240] permits will be issued; [OR 1 EWE BY DRAWING PERMIT ONLY; UP TO 150 PERMITS WILL BE ISSUED]	Aug. 10—Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	Aug. 10—Oct. 31
1 sheep by bow and arrow only; by drawing permit only; up to 120 permits will be issued	Oct. 1—Oct. 10 (General hunt only)	Oct. 1—Oct. 10

ISSUE: This proposal is intended to replace the full curl horn management strategy with an any ram system. Preliminary research on bighorn sheep has shown that “any ram” regulations may be more advantageous to sheep management through better herd health and more satisfied hunters. Some of the benefits include more larger rams surviving if hunting pressure is limited. Large rams are thought to be advantageous for several reasons. Large rams maintain a stable hierarchy in ram groups before the breeding season and reduce competition and energy expenditure of rams and ewes during breeding. Large rams are desirable because their male offspring are more likely to have large horns.

Dall sheep in Unit 14(C) have been harvested by drawing permit for decades. Some hunters and guide-outfitters have complained that too many hunters are in the field at the same time, which detracts from the hunting experience and increases competition for limited numbers of full-curl sheep. In addition, an unknown number of sublegal sheep are shot and left in the field, and some hunters who shoot sublegal rams accidentally or unknowingly bring them out of the field for inspection and confiscation.

All of the hunt areas include substantial portions of Chugach State Park, where large rams are also valued for viewing purposes. Restructuring the hunt will provide a new management strategy that may in the long term produce more rams and larger rams in the harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Although these sheep hunts are popular and well managed, some hunters will complain about overcrowding and some sublegal sheep may not be salvaged or accounted for in harvest reports.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The sheep population may be more productive with more large rams for breeding. Large rams that survive the hunting season will be even larger next year if they do not succumb to natural mortality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Permit winners, because if any sheep is legal some hunters who would not have shot a full-curl ram or ewe will shoot smaller rams, and this should increase success rates. Hunters concerned about overcrowding, because with higher success rates, fewer permits can be issued to achieve the same or a slightly higher sheep harvest. Other park users who also value large rams.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? With fewer permits, it is likely that more applicants will be unsuccessful.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Reduce the number of drawing permits to reduce overcrowding while maintaining the existing full-curl restriction.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-98)

PROPOSAL 160 - 5 AAC 85.055 Hunting Seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Create a drawing permit only hunt in Unit 13D. Non-residents will require a guide client agreement prior to application deadline.

ISSUE: Lack of mature Dall sheep rams to harvest by residents and non residents. Limit Guides in the area by a point selection system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sheep will be shot that are nnot legal. Hunters will continue to kill or harvest sheep that are

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This proposal will allow sheep to mature.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska residents, nonresidents and guides.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Limit guide use in drawing areas.

PROPOSED BY: Gary Munoz (SC-07S-G-005)

PROPOSAL 161 - 5 AAC 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting Seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep.

Amend this regulation to provide the following:

The area described as the Tonsina Control Use Area in Unit 13D is open for Dall sheep hunting to residents only.

ISSUE: I would like to see the Tonsina walk in area restricted to residents only for Dall sheep hunting, due to the low numbers of sheep in Unit 13D and the high success rates of guided nonresident hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sheep numbers will continue to decline.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, more rams would live longer allowing more mature rams to breed.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sheep hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one would suffer because registered guides could hunt other areas.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Drawing permit hunt was considered but rejected due to the fact that resident success is extremely low when compared to nonresident guided hunters. Resident hunters would not have an impact on the area.

PROPOSED BY: Richard French (SC-07S-G-008)

PROPOSAL 162 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep; and 5 AAC 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit. Amend the regulations as follows:

For subunits 13A and 13D: One full curl ram or larger every four regulatory years.

ISSUE: The well known and recognizable lower sheep populations in Unit 13A and 13D along with the high demand of this stressed resource. Plus, to help provide a quality outdoor sheep experience when hunting or viewing for all in these areas. The pressure needs to be limited and spread out. A regulation allowing the take of one full curl ram or larger every four regulatory years needs to be adopted and implemented just like the regulation that is currently in place for Unit 9 brown bear, the DS102 Tok sheep draw area, and the Kodiak brown bear draw areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The already extremely low sheep numbers will continue to decline from over harvesting. Additionally, outdoor sheep viewing and hunting quality experiences in these areas will continue to degrade and cause conflicts amongst all user groups of this resource.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Having this year requirement in place will help relieve some of the stress off this resource and greatly improve the experiences in the field of all users group.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who want to hunt sheep every year.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close these units to sheep hunting until sheep numbers rebound. I rejected this idea because it was to extreme.

PROPOSED BY: Don Schwandt (HQ-07S-G-071)

PROPOSAL 163 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep; and 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit. Amend the regulations as follows:

For Unit 13D sheep in the Klutina and Tonsina River drainages and their tributaries:
One full curl ram or larger every four regulatory years by drawing permit with season dates August 10 to September 30.

ISSUE: With the critically low sheep population numbers in the Klutina and Tonsina River drainages and their tributaries in Unit 13D, and along with the high demand of this over-stressed resource in these areas. Swift action is needed to limit and spread out the pressure on the sheep in these areas. With a lack of a predator control program in this unit for many years and additionally when the Unit 13D nonresident moose hunting seasons were eliminated. The guides using this area to conduct guided nonresident moose hunts shifted there moose hunter numbers into sheep hunters. These two key factors have had a devastating effect on the sheep populations in these areas. In order to help turn around the low sheep population in these areas, a one full curl ram or larger every four regulatory years by drawing permit regulations needs to be adopted and implemented immediately just like the regulation that is currently in place for DS102 Tok sheep draw area.

The combination of low sheep density, declining hunter success rates, apparent declining population trends, apparent lower age structure of adult male sheep, and lower yearly recruitment require regulating human harvest to allow for conservation of the population, and a sustainable quality experience for all users. Hunter numbers need to be regulated to allow this population to recover to previous higher levels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Without changes, the Unit 13D sheep population will continue to decline and be unable to sustain continued sport hunting, subsistence hunting, or viewing opportunities. Additionally, outdoor sheep viewing and hunting quality experiences in these areas will continue to degrade and cause conflicts amongst all user groups concerning this resource.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Having this permit system will provide managers another tool for managing the sheep population from year to year, and to maintain a healthy sustainable population for all user groups to take advantage of each year. This will help balance the demand between users to ensure sheep population numbers are at a sustainable level. Additionally, it will help provide a quality of experience.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This is a positive solution all around, it creates a smooth system to manage resource levels and provide a quality outdoor experience in Unit 13D for all

users and groups. In the long term all users and groups will benefit by having good numbers of sheep to harvest and view.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those that want to hunt sheep every year with no regard to resource levels.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close these areas to sheep hunting until sheep numbers rebound. I rejected this because it was to extreme when a sheep drawing systems was a better fit and would still allow limited use of this resource.

PROPOSED BY: Don Schwandt (HQ-07S-G-070)

PROPOSAL 164 - 5 AAC 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep.
Amend the regulation to provide the following:

For Units 14A and 14B, make all or a portion of these areas (drainages/ranges) drawing permit areas like Tok and Delta, and Unit 14C. Limit guides for areas using a selection point system similar to the federal system for refuges. Have guide client agreement for nonresident hunters.

ISSUE: Full curl Dall sheep not being in sufficient number for residents, guides and nonresidents. There are too many guides harvesting sheep. There are also low numbers of legal full curl rams. There are too many guides operating in Units 14A and B.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nature and Hunting pressure will make sheep hunting in the areas non-existent

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Limited harvest will result in better quality and numbers of Dall sheep.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskan resident hunters and the guide industry.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. All areas do not have to be drawing. Part of 14A and B can be designated open, otherwise drawing.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions considered, the area must be limited to drawing permits.

PROPOSED BY: Gary Munoz (SC-07S-G-006)

PROPOSAL 165 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep; and 5 AAC 92.530(X) Management areas. Amend the regulations as follows:

In Unit 14C, (department to determine subunit), provide three permits for full curl sheep for a winter drawing sheep hunt for senior citizens.

ISSUE: Add a winter drawing sheep hunt for seniors (age 60 and over) in Unit 14C for residents. For some of our seniors taking long extensive sheep hunting trips is often no longer

possible. A hunt in Unit 14C would allow them to continue to have access to a reasonable close area to harvest a legal sheep.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Many senior hunters will be unable to pursue hunting a legal sheep.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will allow greater access to the resource without over harvesting. It will increase the number of seniors who are capable of hunting for sheep.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Senior hunters who enjoy recreational opportunities to hunt for a sheep.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A small number of hunters who have not reached age 60.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Looked at area in Tok but far away from metropolitan areas.

PROPOSED BY: Mark Vingoe (SC-07S-G-043)

PROPOSAL 166 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep; and 5 AAC 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit. Amend the regulations for Unit 14A sheep to reflect the following:

The 14A sheep drawing permits will include the following conditions.

- a. One full curl ram or larger every 4 regulatory years by drawing permit.
- b. An alternate list would be established that represents the unsuccessful drawing applicants in the order that they were selected in the drawing. If a permit is not utilized through the alternate list it becomes available over the counter through registration after four working days from the time notice was given from the last alternate on a first come first serve basis.

Note: I recommend dividing it into two drawing areas: 1) Unit 14A south of the Glenn Highway, 2) Unit 14A north of the Glen Highway.

The proposed change would create new sheep drawing permit areas in Unit 14A like the 14C subunit. Subunit 14C has successful, established drawing permits for sheep. This new drawing permit hunt would fall into the winter drawing permit supplement cycle for sheep. Permit systems that have been in place have benefited game populations over those areas with unrestricted harvests. Additionally, this would help all users have a more enjoyable time in the field in Unit 14A by limiting and spreading out users.

ISSUE: In the last seven years, I and many other users have seen a noticeable and steady decline in sheep population in Unit 14A. The significant increase in hunting pressure from hunters, transporters and guides are obvious factors in this decline. The increase cost of transportation into remote Alaska bush areas over the years has contributed to the increase in pressure in this area, along with its close proximity to Anchorage and Palmer, Alaska areas. My hours of personal observations over the years here continually reveal lower numbers of adult male sheep, and what appears to be a lower age structure of the sheep harvested. This raises

serious concerns about the status of their population. I believe the combination of low sheep density, and apparent declining population trends and lower yearly recruitment raises serious concerns as to regulating the harvest quota to allow for conservation of the population, and a sustainable quality experience for all users. The population must recover to previous higher levels in order to achieve this.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Without changes, the Unit 14A sheep population will continue to decline and be unable to sustain continued hunting viewing opportunities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Having this permit system will provide managers another simple tool for managing the sheep population from year to year, and to maintain a healthy sustainable population for all user groups to take advantage of each year. This will help balance the demand between users to ensure sheep population numbers are at a sustainable level. Additionally, it will help provide a quality of experience and enhanced safety for all.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This is a positive solution all around, it creates a smooth system to manage resource levels and provide a quality outdoor experience in Unit 14A for all users and groups. In the long term all users and groups will benefit by having good numbers of sheep to harvest and view. Last, this permit system takes into account all groups, to include the Alaska residents as well as the nonresidents, plus ensures there is enough of a resource for viewing.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Also, those that want to leave it the way it is. Guides and transporters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None at this time.

PROPOSED BY: Don Schwandt (HQ-07S-G-072)

PROPOSAL 167 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep, and 5 AAC 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit. Amend the regulations for Unit 14C sheep to include the following conditions:

- a. One full curl ram or larger every four regulatory years.
- b. An alternate list would be established that represents the unsuccessful drawing applicants in the order that they were selected in the drawing. If a permit is not utilized through the alternate list it becomes available over the counter through registration after four working days from the time notice was given from the last alternate on a first come first serve basis, in person or by phone.

ISSUE: Amend the Unit 14C sheep hunting regulations. Unit 14C sheep permits are in high demand and to give all sheep hunters an opportunity to draw a highly prized Unit 14C sheep permit. A one full curl ram or larger every four regulatory years regulation needs to be implemented just like the regulation that is currently in place for DS102 Tok sheep draw area, Kodiak brown bear draw areas, and Unit 9 brown bear.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Numerous hunters will get multiple permits of this prized sheep draw area while others receive none.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Having this year requirement in place will help give more hunters an opportunity at this highly sought after resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users that want to hunt sheep in GMU 14C

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who harvested a Unit 14C sheep and want a 14C sheep permit every year.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There are no other solutions I found to consider at this time.

PROPOSED BY: Don Schwandt (HQ-07S-G-073)

PROPOSAL 168 - 5 AAC 92.171. Sealing of Dall sheep horns. Amend the regulation as follows:

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

ISSUE: Misguided sheep sealing requirement.

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

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Chapter of FNAWS and Anchorage Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-079)

PROPOSAL 169 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf.

Amend the regulation as follows:

Allow land and shoot hunting for wolves in Unit 9B, December 1 – March 30.

ISSUE: Residents are having difficulty in harvesting wolves in 9B.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued over-population of wolves, resulting in the declining population of moose and caribou.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lake Iliamna Advisory Committee (HQ-07S-G-010)

PROPOSAL 170 - 5 AAC 92.125. Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans.

Amend the regulation as follows:

Implement a predator management plan for Unit 9 to help increase the caribou populations so that caribou can be harvested.

ISSUE: The need for a predator management plan for Unit 9B, 9C, and 9E.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Caribou population in 9C and 9E will continue to be below harvestable levels. Moose population will continue to decline.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Randy Alvarez (HQ-07S-G-008)

PROPOSAL 171 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf. Amend the regulation as follows:

In Unit 13, change the wolf hunting season to August 10 – June 15.

ISSUE: Wolf hunting season ending April 30.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Lost opportunity for harvesting wolves.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Proposal improves the chance for moose and caribou calf survival.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wolf hunters, moose and caribou hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who do not want to hunt wolves.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSAL 172 - 5 AAC 92.125. Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans. Amend this regulation as follows:

Unit 13 aerial wolf control area is expanded to the Alaska railroad.

ISSUE: Wolf harvest opportunities due to exclusion of the Unit 13E area east of the Alaska railroad are being lost. This area should be included in the aerial wolf management plan.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Base moose herd will continue to decline in the area. Pilots report lost wolf harvest opportunities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Increased moose, caribou, and sheep survival.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who want moose herd recovery

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No adequate data for suffers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Denali Advisory Committee

(SC-07S-G-010)

PROPOSAL 173 - 5AAC 92.125. Unit 16 Wolf and Black Bear Predation Control Implementation Plan. Establish a predator implementation plan for Unit 16A, and a black bear predator plan for Unit 16B as follows:

(1) Geographical area description: A mainland 16 wolf predation control area is established and consists of all non-federal lands and non-state park lands within the mainland portion of Game Management Unit 16 encompassing approximately 12,300 square miles.

(2) Geographical area description: A mainland 16(B) black bear predation control area is established and consists of all non-federal lands and within the mainland portion of Game Management Unit 16(B) encompassing approximately 10,393 square miles.

(3) Authorization for the department to conduct a predation control program: Notwithstanding any of the provisions in this title, the commissioner or the commissioner’s designee may conduct a wolf population reduction or wolf population regulation program in the Unit 16 wolf predation control area and may conduct a black bear population reduction or black bear population regulation program in the Unit 16(B) black bear control area.

(4) Discussion of wildlife population and human use information:

(A) Prey population information

(i) The moose population for mainland Unit 16B was estimated in fall 2005 to be 3193-3951 moose, based on census data collected in 2003 and 2005 in the unit The moose population for Unit 16A was estimated to be 1422-1815 moose, based on census data collected in fall 2005. These populations are composed of subpopulations that reside wholly in Unit 16 however a subpopulation from the eastern half of Unit 16A and a subpopulation from the flanks of Mount Susitna and Alexander Creek mix in winter with moose from Units 14B and 14A in the Sustina River.

(ii) Habitat does not appear to be limiting these moose populations, or a factor in calf survival, and is not expected to limit the moose populations at objective levels. While the majority of the unit is covered in a mixed forest composed of birch spruce and cottonwoods, habitat has changed little since the high moose densities of the 50's, 60's and 70's. Fire has not played a major roll in Unit 16 creating moose forage due to the mixed nature of the forest and high levels of precipitation. The minimum moose density objective for mainland Unit 16B is 1.0 moose per square mile and for Unit 16A is 2.2 moose per square mile based on the intensive management objectives of 6,500-7,500 and 3,500-4,000 moose. Presently, mainland 16B and 16A moose population estimates place moose densities at .55 and 1.0 moose per square mile.

(iii) The age structure of the population in mainland Unit 16B is believed to have shifted towards the older age classes in the 1990's as the moose population declined. The number of spike-fork bulls estimated in the mainland 16B census and survey data 1999-2005, which is approximately the same as the number of yearling bulls in the population, showed ratios of three to eight yearling bulls per 100 cows. Assuming these numbers to be half the year's cohort, this indicates an approximately recruitment rate of 6-16 percent. Given estimated moose mortality rates in the mainland 16B population, the decline in numbers/or lack of recovery is expected to continue without active predator control activities. Unit 16A moose rebounded after the severe winters of the late 80's due to milder winter weather and adequate calf recruitment to a population estimate of 3636 in 1997. The average calves per 100 cows ratio during fall moose censuses during this period was 30.5 calves per 100 cows. Despite winter weather similar to the growth period 1990-1997 the population declined by 33 percent to a census estimate of 2420 by 2000 in direct correlation to the growth in the wolf population. By 2005, the population fell another 33 percent to a census estimate of 1619. Given the recent problems with poor recruitment and survival of adult cows, without active predation control activities the moose population in Unit 16A can be expected to continue to decline to levels similar to those in adjacent Unit 16B.

(iv) The bull to cow moose ratio for main land Unit 16B in fall 2003-2005 was between 23-35 bulls per 100 cows for the three census and trend areas. This is similar to ratios observed in the 1990's. The bull to cow ratio in Unit 16A for fall 2005 is 22 bulls per 100 cows. This would represent the lowest ratio in 30 years and is directly related to heavy hunting pressure due to a 50 day season and restrictions on hunting in Unit 16B mainland and other neighboring units.

(v) Limited flights in spring 2005 to count newborn calves and natality data from radio collared moose indicated the 80 percent of adult cows gave birth with 50 percent of these having twins. Together, these data indicated a birth rate of 122 calves per 100 cows. The collared moose are located primarily in the middle-eastern part of Unit 16B and southern Unit 16A where densities are greater than .6 moose per square mile. A high twinning rate following a severe winter is a characteristic of a moose population well below carrying capacity. Flights conducted I the spring of 2006 found a twinning rate of 50 percent.

(vi) The calf to cow moose ratio during the fall moose surveys and censuses from 2003-2005 for Unit 16B fall between 14-23 calves per 100 cows. Ratios have not been above 20 calves per 100 cows in the northern $\frac{3}{4}$ of Unit 16B for nearly a decade. With estimated over-winter calf mortality of 40 percent the recruitment rate would be 8 to 14 moose per 100 cows. Information collected form radio collared moose in December following parturition indicate a calf survival rate of 8 percent and a calf to cow ratio of 10:100 which was lower than the ratio observed during the November census of the area. The reason for the difference between natality and recruitment appears to be largely due to predation. The calf to cow moose ratio fro Unit 16A from a 2005 fall census was 19 calves per 100 cows down to 45 percent from the 35 year average of 35 calves per 100 cows and constituted the lowest ratio ever recorded. Fall calf numbers have fallen as the bear to moose ratio has dropped from approximately one bear per 4.5 moose to one bear per two moose. This was caused by the 55 percent moose population decline between 1997 and 2005.

(vii) The current harvestable surplus (for 2006) in Unit 16B mainland is 140 bulls which is well under both the minimum harvest objective of 310 moose and the minimum of 199-227 harvestable moose need to meet the amount necessary for subsistence. This number is a reflection of the overall decline in the moose population even though bull to cow ratios have been at or above objective. As a result the moose herd has provided only limited resident-only harvest for several years. Using an extremely high harvest rate of 10 percent for Unit 16A would only provide a harvestable surplus of 160 bull moose, well under the minimum harvest objective of 190 moose. Harvesting half the remaining bulls most likely would alter the composition of the moose population in a biologically unacceptable manner.

(viii) The Intensive Management population objectives established by the Board of Game for mainland Unit 16B and Unit 16A are moose populations of 6500-7500 and 3500-4000 and the Intensive Management harvest objectives are 310-600 and 190-360.

(ix) The decline in the mainland Unit 16B moose population is attributed to poor calf survival, high adult mortality, and four consecutive severe winters in the late 1980's. Snow related malnutrition has probably been overemphasized during the 1990's as recently radio collared cows, calves and yearlings during the moderate winter in 2005-2006 with snow depths in excess of 37 inches showed excellent health in March with 100 percent survival of 85 collared moose. This high survival rate indicates that the wolf control program initiated in 2004 has substantially increased moose survivability. The fact that the Unit 16B moose population at a density of 1.0-1.2 moose per square mile declined by 13 percent from 1990 to 1997 and the Unit 16A moose population just across the Kahiltna and Yentna rivers at a density of 1.9 to 2.2 moose per square mile grew by 16 percent while experiencing the same winters implies that winter related malnutrition was not an important factor in the decline of the moose population in Unit 16B. The mainland Unit 16B moose population is considered to be substantially reduced from the mid 1980's when estimates place the population at approximately 10,000 moose and is currently about half the IM population objective. The decline in the Unit 16A moose population is attributed to high adult mortality, particularly cows. The current Unit 16A moose population is less than half the IM population objective.

(x) Without an effective wolf and black bear control program, moose in mainland Unit 16B are likely to persist at low numbers or continue to decline. Without an effective wolf control program, moose in Unit 16A are likely to persist at low numbers or continue to decline. Data from moose mortality and predator/prey studies conducted throughout Alaska and similar areas in Canada indicate that reducing the numbers of wolves and black bears in mainland Unit 16B and wolves in Unit 16A can reasonably be expected to increase survival calves, yearlings, and adult moose.

(B) Human use information for prey populations.

(i) Reported subsistence harvest for mainland 16B has varied from 30 to 120 moose, and some additional subsistence harvest occurs within the general fall hunting season when one is held. During regulatory year 2003-2004 Tier II subsistence harvest was 80; in regulatory year 2004 – 2005 it was 79.

(ii) High demand for subsistence moose is demonstrated by the 900 to 1100 applicants who annually apply for the 260 to 460 permits available for mainland Unit 16(B). Additional subsistence demand exists within the unit and is captured by the limited general resident-only hunting opportunity that has occurred in September in recent years.

(iii) All general season and fall Tier II moose bag limits were reduced in 1993 to one bull with a spike or fork or 50" antlers or antlers with three or more brow tines on one side in mainland Unit 16. Nonresident moose hunting was first reduced to a portion of Unit 16(B) in 1993 and completely eliminated in 2001. All general season hunting was closed in 2001 and 2002 and only a limited Tier I subsistence (resident only) season was allowed in Unit 16B 2003-2005. In 2001 any bull drawing permits and winter spike fork hunts were eliminated in Unit 16A. The average general season harvests for Unit 16B from 1972-1992 was 426 moose; from

1983 through 1989 was 388; and declined to 168 from 1990 – 1999. Recent resident-only seasons in mainland Unit 16B in 2003, 2004, and 2005 produced harvests of 83, 84, and 53 bulls respectively. The average general season harvests for Unit 16A was 217 moose from 1983-1989; 140 from 1990-1999; and recent harvests for 2003, 2004, and 2005 were 167, 139, and 94. Recent harvests of bulls for Unit 16A reflect a nonsustainable harvest rate of 6 to 11 percent of the current population estimate.

(iv) There is a small, limited demand for moose to provide for rural federal subsistence hunting on federal lands within mainland Unit 16(B). Subsistence hunting in northwest Unit 16B has declined in recent years as success is difficult since the moose population has declined on federal land from 198 moose in 1984 to 41 moose in 2005 and densities have dropped from one moose per square mile to one moose per seven square miles. These moose numbers were obtained from counts conducted by the National Park Service. There is some interest in moose for viewing opportunities in portions of the unit where guides and other operations provide services that promote wildlife viewing.

(v) It is unlikely that the demand in mainland Unit 16(B) for moose for subsistence and general hunting opportunity will decline. Given the increasing human population in the nearby Anchorage and Mat-Su Valley areas as well as historic local subsistence use, it is probable that demand will match any increase in harvestable surplus gained through active management of the moose herd to current management objectives.

(C) Predator population information.

(i) The fall 2005 wolf population in mainland Unit 16(B) was estimated to be 85- 114 wolves in 10 to 12 different packs, a density of approximately 0.82 to 1.1 wolves per 100 square miles. The fall 2005 wolf population in Unit 16A was estimated to be 39-55 wolves in five to seven packs, a density of approximately 1.95 to 2.75 wolves per 100 square miles.

(ii) Habitat carrying capacity for wolves is dependent upon prey availability and competition from other predators such as brown and black bears. Carrying capacity for wolves in Unit 16 mainland has not been determined, however harvest from sealing records and a sample unit probability estimation in 1993 and a lice treatment program in 1999 have indicated the wolf population had grown substantially from estimate in the early 1990's. The average annual harvest from sealing records during 1984-1988 was 6.6 wolves compared to a single year harvest in 2002-2003 of 88 wolves.

(iii) In mainland Unit 16B the current wolf to moose ratio is between 28 and 46 moose per wolf. The pre-control (2003) estimated ratio was as low as 17:1. In Unit 16A the current wolf to moose ratio is between 29 and 41 moose per wolf. Historically, estimates have ranged as high as 250 moose per wolf in this unit.

(iv) Alternate prey includes caribou, sheep, beaver and hare. For most wolves in Unit 16 there are few options for alternate prey. Small populations of caribou and sheep exist in the higher elevations of the western side of the unit. However pack territorial structure probably prohibits most wolves from accessing this limited resource, thus limiting them to small prey such as beaver, domestic pets, and hare.

(v) The number of moose that are killed by wolves in any give year is highly dependent on the depth of winter snowfall, competition with other predators and the abundance of alternate prey. In Alaska and areas of Canada where moose are the primary prey of wolves, studies documented kill rates form four to seven moose per wolf per winter. Using this range with our current population estimate of wolves in Unit 16, wolves are estimated to be capable of taking between 496 and 1183 moose per winter.

(vi) Mortality factors affecting wolves in mainland Unit 16 include Human harvest, other wolves, and disease or malnutrition. Harvest of wolves in the unit has increased form a low of two animals in the fall/winter of 1990/1991 to 88 in the fall/winter of 2002/2003. Total wolf take for 2004-2005 was 127 animals with 81 of those taken in the predator control program initiated in January of 2005 in Unit 16B.

(vii) It is the intent of this plan to maintain wolves as part of the natural ecosystem within the geographical area described for this plan. However, studies in Alaska and elsewhere have repeatedly concluded that large, annual reductions in wolf populations are required to reduce wolf population levels and predation on their prey. To achieve the desired reduction in wolf predation, but insure that wolves persist within the plan area, the wolf population objective for Unit 16B mainland is set between 22 and 45 wolves for Unit 16A is set between 8 and 15 wolves.

(viii) Wolf harvest objectives in mainland Unit 16 have been set in an attempt to reduce the wolf population to the population objectives of between 22 and 45 for Unit 16B and 8 and 15 for Unit 16A. This would require a reduction in wolves from hunting, trapping, and the control program of between 40 and 92 animals in Unit 16B and between 24 and 47 animals in Unit 16A at current wolf population levels.

(ix) Without a predator control program in the Unit 16 mainland area, it can be expected that the wolf population will increase to numbers at or above their historic high levels. Current trends in fuel prices, low fur prices, and low quality of wolf pelts in the unit due to the louse infestation, have resulted in a decrease in hunting and trapping effort in the area, thus removing the major cause of wolf mortality. If the predator control program continues it is expected that the wolf population will be reduced toward the IM population objectives.

(x) The 2005 estimate for the black bear population for Unit 16B is 2100 bears. The population has been assumed stable since 2001. The 2001 estimate was based on the line transect surveys conducted during the spring of 2000 and 2001 in the northern section of Unit 16 which produced an estimate of 29.3 black bears per 100 square miles. Applying this to the 1995 estimate of 9346 square miles of brown bear habitat in Unit 16 produced an overall estimate of 2700 bears for Unit 16 with 2100 bears in Unit 16B.

(xi) In Unit 16B the current black bear to moose ratio is one bear per 1.6 moose and may be the lowest ever in the area. Black bears were heavily hunted by the area natives in the early 1900's so black bear populations were probably much lower than present day. The black bear population has not been thought to have increased significantly in the last 30 years; the low ratio is a product of the reduced moose population of the unit.

(xii) Black bears are omnivores and moose calves, and adults to a much lesser extent, are primarily a spring food source. Alternate food sources include salmon, greases, berries, insects, small mammals, snowmachine seeds, etc. it is believed that black bear populations are not limited by the decline in the moose population, other than an increase in mortality by brown bears is possibly occurring.

(xiii) The number of moose calves killed by black bears has not been measured in Unit 16B, however, studies conducted in neighboring Unit 13 and 19 with the same species of moose and bear have shown that black bears contributed heavily to moose calf predation during the spring and summer. It has been suspected for nearly two decades that bear predation on calves in Unit 16B were the main reason for calves per 100 cow ratios below 25 in the fall composition counts. Unit 16B fall calf to cow ratios have been below 20 since the mid 1990's for most years and throughout most of the unit. One exception would be the Kalgan Island (a predator free environment) where ratios have been between 36 and 60 calves per 100 cows. Using the current natality data from the radio collared cows and an estimated 122 calves per 100 cows and approximately 2200 cows in the Unit 16B moose population and only 14-23 calves per 100 cows in the fall composition counts would put spring and summertime calf mortality at 2178 to 2376 calves. Crediting the black bear population with 40 percent of this mortality which have occurred in studies in neighboring units, would produce an estimate of black bear calf predation at 871 to 950 calves.

(xiv) Mortality factors affecting the Unit 16B black bear population would be predation by brown bears, cannibalism, and human harvest. Harvest of bears has fluctuated during the last decade from 67 to 173 with female component generally below 30 percent of harvest. Not trend

in harvest is apparent for the last 30 years. The harvest for the last 30 years would average less than 100 bears per year. This would be approximately a 4.5 percent harvest rate and would not have had any impact on the black bear population.

(xv) It is the intent of this plan to maintain black bears as part of the natural ecosystem within the geographical area described in this plan. There is no minimum population objective for black bears in Unit 16B, however, the level of removal will not be allowed to exceed one fourth of the current population estimate of 2100 bears yearly or 550 bears per year. The level of harvest may be severely restricted the following spring when fall composition counts show at least 35 calves per 100 cows.

(xvi) Black bear harvest objectives in mainland Unit 16B have been set in an attempt to reduce black bear predation primarily on moose calves. There is no attempt to scientifically calculate the exact number of bears necessary to be removed in order to achieve the desired increase in calf survival. Any attempt would probably not have any scientific validity based on innumerable variable and unknowns. (Such as the exact number of bears, composition of bear population, number of bears involved in calf mortality, productivity of bear population, percent of calves killed by black bears, number of calves born each spring, distribution of black bear population, number of cows killed defending calves, etc.) Amount of removal required and specific areas of removals will be monitored by yearly moose composition counts conducted in the unit currently funded through unit management funds.

(xvii) Without black bear predator control program in Unit 16B it can be expected that the black bear population will remain stable or increase. Current demand for black bears by hunters using current methods and means, generally allowed during general hunting, and using current definitions of legal bears will not achieve the objective of reducing the black bear population and achieve the desired increase in calf survival. If a black bear predator control program is instituted it is expected that moose calf survival will increase to a level that will allow growth in the mainland Unit 16B moose population towards the IM objective.

(D) Human use information for predator populations:

(i) Harvest of wolves with a firearm (excluding same day airborne take) has been highly variable since the early 1980's and has ranged from zero to 42 wolves. Since 2000, firearms have accounted for an average of 23 wolves annually, or 40 percent of the harvest. Harvest of wolves with the use of a snare or trap has similarly been highly variable and has ranged from one to 65. Since 2000, the use of traps and snares has accounted for 46 wolves annually, or 60 percent of the harvest.

(ii) Unit 16 receives less trapping pressure than some other areas of the state. Hunter harvest of wolves has always been opportunistic, and is difficult to predict. Trapper harvest of wolves is limited by the number of skilled trappers willing to spend the time targeting this furbearer amidst variable winter travel conditions. Winters have begun later, and have been highly variable in temperature and snowfall in recent years for creating hazardous conditions for winter hunters and trappers. In addition to open creeks and regular overflow, many large rivers in the area have stayed open until late winter or even year round, completely eliminating pressure from remote areas of the unit.

(iii) Harvest of black bears in Unit 16 has been highly variable since 1973 with a low of 67 and a high of 250 with percent female between 23 and 42 percent. Since 1993 the harvest in Unit 16B has ranged from 67 to 173 bears. This is well below the current harvest objective of 225 bears per year with greater than 30 percent being female. Generally, about 2/3 of the harvest occurs in the spring. It was thought that recent closures in the fall moose season would negatively impact opportunistic black bear harvest by moose hunters. There does not seem to be any pattern of reduced fall harvest that corresponds with moose seasons. There is no corresponding evidence to support this theory.

(iv) The current black bear season is open the entire year with a three bear limit. Several changes in methods and means, salvage requirements, and redefinitions of a legally harvestable

bear may be required to meet management objectives. Removal of certain requirements related to bear baiting registration, distance for unoccupied seasons cabins, and adjustments in the baiting season would probably increase harvest.

(5) Predator and prey population levels and populations objectives and the basis for those objectives:

(A) The fall 2005 moose populations for mainland Unit 16B was estimated to be 3193-3951 moose compared to the Intensive Management objective of 6500-7500. The fall 2005 moose population for Unit 16A was estimated to be 1422-1815 as compared to the Intensive Management objective of 3500-4000 moose. The IM objectives were developed based on the fact that the populations were at this level at the time of adoption of the IM objectives. Both units from the late forties through the eighties were at or well above these objectives. The IM harvest objectives reflect harvest routinely achieved or exceeded during the seventies and eighties.

(B) The pre-control population of wolves in Unit 16B in the fall of 2003 was 160-220. The pre-control population of wolves in Unit 16A in fall 2005 was 39-55. Studies in Alaska and elsewhere have repeatedly concluded that large annual reductions of wolves are required to diminish wolf population levels and predation by wolves on their prey. Consistent with scientific studies and department experience and objective of this plan is to substantially reduce wolf numbers compared to the pre-control level in order to relieve predation pressure on moose and allow for improved recruitment to the moose population. This plan also has a goal to maintain wolves as part of the natural ecosystem within the described geographical area. To achieve the desired reduction in wolf predation, but ensure that wolves persist within the pan area the wolf population in Unit 16B and Unit 16A will be reduced to no fewer than 22 and 8 wolves respectively.

(C) The spring (late winter) wolf population objectives for Unit 16B and 16A were set at 22-45 and 8-15 wolves based on prior estimates of the wolf population sizes in the area when the moose populations achieved high densities in the past.

(D) The Unit 16B black bear population estimate for fall 2005 is estimated at 2100 bears. Studies in neighboring Units 13 and 19 have found that black bear predation on calves to be a major cause of summer time calf mortality. The removal of large numbers of bears during experiments conducted in these units has shown a corresponding increase in calf survival. It is expected that the removal of a large number and/or a reducing in the black bear population in and around calving areas and during calving season will result in a significant increase in recruitment into the moose population. To achieve the desired reduction in black bear predation, but ensure that black bears persist in the unit the black bear population will be reduced to no fewer than 1000 bears. Control efforts will be suspended when fall moose composition counts show at least 35 calves per 100 cows.

(E) There is no black bear population objective for the unit. The management objective since 20001 has been to reduce the black bear population in order to reduce predation on the declining moose population.

(6) Justification for predator control implementation plan.

(A) The Board of Game determined the moose populations in mainland Unit 16B and Unit 16A important for providing high levels of human consumptive use; the board established objectives for population sizes and annual sustained harvest of moose is consistent with multiple use and principles of sound conservation and management of habitat and all wildlife species in the area; the objectives of the predation control program are to halt the decline of the moose populations within the control areas and to increase the fall (post-hunt) moose populations to the Intensive Management objectives of 6500-7500 and 3500-4000 moose, providing a sustainable harvest of 310-600 and 190-360 moose for Units 16B and 16A.

(B) The population objectives for moose in mainland Unit 16 are not being met and this is largely due to high predator numbers in comparison to moose numbers which will not allow moose population growth due to high levels of predation.

(C) A reduction in wolf numbers and a reduction in bear numbers through liberalized bear hunting methods and a black bear control program in Unit 16B are necessary to enhance survival of mainland Unit 16 moose, halt the population decline, and achieve population objectives in the wolf and black bear predation control areas. During the 1970's and the 1980's, same day airborne hunting of wolves by the public, at little or no cost to the department, effectively kept wolf populations at level well below present levels, and moose populations were increasing or stable; trapper and hunter harvests of wolves in the last 10 years has averaged less than 2.5 wolves per trapper and hunter. Black bear predation on calves prior to the mid 1980's was not causing a decline in the mainland Unit 16B moose population. A severe decline in the moose population in the late 1980's due to four consecutive severe winters caused an imbalance between moose and bear numbers which has become progressively worse as the moose population declined by half during the 1990's. The current black bear season, bag limit, and methods and means have changed little in the last 20 years. Hunter harvest has averaged about five percent of the population with the female component around 30 percent. This harvest has been well within sustainable levels having no effect on the black bear population.

(D) Moose population objectives are not being met although trapper and hunter harvest of wolves have increased over the last 10 years and black seasons have been long and limits have been high for mainland Unit 16. Maximum harvest opportunity appears to have been provided for wolves and black bears and wolf numbers have been above population objectives since the early 1990's and harvest rates on black bears have not been high enough to cause any reduction in the black bear population. The current spring population objective in the mainland Unit 16 control use area is 22-45 wolves in 3 to 5 packs in Unit 16B and 8-15 wolves in 1 to 3 packs in Unit 16A. The fall wolf population estimate for Unit 16B is 85-114 wolves in 10 to 12 packs and 39-55 wolves in 5 to 7 packs in Unit 16A.

(E) Previous programs utilizing same-day airborne hunting of wolves effectively kept the wolf population at levels well below present levels, and moose populations were increasing or stable. Airplane based control of wolf populations is necessary to reduce numbers over short periods of time and allows for a more timely recovery of the moose population.

(F) Multiple measures have been taken to improve survival of moose within mainland Unit 16 general predator hunting and wolf trapping seasons alone have failed to result in sufficient reductions of predators and increased numbers of moose. Liberalization of seasons, bag limits, and other restrictions on harvest of bears and wolves has shown no detectable effect on the moose population in the unit. After one year of the wolf control program 85 radio collared cows, yearlings, and calves have show 100 percent survival through March of the moderate winter of 2005-2006. The ongoing wolf control program appears to be showing an increase in winter survival of all moose. Currently in Unit 16B there is a year round season for black bear with a three bear limit and no tag required for brown bear with a two bear limit.

(G) Presently known alternatives to predator control for reducing the number of predators are ineffective, impractical, or uneconomical in the Unit 16 situation. Hunting and trapping conducted under the authority of ordinary hunting and trapping seasons and bag limit is not an effective reduction technique in sparsely populated areas such as Unit 16. Numbers of hunter and trappers are relatively low and so far have been unsuccessful increasing the harvest of wolves and black bears to the extent of having a positive effect on the moose population. The inherent wariness of wolves, difficult access, and relatively poor pelt prices also explain low harvest rates on wolves. The more difficult hunting and remote nature of Unit 16B has resulted in little black bear hunting pressure. Application of the most common sterilization techniques (surgery, implants or inoculation) are not effective reduction techniques because they require immobilization of individual predators, which is extremely expensive in remote areas.

Relocation of black bears and wolves is impractical because it is expensive and difficult to find publicly acceptable places for relocated animals. Habitat manipulation is ineffective because birth rates and pregnancy rates are at extremely high levels and high mortality due to predation is the reason for the continuing decline in the moose population. Supplemental feeding of wolves and bears as an alternative to predator control has improved moose calf survival in experiments. However, large numbers of moose carcasses are not available for this kind of effort and transporting them to remote areas of Alaska is not practical. Stocking of moose is impractical because of capturing and moving expense. Any of the alternatives to a wolf and black bear predation control program are not likely to be effective in achieving the desired level of predator harvest.

(7) Methods and means.

(A) Hunting and trapping of wolves in Unit 16 and hunting of black bears in Unit 16B during the term of this program will occur as provided in the hunting and trapping regulations set out elsewhere in this title, including the use of motorized vehicles provided for in 5 AAC 92.080.

(B) The commissioner may issue public aerial shooting permits or public land and shoot permits as a method of wolf removal pursuant to AS 16.05.783.

(C) The commissioner may authorize the following methods and means for black bear control in Unit 16B; the use of communications equipment, sale of hides and skulls, trapping, bear baiting, changing the definition of a legal bear, and same day airborne taking.

(8) Anticipated time frame and schedule for update and reevaluation.

(A) For up to five years beginning on July 1, 2007 the commissioner may reduce the wolf population in mainland Unit 16 and black bear population in Unit 16B.

(B) Annually, the department shall to the extent practicable, provide to the board at the spring board meeting, a report of program activities conducted during the preceding 12 months, including implementation activities, the status of moose, fall moose calf numbers, and wolf and black bear populations, and recommendations for changes, if necessary, to achieve the plans objective, which is moose population growth.

(9) Other specifications the board considers necessary.

(A) The commissioner shall reduce the wolf population and the black bear population in Unit 16B in an efficient manner, but as safely and humanely as practical.

(B) The commissioner will suspend wolf control activities:

(i) When wolf control inventories and/or accumulated information from permittees indicate the need to avoid reducing wolf numbers below the management minimum objectives of 22 wolves in Unit 16B and 8 wolves in unit 16A specified in this section; or

(ii) When spring conditions deteriorate to make wolf control operations infeasible; or

(iii) No later than April 30 in any regulatory year.

(C) The commissioner will suspend black bear control activities

(i) When fall moose composition counts in mainland Unit 16B show at least 35 calves per 100 cows; or

(ii) When the fall black bear population estimates indicate that continued black bear control will reduce the black bear population below 1000 bears.

(D) Wolf and bear control activities will be terminated

(i) When prey population management objectives are obtained; or

(ii) Upon expiration of the period during which the commissioner is authorized to reduce predator control numbers in the predator control area.

(E) The commissioner will annually close wolf hunting and trapping seasons and bear hunting seasons as appropriate to ensure that the minimum wolf population objectives are met and that at least 1000 black bears remain in Unit 16B.

ISSUE: The Board of Game is not in compliance with the applicable requirements under

5 AAC 92.106, Section 3, which in summary, requires that the board will find that depletion of a big game prey population has occurred when: A.) The number of animals available for harvest estimated by the department on an annual basis is less than the minimum harvest objected. 1. This harvest cannot reduce the population below objective, 2. this harvest cannot prevent growth toward objective, 3. this harvest cannot alter the composition in an unacceptable manner. B.) The population size is below objective. Section 4.: The board will determine if a finding may result in significant reduction of harvestable surplus. Section 5: The board will not consider as significant: A.) any reduction that allows harvest of objective and B.) Any reduction that is short term in nature. The board will utilize management of habitat and predation to reverse reduction in harvest.

Unit 16A has met the above requirements since the spring board meeting of 2001 when the current harvest level of 140 moose (minimum objective 190) was found unsustainable and the board removed the any bull drawing hunts and the winter spike fork hunts. Thinking that the reduction in harvest would be more than wanted, the board added five days to the spike fork-three brow tine general season. However, the overall goal was to reduce harvest below 140 animals. The current moose population from a census conducted in the fall of 2005 is 1619 animals (minimum objective 3500) with a barely adequate bull to cow ration of 22; calf ratios at a 35 year low of 19 per 100 cows.

As far as meeting the requirements of 5 AAC 92.106, Section 3: 1.) Any harvest is driving the moose population further below objective. A harvest of 190 animals out of a total of 1619 would be a non-sustainable rate of approximately 12 percent. 2.) Cow or calf harvest would be preventing growth towards objective, which leaves bulls only. 3.) With approximately 250 bulls in the population with poor calf recruitment increasing this number slightly a harvest of 190 bulls would surely drive the bull to cow ration well below the minimum of 20 bulls per 100 cows which would result in a biologically unacceptable composition.

As regards to Section 6, I am aware of no active management occurring within Unit 16A that is for the sole purpose to address the depletion in the big game prey population of that subunit. The second issue addressed is the 20 years of poor calf survival primarily caused by bear predation within Unit 16B.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose populations in Unit 16 will continue to persist well below objectives. Harvest objectives of moose and black bears will never be achieved.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The moose populations should grow.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters or viewers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Add Unit 16A to black bear control and include brown bears. It is unclear which bear species is doing the most calf killing. Since the department is not doing in depth calf mortality study, anecdotal evidence from calf twinning studies indicates many black bears in and among calving moose.

PROPOSED BY: David McHoes

(HQ-07S-G-034)

PROPOSAL 174 - 5 AAC 92.125. Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans.

Establish a wolf control program for Unit 15.

We would like the board to initiate a wolf control program that would take 100 wolves off the Kenai Peninsula. It might require the need for a bounty system since aerial hunting will not work well here.

ISSUE: Too many wolves on the Kenai Peninsula and not enough hunting or trapping them because the hides have little value due to the lice problem. Wolves are killing too many moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose populations will go down, we should not wait until the population becomes critical to do something.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who wants a stable moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who believe game management should be left to mother nature.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Central Peninsula Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-055)

PROPOSAL 175 - 5 AAC 92.125. Predation Control Areas Implementation Plans. Amend the regulation as follows:

Establish a wolf control program in Unit 17B and 17C, areas important to the Mulchatna caribou herd.

ISSUE: Continued decline of the Mulchatna caribou herd and predation by wolves.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued predation, especially on newborn calves, will contribute to the decline of this herd.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Reducing the number of Mulchatna caribou killed by wolves will slow the decline of this herd and help in its recovery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who use Mulchatna caribou.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who do not like wolf control.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Same.

PROPOSED BY: Hans Nicholson (HQ-07S-G-053)

PROPOSAL 176 - 5 AAC 85.065 Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Amend the regulation as follows:

Unit 9: Ten coyotes, August 10 – **May 25**[APRIL 30].

ISSUE: Change the coyote hunting season in Unit 9 to be the same as the wolf hunting season in Unit 9 as it used to be before the wolf season was lengthened to May 25. Most areas of the state have the same season dates for wolf and coyote. This has caused needless confusion.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Confusion about these seasons will continue and fear of misidentification may result in fewer wolves being taken. Misidentification could result in a needless citation.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those wishing to see less confusion in the hunting regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Richard Guthrie (HQ-07S-G-041)

PROPOSAL 177 - 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Amend the regulation as follows for the southcentral and southwest units:

No closed season, no bag limit on coyotes.

ISSUE: Increasing coyote populations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? I think Dall sheep populations will continue to decrease in certain parts of the state.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? My proposal would help sheep populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Big game and predator hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered lengthening the dates and the bag limits. I rejected the idea because coyotes are kind of a novelty or an incidental animal. Meaning that most people harvest them by chance while pursuing different big game species. I think coyotes have expanded their range and are taking a toll on the sheep population statewide. Coyotes are not worth much money wise, compared to wolves. So most trappers do not target them. Most hunters, or at least some of them, will not shoot a coyote while hunting big game in the fear of possibly spooking nearby game. Coyotes are very prolific breeders and can easily multiply. I think you could open the coyote season up to no closed season, no bag limit and you would not

hurt the coyote population. Primarily because coyotes are not a highly sought after species. I think opening up the season like I suggested would increase the coyote harvest a little. If it means having a few extra dall sheep lambs grow to maturity I do not see where it would be a bad regulation.

PROPOSED BY: Richard L. French II (HQ-07S-G-060)

PROPOSAL 178 - 5 AAC 85.065 Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Amend this regulation as follows:

Align the Unit 6D Ptarmigan season with the rest of Unit 6.

ISSUE: Ptarmigan hunting in Unit 6D closes earlier than the rest of Unit 6.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued confusion and honest mistakes will persist along the boarder between Unit 6D and the rest of Unit 6.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People hunting along the boarder between Units 6, 6D, and 13.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? This proposal is unlikely to inconvenience or harm anyone.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The status quo and aligning Unit 6 with Unit 13 are unnecessarily restrictive given the healthy condition of stocks and the inaccessibility of most the region.

PROPOSED BY: Valdez Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-032)

PROPOSAL 179 - 5 AAC 92.530 Management areas. Amend the regulation as follows:

Allow the use of shotguns in the Eagle River Management Area, Unit 14C, more than ¼ mile from any road and outside of an area near the Eagle River Nature Center. Shotguns should only be allowed if the hunter has passed a hunter education safety course and obtained a permit from the state.

ISSUE: Shotguns are not allowed for taking small game in the Eagle River Management Area of Unit 14C for no apparent reason.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Shotgun hunters will continue to be disenfranchised for no reason.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters wishing to harvest game birds in the Eagle River drainage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, as the Eagle River drainage is open to hunting with muzzleloaders and bow and arrow for small game.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The current system supports a less sporting way to take game birds.

PROPOSED BY: Patrick M. Mc.Cormick (HQ-07S-G-007)

PROPOSAL 180 - 5 AAC 92.011. Taking of Game by Proxy. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Relatives within second degree of kindred may proxy hunt for any permit holder over 65 or at least 70 percent disabled, in Unit 13 drawing, registration, or Tier II hunts.

ISSUE: The regulations make it difficult to continue a family use of caribou in Tier II hunts because it is difficult for a family member younger than 35 to get a permit, and only a Tier II permit holder can proxy hunt for a parent older than 65 or disabled. The system discourages a son or daughter being able to proxy. This is further exacerbated by only allowing a caribou permit per household.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Families will be discouraged from hunting together in some cases, and able-bodied sons and daughters won't be able to proxy hunt for their own elderly or disabled parents until middle age when they can score high enough for a permit.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Families that want to continue their hunting heritage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one other than a potential proxy hunter who would not be related to a permit holder.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Another solution would be to extend youth permit hunter age from 10-17 to 10-35 years. This was rejected because the youth has to be accompanied by the permit holder who may be disabled or over 65 and not able to keep up or realistically hunt effectively.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-028)

This proposal was deferred by the Board from the October 2006 meeting.

PROPOSAL 181 - 5 AAC 99.025. Customary and traditional uses of game populations.
Reexamine the customary and traditional findings and the amounts reasonably necessary for subsistence for the caribou and moose populations in Units 11 and 13.

	Finding	Amount Reasonably Necessary for Subsistence Uses
...		
(4) Caribou		
Unit 11 (Mentasta herd)	positive	
Unit 12 and 13 (Nelchina herd)	positive	100 percent of allowable harvest
...		
(8) Moose		
Unit 11	positive	30 – 40
Unit 13	positive	600

ISSUE: Prior to making substantial changes in the existing subsistence regulations for Units 11 and 13, it will be necessary for the board to reexamine the findings for the customary and traditional uses and the amounts reasonably necessary for subsistence. A review of the customary and traditional use patterns will allow the board to determine how the uses between subsistence and non-subsistence differ.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Board of Game as recommended by the Subsistence Implementation Committee (HQ-07S-G-80)

PROPOSAL 182 - 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures; 5 AAC 92.067. Units 22 and 23 brown bear permits; and 5 AAC 92.069 Units 21(D), Koyukuk Controlled Use Area, and Unit 23 moose drawing permits for nonresidents.
Amend the regulation, and make house-keeping changes, to allow surplus nonresident drawing permits to be issued on a first-come first-served basis as follows:

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

...

(4) permit issuance:

...

(C) unless otherwise provided, if a drawing permit hunt is undersubscribed, surplus permits are void and will not be issued;

5 AAC 92.067. Undersubscribed drawing permits for nonresidents. [UNITS 22 AND 23 BROWN BEAR PERMITS.]

(a) [IN THE UNITS 22 AND 23, GENERAL BROWN BEAR DRAWING PERMIT HUNTS,] the department shall issue any surplus drawing permits on a first-come first served basis to any applicant who holds a valid nonresident hunting license [AND A NONRESIDENT BROWN BEAR TAG.] **Surplus permits will be available on the first workday after July 15th at the division of wildlife conservation office responsible for management of the hunt.** [SURPLUS PERMITS FOR UNIT 22 WILL BE AVAILABLE AT THE NOME DIVISION OF WILDLIFE CONSERVATION OFFICE, AND SURPLUS PERMITS FOR UNIT 23 WILL BE AVAILABLE AT THE KOTZEBUE DIVISION OF WILDLIFE CONSERVATION OFFICE, BEGINNING FIVE DAYS AFTER EACH DRAWING.] Surplus permits are not subject to the limitations in 5 AAC 92.050(2) and (4)(F).

5 AAC 92.069. Unit 21(D), outside the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area, and Units 21(D) and 24, Koyukuk Controlled Use Area[, AND UNIT 23] moose drawing permits for nonresidents.

(a) [IN UNIT 23 MOOSE DRAWING PERMIT HUNTS, THE DEPARTMENT SHALL ISSUE ANY SURPLUS DRAWING PERMITS ON A FIRST-COME FIRST-SERVED BASIS TO ANY APPLICANT WHO HOLDS A VALID NONRESIDENT HUNTING LICENSE AND A NONRESIDENT MOOSE TAG. SURPLUS PERMITS WILL BE AVAILABLE AT THE KOTZEBUE DIVISION OF WILDLIFE CONSERVATION OFFICE BEGINNING FIVE DAYS AFTER EACH DRAWING. SURPLUS PERMITS ARE NOT SUBJECT TO THE LIMITATIONS SPECIFIED IN 5 AAC 92.050(2) AND (4)(F).]

(b) In the Units 21(D) and 24, Koyukuk Controlled Use Area moose drawing permit hunts for nonresidents, the department shall issue permits, and a nonresident may apply for a drawing permit, as follows:

...

ISSUE: Current regulations do not allow surplus drawing permits to be issued except for a few specific hunts where codified regulations have been implemented to allow an exception to 92.050(a)(4)(C). The Board wishes to adopt regulations that would provide surplus permit opportunities to all undersubscribed nonresident drawing hunts. This proposal accomplishes this purpose by:

- preserving drawing hunt requirements and procedures as outlined in 92.050;
- allowing for, and generalizing, surplus permit procedures for nonresidents in 92.067;
- making house-keeping changes in 92.069 to remove duplicate language related to issuing surplus nonresident moose permits in Unit 23.

This proposal makes it possible for the department to issue surplus nonresident drawing permits on an announced date at offices managing the drawing hunt that is undersubscribed.

In many cases, as populations decline and drawing permits are used to limit harvest, commercial guiding operations are impacted. Lottery-style drawing permits contribute to the inability of the guide to obtain clients, due to the uncertainty of obtaining a permit. Unused nonresident drawing permits represent a loss of available harvest opportunity. Issuing surplus nonresident drawing permits on a first-come first-served basis helps achieve allowable sustainable harvest, improves hunter opportunity, and reaches fully-subscribed hunts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Permits for undersubscribed nonresident drawing hunts will continue to go unused.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? All available permits for drawing hunts will be utilized.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Guides and their clients or nonresidents hunting with qualifying resident kindred who receive permits over the counter.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The department will have to spend more time micromanaging permit issuance for a small number of under-subscribed hunts. Revenues from application fees for drawing permits may decline if people choose to wait in line for surplus permits instead of entering the drawing process as an applicant. Hunters hoping for a surplus permit risk not getting one if demand exceeds supply.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Offering surplus permits on a floating date based on drawing permit awards – this was considered less acceptable than announcing a ‘hard date’ because not everybody is equally informed of the ‘drawing date’.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game at the request of the Board of Game.
(HQ-07S-G-100)

PROPOSAL 183 - 5 AAC 92.062. Priority for subsistence hunting; Tier II permits. Amend the regulation as follows:

If a hunter qualifies as a federal subsistence user, they will not be eligible to apply for the Unit 13 Tier II permit hunts for any big game animal, not just caribou.

ISSUE: Federal subsistence users are allowed two caribou each in their own special areas, but also can get a Tier II permit that a non federal permit hunter could get. If they want to be federal hunters make them hunt there only.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The federal permit holders will continue to take Tier II permit away from non federal permit holders.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It will allow more resident hunters a Tier II permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Non federal subsistence permits users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Federal users can already take two caribou in their areas.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I am the person who submitted the original drawing permit hunt in Unit 13, the hunt was never intended to be a Tier II subsistence hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Richard Bradford (HQ-07S-G-139)

PROPOSAL 184 - 5 AAC 92.066. Permits for Access to Walrus Islands State Game Sanctuary; and 5 AAC 92.065 Permit for Access to McNeil River State Game Sanctuary.
Housekeeping items for sanctuary access permits.

5 AAC 92.066 Permits for Access to Walrus Islands State Game Sanctuary.

(1) an application for a permit must be submitted to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Wildlife Conservation[, P.O. BOX 1030, DILLINGHAM, ALASKA 99576];

(2) a wildlife viewing permit may be issued to an individual for a specified period of time during the period from May 1 - September 1 only; under this permit, a person entering the sanctuary shall abide by the following rules, **and other conditions identified on the permit by the department**, established to preserve the natural habitat, flora and fauna of the sanctuary; as provided in AS 16.05.925, a violation of these rules is a misdemeanor and may be a basis for immediate expulsion from the sanctuary:

...

(D) **except as authorized in section 4 of this chapter, the** discharge of firearms, disturbance or harassment of wildlife, removal of wildlife or parts of wildlife, swimming, and recreational diving are all prohibited on Round Island and in adjacent waters within three miles of Round Island;

...

(F) all aircraft access to Round Island is prohibited except with permission of the **department** [AREA WILDLIFE BIOLOGIST, OR THE BIOLOGIST'S DESIGNEE, IN DILLINGHAM]; access to Round Island is allowed only through an access corridor designated by the department; helicopter landings are restricted to the area directly behind the cabin; seaplane landings must be made at least one-half mile offshore within the access corridor;

...

(I) **unless otherwise authorized in writing, visitor access on Round Island is limited to the marked trail system, the campground and other areas designated by sanctuary staff;**

(3) visitor access to Round Island for wildlife viewing is allowed by permit issued on a first-come first-served basis; not more than 30 permittees may be permitted to visit Round Island each day, nor may more than 15 be permitted to remain overnight; 10 of the 15 permits available for an overnight period may be issued **beginning September 1 of the year prior to the permit period** [UP TO SIX MONTHS IN ADVANCE]; the remaining five may not be issued more than 30 days in advance; at the discretion of the department, up to three of the 15 individual overnight permits may be issued at any time for scientific or educational purposes;

...

(5) **the department may issue a sanctuary access permit subject to the conditions identified on the permit by the department to a guide, air, or boat taxi operator, or other commercial transporter or operator; unless otherwise authorized in writing, all access to Round Island is allowed only through an access corridor designated by the department;**

5 AAC 92.065. Permit for Access to McNeil River State Game Sanctuary.

...

(c) The department may issue an access permit, subject to the conditions identified on the permit by the department to a guide, air, or boat taxi operator, or lodge owner for access to areas of the McNeil River Game Sanctuary designated open to access by the department; an individual transported to the sanctuary by a guide, air taxi operator, or lodge owner who has a permit under this paragraph is not required to obtain an access permit; a person issued a permit under this subsection shall submit an annual report, to the department, on a form provided by the department, by October 30 of the year in which the permit was issued.

(d) A person entering the sanctuary from June 7 through August 25 shall abide by the following rules, and those conditions identified on the permit by the department, set to minimize bear-human conflicts and to protect sanctuary resources; as provided in AS 16.05.925, violation of these rules is a class A misdemeanor and may be a basis for immediate expulsion from the sanctuary:

...

(f) The department may issue a sanctuary access permit for a purpose other than participating in the sanctuary bear viewing program. A person issued a permit under this subsection shall abide by the rules in (d) of this section and those conditions identified on the permit by the department. The commissioner may establish criteria consistent with AS 16.20.162 for issuing, denying, and revoking permits issued under this subsection.

ISSUE: These are primarily housekeeping changes that will allow the department to better manage the access program and to more clearly define the department’s authority to condition these access permits for the protection of sanctuary resources.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The access permit program will be more difficult to manage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All interested parties. Permit administration will be more efficient and sanctuary resources will be better protected.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-101)

PROPOSAL 185 - 5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system.

Repeal the following language under 92.070(b)(1):

...

(b) The “ability of a subsistence user to obtain food if subsistence use is restricted or eliminated” may provide up to 40 points. It is measured by the following indicators and points:

[(1) THE RELATIVE AVAILABILITY OF ALTERNATIVE SOURCES OF GAME TO THE APPLICANT'S HOUSEHOLD, WHICH MAY PROVIDE UP TO 20 POINTS, AS MEASURED BY THE FORMULA SCORE = 20(I/J), IN WHICH "I/J" IS THE

PERCENT OF THE APPLICANT'S HOUSEHOLD'S WILD GAME THAT CAME FROM THE TIER II POPULATION OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, IN WHICH "I" STANDS FOR THE AMOUNT OF GAME HARVESTED BY HUNTERS FROM THE APPLICANT'S HOUSEHOLD FROM THE TIER II POPULATION AND "J" STANDS FOR THE AMOUNT OF GAME HARVESTED BY HUNTERS FROM THE APPLICANT'S HOUSEHOLD FROM WITHIN THE STATE; "I/J" MAY BE A PERCENT UP TO BUT NOT EXCEEDING G/H, IN WHICH "G" STANDS FOR THE AMOUNT OF GAME HARVESTED BY HUNTERS FROM THE APPLICANT'S LOCATION FROM THE TIER II POPULATION AND 'H' STANDS FOR THE AMOUNT OF GAME HARVESTED BY HUNTERS FROM THE APPLICANT'S LOCATION FROM WITHIN THE HUNT AREA AND FROM ALL REASONABLY ACCESSIBLE GAME HUNTS WITHIN 150 MILES, AS CALCULATED BY THE DEPARTMENT; BEFORE JANUARY 1, 2012, THE PROVISIONS OF THIS PARAGRAPH DO NOT APPLY TO UNITS 22 AND 23 MUSK OXEN HUNTS;]

...

ISSUE: This proposal repeals the Tier II scoring regulation, 92.070 (b)(1), in order to comply with a judicial ruling in the Kenneth Manning v. State of Alaska, Department of Fish and Game lawsuit. The court ruled that the regulation is unconstitutional, in that it violates equal protection standards. The constitutionality of this standard is currently an issue on appeal to the Alaska Supreme Court. Since the time of the trial court ruling in May, 2003, the Board of Game has adopted emergency regulations each year to comply with the ruling for scoring Tier II applications. Rather than dealing with this issue on a year by year basis until the decision is made, it will be a more efficient process to permanently repeal the regulation and allow the opportunity for public involvement.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The board will continue to adopt emergency regulations every year until the Alaska Supreme Court decision is issued.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Board of Game (HQ-07S-G-078)

This proposal was requested by the board at the October 2006 meeting.

PROPOSAL 186 - 5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system. Amend the regulation as follows:

5 AAC 92.070. Tier II hunting permit point system. (b) The “ability of a subsistence user to obtain food if subsistence use is restricted or eliminated” may provide up to 40 points. It measures by the following indicators and points:

.....

(X) the income of the applicant’s household relative to the most current [insert name of appropriate index] levels for households (adjusted to household size and cost of living at the applicant’s place of residence), which may provide up to X points, as calculated by the following formula, in which “I” stands for the applicant’s household’s income (using the applicant’s and other household members’ taxable income for the last year) and “P” stands for the [insert name of program] level:

Score = X-(5(I/P-1))

.....

Note: The formula in this proposal would award the full number of points to applicants with household incomes at or below “P”. Applicants with household incomes four times greater than P would receive no points. Applicants with household incomes between P and four times P would receive a prorated number of points.

ISSUE: Revisions to the Tier II scoring system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The current scoring system will remain in place.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The proposed change will direct limited Tier II permits to Alaskan residents below a low-income threshold.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Tier II permit holders with household incomes above the threshold.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Board of Game

(HQ-07S-G-035)

This proposal was requested by the board at the October 2006 meeting.

PROPOSAL 187 - 5 AAC 92.070. Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system. Amend the regulations as follows:

(a) Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system. (a) A Tier II subsistence permit applicant's "customary and direct dependence on the game population by the subsistence user for human consumption as a mainstay of livelihood" may provide up to 60 points. It is measured by the following indicators and points:

.....

(X) the amount of time during the year the applicant spends in the non-commercial harvesting of wild fish and game within the hunt area boundary: less than one week = X points; one to three weeks = 2X points; four to six weeks = 3X points; seven to nine weeks = 4X points; and ten weeks or more = 5X points;

.....

Note: This question, with a potential value of up to 15 points, appeared on the Tier II application form prior to 1996.

ISSUE: Revisions to the Tier II scoring system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The current scoring system will remain in place.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence users who utilize a wide diversity of subsistence resources in the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Present subsistence users who do not utilize a wide diversity of resources in the area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Board of Game (HQ-07S-G-039)

PROPOSAL 188 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled Use Areas. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Remove any ATV restrictions in Unit 13, or at least give an exemption to people who live off of the road system and use ATVs for their transportation home. ATV restrictions discriminate against people who live off the road system. If motorized vehicles are a problem, eliminate all motorized vehicles, including the automobile. The regulations should be returned to the previous language.

ISSUE: Restriction of ATV use in Unit 13 for transporting game. Many of the persons that live off the road system and depend on their ATV for transportation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If restrictions are placed on ATV use, many of the true subsistence hunters who live off of the road system will be eliminated from hunting. Many use well defined ATV trails to get to their hunting areas as well to get to their homes. Without ATVs they will not be able to get their game home without spoilage, if at all. Some will resort to poaching to provide for their families. These restrictions will also concentrate the hunters along the road system causing a real potential for accidents. An attempt to drive the Denali Highway when the caribou are present or the Tok Cutoff, between the Tok River and Tok during the moose season. These restrictions also eliminate the older hunter who is not capable of carrying out a moose on his back. The only hunters that benefit are those that can hire an outfitter.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Allow people to use their game and prevent spoilage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who lives off of the road system will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Wayne Shafer and Michelle Apley (SC-07S-G-015)

PROPOSAL 189 - 5 AAC 92.080(4)(F). Unlawful methods for taking game; exceptions.

Amend this regulation to provide the following:

The use of off road vehicles weighing more than 1500 lbs is prohibited in Unit 13 and all such off- road-vehicles must be driven on established trails.

ISSUE: The Ahtna Tene Nene' Subsistence Committee would like to place a weight restriction of 1500 lbs or less on all off-road-vehicles, and limit use of them in Unit 13 to designated and posted trails.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The tundra in Unit 13 will continue to be ruined by heavy weight off road vehicles. The existing trails are being widened and braided by people making new trails whenever they get stuck in the mud. It takes approximately 100 years for the tundra to recover from damage done by heavy weight off road vehicles.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The people who do not have heavy off road vehicles within Unit 13 will benefit through this restriction by the reduced number of hunters in Unit 13 competing for resources. The land owners will benefit by land hunters not crossing on their land.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The hunters who utilize these heavy machines in Unit 13 while they are in the field hunting for large game animals will suffer because they use these machines to hunt so that they can travel 20 miles off the highway system.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Remove the salvage requirements of moose and caribou hides for Tier II permit holders in Unit 13. The salvage requirement of hides which

weigh approximately 300 lbs force hunters to use off road vehicles. Removing this requirement will help eliminate the need for off road vehicles, if that is what the board is proposing to do.

PROPOSED BY: Ahtna Tene Nene' Subsistence Committee (SC-07S-G-037)

PROPOSAL 190 - 5 AAC 92.085 Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.

Amend this regulation as follows:

Nonresident hunters may not harvest game from a boat in Unit 8.

ISSUE: Illegally guided hunts. It is presently illegal for a client to “take” game with a transporter. This includes pursue with a transporter. Game sighted from a boat cannot be legally harvested.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be many illegally guided hunts.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Lawful transporters and guides.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those conducting illegally guided hunts and the nonresidents that go on them.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Guide requirement for all big game is the best solution to end the vast illegal operations statewide. Legislative action would be required to enact this.

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson (SC-07S-G-025)

This proposal was requested by the board at the October 2006 meeting.

PROPOSAL 191--5 AAC 92.085 Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions, and 5 AAC 92.104. Authorization for methods and means disability exemptions. Prohibit the use of any motorized vehicle for moose and caribou subsistence hunting in Unit 13 but provide an exemption for qualified hunters to use a motorized vehicle.

5 AAC 92.085 Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. In the following areas, access for hunting is controlled as specified:

...
(13) the use of any motorized vehicle for subsistence moose and caribou hunting in Game Management Unit 13, including the transportation of moose and caribou hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of big game; however, this provision does not prohibit motorized access, or transportation of gear or game, on the Parks Highway, Denali Highway, or Richardson Highway, or other roads and trails designated by the department;

5 AAC 92.104. Authorization for methods and means disability exemptions. (a) A person with a disability, or their personal representative, may submit an application on a form available

from the department for an exemption from a methods and means requirement set out in this chapter. The application must

- (1) include a signed statement from a licensed physician explaining the nature and extent of the person's disability;
- (2) specifically identify the methods and means limitation at issue and the type of exemption requested;
- (3) include a statement by the person with a disability that explains the causal relationship between the disability and the requested accommodation, or how the regulation at issue prohibits meaningful access to a program, service or benefit; and
- (4) be submitted at least 30 days before the requested effective date of the exemption, unless the exemption is being requested as a result of an emergency order or emergency regulation.

(b) The department shall issue a special authorization in writing that grants the requested exemption or an alternate exemption that it determines would provide a person with a disability with meaningful access to the program, service, or benefit in question, and meets the standard set out in this section. In granting the exemption, the department may include any conditions it determines are reasonable to conform the exemption to existing conservation and management objectives. In considering whether to grant the exemption, the department shall consider, among other factors, whether the exemption would

- (1) fundamentally alter a program, service or benefit of the department;
 - (2) place an undue administrative burden or expense on the department;
 - (3) have an unreasonable impact on the conservation, development, or utilization of game;
- or
- (4) constitute an unreasonable risk to public health or safety.

(c) The department may require a hunter or trapper who receives an exemption under this section to be accompanied by another hunter or trapper who has a valid hunting or trapping license and is capable of retrieving game.

(d) The department will not authorize an exemption under this section

- (1) if the regulation does not substantially prohibit the person from meaningful access to the program, service, or benefit;
- (2) that would allow exemptions or modifications to seasons or bag limits; or
- (3) for any accommodation if the Board of Game has previously reviewed and acted on the same request.

(e) Notwithstanding the above provisions, an applicant who provides proof that he or she is blind, physically disabled, or 65 years of age or older may obtain an exemption allowing use of a motorized vehicle for subsistence hunting of moose and caribou in Unit 13.

ISSUE: At the October, 2006 Board of Game meeting, the board directed the department to draft a proposal to prevent the use of motorized vehicles for subsistence moose and caribou hunting in Unit 13. Since these hunts are limited to Alaska residents only (subsistence hunts) the net effect would be to prohibit virtually all moose and caribou hunters from using motorized vehicles across the unit. Because this proposal is so broad, the Board also wanted to allow for those with disabilities to continue using motorized vehicles via an exemption.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose and caribou subsistence hunting will continue under existing regulations. Subsistence moose and caribou hunting with the use of expensive equipment will continue in apparent conflict with existing joint board subsistence criteria.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would likely increase hunting near roads due to a lack of access to remote areas of the unit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Walk in hunters, horse back hunters and hunters who qualify for disability exemptions. Subsistence hunters who do not own expensive off road equipment.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those with a history of using motorized vehicles for access.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Board of Game (HQ-07S-G-129)

PROPOSAL 192 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game, meat, furs, and hides. Amend the regulations as follows:

Those who hunt under the general hunt in Unit 13 for moose and caribou must salvage the Nelchina caribou and moose head, heart, liver, kidneys, and hides.

ISSUE: The board must apply the salvage requirement to all hunters in Unit 13, not just the Tier II moose and caribou permit holders. The hunters who hunt under the general hunt must have the salvage requirement placed upon them.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Tier II permit holders will have restrictions placed upon them that are unfair to them, while other hunters will not have restrictions placed upon them in Unit 13 for moose and caribou salvage requirements.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Tier II permit holders would not be the only hunters in Unit 13 to have salvage requirements placed upon them.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who hunt under the general hunt will have salvage requirements placed upon them and they will have to salvage the head, heart, liver, kidneys, and hides.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Repeal the requirement to the Tier II permit holders that makes it mandatory for them to carry the hides out of the field.

PROPOSED BY: Ahtna Tene Nene' Subsistence Committee (SC-07S-G-036)

PROPOSAL193 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides; and 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. Amend the regulations as follows:

Leave the Tier II salvage requirements as they have been for Unit 13. Adopted unreasonable salvage requirements in not the way to eliminate subsistence.

ISSUE: Salvage requirements on Tier II moose and caribou in Unit 13 which were adopted by the board in October 2006.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hides and heads will be left all our community and along the roads.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All subsistence hunters

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Any and all subsistence hunters, all of our birds and fur animals that feed on the parts left.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Make hide and head salvage voluntary.

PROPOSED BY: Copper Basin Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-001)

PROPOSAL 194 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides; and 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. Amend the regulations as follows:

Remove the salvage requirements for Unit 13 moose. The regulations should be returned to the previous language.

ISSUE: Requirement to salvage the head, heart, liver, and kidneys from moose harvested in Unit 13. None of these parts are defined as edible meat and are not required to be salvage in any other unit. Some doctors advise against eating internal organs because it is not healthy. The primary reason to hunt, kill, and eat wild game is to obtain a healthy mean source for your family.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If these requirements are not deleted, these parts will simply be discarded in the local landfill or alongside the road once the hunter has left Unit 13. The choice, keeping or leaving these parts at the kill site, should be left up to personal preference, not regulation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Requiring the hide to be salvaged causes more time to be spent in the field before the meat can be processed. This additional time could cause loss of meat to spoilage. The quality of meat is very important to the hunter providing food for his family.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who consume the meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions.

PROPOSED BY: Wayne Shafer (SC-07S-G-016)

PROPOSAL 195 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides, and 5 AAC 92.990(49). Definitions. Amend the regulations so that the following applies:

For Units 11 and 13, moose and caribou hunters taking caribou under a Tier II permit must salvage in addition to all edible meat, the horns, heart and liver. The meat must be left on the bone.

ISSUE: Salvage of subsistence (Tier II) moose and caribou.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The salvage requirements adopted by the board at the October, 2006 is set to take effect in the fall of 2007 and will place undo hardship on the majority of Tier II hunters. Additionally, it imposes the traditions of one part of the Tier II user group on all Tier II users.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If hunters are required to salvage the head, hide and all fat, it will require more trips to get an animal out. This leaves open more possibilities for waste, predators and spoilage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Tier II users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one suffers, those who wish to bring out the head, hide and stomach still may.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Paxson Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-050)

PROPOSAL 196- 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. Amend the regulation as follows:

A hunter does not have to pack out heart, liver, hide or saw antlers in half in the Unit 13 Tier II permit hunt.

ISSUE: Eliminate the new regulation that Tier II permit holders have to carry out heart, liver, hide and saw antlers in half. This is all a waste of effort.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A Tier II permit holder will have to pack out heart, liver, hides only to throw them away.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Eliminate a lot of useless effort.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The Tier II permit hunter.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

This proposal was approved by the board as an Agenda Change Request at the November 2006 meeting.

PROPOSAL 197-- 5 AAC 92.029 Permit for possessing live game; 5 AAC 92.080(2) Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. 5 AAC 92.230 Feeding of game; 5 AAC 92.XXX Transport, harboring, or release of live Muridae rodents prohibited; and 5 AAC 92.990, Definitions.

Clarify the definitions associated with deleterious exotic wildlife and nuisance wildlife, clarify the legal use of pesticides approved by the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, create a new regulation prohibiting the intentional or unintentional release of live Muridae rodents (see definition below), and expand the feeding of game regulation to include deleterious exotic wildlife.

5 AAC 92.029 Permit for possessing live game (d)(1) Under this section, and in accordance with the definition of “game” in AS 16.05.940 (which includes feral domestic animals), [A]

(1) **Deleterious exotic wildlife** [EUROPEAN FERRET (*MUSTELA PUTORIUS FURO*), SWINE (*SUS SCROFA* VAR.),] or a nonindigenous gallinaceous bird is feral if the animal is not under direct control of [the] **an** owner, including being confined in a cage or other physical structure, or being restrained on a leash; the commissioner may capture, destroy, or dispose of any feral **deleterious exotic wildlife or** [FERRET, FERAL SWINE,] or feral nonindigenous gallinaceous bird in an appropriate manner.

5 AAC 92.080(2) Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. The following methods of taking game are prohibited:

(2) with the use of any poison or **any** substance that temporarily incapacitates game, except with the written consent of the board; **the use of poisons for taking deleterious exotic wildlife is authorized without board approval when using Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation registered pesticides in their approved manner.**

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

5 AAC 92.XXX. Transport, harboring, or release of live Muridae rodents prohibited. It is unlawful for the owner or operator of a vessel, vehicle, aircraft, structure being translocated, or other means of conveyance to knowingly or unknowingly harbor live Muridae rodents, or to enter Alaska (including Alaskan waters) while knowingly or unknowingly harboring live Muridae rodents.

5 AAC 92.990 Definitions

5 AAC 92.990(52) “deleterious exotic wildlife” means any starling, English sparrow, or raccoon; any **Muridae rodent** [NORWAY RAT], rockdove or Belgian hare that is unconfined or unconstrained; and any feral ferret or feral swine.

5 AAC 92.990(73) “nuisance wildlife” includes

(A) a feral domestic bird or mammal, deleterious exotic wildlife, unclassified game, small game, fur animals or furbearers, except wolf, wolverine, or lynx, or migratory bird for which there is a federal depredation order for this state issued under 50 CFR Sec. 21.43;

(B) an animal that invades **or comes to occupy** a dwelling, **vessel, vehicle, structure, or storage container**; causes property damage, or is an **invasive or introduced nonnative species that poses** immediate **or long-term** threats to **human** health, safety, or property **or to native wildlife, wildlife health, or habitat.**

5 AAC 92.990() “invasive species” means a nonnative species whose introduction does or is likely to cause economic or environmental harm or harm to human health; this includes all of the species listed in 5 AAC 92.990(52).

5 AAC 92.990() “Muridae rodent” includes true mice and rats, gerbils, and their relatives.

ISSUE: These changes will allow the Department to better manage and prevent the impacts of invasive species, especially Muridae rodents (rats and mice), on native wildlife populations. They will also allow the public and other agencies to better and more efficiently comply with upcoming nonnative rodent eradication programs, and set the groundwork for wildlife education campaigns in 2007 and beyond aimed at promoting broad public action against invasive nonnative species.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The threat to Alaskan wildlife from invasive species will continue to grow, and the regulations governing control of invasive rodents will remain illogical, contradictory, and cumbersome.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wildlife populations across the state; the public, including individuals involved in the following activities that can be particularly impacted by infestations of rodents and other invasive species: Maritime industries, seafood & fish processing; freight, cargo handling; public health, food & sanitation; wildlife harvest and viewing.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-106)

PROPOSAL 198 - 5 AAC 92.450. Description of game management units. Amend the regulation as follows:

Change the northwestern boundary line between Unit 17B and 17C between Lake Kulik and Nuyakuk Lake to be consistent with the natural drainages when sub-district boundary lines are drawn.

ISSUE: Increasing hunting pressure in that portion of 17B south of Nuyakuk Lake since the Nushagak/Mulchatna River corridor restrictions were adopted and put into regulation. Hunter effort has increased significantly within the Wood/Tikchik State Park.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued increase of nonresident hunt activity and competition for moose.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Resident hunters will have increased opportunity and success rates if competition is reduced.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Unit 17C moose hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Former Unit 17C moose hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Non-residents drawing permit. We may not want to go there yet, but look at other options.

PROPOSED BY: Nushagak Advisory Committee (HQ-07S-G-062)

PROPOSAL 199 - 5 AAC 92.510 Areas closed to hunting. Amend the regulations as follows:

No shooting within half mile of houses along the Aleknagik Lake Road in Unit 17.

ISSUE: Shooting near houses along the Aleknagik Lake Road between Dillingham and Aleknagik. Moose and grouse hunters are shooting near houses and endangering people.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Someone could get shot.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents living along the lake road.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Someone who wants to shoot recklessly.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Dennis L. Olson Sr. (HQ-07S-G-042)

PROPOSAL 200 - 5 AAC 92.520(b). Closures and restrictions in state game refuges.

Allow hunting for deleterious exotic wildlife, require bowhunters to complete a hunter safety course and register to hunt small game, and prohibit intentional wildlife feeding in the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge in Unit 14C.

(b) Unit 14:

(1) The Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge (formerly the Potter Point State Game Refuge) in Unit 14C, described in AS 16.20.031,

(A) is open to small game hunting with shotguns, **bow and arrow** [BOWHUNTING], and falconry only, except for that portion between the Alaska Railroad and the Old Seward Highway, **and deleterious exotic wildlife hunting with bow and arrow, falconry, and air rifle with rifled barrel only;**

(B) is closed to the use of motorized vehicles;

(C) is closed to the discharge of all firearms except that shotguns may be used in those areas open to hunting north and west of a line extending south from the radio tower located at the Kincaid Park motocross area and south and east of a line extending from an ADF&G regulatory marker at the point where Furrow Creek enters the refuge through a second ADF&G regulatory marker west of Furrow Creek from September 1 through March 31; before hunting, a person wishing to hunt with a shotgun **or bow and arrow** must complete a certified hunter safety course and must register annually with the department; a person convicted of a hunting violation in one year is not eligible to register to hunt in the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge the following year; a hunter using a shotgun **or bow and arrow** shall present in the field upon request, the registration permit;

(D) in addition to the prohibitions set out in (A) – (C) of this paragraph, no person may intentionally distribute bread scraps, cereal grains, corn, or other waterfowl foods; or otherwise feed waterfowl **or other wildlife, except for authorized management purposes,** in the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge.

ISSUE: Deleterious exotic wildlife—such as rock pigeons, European starlings, and European rabbits—are increasing in the Anchorage metropolitan area. These species may be hunted in the Anchorage Management Area with an air rifle with rifled barrel. As their populations grow, there is no reason why these species will not move into the refuge, if they have not already done so. In addition to allowing the use of an air rifle, this proposal would allow the hunting of deleterious exotic wildlife by bow and arrow and falconry in the refuge, including Potter Marsh.

Currently, bowhunters are not required to complete a certified hunter safety course and register to hunt in the refuge, unlike shotgun hunters, although some bowhunters comply voluntarily. The number of hunters using bows to hunt small game in the refuge is increasing. Bowhunters are required to complete hunter safety courses for other hunts, and there is no good reason why they should be exempted from registering to hunt in the refuge.

The department is planning to expand the visitor facilities in Potter Marsh, including extending the boardwalk and trails into the woods and providing more parking and restroom facilities. This will certainly increase human use of the marsh. Currently, no one is permitted to intentionally feed waterfowl in the refuge. With facilities expanding into the wooded fringe, we anticipate that visitors will attempt to feed other wildlife, such as squirrels or songbirds, and this could attract bears. We propose to prohibit all intentional feeding of wildlife, with an exception for management purposes (e.g., capturing animals).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Deleterious exotic wildlife will compete for refuge resources with native wildlife. Some recreationists will disturb wildlife, particularly nesting and brood-rearing waterbirds, unnecessarily. Bowhunters will continue to hunt in the refuge without hunter safety certification or registration permits. Some people will unintentionally feed bears, or feed them intentionally while claiming to feed other animals.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quality of refuge habitats and the visitor experience will be maintained.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All refuge users pursuing wildlife-related experiences.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Bowhunters who are currently allowed to hunt in the refuge without hunter safety certification or a registration permit.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07S-G-103)

PROPOSAL 201 - 5 AAC 92.530(6). Management areas. Amend the regulation as follows:

In Unit 15A, the Skilak Loop Special Management Area, allow a youth hunt for small game only by rim fire, shotgun or muzzle loading firearm, October 1 through March 1. Open only to youth ages 16 and under in possession of a state approved hunter education certification and a hunting license for those 16 years of age. The hunter must be accompanied by a licensed hunter 18 years or older, also in possession of a state approved hunter education certification.

ISSUE: The lack of opportunity for persons 16 years of age and younger to hunt small game within road accessible areas of the Kenai Peninsula with reasonable to high opportunity for success. Areas currently open on the road system are often already heavily hunted by older and typically more experienced hunters with access to the use of a motor vehicle (road hunters).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters 16 years of age and younger will continue to have less opportunity for successful harvest while hunting small game. When there is less chance for successful harvest, there may be a corresponding loss of interest in the activity by younger and often less patient hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This proposed regulation change will provide increased hunting opportunity and may increase the likelihood that young hunters will take home game harvest by their efforts. While it is recognized that harvest alone is not the total measure of the hunt, it is a reality that our youth have so many other distractions and activities from which to choose these days that traditional harvest opportunities with little chance of actual harvest hold little allure.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone. Hunters pay for the lion's share of wildlife management in the United States through fees and by direct contributions to the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Fund, hunting license and tag fees and by direct contributions to wildlife agencies and pro-hunting organizations. Demographic studies show that people

participating in hunting activities are getting older and hunter numbers are on the decline in the U.S. Our wildlife resources, habitat and the people who enjoy them will benefit from the recruitment and retention of younger hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who feel that hunting and (so-called) non-consumptive uses are incompatible.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo. Not an increase in youth opportunity to hunt in road accessible area with limited competition and reasonable opportunity for success.

PROPOSED BY: Gary J. Hawkins (HQ-07S-G-048)

PROPOSAL 202 - 5 AAC 92.530(6) Management Areas: Amend the regulation as follows:

Hunting regulations for the Skilak Wildlife Recreation Area (WRA) adopted in 1987 (small game hunting by bow and arrow from October 1 to March 1, and moose hunting by permit when certain conditions are met) would continue. In addition, a shotgun only youth hunt of hare and grouse is allowed up to a nine day period between November and March west of the Seven Lakes Trail. The boundary description for the Skilak WRA would also change and add 497-acres of land adjacent to the Kenai River. The proposed new language to describe this state restricted area would be:

“Skilak Wildlife Recreation Area [SKILAK LOOP WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREA]... bounded by a line at the eastern most boundary of the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge (mile 55 Sterling Highway) [BOUNDED BY A LINE BEGINNING AT THE EASTERNMOST JUNCTION OF THE STERLING HIGHWAY AND THE SKILAK LOOP ROAD (MILE 58),then southerly along the south band of the Kenai River to its confluence with the Skilak Lake, then westerly along the north shore of Skilak Lake to Lower Skilak Lake campground, then northerly along the Lower Skilak Lake campground road and the Skilak Loop Road to its westernmost junction with the Sterling Highway (mile 75.1), then easterly along the Sterling Highway to the point of beginning, is closed to hunting and trapping except that small game may be taken from October 1 through March 1 by bow and arrow only and moose by permit only. In addition, that portion of the area west of a line from the access road from the Sterling Highway to Kelly Lake, the Seven Lakes Trail, and the access road from Engineer Lake to Skilak Lake Road, and north of the Skilak Lake Road, is open to hunting of hare and grouse for nine consecutive days beginning on the first Saturday in November each year by hunters between the ages of 10 and 17. Eligible hunters must have a Basic Hunter Education Certificate and be accompanied by an adult 18 years old or older. Only the youth may hunt and only shotguns using size four birdshot or smaller may be used. The daily bag limit is five snowshoe hare, five spruce grouse, and one ruffed grouse for the youth hunt.

ISSUE: On Thursday, December 7, 2006, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s (USFWS) regional director signed a decision notice – a Finding of Now Significant Impact (FONSI) – for the Skilak Wildlife Recreation Area (Skilak WRA) Draft Management Plan and Environmental Assessment. Pursuant to the plan, the USFWS is seeking Board of Game action to implement hunting regulations proposed for the area. The proposal, as submitted, has been developed in cooperation with Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) representatives and is supported by the USFWS Alaska regional director and the department commissioner.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Should the board not make the proposed changes, new youth hunting opportunities may not be realized.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposed changes allow for limited additional hunting opportunities in the area without significantly impacting the primary objectives of the area of managing for enhanced wildlife viewing opportunities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Young hunters will have a new area to hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Other users in the area at the time the hunt is offered will likely include ice fishermen, dog mushers, and winter hikers and skiers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The Skilak Wildlife Recreation Area Management Plan is the result of over a year of efforts between the USFWS and the ADF&G and replaces the current management plan for the area. Other alternatives were evaluated including status quo management (no additional hunting opportunities) and opening over half of the area to small game and fur animal hunting with firearms by all hunters. Additionally, alternatives evaluated other boundary adjustments and a variety of facility development scenarios. The preferred alternative of the draft plan, at the request of the State of Alaska, was amended to include the youth hunt opportunity and only one minor boundary extension (497-acres to the east vs. the proposed addition of the 497-acres plus 8,243-acres to the west of Skilak Lake Road to the westernmost refuge boundary).

PROPOSED BY: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (SC-07S-G-083)

PROPOSAL 203 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Amend the regulation as follows:

For Unit 16A, create a non-motorized area defined by waterways south bank Kroto Slough, West bank Big Susitna River and East bank Yentna River. Motorized equipment shall remain in the main or normal channel of the previously mention waterways.

ISSUE: The area defined by waterways south bank Kroto Slough, west bank Big Susitna River and east bank Yentna River shall be a non-motorized hunting area in order to protect critical game habitat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Motorized access into the swamps causes damage to the wetlands. In addition to the physical damage to the terrain, continued motorized access to this area significantly jeopardizes wildlife. This area is well known as an important area for moose breeding and calving waterfowl nesting, including swans, cranes, and various ducks.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The swamps and wetlands, and the most important benefit will be the refuge for breeding animals and waterfowl.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those that use motorized equipment to access the swamps and wetlands.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Any solution that includes allowing access to the wetlands other than by foot enables a practice that damages our resources, both the wetlands and the breeding animals. This regulation proposal will also offer protection of hunters fair chase ethics.

PROPOSED BY: Michael Janacek

(SC-07S-G-085)

PROPOSAL 204 - This proposal asks the Board of Game to recommend, per its authority under Alaska Statute 16.05.255(a)(1) to the legislature for approval the establishment of a wildlife refuge as follows:

The Unit 13 state-land and waters with these boundaries:

- On the west by the Maclaren River
- On the east by the Richardson Highway
- On the south by the Denali Highway
- On the north from the northeast corner of Sec 11, T20S, R6E, eastward to the northeast corner of Sec.7,T20S,R10E, then south to the northeast corner of Sec. 30, T20S, R10E, then east to the Richardson highway

Purpose of this refuge shall be to:

- (1) Ensure the protection of critical seasonal wildlife habitat.
- (2) Ensure the conservation of caribou, moose, and other wildlife.
- (3) Ensure the continued use of these populations for hunting, trapping, and viewing.
- (4) Ensure continued management consistent with all of Unit 13.
- (5) Ensure continued protection of archeological areas and their artifacts.

To further these purposes, the following shall apply to this refuge:

- (1) Disallow Hard-rock mining.

ISSUE: The Nelchina caribou herd is the largest, most important road-accessible caribou herd in southcentral Alaska, and many caribou from the herd utilize the eastern Denali highway region, which is within Unit 13. The area around Tangle Lakes is particularly crucial as winter habitat for these caribou. The area is also an important fall staging and rutting area for the Nelchina Caribou Herd.

Because the area is important to the herd, maintenance of its habitat is important to continuance of the largest subsistence hunt in southcentral Alaska. Fall hunts draw thousands of hunters from across the state. Winter hunts are also important to many hunters who prefer that season or who failed to take caribou earlier. The consistency with which caribou utilize these habitats in fall and winter has made this a favored hunting ground for thousands of years. Archaeological evidence shows that hunters spotted game 10,000 years ago from the same ridges that they do today.

The eastern Denali Highway area also contains good year-round moose habitat, making it an important moose hunting and viewing area. Other important game species are grizzly bear, wolf, ptarmigan and waterfowl. The value of this area for small game hunting draws even non-resident hunters. National sporting magazines and a television show have featured ptarmigan hunting near Tangle Lakes. Trapping of fox, wolf, and wolverine provides income for local residents. The area's diverse land and water habitats support a great variety of non-game species,

including Arctic warblers, a target species for visiting birdwatchers, Long-Tailed Jaegers, and Red-Throated Loons.

Good access along the Denali Highway and the ease of sighting game across open alpine tundra contribute to this area's popularity not only with hunters, but also berry gatherers and wildlife viewers. Wildlife viewing tours provide revenue for an increasing number of small businesses. Birding tours seek out the region's unusual species. Princess Tour buses also cross the Denali Highway to give their clients views of wildlife and spectacular scenery-scenery which at present is not marred by open pit mines. The Tangle Lakes/Delta Wild and Scenic River are popular for hunting, fishing and other adventure recreation. BLM has built facilities in the corridor to specifically serve these users. The mile wide river corridor is off-limits to mining, but most of its scenic views are not protected.

The eastern Denali Highway area falls under the Tanana Basin Area Plan and the Copper Basin Area Plan, both produced by the Department of Natural Resources and the Department of Fish and Game, with considerable public input. Both documents state that the primary use for these lands is fish and wildlife habitat. Mining is an allowed use, but not a primary one.

Claims for subsurface mineral resources in most state lands in the eastern Denali Highway are held by a single Canadian company, and mineral exploration was carried out between 2004 and 2006 by a major British-owned multi-national mining company. After drilling the northern part of the claims area--the part it considered most promising--and finding insufficient mineralization, the latter company withdrew from the project. However, the claims holder continues to promote the possibility of a "world class" hard-rock nickel/copper/platinum mine, either underground or open pit, in the southern part, near the Denali-Highway and the Tangle Lakers. Thus, the threat of renewed exploration continues.

Large-scale hard-rock mining, and some mineral exploration practices, can harm wildlife habitats and wildlife. Hard-rock mines have a solid history of harming air and water quality. They displace wildlife and alter habitats with their extensive processing facilities, waste rock and tailing dumps, power lines, new roads, and increased traffic. In addition, open pit mines can destroy thousands of acres.

Hard-rock mining is not compatible with wildlife, hunting, recreation and tourism in this area. The continuing long-term value of renewable resources in the eastern Denali Highway area exceeds the short-term non-renewable value of any minerals that might be extracted.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? When exploration permits are submitted to the office of Habitat Management and Permitting within DNR, the agency does not have the authority to **make stipulations to prevent** impacts to mammals-only to fish. Thus, even in these early steps toward a possible mine, wildlife can be displaced. If drill sites are accessed in winter, any caribou and moose present can be disturbed at a time where their survival is difficult. If drill sites are accessed overland in the summer, vegetation and drainage are often disturbed. If helicopter-supported drilling activities occur in the summer, this can disrupt moose calving. It is only after mining companies invest funds, typically millions of dollars, in exploration, that they may determine that mine development is feasible, and only then are the impacts to wildlife considered. At that point, those invested funds become another rationale for allowing mine development. This exposes the Nelchina caribou herd and other wildlife to an unacceptable risk. Consequently, hunting and viewing opportunities will be at risk.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal addresses maintenance of high quality habitat for moose, caribou, and other animals, furbearers, and upland bird and waterfowl. It seeks to maintain the high quality of caribou, moose, and other game meat by protecting the air and water from potential mine contaminants.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The solution will benefit all those who harvest and view caribou, moose, and other wildlife in the eastern Denali Highway area’s scenic setting. It will also benefit a growing, sustainable sightseeing and recreational tourism economy. By addressing the problem now, during a hiatus in mineral exploration, this solution is also more fair to mining exploration companies than waiting until more funds have been invested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? This proposal addresses hard rock mining not the small-scale placer mining that has occurred in the area for decades; this proposal should not harm small-scale miners. It will displace hard-rock mining and mineral exploration companies, which are currently and typically are not Alaskan-owned.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? At the time that the State of Alaska was considering taking conveyance of a large block of eastern Denali Highway lands from BLM, Alaskans submitted comments pointing out the high value of wildlife that should be protected from mineral exploration. The Department of Natural Resources decided in 2003 to proceed with conveyance and allow mining. Alaskans took their concerns to the companies which held the claims and were conducting mineral exploration, but they continued their activities. Alaskans asked the office of Habitat Management and Permitting to disallow mineral exploration permits basis of impacts to mammals, but that office is allowed to make stipulations pertaining to impacts to fish only.

PROPOSED BY: Copper Basin Advisory Committee (SC-07S-G-002)

PROPOSAL 205 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Amend the regulation as follows:

Mountain goat hunting in Unit 14 by drawing permit only. Season: September 15th thru October 31st with a specific number of permits dedicated to bow hunting only.

ISSUE: The over exploitation by local and out of state outfitters, guides, and booking agents of a very limited population of harvestable mountain goats in the registration permits.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Goat harvest will keep occurring as a bonus hunt for guided nonresident hunters, whose original goal was sheep, thereby exceeding the harvest quota before the resident hunters (firearms and archery) have a chance to hunt.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by allocating a specific number of permits for archery only, you can provide more permits to hunters, giving those that choose to hunt with archery equipment more days in the field, with less an impact on the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident mountain goat hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides, outfitters, and nonresident hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Scott Butler (SC-07S-G-022)

The Spring 2007 Board of Game Proposal Book contains errors that are corrected as follows:

PROPOSAL 20 - Proposed by Scott Butler

PROPOSAL 81 – Should read as follows:

Unit 10 Aleutian Islands:

Adak: Six cow caribou every regulatory year – no closed season.

One bull caribou every regulatory year – September 10 – December 31.

PROPOSAL 201 – Proposed by Gary Dawkins