

**PROPOSAL 1 – 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping.** Lengthen the wolf trapping season for Unit 1A as follows:

Wolf, Unit 1A: November 1 - April 30, bag limit of “no limit.”

**ISSUE:** Trapping season for wolf used to open November 1. This better coincided with the peak of the rut in 1A for deer. This is a very vulnerable time for bucks, and does in estrus.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** A continued loss of opportunity to take wolves when deer are most vulnerable to wolf predation.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Wolf quality remains the same, "good".

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** For the most part the Department of Fish and Game. This, once again improves a management tool that the department already has.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Earlier opening but stayed with November 1<sup>st</sup> because it was in place once before without any negative effects.

**PROPOSED BY:** Robert Jahnke (HQ-09G-040)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Trappers Association PC17 Robert Jahnke PC44 Petersburg AC2		Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 E.Jozwiak PC46 Form Letter with 141 Signatories PC1 George Herben PC58 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Marylin Houser PC62 Mrs Judith Reese PC3 Ms. Beverly Minn PC4 Ms. Penelope Wells PC2
--	--	---

**PROPOSAL 2 – 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping and 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf.** Raise the management objectives for wolves in Unit 1A as follows:

Raise the management objectives for wolves from twenty per year to twenty-five per year in Unit 1A.

**ISSUE:** The management objective on wolves in Unit 1A is too low. For 21 years or more the average harvest in Unit 1A has been near thirty wolves per year. The management goal can be higher and still sustain healthy wolf populations.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Status quo - 25 wolves would be a more realistic approach for the state to take because it would show that the Department of Fish and Game is flexible enough to promote more effort when wolf predation is high.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal deals with numbers already obtained and surpassed. This is not a difficult problem.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** N/A

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** N/A

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Raising the objective to thirty wolves. Although thirty is surely a realistic number it is a number the Board of Game should designate.

**PROPOSED BY:** Robert Jahnke (HQ-09G-039)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Trappers Association PC17 Robert Jahnke PC44 Matanuska Valley AC14		Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 E.Jozwiak PC46 Form Letter with 141 Signatories PC1 George Herben PC58 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Marylin Houser PC62 Mrs Judith Reese PC3 Ms. Beverly Minn PC4 Ms. Penelope Wells PC2
---	--	---

**PROPOSAL 3 –5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.** Reduce the bag limit for deer from 4 bucks to 2 bucks in that portion of Unit 1(A) on the Cleveland Peninsula bounded by an east-west line from Yes Bay to Santa Anna Inlet. The Cleveland Peninsula is currently split down the middle and includes parts of Units 1A and 1B, with differing deer bag limits of 4 bucks and 2 bucks, respectively. This regulation would make the 2 buck bag limit consistent for all the Cleveland Peninsula:

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
(1) <b><u>Unit 2 and the remainder of Unit 1(A)</u></b> [UNITS 1(A) AND 2]	Aug. 1–Dec. 31	Aug. 1–Dec. 31
4 bucks ... <b><u>Unit 1(A), that portion on the Cleveland Peninsula bounded by an East-west line from Yes Bay to Santa Anna Inlet,</u></b> Unit 1(B), and remainder of Unit 1(C)	Aug. 1–Dec. 31	Aug. 1–Dec. 31
2 bucks		

**ISSUE:** Department of Fish and Game biologists and resident hunters have become concerned with the decline in deer numbers on the Cleveland Peninsula that has occurred over the past 15 years. For example, in 1995, more than 200 deer were harvested on the Cleveland Peninsula, while just 11 years later in 2006, the harvest had declined to an estimated 17.

The existing clumped nature and distribution of deer creates a situation for potential over harvest of bucks in certain areas of the Cleveland Peninsula. Department biologists believe it is necessary to implement the suggested change to reduce harvest in this area for conservation purposes, while providing harvest opportunity for a larger number of hunters by lowering the individual bag limit. This change would make the entire Cleveland Peninsula deer bag limit consistent with other mainland areas including Units 1B and 1C.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Low deer numbers will persist for this deer population. Additionally, the harvest of 4 bucks by a single hunter in this area of low deer density will limit the opportunity for other hunters to harvest a deer.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, a lower harvest will hopefully pay dividends by providing a healthy and sustainable population of deer as well as provide a greater number of hunters with an opportunity to harvest deer from this population.

**PROPOSAL 3 CONTINUED**

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters interested in sustainable harvest deer on the Cleveland Peninsula.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Hunters who want to harvest 4 deer on the Cleveland as well as hunters who harvest deer in other areas with higher bag limits who then want to hunt the Cleveland later in the deer season.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** A) Close the current deer season on the Cleveland Peninsula. We did not think this extreme measure was necessary. B) Reduce the bag limit from 4 to 1. We consider the reduction to 2 bucks to be sufficient to meet the low deer numbers addressed in this proposal, and, having the 2 buck bag limit would make it consistent with the remainder of the Cleveland Peninsula.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09G-014)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Kurt Whitehead PC57 Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC61 Petersburg AC2 East Prince of Wales AC9 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56		Randy Jahnke PC48 Robert Jahnke PC44
---	--	---

**PROPOSAL 4 – 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat.** Modify the bag limit for goat in Unit 1A as follows:

The bag limit for mountain goats is two in Unit 1A.

**ISSUE:** Changing the mountain goat bag limit from one to two goats in Unit 1A.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Around Ketchikan the goat harvest has been very low. The last ten years or so the price to fly into a lake to hunt is real high now for one goat.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** There would be more interest in flying into a goat lake with a higher bag limit. More meat to offset the price of the flying.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** People who want to fly into a high lake and do some hunting and harvest some goat meat. With a two goat bag limit maybe a few more people would go.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. There are so few goats shot around Ketchikan anymore I can't see a two goat limit hurting anything.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No.

**PROPOSED BY:** Brian Warmuth

(HQ-09G-033)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Robert Jahnke PC44 Petersburg AC2		Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56 Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Johnny Laird PC40 Kurt Whitehead PC57 Lisa Mariotti PC53
--------------------------------------	--	---

**PROPOSAL 5 – 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures and 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures.** Modify the black bear baiting permit conditions in Unit 2 as follows:  
Add language to 5 AAC 92.044 (a) as follows:

...

a) A person may not establish a black bear bait station to hunt black bear with the use of bait or scent lures without first obtaining a permit from the department under this section. **In addition to designated department offices permits shall be available by mail.**

Add condition number 11 to 5 AAC 92.044 as follows:

...

**(11) Providing exact bait locations, including GPS coordinates or map markings is voluntary.**

**ISSUE:** For the 2008 hunting season the Department of Fish and Game has imposed conditions for bear baiting in Unit 2 that require a bear baiter to provide, in person to the Ketchikan or Craig office exact GPS coordinates or an exact point on a map of bait locations before a baiting permit will be issued.

Anyone wishing to bait bear in Unit 2 for the first time or without a prior bait location, or anyone wishing to change bait locations, will have to travel to the hunting area and obtain GPS coordinates or an exact bait locations, then travel to Ketchikan or Craig, apply for a bait permit during department office hours, and then travel back to the bait location before a bait can be established. Please understand, Unit 2 is a large, hard to access Unit with many remote islands. Much of the Unit is accessible only by boat or airplane, not all Unit 2 bear baiters bait Prince of Wales Island or have vehicles there, or travel through Ketchikan or Craig to reach Unit 2.

5 AAC 92.044 is the regulation establishing bear baiting conditions by the Board of Game. The conditions being imposed in Unit 2 are NOT conditions in 5 AAC 92.044. The Department is imposing baiting conditions that have not gone through the regulatory process.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Unit 2 baiters will continue to incur the unreasonable expense and time of multiple trips between the hunting area and Ketchikan and Craig. This could cost upwards of \$2,000 and two to three travel days.

Due to these new conditions bear baiting and baiting permits have dropped to a fraction of historic averages, thus reducing hunting opportunities in Unit 2. Hunters wishing to bait in Southeast Alaska will move to neighboring units, such as Unit 3, thus shifting baiting pressure to other Units.

5 AAC 92.044 will not be applied consistently throughout Alaska. The department will continue to subjectively add baiting conditions that are not in 5 AAC 92.044 without Board of Game action or due public process. Any person will be able to find a baiters exact bait location through the Public Information Act. This will likely cause infringement and harassment issues.

**PROPOSAL 5 CONTINUED**

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, it allows for an effective management tool which will benefit bear management.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All bear baiters, state and private concerns who benefit from revenues generated bear baiting.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who wish to reduce bear baiting.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** I tried to resolve the issue with the department without success. I also considered litigation, but at the Department of Law’s recommendation, I will attempt to resolve the issue at the Board of Game level.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ken and Anna Vorisek

(HQ-09G-002)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Ken Vorisek PC20 Alaska Bowhunters Association PC25 Homer w/Am. AC4 Fairbanks AC12 Matanuska Valley AC14	USFWS PC6	Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56 Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Brad Dennison PC51 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 East Prince of Wales AC9 Johnny Laird PC40 Ketchikan AC8 Kurt Whitehead PC57 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Sumner Strait AC5 Upper Lynn Canal AC13
--	-----------	--

**PROPOSAL 6 – 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear.** Close the black bear fall hunting season in Unit 2.

Eliminate the fall sport hunt 100%. If residents want to subsistence hunt in the fall let them get a separate subsistence tag. Also, limit the spring sport hunt to a specific number. I propose 100 tags for non-resident hunters. Perhaps a lottery?

**ISSUE:** Sport hunting of black bear on Prince of Wales Island. Specifically I think there are too many out of state hunters and they shoot at any bear they see regardless of size or sex.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Even now I am seeing less bears on Prince of Wales. My job takes me all over the island on a weekly basis. I used to see bear almost every time I drove. So far this year I have only seen three or four bears. One was a cub whose mother had been shot.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, this would allow the bear population to increase again to a healthy level.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The bears.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Trophy hunters.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** I did consider a moratorium on all out of state bear hunting and I actually prefer that solution but I figured it would not be considered.

PROPOSED BY: Karen Petersen (HQ-09G-006)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC61 Sumner Strait AC5	Defenders of Wildlife PC43 Jim Baichtal PC50	Alaska Bowhunters Association PC25 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56 East Prince of Wales AC9 Ketchikan AC8 Kurt Whitehead PC57
--	---	---



**PROPOSAL 7 – 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear.** Close the black bear fall hunting season in a portion of Unit 2 as follows:

No fall hunts, close this area of El Capitan passage and Dry Pass until the bear population increases.

**ISSUE:** We have lived at El Capitan (North end of Prince of Wales Island) since 1992. When we moved here there were many bears in El Capitan Creek and across the bay. By the late 1990's the bear population had dropped dramatically due to the increase of pressure (guided, non guided, and illegal guiding). In the past sixteen years we have encountered many orphaned cubs, some years one, not many, and some years as many as ten.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** People will need to go to a zoo to see the bears.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. The stocks in this area have been hurt by over hunting. There will start to be plenty of area to hunt.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Glenn and Kay Keller

(HQ-09G-022)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC61	Defenders of Wildlife PC43 Jim Baichtal PC50	Alaska Bowhunters Association PC25 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56 Ketchikan AC8 Kurt Whitehead PC57 Petersburg AC2
---	---	---

**PROPOSAL 8 – 5 AAC 84.270(6). Furbearer trapping.** For Kuiu Island in Unit 3, shorten the marten trapping season for residents, close the nonresident marten trapping season and create a Kuiu Island Management Area that is closed to the use of motorized land vehicles for trapping marten.

<b>Species and Units</b>	<b>Open Season</b>	<b>Bag Limit</b>
.....		
(6) Marten		
Units 1-3 ( <b><u>except Kuiu Island</u></b> )	Dec. 1 –Feb. 15	No Limit
<b><u>Unit 3 (Kuiu Island)</u></b>		
<b><u>Resident trappers:</u></b>	<b><u>Dec. 1 – Dec. 15</u></b>	No Limit
<b><u>Nonresident trappers:</u></b>	<b><u>No open season</u></b>	

**5 AAC 92.530. Management areas.** The following management areas are subject to special restrictions

- .....
- (25) the Kuiu Island Management Area
    - (A) the management area consists of Kuiu Island in Unit 3;
    - (B) the use of motorized land vehicles for trapping marten in the management area is prohibited.

**ISSUE:** An extended period of low marten harvest and anecdotal information from trappers citing low marten numbers have given rise to conservation concerns for marten on Kuiu Island. Research conducted during the past few years involving extensive live capture and hair-snaring efforts by department personnel and university researchers indicates that the Kuiu Island marten population exists at extremely low levels. A recently initiated Department of Fish and Game radio-telemetry study indicates a high degree of natural over-winter mortality resulting in concerns about marten survival and recruitment on the island necessitates restricting harvest.

Repetitive marten live capture surveys along the Kuiu Island road system between Rowan Bay and Three-mile Arm in 2001, 2002 and 2007 yielded marten capture rates of 1.0 captures/100 trap-nights, 0.7 captures/100 trap-nights, and 0.4 captures/100 trap-nights, respectively. In 2005 university personnel logged 1,057 trap nights for marten on Kuiu Island, including the southern portion of the island. They documented an overall marten capture rate of 0.3 captures/100 trap-nights. For comparative purposes, that same year on neighboring Admiralty Island a total of 936 trap nights yielded a marten capture rate of 4.0 captures/100 trap-nights. A recently initiated Department of Fish and Game radiotelemetry study indicates a high degree of natural over-winter mortality (54%) resulting in concerns about marten survival and recruitment on the island.

## **PROPOSAL 8 CONTINUED**

Marten are highly associated with old-growth forest in Southeast Alaska. Habitat conversion resulting from past and planned timber harvest and road building further contribute concerns regarding Kuiu Island marten populations. Scheduled logging in the near future and an associated influx of workers has the potential to greatly increase trapping effort on the island. Furthermore, recent high prices for marten pelts may provide trappers with increased incentive to target Kuiu Island marten despite their low numbers.

Shoreline access and high road densities on the northern half of Kuiu Island have exacerbated concern for overharvest by increasing human access and trapping vulnerability. Telemetry relocation data indicates that Kuiu Island marten tend to concentrate near the beaches during winter where they are particularly vulnerable to shoreline trapping. While a significant portion of southern Kuiu Island is federally designated wilderness and could potentially function as refugia, research conducted by university personnel indicates that marten numbers are equally low on the southern portion of Kuiu Island.

Prior to 1953, martens in North America were considered two species (*Martes americana* and *Martes caurina*) based on morphological characteristics, but were then lumped into a single species (*M. americana*). However, more recent molecular analyses clearly distinguish these two forms and indicate that they have very different evolutionary histories. They are more divergent from each other than other recognized species (e.g., brown bears versus polar bears). In 2002, a genetic survey in Southeast Alaska by the personnel from the University of Alaska Fairbanks found that both marten species were found in the region. This survey found that *M. caurina* inhabits only two islands within the archipelago (Admiralty and Kuiu islands) and should be considered endemics. In light of the low marten population and conservation concerns, the department recommends a greatly reduced marten trapping season on Kuiu Island.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Allowing the harvest to continue under present regulations despite such low population levels could result in an unsustainable *Martes caurina* population from Kuiu Island.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. This regulatory action should assure that this marten population can be maintained at a sustainable level while still providing some harvest opportunity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those interested in ensuring that sustainable populations of marten are maintained on Kuiu Island.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** A relatively small number of trappers (0-3 annually) who periodically trap marten on Kuiu Island could be affected.

**PROPOSAL 8 CONTINUED**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

- Close the marten season on Kuiu Island. The department believes this may eventually be a necessary step, but at this point additional data will be collected over the next year to guide our management strategy. The present proposal may accomplish our objective of decreasing marten harvest to a level we believe does not jeopardize this population.
- Close the Kuiu Island marten season by emergency order. While an emergency closure would provide a short-term solution to marten conservation concerns, the department finds that the marten population status on Kuiu Island requires significant regulatory restrictions to sustain this insular population.
- Shortening the marten trapping season on Kuiu. This wasn't considered a viable stand alone alternative due to the short amount of time it would take trappers to harvest the majority of marten in this small and easily accessed area.
- Establish a controlled use area and motorized land vehicle restriction on Kuiu Island. Due to the nature of Kuiu marten utilizing the beach zones to such a high degree, with the current season length it is believed this would not be a sufficient stand alone alternative because marten would still be vulnerable to overharvest from beach access alone.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-09G-012)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Erica Hill PC24

Kneeland Taylor w/Am. PC39

Defenders of Wildlife PC43

Lisa Mariotti PC53

Alaska Wildlife Alliance w/Am. PC61

Butch Young PC65

Petersburg w/Am. AC2

Alaska Trappers Association PC17

USFWS PC6

**PROPOSAL 9 – 5 AAC 85.035. Seasons and bag limits for elk.** Modify the hunting season for elk in Unit 3 as follows:

Provide alternate bow and rifle seasons for elk on Etolin Island in Unit 3.

**ISSUE:**

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will continue to be very few successful hunters.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The success rate would be higher for rifle during the peak of the rut.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Rifle hunters; when it's their turn there are more rifle hunters than bow hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Bow hunters when they get the off season.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Richard Olmstead (HQ-09G-059)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Ketchikan AC8	Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5	Lisa Mariotti PC53 Petersburg AC2
---------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

**PROPOSAL 10 – 5 AAC 85.045(a)(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose** Modify the moose antler restriction in RMO38 to allow the harvest of bulls with 2 brow tines on both sides in addition to the existing spike-fork, 3 or more brow tines on one side, or 50-inch antler bag limit.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
....		
Units 1(B) and 3  1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side <b><u>or antlers with 2 brow tines on both sides</u></b> by registration permit only; or	Sept. 15–Oct. 15	Sept. 15–Oct. 15
[1 BULL BY DRAWING PERMIT; ONLY UP TO 50 PERMITS MAY BE ISSUED]	[SEPT. 15–OCT. 15]	
....		
Unit 1(C), that portion south of Point Hobart, including all Port Houghton drainages	Sept. 15 - Oct. 15 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15 - Oct. 15
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side <b><u>or antlers with 2 brow tines on both sides</u></b> by registration permit only; or		
[1 BULL BY DRAWING PERMIT ONLY; UP TO 50 PERMITS MAY BE ISSUED]	[SEPT. 15–OCT. 15]	

**ISSUE:** The antler restrictions currently in place for Units 1B and 3 were originally developed for Alaska-Yukon moose (*Alces alces gigas*) on the Kenai Peninsula and later applied to western Canada moose (*Alces alces andersoni*) inhabiting the central southeast Panhandle. Speculation has long existed that the current moose antler restrictions are overly protective when applied to the smaller *andersoni* subspecies inhabiting the central Panhandle region. Unlike *gigas* moose found elsewhere in the state *andersoni* moose in the central Panhandle region typically possess smaller

antlers that do not develop predictable configurations that correlate well with age. Therefore, the current antler restrictions do not partition the harvest among various age classes exactly as intended.

### **PROPOSAL 10 CONTINUED**

Nonetheless, the existing antler restrictions have done a good job of constraining the moose harvest to sustainable levels given the high level of interest and participation in the RM038 moose hunt.

Moose in central southeast seldom acquire antler spreads in excess of 50 inches and it is widely believed that the current antler restrictions are protecting mature bulls in excess of those needed for breeding. Modifying the moose antler restrictions to allow the harvest of bulls with 2 brow tines on both antlers has been proposed by the public in the past. At the time, however, the department lacked sufficient information on the age structure of bulls with 2 brow tines on both antlers to allow taking these animals without risking overharvest.

In 2004 the Board of Game established a limited number of any-bull drawing permit hunts within the RM038 hunt area to both provide additional harvest opportunity and allow the department to obtain additional age and antler development data from the otherwise protected segment of the bull population. After three seasons of limited any-bull harvest, the department now finds it has sufficient information with which to safely recommend that the current antler restrictions be modified to allow the harvest of bulls with 2 brow tines on both antlers. Analysis of antler and age data collected from any-bull drawing permit hunts indicates that in Units 1B and 3 the median age of a bull with 2 brow tines on both antlers is 6 years of age (n = 31). Under the current selective harvest strategy this puts most of the 2 brow-tine bulls in an age class considered suitable for harvest. We therefore believe that modifying the current antler restrictions to allow the harvest of bulls with 2 brow tines on both antlers could provide additional harvest opportunity without jeopardizing the health of the RM038 moose herd.

If the Board approves the proposed change to the RM038 moose antler restrictions we recommend that the any-bull drawing hunts be suspended until such time that the impact of the revised antler restrictions on the moose herd can be evaluated.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The antler restrictions in the RM038 hunt area will remain overly restrictive and harvest opportunity will be unnecessarily restricted.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. The antler restriction hunting measures recommended in this proposal will provide for a healthy bull moose population which is being compromised at this time, while actually increasing hunting opportunity..

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those who feel the current antler regulations are overly restrictive. Those interested in maximizing harvest opportunity in the RM038 moose hunt.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those individuals who feel that the current antler restrictions have functioned as intended and provide sufficient harvest opportunity. Those individuals who would prefer to see the current any-bull drawing hunts continue.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo. Reducing the antler spread requirement from the current 50-inches to some lesser measure more appropriate for smaller *Andersoni* moose. This was rejected because local hunters overwhelmingly prefer being able to count points over a subjective evaluation of antler spread in the field.

**PROPOSAL 10 CONTINUED**

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09G-017)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Brennon Eagle PC34 Brian Merritt PC63 Butch Young PC65 Elfin Cove AC3 Homer AC4 Ketchikan AC8		Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Petersburg AC2
--	--	--



**PROPOSAL 11 – 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Modify the moose antler restriction in Units 1B and 3 as follows:

A legal bull is a spike or a fork or has 2 brow tines on each side or has a 50-inch spread.

**ISSUE:** The current antler restriction for moose is more restrictive than it needs to be.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will continue to be more bulls in the population than is necessary. Some bulls will never reach an antler size that will make them legal.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All hunters who participate in the hunt.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** I considered leaving the regulation as it is, however this would not be consistent with the intent of the antler restriction rationale that is applied in the rest of the state. As I have had this explained to me the antler restriction should allow for a harvest to some of the yearlings and when the moose reach 5 or 6 years of age they should all be growing antlers that will make them legal with either 3 brow tines or a 50-inch spread.

This is not the case in this area of Alaska. Preliminary age and antler data shows that our 3 brow tine moose are generally 6 years old. Data from our any bull draw hunt shows that our 2 brow tine bulls are also the same age. It is also the feeling of many hunters in this area that many of the bulls are never reaching 3 brow tines or 50 inch spread.

I also rejected the status quo because it was the intent of the department and the board after the Board of Game meeting in the fall of 2006 that we would take the data from the any bull hunt and use it to modify the general hunt antler configuration and eliminate the any bull hunt. This was supposed to be done in the fall for 2008.

**PROPOSED BY:** Brennon Eagle (HQ-09G-047)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Brennon Eagle PC34 Brian Merritt PC63		Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Petersburg AC2 Upper Lynn Canal AC13
--	--	---

**PROPOSAL 12 – 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf.** Extend the hunting season for wolves in Unit 3 as follows:

Open season would be August 1 to May 31 of each year. The season will be closed when harvest count of 20 wolves are reported during a regulatory year.

**ISSUE:** Spring hunters are not able to harvest wolves after April 30. Most sporting activities occur beginning with the month of May when weather and daylight permit safe access to the hunting areas. Those that hunt Kuiu Island incur significant time and costs to reach the island. Hunters should be allowed to harvest wolves to May 31 of each year.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Reasonable access to an Alaskan resource is denied. Many sportsmen hunt the area once or twice in their lifetime. Spring hunts for many individual may be their only opportunity to harvest a wolf for the value as a trophy ( as opposed to the harvest for the value as a "fur")

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Value added in regards to deer predation. Future subsistence opportunities may increase in deer and moose populations. Value added in regards to bear population as the wolf is also a predator of bear.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Resident and non-resident sportsmen who have reasonable and safe access to the hunting grounds for the purposes of sport, personal and or subsistence use. Those individuals who desire to obtain a wolf as a trophy (skull and hide considered the tangible element of the trophy), lessening of predation on deer and moose populations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who oppose the hunting and harvesting of wolf.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Bradley Shaffer (HQ-09G-027)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Brad Dennison PC51 Butch Young w/Am. PC65 Kurt Whitehead PC57 Petersburg AC2 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56		Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 E.Jozwiak PC46 Form Letter with 141 Signatories PC1 George Herben PC58 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Marylin Houser PC62
--	--	---

		Mrs Judith Reese PC3 Ms. Beverly Minn PC4 Ms. Penelope Wells PC2
--	--	--

**PROPOSAL 13 – 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf.** Extend the hunting season for wolves in Unit 3 as follows:

Unit 3: Five wolves, August 1- [APRIL 30] **June 30.**

**ISSUE:** Over population of wolves in Unit 3. Wolf population is limiting moose population and reducing deer and black bear numbers. We have guided spring and fall in Unit 3 for nearly fifty years and the wolf population is at an all time high and increasing.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued reduction of moose, deer, and black bear populations.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Wolf numbers can be controlled, giving moose, deer, and black bear additional opportunity to rebound to historic levels.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All wolf, moose, deer and black bear hunters in Unit 3.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Unknown.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Year long season. Hair quality can be poor in July and August.

**PROPOSED BY:** Jimmie and Mary Ann Rosenbruch (HQ-09G-031)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Professional Hunters Association w/Am. PC56 Brad Dennison PC51 Butch Young w/Am. PC65 Petersburg AC2 Upper Lynn Canal AC13	Jimmie Rosenbruch PC41	Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 E.Jozwiak PC46 Form Letter with 141 Signatories PC1 George Herben PC58 Gerald Brookman PC60 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Marylin Houser PC62 Mrs Judith Reese PC3 Ms. Beverly Minn PC4 Ms. Penelope Wells PC2 Susan Sloss PC59
---	------------------------	---

**PROPOSAL 14 – 5 AAC 92.510(a)(5)(D). Areas closed to hunting.** Clarify the boundaries of the Blind Slough Closed Area in Unit 3 as follows:

The language will read as follows:

(a)(5)(D) [BLIND SLOUGH DRAINING INTO WRANGELL NARROWS AND] a strip one-fourth mile wide on each side of Blind Slough, from the hunting closure markers at approximately mile 15.1[4] to the hunting closure markers at approximately mile 18.4 of the Mitkof Highway, **including the waters of Blind Slough between those hunting closure markers, are** [IS] closed to all hunting.

**ISSUE:** As currently written the regulatory language pertaining to the Blind Slough Closed Area in Unit 3 incorrectly implies that the portion of Blind Slough flowing into Wrangell Narrows is closed to hunting. The actual closed area encompasses only a strip one-fourth mile wide on each side of Blind Slough, from the hunting closure markers at approximately mile 15.1 to the hunting closure markers at approximately mile 18.4 of the Mitkof Highway, including the waters of Blind Slough between those hunting closure markers. Those portions of Blind Slough located outside the aforementioned closed area remain open to hunting unless closed as a result of a separate regulation.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will continue to be confusion on the part of the public and enforcement personnel regarding which portions of Blind Slough are closed to all hunting.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. This language clarification will assure that all users as well as managers and enforcement personnel clearly understand the boundaries of this area.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Consumptive and non-consumptive wildlife users interested in knowing what portions of Blind Slough are closed to hunting. Enforcement personnel would benefit by removing ambiguity from the current regulatory language.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who oppose the hunting and harvesting of wolf.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-09G-016)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**  
Petersburg AC2

Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5

**OPPOSE**

**PROPOSAL 15 – 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping.** Extend the beaver trapping season in Unit 1C as follows:

Open beaver season November 10 instead of December 1.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Lost opportunities to harvest prime beaver.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Increased profit from international auctions.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trappers receiving deposits.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Open season November 1.

**PROPOSED BY:** Barry Brokken

(HQ-09G-042)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Trappers Association PC17 Jacob Miller PC23 Petersburg AC2 USFWS PC6		Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Dixie Hood PC33 Jai Crapella PC49 Juneau-Douglas AC7 Lin G. Davis PC37 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Michael Tobin PC36 Patricia O'Brien PC52 Voices for Douglas Island Wildlife PC21
--	--	--

**PROPOSAL 16 – 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping and 85.060 Hunting seasons and bag limits for beaver.** Modify the hunting and trapping season for beaver in Unit 1D as follows:

Beaver season will be open to both hunting and trapping from September 1 to June 30. Trapping license required.

**ISSUE:** Over population of beaver in the Chilkat Valley.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Excessive damming of critical Salmon spawning streams due to the over population of beaver in the Chilkat Valley.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** It would help reduce the number of Beaver thus resulting in less dams being built across critical salmon spawning streams.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Salmon runs, subsistence and commercial salmon fisheries.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Upper Lynn Canal Fish and Game Advisory Committee (HQ-09G-008)

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>FAVOR</b>		<b>OPPOSE</b>
Alaska Trappers Association PC17 Upper Lynn Canal w/Am. AC13 USFWS PC6		Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Andrea Nelson PC42 Dixie Hood PC33 Jai Crapella PC49 Jeff Sloss PC9 Kathleen Menke PC8 Lin G. Davis PC37 Michael Tobin PC36 Patricia O'Brien PC52 Peter Paquet PC16 Robert Armstrong PC64 Voices for Douglas Island Wildlife PC21

**PROPOSAL 17 – 5 AAC 92.090. Unlawful methods of taking fur animals and 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.** Establish a bounty for taking beaver in Unit 1D:

The Department of Fish and Game would hire a state control officer or institute a bounty on beaver.

**ISSUE:** Over population of beaver in the Chilkat Valley.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued excessive damming of critical Salmon spawning streams.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** It would help reduce the number of beaver thus resulting in fewer dams being built across critical Salmon spawning streams.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Salmon runs, subsistence and commercial salmon fisheries.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Upper Lynn Canal Fish and Game Advisory Committee (HQ-09G-007)

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>FAVOR</b>	<b>OPPOSE</b>
Upper Lynn Canal AC13	Alaska Trappers Association PC17 Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Andrea Nelson PC42 Dixie Hood PC33 Jai Crapella PC49 Jeff Sloss PC9 Kathleen Menke PC8 Lin G. Davis PC37 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Michael Tobin PC36 Patricia O'Brien PC52 Peter Paquet PC16 Robert Armstrong PC64 Voices for Douglas Island Wildlife PC21

**PROPOSAL 18 – 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping.** Lengthen the trapping season for mink and weasel in Unit 1C as follows:

Mink and weasel season to open November 10 in Unit 1C.

**ISSUE:** Open mink and weasel season November 10 instead of December 1.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Lost opportunities to harvest prime mink and weasel.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Mink and weasel can be sold at international auction for increased profit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trappers receiving deposits.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Open season November 1.

**PROPOSED BY:** Barry Brokken

(HQ-09G-043)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Trappers Association PC17 Elfin Cove AC3 Jacob Miller PC23 Petersburg AC2 Upper Lynn Canal AC13 USFWS PC6		Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Juneau-Douglas AC7 Lisa Mariotti PC53
---	--	--



**PROPOSAL 19** – 5 AAC 84.270. **Furbearer trapping.** Lengthen the trapping season for otter in Unit 1C as follows:

Otter season to open November 10 in Unit 1C.

**ISSUE:** Open otter season November 10 instead of December 1.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Lost opportunities to harvest prime otter.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, otter can be sold at international auction for increased profit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trappers receiving depots.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Start season November 1.

**PROPOSED BY:** Barry Brokken

(HQ-09G-044)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Trappers Association PC17 Elfin Cove AC3 Jacob Miller PC23 Petersburg AC2 Upper Lynn Canal AC13 USFWS PC6		Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Juneau-Douglas AC7 Lisa Mariotti PC53
---	--	--

**PROPOSAL 20 – 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping.** Extend the trapping season for marten in Unit 1C as follows:

Marten season to open November 10th in Unit 1C.

**ISSUE:** Marten season to November 10th instead of December 11th.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Lost opportunities to harvest prime marten.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Increased profits from prime marten. Marten could be sold at international auction.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trappers receiving deposits.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Open season November 1.

**PROPOSED BY:** Barry Brokken

(HQ-09G-046)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Elfin Cove AC3 Jacob Miller PC23 Petersburg AC2 Upper Lynn Canal AC13 USFWS PC6	Alaska Trappers Association PC17	Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Juneau-Douglas AC7 Lisa Mariotti PC53
---	---	--

**PROPOSAL 21 – 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.** Modify trapping restrictions for Unit 1C as follows:

Traps with a jaw spread of less than 6 1/4" may be set 3 feet above ground no nearer to an established trail than 50 yards. (Re: Trails now listed as closed.)

**ISSUE:** Closure to trapping within 1/4 mile of certain trails listed in regulations.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Reduced opportunities for trappers. Not enough area for current trappers. No areas for new trappers.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Provides greater opportunities for resource use.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** New trappers and young trappers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Open all trails to trapping. Too many irresponsible dog owners.

**PROPOSED BY:** Barry Brokken

(HQ-09G-045)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Trappers Association PC17 Jacob Miller w/Am. PC23 Juneau-Douglas w/Am. AC7		Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Dixie Hood PC33 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Marylin Houser PC62 Susan Schrader PC47
---	--	---

**PROPOSAL 22 – 5 AAC 92.550. Areas closed to trapping.** Modify the areas closed to trapping in Unit 1C as follows:

Restriction within Unit 1C: Add the following trails heavily used for recreational purposes to the list closed to trapping within 1/4 mile of the trail: Amalga, Auke Nu, Eagle Glacier, Point Bridget, Salmon Creek, as follows (additions in bold and underlined):

(F) a strip within one-quarter mile of the following trails as designated on United States Geological Survey maps: Herbert Glacier Trail, Windfall Lake Trail, Peterson Lake Trail, Spaulding Meadows Trail (including the loop trail), Nugget Creek Trail, Outer Point Trail, Dan Moller Trail, Perseverance Trail, Granite Creek Trail, Mt. Roberts Trail and the Nelson Water Supply Trail, Sheep Creek Trail, [and] Point Bishop Trail, **Amalga Trail, Auke Nu/John Muir Trail, Eagle Glacier Trail, Point Bridget Trail, and Salmon Creek Trail;**

**ISSUE:** Trapping on trails frequented by hikers and skiers with their pets have resulted in dogs being caught, and killed or injured by the traps, along popular hiking trails in the Juneau area. Two dogs in the Juneau area have been caught in traps recently (2008), one on Montana Creek Trail and one on the Eagle Glacier Trail. Complaints from hikers and skiers have reached State Parks Advisory Board recently (and three members had personal experience with pets being caught in the last several years, including one collie dog with leg severely bruised). Recreational trail use has increased dramatically in recent years, and is expected to continue to do so. Other major recreational trails in Unit 1 C are already closed to trapping at least within 1/4 mile of the trail: 5 AAC 92.550 (1) Unit 1(C) (Juneau area).

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Without changes, more dogs will be caught in traps, and more owners and families will be affected by the grief of loss of pets, and the need to care for injuries, as well as by rising vet bills.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This has no expected effect on quality of game.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Dogs that are with their masters as they hike and ski the trails will be saved from pain, injury and death. Owners whose dogs are not injured are saved from family grief and pain, and expense for caring for injured pets. Enjoyment of the trails is enhanced when fear of being caught by traps is reduced.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who want to trap along the trails who would have to set their traps one quarter mile off the trail as is required on other trails in the Juneau area will be affected.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Requiring trappers to post signs with trap locations would be a possible alternative solution that would likely be considered burdensome to trappers, would be difficult to enforce, and may not resolve the problem of dogs being hurt or killed by traps.

**PROPOSED BY:** Juneau State Park Advisory Board

(HQ-09G-029)

**PROPOSAL 22 CONTINUED**

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Dixie Hood PC33 George Herben PC58 Gerald Brookman PC60 Juneau-Douglas w/Am. AC7 Lauren Champagne PC13 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Marylin Houser PC62 Ms. Beverly Minn PC4 Susan Hargis PC11 Susan Schrader PC47 Susan Sloss PC59 Theresa Travel PC7		Alaska Trappers Association PC17 Jacob Miller PC23 Upper Lynn Canal AC13
---	--	--

**PROPOSAL 23 – 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear.** Modify the regulation restricting the taking of white-phase black bear in Unit 1D as follows:

We strongly recommend the Board of Game to direct the Department of Fish and Game to work with legal and regulatory staff to develop language which will be enforceable in a court of law to the effect of **“A light-phase black bear that has cream coloration (or lighter) over more than 30% of its body may not be taken irregardless of any other coloration.”**

**ISSUE:** Efforts to protect the cream-colored black bear known as the Skagway “Spirit Bear” failed this spring when the department's regulation for protection of white-colored black bears in Unit 1D proved unenforceable.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The department should be concerned that they have an unenforceable regulation on their books which will negatively impact protected light-phase bears not only in Skagway but also in Unit 1C as well as the partial Albino moose in Unit 20C.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The proposal gives a higher survivability rate to the unusually colored spirit bears, thereby protecting significant viewing opportunities for the more than 1 million people who visit Skagway each year. Without this regulation, these bears are selected against by individual trophy hunters and the genes are eliminated from the gene pool, to the detriment of the far greater majority who would enjoy viewing and photographing them.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The native community who consider spirit bears to be sacred, school children, visitors on tour, tour operators, professional photographers, independent travelers, and local residents.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Trophy hunters looking for odd colored black bear hides.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** If the board cannot find any other way to protect the spirit bears, then we suggest banning the hunting of any black bear that is not black or very dark brown.

**PROPOSED BY:** John B. Warder, Jr.

(HQ-09G-050)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Alice Sorrell PC30 Angela Kartes PC29 Bob Carlson PC45 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 Dixie Hood PC33 Gary Hanson PC27 Jai Crapella PC49 James McClendon PC26 Jeff Sloss PC9		Juneau-Douglas AC7 Upper Lynn Canal AC13
--	--	---

<p>Kathleen Menke PC8 Lin G. Davis PC37 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Michael Yee PC28 Mr. Logan PC31 Nola Lamken PC32 Susan Schrader PC47 Voices for Douglas Island Wildlife PC21 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56 Donna Snyder PC54 Janice Wrentmore PC55</p>		
--	--	--

**PROPOSAL 24 – 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear and 92.132. Bag limit for brown bears.** Modify the season and bag limit for brown bear in Units 1C and 4 as follows:

Change the season dates to end June 15th instead of May 31. Increase the harvest to one brown bear everyone year instead of every four years.

**ISSUE:** Brown bear season in Unit 1C set up for the “ABC” islands. Due to the different weather pattern on the islands and the mainland the brown bear come out earlier in the spring in the islands. This gives the islands a potentially longer season. We need the season into mid June on the main land to allow access to bears that come out of their dens later than those on the islands. The May 31 closure is too early and many bears are not yet available for harvest due to the later spring.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Less opportunity to harvest brown bear. Which gives a larger number of predators to prey ratio. (Reference the Department of Fish and Game study of Berner’s Bay 1998 through 2007.)

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, it would give the prey greater opportunity for recovery.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Brown bear hunters and brown bear prey.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo. Would like the prey to have a greater opportunity to increase.

**PROPOSED BY:** Nick Yurko

(HQ-09G-023)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Upper Lynn Canal w/Am. AC13		Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56 Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Brad Dennison PC51 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 Dixie Hood PC33 Elfin Cove AC3 Jai Crapella PC49 Jeff Sloss PC9 Juneau-Douglas AC7 Kurt Whitehead PC57 Lin G. Davis PC37 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Marylin Houser PC62 Michael Tobin PC36
-----------------------------	--	---



		Petersburg AC2 Susan Schrader PC47 Voices for Douglas Island Wildlife PC21
--	--	---

**PROPOSAL 25 – 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting.** Modify the area closed to hunting big game in Unit 1D as follows:

I propose there should be a new regulation adopted concerning this problem it should read: **All land in the Klehini River drainages between the Haines Highway and the Porcupine Road from the steel bridge that crosses the Klehini River (known as Porcupine Crossing) to Muncaster Creek is closed to taking of brown and black bears.**

**ISSUE:** The use of the developed recreation facility or adjacent land located south of the Haines Highway near mile point 27 to kill bears or to spot bears for the purpose of harvesting.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** This is a popular eagle and bear viewing area used by the local public and visiting photographers whom travel to Alaska to enjoy sharing our wildlife resource with us. This location, immediately adjacent to the Haines Highway, is known as "Marks Park" and consists of seven picnic tables, paved parking lot, a large covered gathering area, two public spotting scopes for the enjoyment of watching wildlife, a carved marble statue of a bear and interpretive signs describing bears etc.

This is a public recreation and viewing area within a growing residential area and it overlooks a portion of the major salmon spawning and bear feeding habitat of the mainstream of the Klehini River. It is located between the steel bridge that crosses the Klehini River at approximately 26.5 mile and Muncaster Creek located at approximately 27.3 mile Haines Highway. The location is closely paralleled by the Porcupine access road to the south and the Haines Highway to the north.

Every fall hunters and even local professional hunting guides utilize the location to spot or shoot at bears, and in fact some very large bears have been harvested from here. However, over several years several bears have been wounded and then abandoned when they enter the dense brush along the river because the location offers exceptional long-range spotting and shooting opportunities to unskilled hunters.

If this problem is not solved unskilled hunters will continue to wound bears that frequent a residential area. Some hunting guides will continue to provide a poor experience to visiting sportsman and local individuals and visiting photographers will be deprived of a world class bear viewing opportunity immediately adjacent to a Haines Highway wayside park.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** My proposal addresses improving the quality of relations between hunters and the non hunting public who have the right to enjoy watching undisturbed wildlife in a beautiful setting while safely utilizing an elevated developed picnic area immediately adjacent to the Haines Highway.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone that has sensible attitudes concerning fair chase hunting and sharing our resources will benefit. School children will be able to watch bears from the school bus instead of viewing an abandoned carcass of the one they were watching the day before.

**PROPOSAL 25 CONTINUED**

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** I can't see how anyone can suffer from a regulation that prohibits the killing of Alaska's most valued trophy animal from this location. Killing bears, or spotting them for stalking, from such an accessible public location should not be considered hunting. I personally have the oldest registered hunting guide license in the Haines Borough and I proudly specify in my literature that I do not bait bears and I do not guide hunters in residential areas or along the highway system. The individuals that take their clients to locations such as this are an embarrassment to the profession and the Alaska Board of Game would be wise to prohibit them from providing such a low quality experience to their clients..

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** I see no other way in which to remedy this situation other than closing the entire area previously described. If a law was passed to only prevent shooting from the park location it would still be used for spotting and stalking by unscrupulous hunters and some professional guides so the conflict would continue to exist.

**PROPOSED BY:** Al Gilliam

(HQ-09G-024)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Kathleen Menke PC8 Lisa Mariotti PC53		Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56 Upper Lynn Canal AC13
--	--	--

**PROPOSAL 26 – 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat.** Establish an archery hunt for goat in Unit 1D as follows:

One goat by bow and arrow only in Unit 1D between Taiya Inlet/River and the Whitepass/ Yukon Railroad. Season to open September 15 – November 15, by permit only.

**ISSUE:** No open season on goats in Unit 1D between Taiya Inlet/ River and the Whitepass/Yukon Railroad.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Loss of potential hunting area for bow hunters.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bow hunters getting access to an area of high goat density.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Upper Lynn Canal Fish and Game Advisory Committee (HQ-09G-009)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Bowhunters Association PC25 Petersburg AC2 Upper Lynn Canal w/Am. AC13		Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Lisa Mariotti PC53
---	--	--

**PROPOSAL 27 – 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Eliminate the antlerless moose season in Unit 1C as follows:

Eliminate the DM043, DM044, and DM045 hunts.

**ISSUE:** Eliminate the cow moose season for DM 043, DM044, DM 045, specifically Unit 1C - Gustavus Forelands.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The Department of Fish and Game will kill off the moose heard in Gustavus.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone who hunts bull moose in Gustavus.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Juneau residents who draw cow permits.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Chuck Burkhardt (HQ-09G-037)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Calvin Casipit PC19 Community of Gustavus PC22	Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Lisa Mariotti PC53	Juneau-Douglas AC7 Petersburg AC2
---	---	--------------------------------------

**PROPOSAL 28 – 5 AAC 85.045(a)(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for Moose.** Replace the "any bull" hunt at Gustavus with an antler restriction hunt. Bulls with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side would be legal.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(1) .... Units 1(C) that portion west of Excursion Inlet and north of Icy Passage		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 bull <u>with spike-fork or 50- inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side</u> by registration permit only; or	Sept. 15–Oct. 15	Sept. 15–Oct. 15
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 100 permits may be issued	Nov. 10 –Dec. 10	Nov. 10 –Dec. 10
....		

**ISSUE:** Since the first bull moose was harvested at Gustavus in 1989, this hunt has been managed under a registration permit, with any bull being legal. Through 2002, this was an effective management strategy for this population, as a high rate of recruitment of young bulls allowed for unlimited hunter participation while still providing a sustainable harvest of bull moose. During this time period the hunt duration was 20-30 days annually, allowing managers to adequately control the hunt. In recent years however, the recruitment of young bulls into the population has declined due to predation and other factors, resulting in fewer surplus bulls. The any bull hunt strategy that was so successful in earlier years has now resulted in a concern for over harvest of bull moose, because of the extreme hunting pressure in this area that results in a rapid and somewhat uncontrollable harvest. This derby style atmosphere has resulted in a hunt duration of as little as 2-3 days in recent years.

Although biologists have closed this hunt by Emergency Order every year since 1997 to preserve a healthy bull:cow ratio, this is becoming increasingly difficult with the present extreme hunt intensity, and rapidity at which guideline harvest levels are reached. This concern is enhanced by the fact that reliable composition data is difficult to attain year to year due to

marginal snow cover while bulls still retain their antlers. This adds to the difficulty in assuring a healthy bull population with a hunt that allows the taking of any bull.

**PROPOSAL 28 CONTINUED**

By changing the management of this hunt from that of any bull to an antler restriction hunt, we can still manage this under an unlimited registration permit, yet protect enough bull moose to retain a healthy bull:cow ratio. This type of hunt would not only be biologically sound, but would allow for a longer lasting hunt providing greater opportunity for those interested in participating in this hunt.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The harvest of bull moose under the present management strategy could exceed management guidelines, and jeopardize the sustainability of this herd.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. The antler restriction hunting measures recommended in this proposal will provide for a healthy bull moose population which is being compromised at this time, while actually increasing hunting opportunity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those hunt managers and others interested in the long term sustainability of this herd. And, those hunters who want to move away from the derby atmosphere of the present hunt.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those individuals who want to harvest any bull, and do not want to be forced into a selective harvest strategy.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo: this is fast approaching an unmanageable situation both biologically and functionally. Draw hunt: although this would reduce the “derby” atmosphere, it might still subject this herd to an over harvest of bulls.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09G-015)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5  
Juneau-Douglas AC7  
Lisa Mariotti PC53  
Mitch Faulk w/Am. PC10  
Petersburg AC2

**OPPOSE**

Calvin Casipit PC19

**PROPOSAL 29 – 5 AAC 92.150(c). Evidence of sex and identity.** Extend the damaged, broken, or altered moose antler regulation in effect for Units 1B and 3 to include the entire RM038 hunt area, including that portion located within Unit 1C south of Port Hobart, including all Port Houghton drainages.

**5 AAC 92.150. Evidence of sex and identity.**

...

(c) If a big game bag limit includes an antler size or configuration restriction, both antlers must be salvaged. A person possessing a set of moose antlers with less than the required number of brow tines on one antler shall leave the antlers naturally attached to the unbroken, uncut skull plate. If antlers or horns must be salvaged, they may not be altered before the completion of all salvage requirements, unless alteration is required under permit conditions. In Units 1(B), **1(C), that portion south of Port Hobart, including all Port Houghton drainages,** and 3, a damaged, broken, or altered antler is not considered a spike-fork antler as defined in 5 AAC 92.990.

**ISSUE:** In 2007 the Board of Game partially repealed a region-wide regulation stating that a damaged, broken or altered antler does not satisfy the spike-fork requirement in antler restricted moose hunts unless the opposing undamaged and unaltered antler meets the specified point requirements. However, the board determined that there remained sufficient evidence of abuse within the RM038 hunt area that the broken antler regulation should be remain in effect in Units 1B and 3. At the time the new regulatory language was crafted a small portion of the RM038 hunt area located in subunit 1C was inadvertently omitted from the regulatory language. As a result the broken antler regulation does not apply to the Unit 1C portion of the RM038 hunt area. The department, therefore, requests that the language for the damaged, broken or altered moose antler regulation be amended to include the entire RM038 hunt area including that portion located within Unit 1C south of Port Hobart, including all Port Houghton drainages.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** A loophole will continue to exist allowing damaged, broken or altered moose antlers to satisfy the spike-fork antler requirement in the Unit 1C portion of the RM038 hunt area.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. By clarifying the RM038 permit area to include the portion of Unit 1C that was omitted, the moose population in this area will only be subject to harvest of bull moose that fit the legal antler configuration, thereby preventing an overharvest of bulls in this area.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Managers and hunters interested in consistent application of moose antler regulations throughout the entire RM038 hunt area.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who might shoot a moose with a broken or damaged antler in the Unit 1B and 3 portion of the RM038 hunt area and claim that it was harvested in the Unit 1C portion of the hunt area where broken, damaged or altered antlers are not currently prohibited.



**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSAL 29 CONTINUED**

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-09G-018)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5

Lisa Mariotti PC53

Petersburg AC2

**PROPOSAL 30 – 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Moose.** Modify the eligibility and bag limit for the subsistence moose hunt in Unit 1D as follows.

Eliminate the current point system for the TM 059 hunt, and open the hunt to any Haines resident applicant, but limit them to one moose every two years per family. Its equal to half a beef each year.

**ISSUE:** Tier II is a subsistence program designed to fairly manage a limited resource for local residents who need or depend on that resource. It is not supposed to be a recreational proxy hunt for friends or relatives. As such, it is not being managed equitably. This would increase the applicants chances because the majority of moose harvested each year are taken by the same hunters. The point system promotes it. The more you hunt, the more moose you take, the more points you get. If you don't need extra meat, can't or won't be able to hunt, or if you forget to apply on time, then you lose your points to hunt next year and possibly the next. Of the 260 applicants, 225 are approved. Many applicants "say" they hunted just to keep their points active, some are anti-hunting activists, and some sign up their spouses to double their chances. Hence, the number of actual hunters is much smaller than the number of permits issued. The current points system is complicated, unfair, inequitable and needs to be adjusted.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?**

**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:** David Werner

(HQ-09G-005)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Craig and Cheryl Loomis PC14

Kathleen Menke PC8

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5

Lisa Mariotti PC53

**PROPOSAL 31 – 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping and 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf.** Lengthen the hunting and trapping seasons for wolf in Unit 1D as follows:

Wolf hunting & trapping season in Unit 1D will be open from August 1 - May 15.

**ISSUE:** The wolf population in the Chilkat is to a point where it could have a detrimental effect on the moose herd.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The moose herd could be decimated to the point that it could not sustain itself.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Less predation on moose herd letting her expand & improving chances for subsistence hunters to harvest a moose.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Moose herd and subsistence hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Upper Lynn Canal Fish and Game Advisory Committee (HQ-09G-010)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Trappers Association PC17 Upper Lynn Canal AC13		Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 Dixie Hood PC33 E.Jozwiak PC46 Form Letter with 141 Signatories PC1 George Herben PC58 Jai Crapella PC49 Jeff Sloss PC9 Kathleen Menke PC8 Lin G. Davis PC37 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Marylin Houser PC62 Michael Tobin PC36 Mrs Judith Reese PC3 Ms. Penelope Wells PC2 Voices for Douglas Island Wildlife PC21
---	--	--

**PROPOSAL 32 – 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping.** Lengthen the season for trapping lynx in Unit 5 as follows:

Lynx in Unit 5 opens November 10 and closes February 15 with a bag limit of “no limit”.

**ISSUE:** Lynx should be opened on November 10 instead of December 1.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Trappers in Unit 5 may catch a lynx in either a wolf or wolverine set and be forced to either illegally take it or skin it and turn it into the Department of Fish and Game.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, trappers are more likely to care for fur they get to keep, than those they must give up.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trappers in Unit 5. Law enforcement because all seasons open on the same day.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Trappers in Unit 5 will be kept from harvesting lynx for no good reason.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Open lynx November 10 - April 30. More important to open on the same day.

**PROPOSED BY:** Rick Newlun

(HQ-09G-021)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Trappers Association PC17  
Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5  
Lisa Mariotti PC53

**PROPOSAL 33 – 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.**  
Eliminate Unit 5 from the trap identification requirement as follows:

Units 1-~~4~~ [5] require all traps and snares to be marked with a permanent tag with trappers name and address or permanent identification, or be set within 50 yards of a sign with same information.

**ISSUE:** To remove Unit 5 from trap tag requirement on traps and snares, also the signage requirement within 50 yards of trap. It is unwarranted and was not proposed by or for Unit 5.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** It is an unneeded cost to trappers at a time of little income in the area and it will cause trappers to go out and spend money on something unneeded in a rural setting.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trappers in Unit 5.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Leave regulation as is, but Unit 5 was not represented at the meeting when it passed.

**PROPOSED BY:** Rick Newlun (HQ-09G-036)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Trappers Association PC17 Robert Jahnke PC44		Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Homer AC4 Lisa Mariotti PC53
--	--	---

**PROPOSAL 34 – 5 AAC 84.270(14). Furbearer trapping.** Shorten the wolverine trapping season in Units 1-5 to end on February 15.

<b>Species and Units</b>	<b>Open Season</b>	<b>Bag Limit</b>
(14) Wolverine		
Units 1-5	Nov. 10 – <b>Feb. 15</b> [APR-30]	No Limit

**ISSUE:** To maintain sustainable populations of wolverine in Southeast Alaska the harvest of productive females needs to be minimized. Recent genetic research on wolverines in Unit 1B indicates that recruitment of reproductive females is primarily from females that are born within the region and survive to reproductive age. Females do not reproduce until at least three years old and frequently only successfully raise one or two young every other year. Wolverine kits are born in February and early March and remain in the den until late May. During this late winter period reproducing females are vulnerable to trapping because they travel extensively to obtain food while trying to meet the energetic demands of lactation. Harvesting any female wolverines at this time could have major negative ramifications on future recruitment into the population.

Most wolverines in Southeast Alaska are harvested in December, January, and February. Shortening the wolverine season would not have significant impact on trapping opportunity or the period when most wolverines are trapped and it would help reduce harvest of reproductive females and make the trapping season more consistent with other furbearer trapping seasons in the region.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** An increase in trapping pressure, due to either an increase in the number of trappers, trapper effort, or improved access to mainland habitats where wolverines occur, could lead to an unsustainable harvest of wolverines in those portions of Southeast Alaska that are relatively isolated from sources of dispersers.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. This proposal will protect female wolverines during the denning season which is critical to provide for recruitment of young into the population. This will contribute to long-term and sustainable wolverine hunting and trapping opportunities.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those interested in ensuring sustainable populations of wolverines in the Game Management Units of Southeast Alaska, and also trappers who could potentially increase their take of wolverines over the long term by increasing the survival of reproductive females.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** A relatively small number of trappers that continue to trap wolverines during late February through April.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

- Shorten the season to end on January 30 to protect the maximum number of reproductive females possible.
- Reduce the bag limit to only 1 wolverine per year per trapper.
- Restrict trapping for wolverines to sets accessed by boat only.

**PROPOSAL 34 CONTINUED**

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-09G-011)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 East Prince of Wales AC9 Erica Hill PC24 Kneeland Taylor w/Am PC39 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Matanuska Valley AC14 Petersburg AC2 Upper Lynn Canal w/Am. AC13		Alaska Trappers Association PC17 Juneau-Douglas AC7 Ketchikan AC8 Randy Jahnke PC48 Robert Jahnke PC44
--	--	--

**PROPOSAL 35 – 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.** Modify the regulation as follows:

Eliminate the trap marking restriction for Units 1-5.

**ISSUE:** In November 2006, the Board of Game passed this restriction as an amended proposal with a margin of one vote. This was done without public input on the adopted language. I would like to see this restriction dropped. This amended proposal was not based in fact as a problem solver. There was no problem. Do we make regulations on supposition? I should hope not. It is my understanding trap tags were tried in other parts of the state and then dropped.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** This restriction has raised questions on what happens when a tag is lost due to an animal fighting the trap and what the penalty would be to the trapper in this situation.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trappers and the Department of Fish and Game need to be reminded that trapping is a profession that is an important management tool in Southeast Alaska when standard predator control methods are not adoptable

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** This restriction was not based on an existing problem. The only solution is to drop the restriction.

**PROPOSED BY:** Robert Jahnke (HQ-09G-038)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Trappers Association PC17 Matanuska Valley AC14 Robert Jahnke PC44		Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 East Prince of Wales AC9 Jacob Miller PC23 Juneau-Douglas AC7 Kenai-Soldotna AC6 Ketchikan AC8 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Petersburg AC2
---	--	--



**PROPOSAL 36 – 5 AAC 85.015(1). Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear.** Amend this regulation in Units 1A, 1B, 1C, 2 and 3: to delay the start of the fall black bear hunting season to September 15 for nonresidents.

<b>Units and Bag Limits</b>	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
Units 1(A),Units 1(B), 2, <b>and</b> 3 (except Kuiu Island) [AND 5]		
<b><u>RESIDENT HUNTERS:</u></b> <b><u>2 bears, not more than 1 of which may be a blue or glacier bear</u></b>	<b><u>Sept. 1 - June 30</u></b> <b><u>(General hunt only)</u></b>	
<b><u>NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:</u></b> <b><u>1 bear</u></b>		<b><u>Sept. 15 – June 30</u></b>
<b><u>Unit 5</u></b>		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 2 bears, not more than 1 of which may be a blue or glacier bear	Sept. 1 - June 30 (General hunt only)	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bear		Sept. 1 – June 30
Units 1(C) [AND 1(D)]		
<b><u>RESIDENT HUNTERS:</u></b> <b><u>2 bears, not more than 1 of which may be a blue or glacier bear; however, a white-colored bear may not be taken</u></b>	<b><u>Sept. 1 - June 30</u></b>	
<b><u>NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:</u></b> <b><u>1 bear; however, a white-colored bear may not be taken</u></b>		<b><u>Sept. 15 – June 30</u></b>
<b><u>Unit 1(D)</u></b>		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 2 bears, not more than 1 of which may be a blue or glacier bear; however, a white-colored bear may not be taken	Sept. 1 - June 30	

**PROPOSAL 36 CONTINUED**

**NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:**

1 bear; however, a white-colored bear may not be taken

Sept. 1 – June 30

3, Kuiu Island

**RESIDENT HUNTERS:**

2 bears, not more than 1 of which may be a blue or glacier bear

Sept. 1 - June 30

**NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:**

1 bear, the season will be closed by emergency order when the harvest guideline has been reached

**Sept. 15** – June 30  
[SEPT. 1]

**ISSUE:** During the past few years, Department of Fish and Game biologists along with hunting guides, outfitters, resident hunters, and other outdoor recreationists have become concerned about an apparent decline in black bear numbers in many portions of central and southern Southeast Alaska (Units 1C, 1B, 1A, 2, and 3). The annual harvest of black bears in this area more than doubled between 1990 and 2000 (increasing from 434 to 978), with nonresidents accounting for more than 70% of the harvest in some of the units. This rapid increase in harvest prompted the department to submit a proposal to the Board Of Game in 2000 to impose a nonresident guideline harvest cap on Kuiu Island which at the time was the main area of concern. Though this provided relief by slowing and even lowering the harvest on Kuiu Island, the harvest on the neighboring Prince of Wales Island (POW) continued to see an increase in bear harvest through 2006.

The department is concerned that the increasing hunter harvest has led to a decline in bear numbers and this raises concerns about the sustainability of this level of hunting effort. We believe it is necessary to slow and preferably lower the harvest on black bears until we can better assess the impacts of this harvest level, and the competing interests for this resource. Part of this assessment will involve a companion proposal submitted by the department that would require all black bear hunters to obtain a harvest ticket prior to hunting. The information collected from harvest tickets would allow us to gather important information from all black bear hunters as well as allow us to subsequently survey hunters about black bear management issues.

Having already seen the ramifications of what restricting the harvest on one area (Kuiu Island) has on adjacent areas (POW Island), the department believes it is necessary to apply this proposal to a broader area (Units 1C, 1B, and 1A) to avoid a shift in hunting pressure to neighboring locations and again be faced with potential over exploitation of the black bear populations.

**PROPOSAL 36 CONTINUED**

Because nonresident hunters account for the majority of the black bear harvest in these areas, this proposal would restrict only nonresident hunting. We focused on the early September season because a disproportionate number of females are killed during early fall compared with late fall and spring hunts.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Recent harvest trends suggest the harvest of black bears will remain at the present high levels or even continue to increase unless we take some measure to slow the rate of harvest. This could prove detrimental to the long term stability of these populations.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, a lower harvest in the next few years should provide better black bear management into the future by providing healthy and sustainable black bear populations on certain islands and mainland areas.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All people interested in the black bear resource in Southeast Alaska will benefit from healthy and sustainable black bear populations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Nonresident hunters will have a shorter hunting season. Also, guides and outfitters that provide services to non-residents may not be able to provide as many hunts.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** A) Initiate a harvest cap on black bears for each area of concern. Biologically this can produce the same reduction in harvest, but it makes planning a hunt more difficult because of the risk that the season may be suddenly closed. This may also concentrate hunting in the early season, reducing the quality of hunting experience.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09G-020)  
 \*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 East Prince of Wales AC9 Gregg Parsley PC18 Jim Baichtal w/Am. PC50 Juneau-Douglas AC7 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Sumner Strait AC5	Alaska Bowhunters Association PC25 Ketchikan AC8	Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56 Brad Dennison PC51 Jimmie Rosenbruch PC41 Johnny Laird PC40 Kurt Whitehead PC57 Randy Jahnke PC48
--	---	--

**PROPOSAL 37 – 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear and 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures.** Establish registration hunt requirements for black bear in Units 1, 2 and 3 as follows:

Registration hunt requirements for black bear in Unit 1, 2 and 3.

**ISSUE:** Hunt report does not provide sufficient data and has poor response rate from harvest tickets. Lack of any biological data on black bear. US Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department of Fish and Game do not have sufficient data to properly manage the black bear resource.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The Board of Game will have to manage black bear without any biological data on black bear.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Black bear resource can be managed with sound data and good management practices.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All black bear hunters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Inconvenience in complying with registration hunt requirements.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Conduct population studies, very expensive and does not reflect hunter effort (i.e.: successful and unsuccessful hunts, wounding loss, etc.)

**PROPOSED BY:** Jimmie Rosenbruch (HQ-09G-032)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Brad Dennison PC51 Jimmie Rosenbruch PC41 Johnny Laird PC40 Juneau-Douglas AC7 Ketchikan AC8 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56	Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5	Alaska Bowhunters Association PC25 East Prince of Wales AC9
--	------------------------------	--

**PROPOSAL 38 – 5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets and reports.** Amend this regulation to provide the following: In Units 1-5, individuals will be required to obtain a black bear harvest ticket prior to hunting black bear.

**5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets and reports.**

....

**(1) for black bear: a person may not hunt black bear, except in a permit hunt, in Units 1-5 unless the person has in possession a harvest ticket for the species and harvest report (issued with the harvest ticket).**

**ISSUE:** At present all successful black bear hunters in Units 1-5 are required to have their bear sealed at a Department of Fish and Game office or designated sealer. During the sealing process, biological data on the harvested bear (sex, age, skull size) are collected, as well as data on the hunt itself (days hunted, hunt location, mode of transport, # of bears seen, etc.). These data are useful to managers for tracking successful hunting effort and harvest but it does not provide any information from unsuccessful hunters.

Due to growing concerns about the status of black bear populations in Southeast Alaska by Department of Fish and Game biologists, guides, outfitters, and other outdoor resource users, we believe that developing a black bear management plan in Southeast Alaska is warranted and necessary. To develop a black bear management plan the department needs information on all users, including unsuccessful hunters. Requiring a harvest ticket means all black bear hunters are identified and the department will have contact information in order to survey hunters regarding their desires and opinions. This is an important component in being able to develop a black bear management plan to help direct future population objectives.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** We will continue to get information from successful black bear hunters only, and miss the valuable data other hunters could provide us about where, when, and how they hunted. We also may be forced to manage much more conservatively because of the lack of information we have about the hunting effort.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, by collecting data from all black bear hunters we will have a more robust data set to assist us in managing this resource and to proceed with a black bear management plan.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All people interested in the black bear resource here in Southeast Alaska, will benefit from managers having better data to guide their management decisions.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Hunters who do not want to bother acquiring a harvest ticket prior to going in the field.

**PROPOSAL 38 CONTINUED**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** A) Implement a registration permit hunt for black bears in Units 1-5. This solution was rejected because registration permits are generally used to closely monitor a specific hunt. While there are areas with black bear harvest concerns, region-wide data will assist in determining future regional management direction. In addition, harvest tickets can be distributed by vendors making it easy for hunters to obtain them, whereas registration permits are generally issued from department offices and require an additional stop to procure the permit. B) Status quo. This solution was rejected based on concerns with the current black bear harvest. We anticipate the demand for black bears to continue to increase and additional data is necessary for management decisions and action.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09G-013)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**  
Alaska Bowhunters Association PC25  
Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5  
Brad Dennison PC51  
East Prince of Wales AC9  
Jimmie Rosenbruch PC41  
Juneau-Douglas AC7  
Lisa Mariotti PC53  
Petersburg AC2  
Sumner Strait AC5  
Upper Lynn Canal AC13  
Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56

**OPPOSE**  
Robert Jahnke PC44

**PROPOSAL 39 – 5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets and reports.** Require harvest tickets for hunting black bear in Units 1-3 as follows:

Units 1-3: Prior to hunting black bears individuals will be required to first attain a black bear harvest ticket.

....

**(1) black bear: a person may not hunt black bear in Units 1-3 unless the person has in possession a harvest ticket and hunt report for the species. Hunt reports must be completed and returned to the department at the time of sealing for successful hunters and within 30 days of the end of the season for unsuccessful hunters.**

**ISSUE:** There is a concern among many Southeast Alaska hunting guides about the level of non-resident hunting pressure for black bears, particularly in Unit 2 and 3. Currently, because only successful hunters file any type of report, there is a significant lack of information available regarding hunting effort, wounding loss, and perhaps other general biological data relating to black bears.

To develop a complete picture of what is taking place in the field, the Department of Fish and Game needs information on all users, including unsuccessful hunters. We would like to see a new requirement that all nonresident black bear hunters in Units 1-3 be required to have in their possession a harvest ticket and hunt report while hunting black bears. black bear hunters will be required to report, not just those that are successful. Requiring a harvest ticket means all nonresident black bear hunters will be required to report, not just those who are successful.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Nonresident hunting pressure for Southeast Alaska black bears would continue to increase with inadequate monitoring and in the absence of a viable black bear management plan. This type of situation will ultimately lead to reactionary proposals by the Department of Fish and Game based upon gut feeling rather than sound information.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Although the total number of bears observed by guided hunters appears to be stable the number of trophy quality black bears seen has decreased in recent years in many areas. There is a feeling among guides that increasing non-residents hunting effort is a major factor. Information generated from harvest ticket reports can be used to develop a management plan designed to improve the overall potential for non-residents and residents alike to harvest trophy quality black bears in Southeast Alaska.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All users should benefit. Information from the harvest ticket hunt reports will help in the development of a viable management plan for black bears in Southeast Alaska.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** There will be an additional workload in handling the information generated from the hunt reports which may translate into some additional expense to the Department of Fish and Game.

**PROPOSAL 39 CONTINUED**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1. Registration hunt. Requires nonresidents to arrive in Alaska 1-3 days prior to their hunt in order to obtain a registration permit from a Department of Fish and Game office.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Professional Hunters Association (HQ-09G-048)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5  
Brad Dennison PC51  
Defenders of Wildlife PC43  
Jimmie Rosenbruch PC41  
Juneau-Douglas AC7  
Robert Jahnke PC44  
Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56  
Lisa Mariotti PC53

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Bowhunters Association PC25



**PROPOSAL 40 – 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures.** Modify the black bear baiting permit requirements for Units 1-5 as follows.

Bear stations should be operated by archers only. Alaska archer's certificate is required before registering a bait station.

**ISSUE:** Bear baiting stations are being used by anyone and everyone; this takes a lot of the meaning of fair chase out of the picture. It has been said archers need to use bait station to draw bear in close but gun hunters do not need this.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** We have taken the fair chase out of bear hunting and have replaced it with feed the bears and shoot them while eating our food put out for them. We are training bears to come to our free food that humans have provided instead of living life natural and meeting the bears on their terms.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Fair chase hunting should be our main bases for good hunt as well as good number of animals to harvest. Bear baiting is like feeding your dog on the back porch and going out and shooting it.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The quality of the fair chase hunting would again mean meeting the animals on their ground under natural terms. Hunting is a physical sport and should be. The benefits would be a trophy well earned in a natural state not at a humans food dish.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who physically cannot hunt and chase after the game. Bear hunting with this handicap would need to be addressed but if the game runs after the shooting starts who is going after it?

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Total bear baiting ban. This has already been addressed and was rejected.

**PROPOSED BY:** Marlin Benedict (HQ-09G-001)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Kurt Whitehead PC57 Lisa Mariotti PC53		East Prince of Wales AC9 Homer AC4 Ketchikan AC8 Petersburg AC2 Upper Lynn Canal AC13
---	--	---

**PROPOSAL 41 – 5 AAC 92.052 Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures.**

Modify the current language to provide clarification regarding the intended authority of this section relative to issuing bear baiting permits in Unit 1-5.

**5 AAC 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures.** The department may apply any or all of the following additional conditions to a permit hunt, when necessary for management of the species hunted. **In Units 1-5 permit conditions from this section also apply to 5 AAC 92.044.**

**ISSUE:** The department has regularly attached conditions to black bear baiting permits issued in Units 1-5. These conditions are necessary to control the use of these permits. A recent change in the requirements for permits issued in Unit 2 has caused some hunters to question whether the conditions of the permit are intended to include the discretionary permits hunt conditions in 5AAC 92.052. This proposal is intended to clarify the authority that the Board intended relative to issuing black bear baiting permits in Unit 1-5. This is a housekeeping proposal.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Confusion will continue for those who question the intent of the current authority, which could result in litigation and/or an emergency Board meeting to resolve the issue.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. This proposal will allow the department to attach important and necessary permit conditions to black bear baiting permits to assure successful management of this type of hunting opportunity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Managers and hunters who recognize the importance of having specific condition apply to ensure that permits are obtained and used in a manner that is necessary to regulate the hunting activities associated with bear baiting.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who disagree with the need for applying specific conditions associated with bear baiting.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09G-019)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Brad Dennison PC51 Bruce Parker PC38 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 Homer AC4 Ketchikan AC8 Petersburg AC2 Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56 Lisa Mariotti PC53		Alaska Bowhunters Association PC25 Fairbanks AC12 Jimmie Rosenbruch PC41 Ken Vorisek PC20
---	--	--

**PROPOSAL 42 – 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures, and 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures.** Modify the black bear baiting permit requirements for Units 1-5.

After you have register your bear bait in person with the Department of Fish and Game and wish to relocate the bait, you can call in the new GPS coordinates to the local Department of Fish and Game office during normal business hours.

**ISSUE:** The requirement of reporting your bear baiting location in person at the Department of Fish and Game office.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Many hunters are discouraged to go hunting for bears with the use of bait, due to the amount of travel that is currently involved.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All bear baiters. Changing the requirement to have to report your bear bait location in person every time you wish to move it is a very expensive and time consuming ordeal. At today’s fuel prices we should not be expected to spend hundreds of dollars just to satisfy the local department's requirement, when a phone call during normal hours will suffice.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** I believe enforcement and the department. They must believe the coordinates that you give them in person. Why not over the phone?

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** N/A

**PROPOSED BY:** Allen Barrette (HQ-09G-049)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Homer AC4	Alaska Bowhunters Association PC25 Allen Barrette w/Am. PC66 USFWS PC6	Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56 Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Brad Dennison PC51 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 Gregg Parsley PC18 Lisa Mariotti PC53
-----------	--	--

**PROPOSAL 43 – 5 AAC 92.200(8). Purchase and sale of game.** Allow deer to be bartered in Unit 1 as follows.

...

(8) the meat of big game and small game, except hares and rabbits; [HOWEVER,] **With the exceptions of: Units 22-26,** caribou may be bartered [IN UNITS 22-26,]but may not be transported or exported from those units. **Unit 1, deer may be bartered but may not be transported or exported from Unit 1.**

...

**ISSUE:** I would like to be able to trade deer meat for salmon with my friends. I rarely catch salmon but I usually get all the venison that I want. I love grilling up salmon steaks. In Unit 1C, Alaskan residents may trade the meat from moose, deer, goats, bears and game birds for salmon, halibut, and crabs.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** To be able to enjoy eating salmon I will have to buy it from a store. In Alaska, animals may be trapped and the furs sold. Some parts of animals can be made into clothing or crafts and sold. In some areas of the state bartering is allowed. Commercial fishers can catch millions of salmon and sell them. Crabbers can catch and sell crabs. It seems unfair for me not to be able to trade venison for salmon. Two of my neighbors catch all the salmon they want but rarely harvest deer. We could trade venison and fish and all of us would be happy.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Most people who hunt or fish.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who want to trade wild meat for fish.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The alternative to the current regulations is to illegally trade game meat.

**PROPOSED BY:** Gary Miller

(HQ-09G-030)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

	Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Lisa Mariotti PC53	Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56 Homer AC4 Ketchikan AC8 Petersburg AC2 Robert Jahnke PC44
--	---	---

**PROPOSAL 44 – 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.** Modify the antler restriction for moose in Unit 1 as follows:

The new regulation for Southeast moose should read: **A legal bull is one that possesses a spike, fork, or 5 points or more of any kind on one side of his rack. In order for a point to be legal it has to be 1” long or longer and it has to be higher than it is wide. The type of point is irrelevant.**

**ISSUE:** Since the Department of Fish and Game imposed the spike, fork, 50-inch, or three brow tine regulation on the Stikine River moose herd, a lot of older bull moose have been left in the population because they don't grow three brow tines or ever get to 50 inches. The 50-inch provision of this regulation needs to be dropped totally because hunters are guessing at 50 inch, and many guess wrong and then a 48 inch moose is shot and left in the field to rot. In past years a lot of bulls have been shot that didn't possess three brow tines and yet the hunter thought it did. This killing of a non-legal moose usually is the result of a hunter not being able to identify a brow tine from a mid antler point or main palm point. The Southeast Alaska moose grow rather small, odd antlers in a lot of cases. A proposal needs to be implemented that would get rid of the type of points or spread a moose has to determine legality.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Hunters will continue to have problems identifying legal moose and animals will be shot and left in the field.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, less moose will be left in the field to rot because hunters can easily identify legal moose and older moose will be taken out of the population allowing room for younger moose. It has been documented that some hunters have left non-legal moose in the field to rot so they wouldn't receive a fine and have to be embarrassed publicly..

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All hunters who can count to at least 5.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Nobody

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The three brow tines on one side is barely working and hunters are constantly shooting moose that don't possess three legitimate brow tines.

**PROPOSED BY:** Brian Merritt (HQ-09G-003)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

		Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Petersburg AC2 Upper Lynn Canal AC13
--	--	---

**PROPOSAL 45 – 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf.** Extend the wolf hunting season dates for Units 1 and 2.

The wolf hunting season will have a closing date of May 31 in Units 1 and 2.

**ISSUE:** The closing date of the wolf season in Unit 1 and Unit 2. Moving the closing date from April 30 to May 31.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** When people are out spring bear hunting they will not be able to harvest one wolf they see while bear hunting.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, bear hunters will be able to harvest the odd wolf while bear hunting. Right now there is no harvest in May.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bear hunters who would enjoy harvesting a wolf.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** There is no shortage of the wolf resource in Unit 1 and 2, so, I can't see a problem with the harvest of a few more.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** A year round wolf season. I didn't think the Board would agree to that.

**PROPOSED BY:** Brian Warmuth (HQ-09G-034)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56 Juneau-Douglas AC7 Kurt Whitehead PC57 Petersburg AC2 Robert Jahnke PC44 Upper Lynn Canal AC13		Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 Dixie Hood PC33 E.Jozwiak PC46 Form Letter with 141 Signatories PC1 George Herben PC58 Jai Crapella PC49 Jeff Sloss PC9 Kathleen Menke PC8 Lin G. Davis PC37 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Michael Tobin PC36 Mrs Judith Reese PC3 Ms. Beverly Minn PC4 Voices for Douglas Island Wildlife PC21
--	--	--

**PROPOSAL 46 – 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf.** Modify the wolf hunting season dates for Units 1, 3, 4, and 5 as follows.

	<b>Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General hunts)</b>	<b>Nonresident Open Season</b>
<b>Units and bag limits (1)</b>		
<b>Units 1 and 3-5</b>	[AUG. 1-APR. 30] <u>Sep.1-Mar.31</u>	[AUG.1-APR.30] <u>Sep.1-Mar.31</u>
<b>5 wolves</b>		

**ISSUE:** In 2004, the start and end dates of the wolf hunting season in Units 1,3,4 and 5 were changed from September 1 - March 31, to August 1 - April 30. These seasons are now excessively long and begin when pups are still completely dependent on adults for food and protection and hides are not prime. With seasons extending late into spring when females are pregnant, dens are being established and fur quality is poor. The state's 2005 wolf management report of survey and inventory activities documents that few wolves have been taken by hunting and trapping during August in all units. There is no evidence that opening wolf hunting seasons early and closing them late has any significant impact on deer or mountain goat numbers. Any rationale for having excessively long seasons in order to benefit prey populations is therefore invalid and seasons can be shortened to better manage wolves as big game animals and furbearers.

Background and justification

Prior to statehood, wolves throughout Alaska were managed as predators--undesirable animals that should be reduced or eliminated. During the 1950s , federal efforts to eliminate wolves over vast areas employed poison, aerial shooting, trapping, cyanide guns, bounties, and denning. After statehood, aerial shooting and bounties continued until 1972. Wolves were eventually classified as big game animals and furbearers and managed like other species with hunting and trapping seasons and bag limits to protect populations from over-harvesting.

By the 1970s there were cries for wolf control as ungulate populations declined and hunter demand increased. The Board of Game (board) complied and authorized Alaska Department of Fish and Game (department) biologists to shoot wolves from helicopters in several areas. About 1,300 wolves were taken during 1975-1983 at a cost of \$824,000.

In 1994, the Intensive Management statute (IM) passed the legislature. This mandated that depleted ungulate populations found important for human use be restored to former levels of abundance. The primary intensive management too is predator control.

## **PROPOSAL 46 CONTINUED**

Over the years since the IM law passed the board has adopted various IM programs. These have allowed private pilots to shoot wolves from the air and ground. In addition, the board lengthened wolf hunting and trapping seasons and increased bag limits over virtually the entire state. The board's rationale was that taking these actions might increase wolf harvest, reduce wolf numbers and increase ungulate prey. In essence, this was de facto wolf control.

Previously set at September 1 to March 31, wolf hunting seasons in Unit 1,3,4, and 5 now open on August 1 and close on April 30. On August 1 wolf pups are only about half grown and are totally dependent on adults for food and protection from predators including bears. In August, wolf hides are nearly worthless on the fur market and make very poor trophies. Hides are not prime until several months later.

In late April, female wolves are pregnant and nearly at full term. Shooting them is inhumane and not sound conservation for a species with big game and furbearer values. Hides in late April are often badly rubbed and have much reduced value on the fur market. They make poor quality trophies for hunters.

The board has issued no written findings indicating deer populations in southeast Alaska currently require predator control to increase deer numbers. There is no evidence that excessively long wolf hunting seasons have an impact on deer or mountain goat numbers. There is no evidence that excessively long wolf hunting seasons have any impact on wolf numbers, or that shortening those seasons would result in increasing wolf numbers.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Orphaned wolf pups in summer and early fall will continue to starve and die inhumanely. Pregnant, full-term female wolves will be shot in April. Hunters will continue to take wolves with un-prime fur, a waste of a valuable, renewable resource. Hunters will continue to take poor quality trophies. Unnecessary de facto wolf control programs will continue. Wolves will continue to be unnecessarily managed as predators rather than as big game animals and furbearers of considerable value. The public will continue to view the Board as managing wolves only as predators to be reduced by any means available.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The quality of harvested wolf hides would go up. Hides in late April are often badly rubbed and have much reduced value on the fur market. They make poor quality trophies for hunters. Similarly, wolf hides taken in August are un-prime.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Hunters will benefit by taking wolves during times when pelt quality is higher. Such hides have greater commercial and trophy values than those taken in August or April. The affected game management units are in or near Misty Fjords National Monument, Glacier Bay National Park, and Wrangell-St. Elias national Park and Preserve. By shortening the hunting season, visitors may have an increased opportunity to see wolves.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Relatively few wolves are being taken during August and April. No one will suffer -- with the possible exception of a small number of hunters who wish to take wolves during times when fur quality is poor.



**PROPOSAL 46 CONTINUED**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** There are no alternatives solutions to this problem.

**PROPOSED BY:** Defenders of Wildlife, Alaska Wildlife Alliance, Alaska Center for the Environment, Tongass Conservation Society (HQ-09G-025)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 George Herben PC58 Gerald Brookman PC60 Jai Crapella PC49 Jeff Sloss PC9 Kathleen Menke PC8 Marylin Houser PC62 Michael Tobin PC36 Ms. Beverly Minn PC4 Susan Schrader PC47 Susan Sloss PC59 Voices for Douglas Island Wildlife PC21 Lisa Mariotti PC53		Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56 Alaska Trappers Association PC17 Brad Dennison PC51 Juneau-Douglas AC7 Kenai-Soldotna AC6 Ketchikan AC8 Kurt Whitehead PC57 Lin G. Davis PC37 Matanuska Valley AC14 Pete Nelson PC35 Petersburg AC2 Robert Jahnke PC44 Stony-Holitna AC10 Upper Lynn Canal AC13
--	--	---

**PROPOSAL 47 – 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game.** Modify the season dates for hunting waterfowl in Southeast Alaska as follows:

Amend season dates for waterfowl in Southeast Alaska to run from early October to mid-January to provide increased hunting opportunities to a broader spectrum of hunters.

**ISSUE:** The current season dates provide inferior opportunity for the majority of hunters. Further, the current setup wastes hunting days granted by federal managers by having an open season when the number of birds is very limited. The traditional end of the season in mid December occurs when populations in the region are limited to a small number of resident birds that are spread out geographically and do not respond well to decoys and calling. The traditional end of the season in mid December occurs prior to the arrival of many sea ducks and while excellent puddle duck and goose hunting still exists. An October start date would allow for the arrival of larger numbers of ducks and geese that are responsive to decoys and calling as well as jump and pass shooting. At this time resident birds are present as well as large numbers of migrants. Ending the season in January would provide an opportunity to hunt sea ducks that currently does not exist.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued lack of opportunity for the majority of hunters, frustration, and dissatisfaction due to wasted hunting days with few birds around.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Absolutely. Changing the season dates as proposed here would allow more hunting in cooler weather, decreasing spoilage. Further benefits would be hunting of birds in fully developed plumage, which would provide better opportunity to selectively shoot drakes only and increase the trophy quality of birds for mounting.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The broadest possible spectrum of users. The proposed change would allow for hunting during the most productive part of the fall and winter for the greatest variety of puddle ducks, diving ducks, sea ducks, and geese. Subsistence and sport hunters would benefit equally, as would guide/outfitters offering sea duck hunts due to the ability to book more trips. There would also be potential for benefit to local economies due to possibility of guided sea duck hunters spending in communities.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Only those hunters wishing to pursue teal, due to their early migration habits. This negative is easily negated however by the increased opportunities for other species afforded by this proposal.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** A possible compromise would be a split season consisting of a seven to ten day teal season in mid September if survey data showed sufficient hunter interest in this time frame.

**PROPOSED BY:** Kyle Ferguson (HQ-09G-026)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 47 CONTINUED**

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Bruce Parker PC38 Elfin Cove AC3 Kurt Whitehead PC57 Petersburg w/Am. AC2	Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Lisa Mariotti PC53	Juneau-Douglas AC7 Ketchikan AC8 Robert Jahnke PC44 Upper Lynn Canal AC13
--	---	--

**PROPOSAL 48 – 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.** Modify the methods for taking big game Units 1, 2, 3 and 4 as follows:

Big game in Units 1, 2, 3 and 4 may not be taken with the use of 223 caliber full metal jacket bullets.

**ISSUE:** Full metal jacket bullets are designed for maiming people in time of war. Soft tipped or solid bullets are designed to kill. 223 full metal jacketed should be a prohibited bullet type for the harvest of big game in Southeast Alaska (primarily for deer).

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued loss of big game due to the wounding, maiming or crippling due to the use of an inappropriate type of bullet for hunting. Bullet wounds do not bleed openly as an indication of being hit during tracking. The silver of stainless steel zips through the animal and bullet impact may not be apparent if a body shot occurs while the animal is moving.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The proposal will reduce the loss of big game and improve the quality of the resource population by minimizing or reducing waste.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All big game hunters who desire a healthy game population and strive to achieve clean kill shots.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** All big game boat hunters interested in harvesting deer on the beaches that desire shooting deer from 223 caliber semi-autos loaded up with non-hunting bullets.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Most bullets available to the public as full metal jacket are in the 223 caliber so prohibiting use of all caliber of full metal jacket appears to overstep the primary problem. Hunters have access to 223 caliber hunting bullets and ammunition at very reasonable costs.

**PROPOSED BY:** Bradley Shaffer

(HQ-09G-028)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56  
Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5  
Ketchikan w/Am. AC8  
Upper Lynn Canal w/Am. AC13  
Lisa Mariotti PC53

**OPPOSE**

Homer AC4

Juneau-Douglas AC7

**PROPOSAL 49** – 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions, and 92.260. Taking cub bears and female bears with cubs prohibited. Modify the methods for taking black bear in Unit 25D as follows.

5AAC 92.260. Taking cub bears and female bears with cubs prohibited **except in Unit 25D for female black bears.**

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

(6) with the use of a trap or snare; **except to snare black bears in Unit 25D. Snares need to be checked every 48 hours.**

(9) from a boat in Units 1-5 **and Unit 25D (to take black bears)**; however...

**ISSUE:** The large number of black and grizzly bears continue to be a problem because of their predation on moose calves. The moose population in this area is very low. Current regulations include no closed season for three black bears but they do not allow us to use our traditional methods (snaring and taking them in the river and their dens) to manage bear predation. The current regulations for methods and bag limits are not adequate to allow people to get back bears.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Black and grizzly bear numbers will increase. Moose numbers will continue to decrease. Moose is the main subsistence food for residents of Unit 25D. We would like to use known, proven, traditional methods to address this problem.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Taking any black bear using our traditional methods (snaring and taking them in the river and in their dens) helped manage the bear population in the past. It is fast and efficient.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** People who want more moose for subsistence. People who want to solve the problem of a high bear population in the most efficient way by using traditional methods that have been proven over many years.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who do not like our traditional methods and people who do not like to see female black bears with cubs killed. However, there are plenty of black bears.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** We have already tried other solutions and they have not worked (e.g., liberalizing bear seasons.)

**PROPOSAL 49 CONTINUED**

**PROPOSED BY:** Yukon Flats Advisory Committee & Council of Athabaskan Tribal Government. (HQ-09G-035)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Alaska Trappers Association PC17 Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence R.A.C. PC12 Fairbanks w/Am. AC12 Homer AC4 Matanuska Valley AC14 Stony-Holitna AC10 Yukon Flats w/Am. AC11	Minto-Nenana AC1 Petersburg AC2	Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56 Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 E.Jozwiak PC46 Form Letter with 141 Signatories PC1 George Herben PC58 Gerald Brookman PC60 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Marylin Houser PC62 Mrs Judith Reese PC3 Ms. Beverly Minn PC4 Susan Sloss PC59
---	------------------------------------	---

Note: This proposal was deferred from the March 2008, Interior Region meeting. It was previously listed as proposal 103.

**PROPOSAL 50— 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions, and 92.125. Predator control areas implementation plans.** Amend the regulations to allow wolf denning as follows:

In Unit 19, make it legal to disturb and destroy wolf dens in the pursuit of customary and traditional predator management methods. (The wolf season and daily bag limit in Unit 19 are sufficient at this time.)

**ISSUE:** The predator populations in Unit 19 must continue to be held in check to allow moose populations to increase and stay at a level of sustainable yield that is sufficient to meet the needs of the large number of humans living in Units 18 and 19. The predator management programs that exist are constantly under assault by those against them through the courts, U.S. Congress, and by ballot initiative. The predator management program in Unit 19A is due to expire June 30, 2009. The present state predator management programs are effective, but their future is tenuous. The state must have alternative, additional legal methods for the Department of Fish and Game and/or Alaskans to control predator numbers.

In the expectation that the Board of Game adopts proposal 41 at the Statewide board meeting, the Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee (CKAC) proposes that the board apply the new regulation to Unit 19. If proposal 41 has not been adopted, the CKAC urges the board to adopt this proposal for Unit 19.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If Unit 19 loses its predator management programs, the ungulate populations will continue to decrease. There will be few other legal, effective methods left, to hold predator numbers down.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. It has been proven that limiting predator numbers contributes to maintaining larger ungulate populations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All those who depend on ungulates as a main source of food, and sport user groups.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who are fundamentally against active predator control, or the use of wildlife by humans for food.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee

(INT-08S-G-019)

**PROPOSAL 50 CONTINUED**

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

<p>Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56          Alaska Trappers Association PC17          Fairbanks AC12          Homer AC4          Kenai-Soldotna AC6          Matanuska Valley AC14          Minto-Nenana AC1          Petersburg AC2          Stony-Holitna AC10</p>	<p>David Epchhook PC15</p>	<p>Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56          Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5          Defenders of Wildlife PC43          E.Jozwiak PC46          Erica Hill PC24          Form Letter with 141 Signatories PC1          George Herben PC58          Gerald Brookman PC60          Kathleen Menke PC8          Lisa Mariotti PC53          Marylin Houser PC62          Mrs Judith Reese PC3          Ms. Beverly Minn PC4          Ms. Penelope Wells PC2          Susan Sloss PC59</p>
---	----------------------------	---



Note: This proposal was deferred from the March 2008, Interior Region meeting. It was previously listed as proposal 100.

**PROPOSAL 51— 5AAC 92.260. Taking cub bears and female bears with cubs prohibited, and 92.125. Predation control areas implementation plans** Modify the methods for taking bears in Unit 19 intensive management areas as follows:

1. The harvest of any bear from a den is legal in intensive management areas.  
**Unit 19, residents, no closed season**
2. The harvest of any bear legal in intensive management areas.

**ISSUE:** Black bears kill a high number of moose calves in the spring and summer. There are a large number of black bears in Unit 19, and a great shortage of moose. Other regulations that have been adopted allowing the taking of more bears have not been as effective as anticipated in reducing the number of black bears. One main issue that has contributed to this is the high cost of fuel for boat travel.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Bear predation on moose calves will remain high without more effective tools to address it. Moose populations will take longer to recover. Wolf control efforts will need to remain in place longer.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. This proposal will reduce bear numbers, and so will decrease predation of moose calves by black bears. The recovery and quality of moose stocks in the area will be the result

1.) The points listed below will all contribute to the taking of more bears by local residents during the winter, particularly in rural areas of the state.

- In the winter, when people are traveling by snow machine there is an opportunity to access a whole area, rather than being limited to river corridors.
- People are trapping in the winter, and bear harvest will be done at the same time.
- This will also be done at a much lower fuel cost, since snow machines are more fuel efficient than outboard motors.
- The meat and hide of bears is superior during the winter, than during summer and fall. People will be harvesting bears for meat as a partial substitute for the moose that have traditionally been relied on.

2.) In the McGrath area when bears were moved, no sows with cubs were moved, only single bears. Because of this, an expensive program that could have made a more lasting difference was short-lived. This is borne out by the increasing calf mortality rate in that area, due to bear predation. In only two or three years, those cubs that could have been taken out, are now adults.

Also, according to some biologists, the killing of mostly boars during spring, summer, and fall increases bear populations.

**PROPOSAL 51 CONTINUED**

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The moose population, and those interested in moose population recovery.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** These actions could cause concern with those who object to the taking of sows with cubs as an ethical issue. This sort of action –the taking of any age or sex of a given prey specie- is routinely done in other countries to balance predator/prey populations, and it is effective. These actions are taken for that reason only, and have nothing to do with sport hunting or fair chase.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Bear snaring, aerial bear control were discussed.

**PROPOSED BY:** Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-035)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Fairbanks AC12 Homer AC4 Kenai-Soldotna AC6 Stony-Holitna AC10	David Epchook PC15	Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 E.Jozwiak PC46 Form Letter with 141 Signatories PC1 George Herben PC58 Gerald Brookman PC60 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Marylin Houser PC62 Mrs Judith Reese PC3 Ms. Beverly Minn PC4 Ms. Penelope Wells PC2 Susan Sloss PC59
---	--------------------------	---

Note: This proposal was deferred from the March 2008, Interior Region meeting. It was previously listed as proposal 78.

**PROPOSAL 52 — 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions, and 92.260. Taking cub bears and female bears with cubs prohibited.** Allow the taking of black bear from dens in Units 21 and 24 as follows:

Allow the taking of any black bear from dens, September 25 to May 1 in Units 21B, 21C, 21D, and 24.

**ISSUE:** Because of the current regulations, it is nearly impossible for people who are hunting bears in dens to be assured of staying legal. Current regulations prohibit the taking of sows and cubs from dens. We need to harvest a certain number of bears from dens to meet our traditional needs. The method we use is to shoot the bear in the den. It is not practical or possible to determine the sex of the bear before the bear is shot.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Traditional needs continue to not be met. If people do shoot a female bear with young cubs, then they are out of compliance with the regulations and their actions become illegal. From a totally practical point of view, when a hunter looks into the den, he sees fur. He cannot determine the sex of the animal nor whether young cubs are present.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Taking bears in dens is a proven method of removing bears from the population. It is fast, efficient, and traditional.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** People who harvest bears from dens and who need the meat but who want to remain legal with their harvest. People who want to keep traditional methods of harvest will also benefit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who object to taking females with cubs. There is a concern that taking females and cubs is a bad thing to do. But those cubs do grow up, and then they become a problem.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Middle Yukon Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-044)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence R.A.C. PC12 Fairbanks AC12 Homer AC4 Stony-Holitna AC10 Western Interior Alaska Subsistence R.A.C. PC67 Yukon Flats AC11	David Epchook PC15	Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 E.Jozwiak PC46 Form Letter with 141 Signatories PC1 George Herben PC58 Gerald Brookman PC60 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Marylin Houser PC62 Mrs Judith Reese PC3
---	--------------------	---

		Ms. Beverly Minn PC4 Ms. Penelope Wells PC2 Susan Sloss PC59
--	--	--

Note: This proposal was deferred from the March 2008, Interior Region meeting. It was previously listed as proposal 79.

**PROPOSAL 53 — 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions, and 92.260. Taking cub bears and female bears with cubs prohibited.** Allow the taking of black bear from dens in Units 21 and 24 as follows:

Allow the taking of any black bear from dens from September 25 to May 1 using artificial light in Units 21B, 21C, 21D, and 24.

**ISSUE:** Taking bears from dens is a traditional method of our people to harvest black bears for our needs. As a safety issue, it is important that we can use flashlights to look into the den to see what the bear is doing. Whether it is sleeping, whether it is dead or wounded after being shot, or whether it is attacking.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** People who take bears from the dens will not have the added safety of the use of flashlights to do so. Current regulations prohibited the use of flashlights in the taking of bears, so anyone who feels it is necessary because of safety, will be breaking the law. The safety of the hunter is at stake, and the welfare of the animal is as well. It is also important to see the bear's activity inside the den, and, for example, whether it has been wounded so it can be shot again. The only practical way one can do that is with the use of flashlights.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Taking bears in dens is a proven method of removing bears from the population. Taking bears from dens is also a traditional method of taking bears. However, not being able to use flashlights if very dangerous to someone crawling around the dens.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** People who want to hunt bears in dens, but who want to hunt in the safest and most efficient way possible.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** This could cause a problem with enforcement. Because using artificial light for hunting moose is illegal, we chose to make this legal after the moose season is closed.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Just taking one's chances in a dark den.

**PROPOSED BY:** Middle Yukon Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-045)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence R.A.C. PC12 Fairbanks AC12 Stony-Holitna AC10 Western Interior Alaska Subsistence R.A.C. PC67 Yukon Flats AC11	David Epchook PC15	Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 E.Jozwiak PC46 Form Letter with 141 Signatories PC1 Lisa Mariotti PC53 Marylin Houser PC62 Mrs Judith Reese PC3 Ms. Beverly Minn PC4
--	--------------------	---

Note: This proposal was deferred by the Board of Game at the Spring, 2008 meeting as amended to consider only option 4, sale of tanned and untanned hides and skulls from bears taken in the control program. It was previously listed as proposal 107.

**PROPOSAL 54 — 5 AAC. 92.125. Predation control areas implementation plans.** Modify the predation control plan for Unit 20E to provide the following:

Under a bear control permit, allow the following: 1.) taking of all sex-age classes of both brown and black bears; 2.) the use of bear snares for taking bears; 3.) taking of bears same-day-airborne; 4.) sale of tanned and untanned hides and skulls from bears taken in the control program. Establish a working group to develop recommendations on methods, means and protocol for carrying out the bear control program. This working group should include members of local advisory committees, public sportsman’s organizations including the Alaska Outdoor Council, and the Department of Fish and Game research and management staff.

**ISSUE:** Current conditions of the bear predation control program in the Upper Yukon/Tanana area have not resulted in elevated levels of bear removal and reduction of the bear-caused ungulate mortality.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Current restrictions on allowable methods to take bears will make bear population reduction impossible. High rates of bear predation will continue to limit moose and caribou populations in this important hunting area.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Effective reduction of bear predation will allow moose and caribou populations to increase providing significantly higher harvests in the future.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Thousands of moose and caribou hunters will benefit. Thousands of tourists will have a greater chance of viewing moose and caribou. Businesses catering to hunters and tourists will benefit economically.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People philosophically opposed to hunting and intensive management. A small number of hunters who may want to hunt specifically for bears in this area.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Upper Tanana / Fortymile Advisory Committee (INT-08S-G-038)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence R.A.C. PC12 Fairbanks AC12 Matanuska Valley AC14 Stony-Holitna AC10		Alaska Professional Hunters Association PC56 Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 E.Jozwiak PC46 Form Letter with 141 Signatories PC1 George Herben PC58 Gerald Brookman PC60 Lisa Mariotti PC53
--	--	--

		Marylin Houser PC62 Mrs Judith Reese PC3 Ms. Beverly Minn PC4 Susan Sloss PC59
--	--	---

Note: This proposal is deferred from the January 2008, Statewide meeting. It was previously listed as proposal 41.

**PROPOSAL 55 — 5 AAC 92.090. Unlawful methods of taking fur animals; 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers, exceptions; 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game, exceptions; 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game, exceptions; and 98.XXX. Areas of jurisdiction for taking predators in intensive management areas.** Amend the regulations for methods, seasons, and bag limits for taking predators in intensive management areas as follows:

1. Establish a new section under 5 AAC 98.0XXX as follows: For the purposes of implementing AS 16.05.255(e), removing den disturbance prohibitions for the taking of wolves in areas with positive intensive management findings requires approval by a majority of the active Advisory Committees with jurisdiction located in, or the majority of whose members reside in the affected unit or subunit. For the purpose of this section an "active advisory committee" is a committee that holds a meeting and acts on the proposal.

2. In areas with a positive intensive management finding within 5 AAC 92.108 where habitat is not a limiting factor and moose or caribou populations are either not achieving or maintaining population or harvest objectives; or the population's harvestable surplus is not maintaining amounts necessary for subsistence:

- a. Delete, or create exception for, restrictions to disturbing or destroying dens for wolves.
- b. Extend wolf season closure date to May 31,
- c. From April 1 through May 31 increase bag limit to 10 per day.
- d. Delete, or create exemption for, prohibition of taking a sow with cubs.

**ISSUE:** Reinstatement of a historical activity that helped promote and maintain more productive moose or caribou populations that are highly important as basic subsistence food sources in Alaska. An activity that was eliminated due to application of imposed societal standards for "sportsmanship" or "fair chase"; and for which purpose has been prevented in more recent decades based on philosophical or existential value/belief systems imported from the lower 48 states. That these practices were conducted for generations without any substantial, long-lasting or irreversible effects to predator populations is testimony to their ecological integrity, as well as substantiating assertions by Alaska's indigenous people that their traditional harvest activities were/are essentially a part of the evolved ecosystem(s).

It has been noted in several different public forums and testimony from rural Alaska residents over the years that "denning", as labeled by western society, was a known generational practice in areas of rural Alaska that some families considered to be their responsibility. Pelts of young obtained through this method were also utilized in the making of handicraft or utilitarian items. In some villages, certain young men were charged with carrying this out (along with other more "distasteful, shocking or indiscriminate" methods and means such as spring baiting) to keep wolf numbers at lower levels. As stated by one elder, "we know that when the wolves increase too much, its time to prepare for starvation"; and from another, "when the moose and caribou are gone - the country dies".



**PROPOSAL 55 CONTINUED**

We are now faced with another ballot initiative focused on pre-emption and prevention of the state's ability to conduct cost effective aerial predator management activities, which may pass or fail based on emotional rhetoric rather than the science that has been incorporated in the few programs currently active. In addition, the threat of congressional interference has recently manifested as well, with the California congressman's introduction of legislation to neuter state's wildlife management rights recognized in the Federal Airborne Hunting Act; that is directly aimed at Alaska's predator management programs.

Whether or not the unfortunate event that either of these "ballot box biology" interferences actually occurs, alternatives should be available to supplement or replace the functional wildlife management purpose, limitations and aspects affected.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The constitutional principles of resource management for sustained yield, common use, and equal application to all those similarly situated (among others), becomes even more of a shameful mockery than it already is due primarily to the limited application or complete lack of active management activities in this arena for most of the state over the last 15 years.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. History, local knowledge and the best scientific information available have shown that maintaining lower predator numbers is highly conducive to achieving and maintaining healthy and abundant ungulate populations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those who utilize these resources as a basic food source. Individuals or organizations (recreational or business oriented) who enjoy or have an interest in seeing abundant wildlife throughout the state.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Individuals or organizations who have personal, philosophical or speculative aversions to maintenance of predator/prey ratios as a viable or acceptable management tool to enhance human harvest needs.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** We considered requesting allowance for some directed level of spring baits, but rejected due to the indiscriminate mortality associated, rather than being able to focus or maintain application to the target species.

**PROPOSED BY:** Orutsararmiut Native Council – Greg Roczicka (HQ-08W-G-058)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence R.A.C. PC12 Fairbanks AC12 Kenai-Soldotna AC6 Stony-Holitna AC10	Minto-Nenana AC1 Petersburg AC2	Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Defenders of Wildlife PC43 E.Jozwiak PC46 Erica Hill PC24 Form Letter with 141 Signatories PC1 George Herben PC58 Gerald Brookman PC60
--	--	---

		Lisa Mariotti PC53 Marylin Houser PC62 Mrs Judith Reese PC3 Ms. Beverly Minn PC4 Ms. Penelope Wells PC2 Susan Sloss PC59
--	--	---

Note: This proposal is deferred from the January 2008, Statewide meeting. It was previously listed as proposal 30.

**PROPOSAL 56 — 5 AAC 92.XXX. Special hunts for disabled veterans.** Create a new regulation for specialty hunts as follows:

Establish special hunts for each big game species on all military and some national and state lands. Permit fees can be charged to cover any administrative or other costs.

**ISSUE:** "Other Disability provisions." There are many disabled Veterans who are not wheel chair bound, however physically can't climb mountains or walk great distances. (I.e. veterans rated 100% , and as you know more and more troops coming back are missing appendages or an eye yet not in wheel chairs.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Veterans and wounded troops can't hunt/fish in the state known world round for its hunting and fishing. This should be changed to help the disabled/wounded veterans adapt easier into normal life.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, I believe so if managed properly. This can be a herd management/predator control resource and balance populations to facilitate all species health of herd.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All resident 100% disabled Veterans and our returning active duty wounded heroes.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** All environmentalists that do not understand the necessity of hunting/fishing to manage wildlife.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Bruce D. Frady (HQ-08W-G-056)

\*\*\*\*\*

**FAVOR**

**OPPOSE**

Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence R.A.C. PC12 Elfin Cove AC3		Alaska Wildlife Alliance PC5 Erica Hill PC24 Lisa Mariotti PC53
--	--	---