

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME  
Interior Region  
February 26-March 7, 2010

**Advisory Committee Comment Index**

1. Delta AC
2. Yukon Flats AC
3. Central AC
4. Middle Nenana AC
5. Fairbanks AC
6. McGrath AC
7. Minto-Nenana AC
8. Upper Tanana/40mile AC
9. Stony Holitna
10. Anchorage
11. Matanuska AC
12. Arctic
13. Juneau Douglas
14. Kotzebue
15. Northern Norton Sound
16. Noatak / Kivalina
17. Upper and Lower Kobuk
18. Copper River / Prince William  
Sound

## *Delta Advisory Committee vote on BOG Proposals 1/27/2010*

**Proposal#1, 10-0**

**No Comment**

House keeping, no comments

**Proposal#2&17, 10-0**

**Support**

No need to trap lynx before they are prime

**Proposal#3, 0-10**

**No Support**

No need to check traps that often, lines too long to make this feasible

**Proposal#4, 9-0-1**

**Support**

Need to control coyote population better

**Proposal#10, 7-1-2**

**Support**

No need to bring hide out during the summer if they harvest the meat and hide is bad

**Proposal#11 10-0**

**Support**

No need to seal with new harvest tag regulation.

**Proposal#12, 10-0**

**No comment**

House keeping,

**Proposal#14, 10-0**

**Support**

This is the recommendation the coalition of ACs came up with to help with managing the 40 mile caribou harvest

**Proposal#16, 1-7-2**

**Do Not Support**

No need to split further

**Proposal#18, 0-7-3**

**No Support**

Small herd size does not need added pressure

**Proposal#19, 0-10**

**No Support**

No need for special season

**Proposal#20, 0-10**

**No Support**

Herd has room to grow

**Proposal#21, 0-10 \**

**No Support**

There is already a plan in place to help.

**Proposal#22, 0-10**

**No Support**

No special seasons for private groups

**Proposal#23, 0-9-1**

**No Support**

Won't affect sheep numbers by reducing number of tags.

**Proposal#24, 0-9-1**

**No Support**

No need to change because of predator control

**Proposal#27, 10-0**

Support as Amended-

Support with proper dates of Aug 10- June 30

Not the original wording on proposal form that we, The Delta AC, submitted

**Proposal#28, 7-0-3**

Support as Amended

With the addition of 20D.

**Proposal#31, 10-0**

Support as amended

With the preferred dates of Aug 10- June 30, This will align it with everywhere else.

**Proposal#32, 0-10**

No Support

No need to change antler restrictions, will increase harvest too much.

**Proposal #33, 1-8-1**

No Support

No need to harvest calves, socially unacceptable. Hard to convince public that it is a good thing to do.

**Proposal#36, 0-10**

No Support

No need to guide everyone.

**Proposal#37, 0-10** No need for separate muzzle loader hunt in 20A.

**Proposal#38, 0-10** Defeats purpose of any bull tag.

**Proposal#40, 9-1** Support reauthorization of 20A antlerless hunt

**Proposal#42, 10-0** Support authorization of antlerless hunt

**Proposal#43, 0-8-2** Need more information, what is the reason for this.

**Proposal#46, 0-10** Will not support special group receiving tags.

**Proposal#49, 0-8-2** Enforcement to difficult with corridor.

**Proposal#s 56, 57, 61, 62, 63, 64, 10-0** No need to restrict wolf management in these areas, they should be open to wolf harvest, they already have the park.

**Proposal#s 58, 59, 60, 65, 0-10** There is no biological reason to limit the wolf harvest in these areas.

**Proposal#66, 10-0** We support intensive management.

**Proposal#67, 9-0-1** We need all available tools for management.

**Proposal#68, 8-0-2** Support preserving this area from ATV traffic

**Proposal#73, 10-0** Reauthorize 20D antlerless hunt

**Proposal#74, 10-0** Support increase in Bison season for better harvest rate.

**Proposal#75, 10-0** Support of our proposal.

**Proposal#76, 10-0** Support to help with Bison management with change of unit 20A to 20D

**Proposal#, 77, 10-0** Help Fish and Game with Bison management

**Yukon Flats AC Comments on Region III BOG Proposals  
Extracted from Meeting Minutes from 2.8.2010**

**Proposal 98**

Support – Authored by this committee

Want to table discussion about using bucket

snares until we have a face to face meeting. We want the board to look at the proposal as written.

**Proposal 99**

Support

Restricts Non-resident hunting.

**Proposal 100**

Support-

From majority of committee, but Arctic Village member stated that Arctic Village does not take caribou at this time of year and members should consider her concern. Arctic Village sends caribou to Venetie and Ft Yukon. She does not like that it is open during calving time and some of the animals may be PCH[Porcupine Caribou Herd].

**Proposal 106**

Support

Sound like a good idea

**Proposal 3**

Support as amended-

Amended to allow for weather delays such as extreme cold, storms, overflow—need to use common sense.

**Proposal 7**

Support

We don't do too much black bear baiting in the flats; but it sounds reasonable.

**Proposal 8**

No Support

The AC doesn't think guides should be allowed to do that on behalf of their clients.

**Proposal 16**

Support

This would give Arctic Village a chance to get out there before guides get out there.

**Central AC Comments**  
**Extracted from Meeting Minutes from 2.10.2010**

Proposal #2

Against

Uniform start day for trapping season was better than the changes proposed.

Proposal #3

Against

Weather can cause delays and safety should be first concern for trapper.

Proposal #6

Support

Proposal #7

Support

More hunting opportunity for black bear hunting is good, proposal offered 2 different start dates, the Central AC likes 4/1

Proposal #12

Support

We have been requesting this for years

Proposal #13

Against

A non-motorized hunt in area with extensive equipment trails is unenforceable.

Proposal #14

Support Strongly

Joint AC proposal, including Central

Proposal #15

Against

Like Proposal #14 solution much better

Proposal #20

Against

Like Proposal #14 solution much better

Proposal #24

Against

Restricting hunt where it doesn't need to be restricted

Proposal #106

Against

Unnecessary regulation of hunting methods.

**Middle Nenana Region III Proposal Comments**  
**Extracted from Meeting Minutes from 1.25.2010**

#2 Furbearer trapping.

For: 0 **Opposed:** 8 Abstain: 0

Reasons: we do not think a longer season is needed.

#3 Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.

For: 0 **Opposed:** 8 Abstain: 0.

Reasons: we felt that a 72 hour time period was to short. We do not wish to see a time limit.

#4 Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game.

**For:** 8 **Opposed:** 0 Abstain: 0

Reasons: we feel there is a large population of coyote in the area that needs to be thinned down .To help out the other populations of animals in the area.

#5 Unlawful method of taking game; exceptions & Taking cub bears and female bears with cubs prohibited.

For: 0 **Opposed:** 9 Abstain:0

Reasons: we do not feel this is necessary.

#6 Purchase and sale of game.

**For:** 8 **Opposed:** 0 Abstain: 0

Reasons: we felt this would help the moose population and we feel that if you legally take a bear you should be able to sell the hide from it.

#7 Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures.

**For:** 8 **Opposed:** 0 Abstain:1

Reasons: we felt this would help out the moose and caribou population.

#8&9 Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent.

For: 0 **Opposed:**8 Abstain: 1

Reasons: we feel that 2 bait stations are plenty.

#10 Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides.

**For:** 9 **Opposed:** 0 Abstain: 0

Reasons: we do not want to see the animal wasted.

#11 Sealing of bear skins and skulls.

**For:** 9 **Opposed:** 0 Abstain: 0

Reasons: we feel harvest ticket reporting will work in place of sealing hides and skulls.

#12 Brown bear tag fee exemptions.

**For:** 9 **Opposed:** 0 **Abstain:** 0

Reasons: we feel this will help out on the other game populations.

#13 Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou.

**For:** 1 **Opposed:** 6 **Abstain:** 2

Reasons: we do not want to see more control over hunting and these types of restrictions.

#16 Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep

**For:** 0 **Opposed:** 8 **Abstain:** 1

Reasons: we did not feel the dates needed to be changed.

#28 & 30 hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear and permit for hunting with the use of bait or scent lures.

**For:** 0 **Opposed:** 9 **Abstain:** 0

Reasons: we do not feel this is needed.

#31 Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.

**For:** 9 **Opposed:** 0 **Abstain:** 0

Reasons: we felt that this would aid in the taking of a small number of bears that would help out the other game populations.

#32 Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

**For:** 0 **Opposed:** 9 **Abstain:** 0

Reasons: we feel that this would wipe out the population of Bull moose in the area .

#33 Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

**For:** 5 **Opposed:** 3 **Abstain:** 1

Reasons: we do not want to see cow with calfs and calfs with cows taken.

#34 Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

**For:** 0 **opposed:** 9 **Abstain:** 0

Reasons: we feel this will cause to many social issues that we have been trying to keep under control.

#36 Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

**For:** 3 **Opposed:** 4 **Abstain:** 2

Reasons: we do not want to see these hunters have to have a guide to hunt moose. This is not needed.

#37 Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

**For:** 9 **Opposed:** 0 **Abstain:** 0

Reasons: we feel this will help stop the conflict between user groups on the trail systems.



#38 Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

For: 0 **Opposed:** 6 Abstain: 3

Reasons: we felt this may be to confusing and was not needed.

#40 Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

**For:**7 **Opposed:** 1 Abstain: 1

Reasons: we feel that this is working so far to complete the goals of the intensive management law that we have to work under.

#46 Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose and community subsistence harvest hunt areas.

For: 0 **Opposed:** 9 Abstain: 0

Reasons: this would be unfair to the other hunters .

#50 & 51 hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

For: 0 **Opposed:** 8 Abstain: 1

Reasons: we do not feel this is needed

#52 Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

**For:** 9 **Opposed:** 0 Abstain: 0

Reasons: it will help take some hunting pressure off of 20A.

#53 Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

**For:** 7 **Opposed:** 2 Abstain: 0

Reasons: we felt this was no longer needed.

#55,58,59,60&65 Areas closed to hunting and trapping.

For: 0 **Opposed:** 9 Abstain: 0

Reasons: we feel this is not needed. Hunters have never asked to decrease the size of the park to create more hunting areas but we are always giving up hunting areas for other groups. We do not want the buffer zone nor do we wish to see the size of it increase!

# 70 Controlled use areas,

For: 2 **Opposed:** 5 Abstain: 2

Reasons: we felt this would be to hard to enforce.

#72 Areas closed to trapping:

For: 0 **opposed:** 5 Abstain: 2

Reasons: there are already restrictions for use in these areas.

#74 Hunting seasons and bag limits for bison.

**For:** 9 **Opposed:** 0 Abstain: 0

Reasons: we felt this would help fish and game meet the population objective.

#75 Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.

For: 0 **Opposed:** 9 Abstain: 0

Reasons: we do not feel that this is needed.

#77 Hunting seasons and bag limits for bison.

**For:** 9 Opposed: 0 Abstain: 0

Reasons: we feel that the cost of pitting collars on these animals is great and it takes too much away from the research when the animal is shot.

Fairbanks Advisory Committee

Comments and recommendations on proposals for the Interior 2010 Board of Game meeting

The Game Sub-Committee held two meetings and the Trapping Sub-Committee held one meeting to discuss the proposals and make recommendations to the full FAC. The full AC then discussed the recommendations and a few of the proposals at its regular meeting on February 10, 2010. Following are the FAC's comments on the proposals. We will include more detail on a few of the proposals in our oral AC comments at the Fairbanks meeting.

The Fairbanks AC representative to the Interior 2010 Board of Game meeting in Fairbanks is authorized to enter discussions and give opinions on any proposal before the board, any issue before the board and to participate in the discussion, including recommendations, on any new issue or proposal presented at the meeting, whether or not the FAC has discussed them.

The FAC makes the following recommendations and comments to the Board of Game. Unless the voting record is shown in the individual comments, the FAC approved these comments, voting 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 absent.

- Proposal #1      FAC Rec. "Adopt" This proposal's "reasons" should embarrass the Department. There was a typo which makes this date change housekeeping. No data is presented to support the speculation (and purely speculation) that user conflicts and overharvest would result from leaving it as is. Either have some complaint(s) data to support the "conflicts" and some harvest numbers to support the "overharvest" speculation or just go back to the "typo". The AC's and the public can understand the situation without the schmoozing.
- Proposal # 2      FAC Rec. "Amend/Adopt" Trapping should be related to the commercial value of the fur. Lynx are not prime in early November. Incidental catch is OK but the present "limit" is being used to "open the season" not as cover for incidental catch. See comments #17. Amend this proposal by adding a requirement that November lynx be sealed by December 5 by either the department or public safety. The amendment is necessary because some individual trappers have the authority to seal their own lynx.
- Proposal #3      FAC Rec. "Do Not Adopt" The cold weather and winter conditions make a "time" to check unnecessary. This is a backdoor attempt to remove those who can only trap on weekends. Most small furbearers are killed as they are trapped or die shortly thereafter (weasel, martin, squirrel, etc.). The larger furbearers (fox, lynx, wolverine, wolf) will not die in a foothold trap for a much longer time than 72 hours. Snares usually kill the animals quickly.
- Proposal #4      FAC Rec. "Amend/Adopt" Amend the proposal to separate trapping of coyotes from hunting by "not requiring the salvage of the animal between May 15 and October 31". The "extended season" creates hunting opportunity and could help lamb survival.
- Proposal #5      FAC Rec. "Do Not Adopt" The bears, cubs and all are state resources. The "methods" that are objective to the NPS are little used and cannot/do not affect the population of bears. We note that once again, the NPS is unwilling to partner in a long established, cultural practice.

- Proposal #6 FAC Rec. We would recommend “Adopt” except this issue should be within the new authorization for “sale of black bear hides” passed at the Statewide meeting. This concept of black bear being a furbearer as well as a game animal would allow for trapping regulations which have shown to be effective. This is a good idea for areas, like Unit 25, where bear predation is high.
- Proposal #7 FAC Rec. “Take No Action” The FAC supports the date change. The BOG should direct the department to make the change. The Board should realize that there are few codified “bear baiting” regulations. Since it approved the “discretionary” authorization by the Department, the Board has foreclosed the public input process for the individual conditions including methods, means and seasons. The FAC recommends the Board add a “condition” on the Department’s authority for discretionary requirements in bear baiting in the hope that by adopting it, the Board can return a public discussion on the conditions, etc., before the local advisory committees. We urge the Board to adopt language, in regulation, prior to considering the bear baiting proposal issues.
- 5 AAC 92.044. add, “Discretionary permit conditions, changes to seasons and other changes to bear baiting authorization that have been delegated to the Department shall not be imposed until they are approved by the fish and game advisory committees identified by the Board for the intended game management units.”
- Proposal # 8 FAC Rec. “Adopt” We prefer the action taken at the “statewide” meeting in Jan. (10 and 2 permits) The “other” issue is “How do hunters in the bush, not near any department office, get a bear baiting permit?” The Board should require an option for mail in or email.
- Proposal #9 FAC Rec. “Do Not Adopt” See our comment for #8.
- late season. This is a win, win option.
- Proposal #11 FAC Rec. “Adopt” The changes reflect the new tag system GMU’s and subunits.
- Proposal #12 FAC Rec. “Adopt” The FAC supports tag fee exemptions in all GMU’s and subunits where bear populations are high and bear predation on ungulates is significant in reducing calf survival.
- Proposal #13 FAC Rec. “Do Not Adopt” We prefer the proposal and conditions offered by the Joint AC committee and the existing harvest plan. This proposal does not recognize the nature and character of the present harvest. The hunt in Zones 1 & 3 is not a “backcountry”, commune with nature experience. It is a subsistence harvest by all Alaskans. Zone 2 already offers the experience this proposal endorses.
- Proposal #14 FAC Rec. “Adopt” The current harvest plan needs this “tweek” and the change in season opening. We expect some of the issues proposed in this book will, and should, be taken up by the next harvest plan. (Due to begin in late 2010 or early 2011.) The vote on this recommendation was 11 in Favor, 1 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent.
- Proposal #15 FAC Rec. “Do Not Adopt” This is one of the issues that needs to be taken up under the next plan. The Fortymile planning process has worked pretty well and the herd distribution and characteristics are still within the planned parameters.

- Proposal #16 FAC Rec. "Amend/Adopt" Amend the opening dates to Aug. 3 for residents and Aug. 10 for non-residents. Amend by adding language to exclude drawing permit hunts from the additional "early" week for resident hunters. In drawing hunts the allocation and conditions are needed for all hunters. The dates recommended would allow the guiding industry to stay on the present "schedule" for beginning sheep hunts and for keeping the number of consecutive hunts planned and the logistics of changing hunters for hunting other species. There is concern that changing anything regarding non-resident sheep hunting could have the unintended consequences of hunters moving to hunts in the Yukon or Northwest Territories or that anything negative toward guides could add to the concern over the loss of guiding opportunity that is expected by actions of the Big Game Commercial Services Board and the DNR. A majority of the FAC supports giving resident sheep hunters an earlier season as do most other states. The vote was 10 in Favor, 2 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent.
- Proposal #17 FAC Rec. "Adopt" Similar to #2, remove the Nov. lynx "season". The season extension may be justified in the colder Units proposed. The area near Tok has experienced abuse of the "incidental 2" to the point where some trappers have taken 5 or 6. Do not allow sealing of November lynx by any authority except the department or public safety.
- Proposal #18 FAC Rec. "Take No Action" This proposal is to open hunting on a very small caribou herd. The "findings" necessary to support hunts that extend from local and subsistence, to include non-residents have not been made, nor has the information to support them been included. The Board should not be in a hurry to open the hunts without the full evaluation of each issue.
- Proposal #19 FAC Rec. "Do Not Adopt" Hunts with small harvest quota's are not good choices for "earmarks" like special hunts within one Zone. This particular proposal has way too high a quota. This issue could be referred to the next FMCH harvest planning effort.
- Proposal #20 FAC Rec. "Take No Action" This should be referred to the next FMCH planning effort.
- Proposal #21 FAC Rec. "Do Not Adopt" The Joint AC committee proposal is best to help with the problem. The issue of orange colored clothing is not a part of the problem.
- Proposal #22 FAC Rec. "Do Not Adopt" The season is set based on the harvestable surplus. It should not change because of land ownership. The landowner's preference is that he/she/they can restrict access.
- Proposal #23 FAC Rec. "Adopt" With the understanding that this is an AC's/public "recommendation" which would still be well within the "up to" language now in regulation.
- Proposal #24 FAC Rec. "Do Not Adopt" It is our understanding that the Anch. AC is asking the Board to withdraw this proposal. If not withdrawn, there is no reason to restrict non-residents, they have been considered as part of the FMCH harvest plan. This concept could be referred to the next FMCH planning effort.
- Proposal #25 FAC Rec. The Board should follow the local AC's.
- Proposal #26 FAC Rec. "Amend/Adopt" There has been little complain about the "open water" portion of the season except for an area on the Chatanika River between the Elliott

Highway and the Steese Highway. Amend to change the beaver trapping season “from the Alyeska Pipeling crossing of the Chatanika River to Mile Post 45 of the Steese Highway, November 1 – April 15” to mostly exclude open water trapping. The local trappers report nearly half of the beaver houses are not active after 2 cycles of open water trapping.

- Proposal #27 FAC Rec. “Take No Action” This should have been presented as open . . . between August 10 and June 30. That would allow harvest during sheep/caribou and moose seasons.
- Proposal #28 FAC Rec. “Take No Action” Better proposals on this issue.
- Proposal #29 FAC Rec. “Take No Action” We support the concept, see comments on #30.
- Proposal #30 FAC Rec. “Support” The issue of harvesting more brown bears and the use of bait and scent in areas where ungulate populations are way below the objectives has our support. The Board should discuss why almost every discussion with F&G field staff suggests this harvest could be managed for conservation of brown bears but the Dept. headquarters always, repeat, ALWAYS overrides any “support” language. The “somebody might yell at us” position has no place in selective actions to help achieve the population balance and objectives. GMU 20C (and on the Yukon Flats) has lots of brown/grizzly bears and few ungulates. Abundance management would benefit from allowing the harvest of brown bear over bait, perhaps conditioned by restrictions of a shorter season and “one per four” years language.
- Proposal #31 FAC Rec. “Amend/Support” Discussion with R-3 staff confirmed our comfort level for a lengthened season. But the June 30 date is too late in the season for heavily hunted Unit 20A. Amend to September 1 to May 31 for Unit 20A. August 10 to June 30 for Unit 20C.
- Proposal #32 FAC Rec. “Take No Action” Our preference is for the “any bull” permits to avoid the spike-fork-50inch regulation. Measurements like 36” are also difficult to judge in the field. The genetics are not really an issue.
- Proposal #33 FAC Rec. “Do Not Adopt” This would be part of the antlerless reauthorization. Our constituents are comfortable with the “no calf or cow accompanied by a calf” definition in place. There is not a biological issue, just our preference.
- Proposal #34 FAC Rec. “Take No Action” This is not the best option for Unit 20A moose.
- Proposal #35 FAC Rec. “Do Not Adopt” The bull cow ratio has more factors for Unit 20A that what is observed in the Woodriver CUA. The antler restrictions are only one condition in managing the bull harvest. The combination of factors in the existing regulation is our preference.
- Proposal #36 FAC Rec. “Do Not Adopt” The “guide required” definitions are not within the authority of the Board of Game. They are statutory.
- Proposal #37 FAC Rec. “Do Not Adopt” Muzzleloaders are already authorized for the Sept. moose season. The muzzleloader only season in November has attracted other proposals . Some changes to that hunt can be made but trappers who have discussed the timing

of interference would rather hunters be in the field in November rather than later whenever possible.

- Proposal #38 FAC Rec. “Take No Action” We prefer the distribution over the various age groups provided by the combination of antler restrictions and any bull hunts.
- Proposal #39 FAC Rec. “Adopt” Although the Unit 20A muzzleloader only hunt has attracted a supporting constituency, the other impacts of hunting one area year after year have been concentrated also. Residents and land owners in that area would like to try different areas. Unit 20B has the “extra” population of moose and would be a good substitute. The Board should also consider lowering the number of permits in the present area and establishing an additional muzzleloader only, drawing hunt in Unit 20B.
- Proposal #40 FAC Rec. “Adopt” We support the reauthorization of antlerless moose hunting and the proposed increase in “any bull” permits. Our goal is to bring this moose population into the population objective range and then to focus harvest in the fall. We would like to eventually eliminate the winter hunts that interfere with trapping. The FAC approval for antlerless hunts in GMU 20 requires the definition of antlerless shown in this proposal.
- Proposal #41 FAC Rec. “Do Not Adopt” The number of permits issued for muzzleloader hunts in Creamers Refuge and the number of moose harvested was set to avoid conflicts with the many other users. The public has responded favorably to the present low numbers.
- Proposal #42 FAC Rec. “Amend/Adopt” We recommend the Minto Flats “registration” any moose hunt season be changed to November 1 – 30. The FAC supports the hunt but would like to avoid, in so far as possible, taking bulls that have dropped their antlers and disruption to the late part of the trapping season. This part of the 20B harvest could be affected by Board’s consideration of the proposal for a community harvest in Minto .
- Proposal #43 FAC Rec. “Do Not Adopt” There is no restriction to taking youth hunters along in the Unit 20B antlerless moose hunt.
- Proposal #44 FAC Rec. “Do Not Adopt” This hunt near Eureka and Baker Creek is for a very small number of permits. This minimal harvest does not affect the ability of local hunters to find opportunity to harvest moose.
- Proposal #45 FAC Rec. “Do Not Adopt” This restriction is not needed, there is no shortage of moose Minto Flats. The management areas were created by the Legislature and preserve many existing access modes. (Some that are protected even though the Board/Dept have suggested restrictions.) The legislation should be reviewed prior to any action.
- Proposal #46 FAC Rec. “Do Not Adopt” The Minto residents have a huge opportunity under the present systems. There is a general season and an early and late “any moose” hunt by permits HANDED OUT IN MINTO. This is not a request for a community harvest which needs the administrative responsibility and a finite number for allocation.
- Proposal #47 FAC Rec. “Do Not Adopt” For the same reasons given under #41.

- Proposal #48 FAC Rec. "Take No Action" FAC recommends including this discussion with #39 with the AB's input. The Dept. has not had an opportunity to discuss "where" in 20B a new muzzleloader only hunt could be held.
- Proposal #49 FAC Rec. "Amend/Adopt" The FAC recommends amending this proposal to include exemptions for the existing road corridor closed areas on Eielson Air Force Base, Harding Lake and Birch Lake. We request the Board to consider the "methods" for this hunt in the following preference, 1. Unrestricted methods (firearms or primitive weapons), 2. Primitive weapons (muzzleloader and archery), and 3. Archery (only). This is a mostly rural corridor but this hunt would be "in view" of the traveling public. We are recommending the hunt but methods should be efficient. This hunt should be permitted between October 16 and February 28 to not interfere with the general hunts and to coincide with the historical peaks in the number of moose struck by automobiles. The Board should note that this proposal was actually developed by Mrs. Curnow and Art Thompson not Art Ward as shown. The vote on this proposal was 7 in Favor, 5 Opposed, 0 Abstained and 3 Absent.
- Proposal #50 FAC Rec. "Take No Action" The seasons are well aligned in the area and this would be a target for an "extra" week after the normal season. The Dept. is concerned that the additional moose taken would exceed the harvestable surplus.
- Proposal #51 FAC Rec. "Adopt" Our own proposal, before we knew the harvest rates.
- Proposal #52 FAC Rec. "Take No Action" The existing non-resident season is set to give the opening "week" to the resident hunters. We prefer to keep it that way.
- Proposal #53 FAC Rec. Follow the Healy AC recommendation, which we understand is to "Adopt". The FAC vote was 11 in Favor, 1 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent.
- Proposal #54 FAC Rec. "Do Not Adopt" We do not want to see the entire Fbks. Mgmt. Area opened to muzzleloader moose hunting. The public is very tolerant of the archery only hunts. There is no reason to harvest additional moose.
- Proposal #55 FAC Rec. "Do Not Adopt" There is no biological or social reason for this proposal. We support the local AC in their support for eliminating the "special areas" outside Denali National Park. Recommend for discussion, use #63.
- Proposal #56 FAC Rec. "Adopt" All the local AC's want to eliminate the special areas in Units 20A and 20C. See comment #55.
- Proposal #57 FAC Rec. "Adopt" See comments for #55 and #56.
- Proposal #58 FAC Rec. "Do Not Adopt" It is our understanding that the Anch. AC will ask to withdraw this proposal at the Interior BOG meeting. See comment on proposal #24.
- Proposal #59 FAC Rec. "Do Not Adopt" The boundary of the Park should be the boundary for hunting and trapping wolves. Private property just outside the park can be posted by the owners who oppose wolf hunting and trapping.
- Proposal #60 FAC Rec. "Do Not Adopt" See comment #59.



- Proposal #61 FAC Rec. "Adopt" See comments #59.
- Proposal #62 FAC Rec. "Adopt" The IM efforts in Unit 20C are waiting budget from Region III, ADF&G. The FAC supports the need for predation control implementation plans for 20C. The IM "harvest and population" objectives have not been met and no action to date has caused an increase in the moose population. There has been significant forest fire burns in the unit that could help start a moose recovery IF the priority for IM for 20C can get a high enough priority from the Dept.
- Proposal #63 FAC Rec. "Adopt" The "buffer zones" are identified in regulation as state restricted areas 17 and 18. They were created as the result of an emotional argument and no biological data exist that the primary public use of wolves "in the park", viewing, is affected by the closure. A primary congressional reason for creating DNPark was to provide an area closed to human harvest that would produce animals for human use when they crossed the park boundaries. The harvest of wolves by trapping and hunting in areas 17 and 18 has not and will not have a significant effect on" in the park" wolf populations.
- Proposal #64 FAC Rec. "Adopt" See comments #59 and #63.
- Proposal #65 FAC Rec. "Do Not Adopt" See comments on the "buffer zone" issues (#59 and #63). There are many access and resource uses that are "changed" by the boundary of Denali National Park. The uses of state and borough lands and resources outside the boundaries should be decided by the state and borough not the NPS.
- Proposal #66 FAC Rec. "Take No Action" Unit 20C's need for an increase in moose population is the subject of several preceding comments.
- Proposal #67 FAC Rec. "Adopt" We prefer a bear reduction program by hunting and snaring for black bears and by hunting for brown bears.
- Proposal #68 FAC Rec. "Adopt" (GC supports but not unanimously). The concept is good but how would enforcement use "above 2500 feet elevation" as a boundary? Hopefully the Board will explore that issue before deliberations.
- Proposal #69 FAC Rec. "Do Not Adopt" Mr. Kappel will withdraw this proposal. The area described in the proposal is not in the WRCUA.
- Proposal #70 FAC Rec. "Do Not Adopt" This proposal does not specify if the ATV use was only for moose hunting permits or all big game. We do not recommend changes to the ATV use at this time.
- Proposal #71 FAC Rec. "Do Not Adopt" Hunters can take "youth aged" hunters during the existing hunts. This area, with multiple uses and close to houses and businesses needs to maintain a low number of hunters and moose and/or furbearers harvested.
- Proposal #72 FAC Rec. "Do Not Adopt" This is a situation of "I built or bought a house in the bush but now I don't want anybody to trap nearby". Trapping was allowed prior to the proponents moving in. The speculation about the effects of killing traps is not justified and no data is presented on the history of trapping problems. Unless the Denali Borough wants to ban trapping in this area, the Board of Game should not ban trapping.

- Proposal #73 FAC Rec. "Adopt" General Comment: The FAC supports including antlerless moose in the harvest in each Unit that is "approved" by the appropriate ACs as authorized by statute.
- Proposal #74 FAC Rec. "Adopt" The FAC supports the need to "take" bison other than in the hunting season. The Board should differentiate between the hunting season for permittees and the "rest" of the year when problem animals would be removed. It would be mis-leading to let the regulation show that the "hunting" season is open year around. If the preference is to "open" the season all the time, the "season" should be described as "no closed season".
- Proposal #75 FAC Rec. "Adopt" We support this same-day-airborne for bison because of the present difficulty in locating bison to hunt. We would oppose the combination (See #76) of allowing use of radio communications between aircraft and ground during the "hunt".
- Proposal #76 FAC Rec. "Amend/Adopt" Although 2 sub-committee members were opposed to any use of radios, all supported restricting their use during the moose season(s). Amend to allow the use of radios from October 1 to March 30.
- Proposal #77 FAC Rec. "Adopt" The FAC supports this proposal to have hunters avoid radio collared bison cows. The color coding will help with "not functional" radio collars.
- Proposal #78 FAC Rec. "Take No Action" by the FAC. We are not familiar enough with the existing reason for restrictions to know if it is time to change. Defer to the local area AC's.
- Proposal #79 FAC Rec. "Adopt" Same comment as #73
- Proposal #80 FAC Rec. "Adopt" We support the proposal as long as the additional harvest is low enough to not affect the IM objectives or trends.
- Proposal #81 FAC Rec. "Take No Action" We support the proposal. Allowing a small additional harvest by non-residents translates directly to more income for the Department.
- Proposal #82 FAC Rec. "Take No Action" This would be a subsistence hunt. Has the Board made a customary and traditional "finding" for these sheep? It seems that there is some research and front end work to do before actually considering this proposal.
- Proposal #83 FAC Rec. "Adopt" We support eliminating unnecessary paperwork, especially when time and travel may be required to "report".
- Proposal #84 FAC Rec. "Adopt" The FAC supports the predator management planning efforts.
- Proposal #85 FAC Rec. "Adopt" The FAC supports the predator management planning efforts.
- Proposal #86 FAC Rec. "Adopt" The FAC supports the predator management planning efforts.
- Proposal #87 FAC Rec. "Adopt" The purpose of the CUA is not served when hunters can use a "loophole" to avoid the historical access that was authorized when the CUA was created. The historical access for hunters in boats has been on the river/slough system. Hunters should not be allowed to circumvent the traditional access.

- Proposal #88 FAC Rec. "Take No Action" The information provided to support this proposal is different from the uses reported by our constituents. Some of the areas stated as underutilized are actually used by floating hunters.
- Proposal #89 FAC Rec. "Adopt" We support the Department's need to use different locations for the check station.
- Proposal #90 FAC Rec. "Adopt" The FAC supports this proposal WITH the addition of the conditions within the Department comments.
- Proposal #91 FAC Rec. "Do Not Adopt" This sounds like a candidate for a real community harvest permit. We suggest the Board recommend the Western RAC look at the CH permit.
- Proposal #92 FAC Rec. "Adopt" We support clarifying and simplifying the Proxy Hunting permit and conditions wherever possible.
- Proposal #93 FAC Rec. "Amend/Adopt" Amend the Harvest Objective to 300-500. Plan for additional harvest at the beginning of "finding" for the IM (Important for human consumption). A harvest objective of 200 is only 5% of the population objective and that is an artificially low "objective" for IM.
- Proposal #94 FAC Rec. "Amend/Support" We would like the Board to consider a smaller "corridor" to this relatively large private property. A corridor one half mile wide and one and one half miles long would be sufficient for access and not include 298 square miles as the proposed corridor or boundary change would require. You can fix the problem for a lot less real estate.
- Proposal #95 FAC Rec. "Take No Action" The harvest record for the area shows no trapper sealing anywhere near the proposed limit. There are no changed conditions that suggest a higher harvest is expected in the future. This change is unnecessary.
- Proposal #96 FAC Rec. "Adopt" We support the consistency stated by the Department.
- Proposal #97 FAC Rec. "Amend/Adopt" Amend the authorization for snaring to include the salvage of the meat.
- Proposal #98 FAC Rec. "Adopt" We support this proposal because of the lack of IM planning and projects in Unit 25. There is a large number of bears and they are a significant predator on the few moose left. Although the taking of cubs and sows is unpopular with the non-hunting crowd, animals taken under this authorization would be utilized and the number of overall predators would be reduced. For these "new" issues authorizing taking of sows and cubs and/or brown bears with bait, consider requiring the use of GPS coordinates or map grid coordinates as part of the "reporting" process. The detail of location would be an extra control for accounting for the harvest. Also, consider adding an "on line" type "hunter education" for equipment and process. Add a "checking interval" for trapped bears, like once every 24 hours.
- Proposal #99 FAC Rec. "Amend/Adopt" Amend the Non-resident bag limit in Units that can support more than 1 caribou to 2 Bulls as a "standard". If herd size is not influenced by hunting, as in Unit 26B, allow non-resident hunters "two caribou".

- Proposal #100 FAC Rec. "Take No Action" Based on #99.
- Proposal #101 FAC Rec. "Take No Action" Based on #99.
- Proposal #102 FAC Rec. "Take No Action" It is not necessary to be as detailed in describing the legal bag limit related to the season. There is no biology to suggest this would benefit the caribou herd or local hunters.
- Proposal #103 FAC Rec. "Take No Action" See comment #102. The growth of the population of this herd does not require any reservation to bulls only, or even bulls only during part of
- Proposal #104 FAC Rec. "Amend/Support" Amend to "two caribou" for non-residents.
- Proposal #105 FAC Rec. "Take No Action" The decision to develop a management plan is not a proper Board function. Most of the intent of this proposal is already being discussed as part of the recommendations and review process.
- Proposal #106 FAC Rec. "Do Not Adopt" Although we are unaware of the source of this problem statement, or inquiry as to the scope of the "problem" leads us to think it's not a big enough issue to require a regulation change.
- Proposal #107 FAC Rec. "Take No Action" Our input from the area biologist is that the moose population in all but a few small drainages in Unit 26C is "stable" at best not growing. The present harvestable surplus is being taken under federal subsistence permit. Therefore the moose population is not high enough for an increased harvest.
- Proposal #108 FAC Rec. "Adopt" Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #109 FAC Rec. "Adopt" Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #110 FAC Rec. "Adopt" Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #111 FAC Rec. "Adopt" Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #112 FAC Rec. "Adopt" Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #113 FAC Rec. "Do Not Adopt" This hunt has not issued permits for some time. We recommend taking it "off the books" with a comment that it can be added at some future time if the population grows enough to support it.
- Proposal #114 FAC Rec. "Adopt" Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #115 FAC Rec. "Adopt" Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #117 FAC Rec. "Adopt" Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #118 FAC Rec. "Adopt" Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #119 FAC Rec. "Adopt" Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #120 FAC Rec. "Adopt" Same comment as #73.

Proposal #121 FAC Rec. "Adopt" Same comment as #73.

Proposal #124 FAC Rec. "Adopt" The FAC supports brown bear tag fee exemption. Same comment as #12.

Proposal #125 FAC Rec. "Adopt" Same comment as #73.

Proposal #126 FAC Rec. "Adopt" Same comment as #73.

Proposal #127 FAC Rec. "Adopt" Same comment as #73.

Proposal #128 FAC Rec. "Adopt" The FAC supports brown bear tag fee exemption. Same comment as for #12.

Proposal #129 FAC Rec. "Amend/Adopt" We support this concept. It could be amended to restrict to "one brown/grizzly bear per permit site every four years".

Proposal #130 FAC Rec. "Amend/Adopt" We support the concept. This needs a discussion of 5AAC 92.044 and then action by the BOG.

**McGrath AC Region III BOG Comments**  
**Extracted from Meeting Minutes 1.25.2010**

**Proposal 79**

Support as Amended

amend so that the controlled use area's southern boundary is the Slatna River

**Proposal 83**

Support

Proposal makes sense

**Proposal 82**

Support as Amended

Amend to say

- Change dates of permit to November 1- February 28
- Change village names to say 'up to 10 permits distributed on a first come-first serve basis in GMU 19D
- Legal sheep is ½ curl or smaller in keeping with a subsistence hunt

**Proposal 3**

Oppose

Not feasible

**Proposal 12**

Support

Less paperwork is always good

**Proposal 80**

Oppose

This is how the regulations read prior to 2006, and the moose have not come back since the change in regulation, and the McGrath AC does not want it changed back for this reason

**Minto-Nenana AC Region III Proposal Comments**  
**Extracted from Meeting Minutes on 2/11/2010**

Proposal 46

Support

subsistence needs are not always met in Minto, and this would help meet those needs on a more permanent basis then waiting in line in the cold in the winter under the current permit system

Proposal 2

No Action

Due to the fluctuation of the lynx population, hard to pin down a good date to start trapping cats

Proposal 3

Support

There are trappers in the area that rarely check their traps, and the quality of the animal harvested is non-existent

Proposal 4

No Action

Coyotes are sheep lamb killers, don't have sheep here

Proposal 7, 8, 9, 28, 29, 30,

Oppose

The Minto-Nenana AC is opposed to expansion of guiding operations around Minto Controlled Use area. Opposed to bear baiting in general, especially around dwellings where there are loose dogs to get into the bait. Another reason for opposing is bear baiting teaches bears bad habits around people

Proposal 10

Support as Amended

Amend so that the hide, skull and meat must be removed from the field year round

Proposal 33

Oppose-

Against taking calves

Proposal 33 as amended by Middle Nenana AC

Oppose

Against taking calves

Proposal 45

Support as Amended by ADF&G

**Upper Tanana/Forty Mile AC Region III Proposal Comments**  
**Extracted from 2/11/2010 Meeting Minutes**

Proposal #2-(6-0) Support with amendment to exclude 20E from this proposal.

Proposal #3-NO Support (0-6) There is no way we could run the long traplines that people do. Would not be economical or feasible. This would eliminate wolf trapping as it would be near impossible to check sets this often.

Proposal #4-(6-0) Support. Good idea. This will help sheep.

Proposal #6-(6-0) Support. This is a good thing.

Proposal #7-(6-0) Support. No problem hauling bait earlier in the year when you can use snowmachines.

Proposal #8,9 (6-0) Oppose. Can't believe there are that many non-residents paying a guide to hunt blacks when they can without. No reason for guides to be able to register more stands than regular hunters.

Proposal #11-(4-1) Support. Support votes-No reason to do this. Oppose vote, reason for is that sealing is data. It is the data needed to support predator control programs. Right now the only data is from sealing, by eliminating the sealing part, the dept. will have to rely on harvest tag info, which is sketchy at best.

Proposal #97 & 98 (6-0) Support. Amend to include Unit 20E.

Season: Have a season from Sept. 1 to May 31<sup>st</sup>.

Bag limit: Black bears: No bag limit, sows and cubs are legal. Grizzly bears, if more than 10 grizzly bears are snared and killed, then the entire snaring season would be closed by EO.

Methods: Snares

Predator Control Program: This benefits the predator control program. The black bear population has increased dramatically since the Gasaway study according to the Gardner hair sample study. In unit 20E, the snaring program would cause very little conflict with regular black bear baiters, since it is an area that is baited very little.

Proposal #14 (6-0) Support. This proposal is BRILLIANT!

Proposal #17 (6-0) Support. This proposal is BRILLIANT!

Proposal #18 (6-0) Support. This proposal is BRILLIANT!

Chisana Caribou Herd: Discussed what the Park Service and State have done to this point. OSM is hesitating to put this on the books. This hunt needs to be on the books, even if there wasn't an actual hunt. It must get on the books first before things can happen.

Amendment: State would get 40% of tags and Feds would get 60% of the tags.

1 of the state permits would be auctioned of as a Governor's tag. The funds raised from this would have to go to the Chisana Caribou herd research/monitoring.



Proposal #19 (5 no-1 abstain) Oppose. We support proposal #14 and this would contradict what we worked for. This could/would be a good idea for a YOUTH hunt in the future when the quota is increased. We do NOT agree with the Disabled or elderly hunt.

Proposal #21-(0-6) Oppose. We support proposal #14.

Proposal #22 (0-6) Oppose. This would be too confusing with all the adjoining lands that would have different season dates. This would also affect other lands that Tetlin lands encompass, both on the Alcan Hwy and the Tok-Cut-off.

Proposal #23 (6-0) Support. This proposal is BRILLIANT!

Proposal #24 (6-0) This is how traditionally, the UT/40 mile AC has always managed units 12 and 20E. We have always supported having non-resident hunting if it is sustainable. This should be taken on a case by case basis. As long as there is reasonable opportunity for residents and there is ample non-resident opportunity along with non-resident fees that help with the on going predator control programs costs as well as the Department's cost. We do have more restrictive season length and bag limit for both moose and caribou.

Proposal #25 (6-0) Support. This proposal cleans up the LCUA and allows access that really won't cause anymore harm.

Amendment: Change the remaining LCUA dates so it would re-open on Sept. 20 instead of Sept. 30. This would allow opportunity for bear hunters to get into the field at the end

Proposal #15 (0-6) Oppose. We support the current harvest plan.

Proposal #20 (0-6) Oppose. We support the current harvest plan.

Proposal #16 (4 no-2-abstain) Discussion that residents should have "some" jump on non-resident hunters, but with the current low sheep populations, this currently would not be a good proposal to have "more" days in the field to hunt sheep. Once sheep #'s increase, this could be looked at.

Proposal #131 (6-0) Support. Long overdue to clarify the ground rules.

Proposal #132 (6-0) Support. This is a good idea and should be implemented.

**Comments of the  
Stony Holitna Fish & Game Advisory Committee  
To the Board of Game Region III Meeting  
Spring, 2010**

**Deferred Proposal: Deadline & Meeting Cycle Changes**

**(A)** **The Stony Holitna Advisory Committee (SHAC) ,SUPPORTS the annual proposal deadline** without regard to a cycle change.

The annual deadline would allow fish & wildlife biologists to deal with management, research, and habitat, rather than preparing for meetings, and often justifying already proven biological methods. Most other problems could be solved or minimized, along with the retention of the 2-year cycle – with increased funding.

**With an annual proposal deadline several problems for ACs would be**

- The limited time the ACs and public have to review proposals, meet, and make comments on them.
- The limited time that the ADF&G has to prepare its recommendations and comments The full value of staff recommendations is lost when ACs and public only read and consider them for a few minutes at an AC meeting, or at the BOG/BOF meeting. Dept. recommendations could be made public in a more timely manner.

**(B)** **SHAC OPPOSES the meeting cycle change** because

- A 3-year cycle would not be responsive enough to some issues that require more immediate action.
- SHAC believes that a 3-year cycle would generate more agenda changes, and proposals would come up out of cycle. ACs would not have the opportunity to comment on late proposals at their meetings, which would create the need for AC representatives to be present at even more meetings than they do presently, to address these extras.

**In SHAC's view, the core problem with the 2-year cycle is lack of funding for ADF&G**

---

—  
Positives with a 3-year cycle -

- Elimination of any overlaps between BOF and BOG meetings.
- Increased focus that ADF&G, BOF, and BOG would be able to give to each region.
- Increased focus and participation by the ACs and the rest of the public at both Regional and Statewide BOF & BOG meetings.
- Decreased deferrals of proposals to future meetings.

As is discussed in the 'talking points' and 'questions and answers' – some potential problems with a 3-year cycle could be addressed through the use of agenda change requests, board generated proposals, emergency petitions, and placeholder proposals. The manner in which the boards deal with these mechanisms would require some changes and flexibility. For example, approval of agenda change requests would have to be liberalized generally, but probably limited to some fields of inquiry, along with a deadline for them. Some of these would be more appropriate for a statewide rather than a regional meeting. If approved, the public would need to be notified in a timely manner.

---

**Deferred Proposal 32 - (from Statewide, 2010 meeting) SUPPORT**

Main support from SHAC is due to the high level of consumptive use in the area, and calf mortality is 43% wolf predation.

**Proposal 3 – OPPOSE Strongly**

This would be an unenforceable regulation.

The only way it could be enforced, assuming there were personnel available to do it, would be for wildlife protection to access an individual's trapline by airplane or snowmobile. Intruding on a trapline by going down a trail or approaching trapping sets, in any manner, would be interference in a trapper's ability to trap.

There is no competition SHAC has observed urban or weekend trappers in Region III.

Under Who is likely to benefit?

SHAC members have never met a wildlife advocate that appreciates any sort of trapping at all.

**Proposal 6 - SUPPORT**

Moot due to passage of Proposal 39 at the Statewide meeting - which SHAC supported.

**Proposals 7, 8,9 -SUPPORT**

These measures will contribute to the success of the hunter, as well as eliminating more predators.

**Proposal 11 – SUPPORT**

SHAC supports this mainly for the reasons given. Sealing is unnecessary. Also, for the hunter in Region III, it is an unreasonable expense to get a hide sealed due to the remoteness of the communities.

**Proposal 12 – SUPPORT**

SHAC supports this, since brown bear are generally targets of opportunity for residents of Region III. Tags are not readily available in this remote part of the state.

**Proposal 78 – OPPOSE Strongly**

The non-resident closed area was put in regulation to eliminate competition for caribou and moose between local subsistence hunters with non-resident hunters. Virtually all subsistence hunting for both species is done by boat, and close to the rivers.

When caribou and moose seasons reopen for non-residents in GMUs 19A&B, the problems this non-res. closed area did away with will recur, and have to be dealt with again.

There is no need for "simplification" of regulations now, and there has been none in the past.

**Proposals 84,85,86 – SUPPORT**

This area has high levels of consumptive use by locals. GMU 19A is adjacent to GMU 21, and SHAC recognizes the need for predator control in the area, as well as the potential effects of that program on GMU 19.

**Proposals 129 & 130 – SUPPORT (recommend inclusion of 19A)**

Along with an increase in hunter success, both of these proposals will provide effective methods for predator control in 19A as well as 21D. Both areas have high levels of consumptive use, and this will aid in the rebuilding of moose stocks.

## Anchorage Advisory Committee

### Comments and recommendations on Interior 2010 Board of Game proposals

Unless otherwise stated findings from the Game subcommittee were adopted 14-1

*AAC: Scott*

Proposal #1 Support

Proposal #2 Support

Proposal #3 Oppose

Proposal #4 Support

Creates hunting opportunity and could help lamb survival.

Proposal #5 Oppose

The bears, cubs and all are state resources. The "methods" that are objective to the NPS are little used and cannot/do not affect the population of bears. We note that once again, the NPS is unwilling to partner in a long established, cultural practice.

Proposal #6 Support

Proposal #7 Amend

Since the board has approved the "discretionary" authorization by the Department, the Board has foreclosed the public input process for the individual conditions and seasons. The AAC offers the following "condition" on the Department's authority for discretionary in bear baiting in the hope that by adopting it, the Board can return a public discussion on the conditions, etc., before the local advisory committees. We urge the Board to adopt language, in regulation, prior to considering the bear baiting proposal issues.

5 AAC 92.0044. add, "Discretionary permit conditions, changes to seasons and other changes to bear baiting authorization that have been delegated to the Department shall not be imposed until they are approved by the fish and game

**RECEIVED**  
**FEB 12 2010**  
**BOARDS**  
**ANCHORAGE**

advisory committees identified by the Board for the intended game management units.”

Proposal #8 Support 8-1-3

The board and Department may be willing to try this strategy in a small area to see how it works compared to the 10 and 2 scenario in unit 16. Plenty of bears to sustain additional harvest. Guides may cause conflict with resident bait hunters. Baiting is controversial enough without this.

Proposal #9 No Recommendation

Proposal #10 Support

This “option” for salvage of black bear meat. Hides are not prime in late season. This is a win, win option.

Proposal #11 Support

The changes reflect the new tag system GMU’s and subunits.

Proposal #12 Support The AAC supports tag fee exemptions in all GMU’s and sub units where bear populations are high and bear predation on ungulates is significant in reducing calf survival.

Proposal #13 Support 7-5

Over harvest has occurred due to easy access and high hunter demand. ATV’s are ruining the habitat. Proposal would only limit the time hunters could use ATV’s. Anchorage residents regularly use ATV’s in the area and should not be restricted.

Proposal #14 support 11-0-1

Addresses 40-mile caribou problems without limiting access.

Proposal #15 Oppose This is one of the issues that needs to be taken up under the next plan. The Forty-mile planning process has worked pretty well and the herd distribution and characteristics are still within the planned parameters.

Proposal #16 12-3

Will benefit anchorage resident sheep hunters. This Will eliminate guide/resident conflict early in the sheep season. May increase harvest because guides will be able to hunt before their clients arrive.

Proposal #17 No Recommendation

Proposal #18 No Recommendation

Proposal #19 Take no Action

Too Broad, generally support youth hunts but this includes too much.

Proposal #20 No Recommendation

Proposal #21 "Do Not Adopt" Orange clothing would only show hunters in the field, non-hunters would therefore being danger as hunters would only be looking for orange vest.

Proposal #22 Oppose 6-7-2

We shouldn't manage for a single private landowner. This would not benefit Anchorage residents. Just a guide looking for more hunting time. No letter of support from Tetlin. Plenty of moose in the area, there is no reason to have a short season.

Proposal #23 Adopt.

Proposal #24 Support 8-6-1

All resident needs should be met before non-residents are allowed to hunt. This is a very popular resident hunting area with crowding issues. This will only keep residents out until the Minimum objectives are met. Non-Residents kill predators too. Guides do the majority of private predator control.

Proposal #25 No Recommendation

Proposal #26 No Recommendation

Proposal #27 No Recommendation

Proposal #28 No Recommendation

Proposal #29 No Recommendation

- Proposal #30 Support**
- The issue of harvesting more brown bears and the use of bait and scent in areas where ungulate populations are way below the objectives has our support. The Board should discuss why almost every discussion with F&G field staff suggests this harvest could be managed for conservation of brown bears but the Dept. headquarters always, repeat, ALWAYS overrides any "support" language. The "somebody might yell at us" position has no place in selective actions to help achieve the population balance and objectives. GMU 20C (and on the Yukon Flats) has lots of brown/grizzly bears and few ungulates. Abundance management would benefit from allowing the harvest of brown bear over bait, perhaps conditioned by restrictions of a shorter season and "one per four" years language.
- Proposal #31 No Recommendation**
- Proposal #32 No Recommendation**
- Proposal #33 Oppose** This would be part of the antlerless reauthorization. Our constituents are comfortable with the "no calf or cow accompanied by a calf" definition in place. There is not a biological issue, just our preference.
- Proposal #34 No Recommendation**
- Proposal #35 No Recommendation**
- Proposal #36 Opposed** The "guide required" definitions are not within the authority of the Board of Game. They are statutory.
- Proposal #37 Oppose** Muzzleloaders are already authorized for the Sept. moose season. The muzzleloader only season in November has attracted other proposals . Some changes to that hunt can be made but trappers who have discussed the timing of interference would rather hunters be in the field in November rather than later whenever possible.
- Proposal #38 No Recommendation**



Proposal #39 No Recommendation

Proposal #40 Support We support the reauthorization of antlerless moose hunting and the proposed increase in "any bull" permits. Our goal is to bring this moose population into the population objective range and then to focus harvest in the fall. We would like to eventually eliminate the winter hunts that interfere with trapping.

Proposal #41 No Recommendation

Proposal #42 No Recommendation

Proposal #43 Oppose.  
Proposal does nothing.

Proposal #44 Oppose.

Proposal #45 Oppose.

Proposal #46 Oppose.

Proposal #47 No Recommendation

Proposal #48 No Recommendation

Proposal #49 Support 12-0  
We support this hunt and recommend the use most efficient weapons up to and including muzzleloaders while still considering public safety.

Proposal #50 No Recommendation

Proposal #51 Support.

Proposal #52 No Recommendation

Proposal #53 No Recommendation

Proposal #54 No Recommendation

Proposal #55 Oppose.

Proposal #56 Support.

Proposal #57 Support.

Proposal #58 Please withdraw our proposal.

- Proposal #59 Oppose.
- Proposal #60 Oppose
- Proposal #61 Support.
- Proposal #62 Support.
- Proposal #63 Support.
- Proposal #64 Support.
- Proposal #65 Oppose.
- Proposal #66 No Recommendation
- Proposal #67 Support.
- Proposal #68 No Recommendation
- Proposal #69 No Recommendation
- Proposal #70 Oppose This proposal does not specify if the ATV use was only for moose hunting permits or all big game. We do not recommend changes to the ATV use at this time.
- Proposal #71 Oppose Hunters can take "young" hunters during the existing hunts. This area, with multiple uses and close to houses and businesses needs to maintain a low number of hunters and moose and/or furbearers harvested.
- Proposal #72 No Recommendation
- Proposal #73 Support General Comment: The AAC supports including antlerless moose in the harvest in each Unit that is "approved" by the appropriate ACs as authorized.
- Proposal #74 Support.  
There was extensive discussion as to the issues surrounding same day airborne hunting and the problems with current Delta Bison management attempts.
- Proposal #75 Support.
- Proposal #76 Support  
The use of radios from Oct 1<sup>st</sup> to March 30<sup>th</sup>.

Proposal #77 Support.  
 Proposal #78 No Recommendation  
 Proposal #79 Support  
 Proposal #80 Support  
 Proposal #81 Oppose 0-12-0  
 Not sure exactly where the proposal is, it states different sub units in two different sections.  
 Proposal #82 Oppose.  
 Proposal #83 Support.  
 Proposal #84 Support The AAC supports the predator management planning efforts.  
 Proposal #85 Support The AAC supports the predator management planning efforts.  
 Proposal #86 Support The AAC supports the predator management planning efforts.  
 Proposal #87 Oppose 0-8-3  
 Just a buffer zone for the KCUA. We are not in favor of an expanded KCUA.  
 Proposal #88 No Recommendation  
 Proposal #89 Oppose 0-10-2  
 We are opposed to the increased salvage requirements. The requirements are meant only to inconvenience hunters that are not from the area. This was an attempt to sneak an increased salvage requirement through in a proposal stated to move a check station.  
 Proposal #90 No Recommendation  
 Proposal #91 No Recommendation  
 Proposal #92 Support  
 Proposal #93 No Recommendation  
 Proposal #94 No Recommendation  
 Proposal #95 Oppose.  
 Proposal #96 Support.

- Proposal #97 Support.
- Proposal #98 Support.
- Proposal #99 Amend/Support Amend the Non-resident bag limit in Units that can support more than 1 caribou to 2 Bulls as a "standard". If herd size is not influenced by hunting, as in Unit 26B, allow non-resident hunters "two caribou".
- Proposal #100 TNA Based on #99.
- Proposal #101 TNA Based on #99.
- Proposal #102 No Recommendation
- Proposal #103 No Recommendation
- Proposal #104 Amend/Support Amend to "two caribou" for non-residents.
- Proposal #105 No Recommendation
- Proposal #106 TNA
- Proposal #107 Support 9-4-2
- Our proposal, the intent is to get the refuge to research the moose in the upper Kongukut and Firth. If there is a steady moose population there should be some harvestable moose. The refuge does not support, they do not have data for the area. Few moose.
- Proposal #108 Support Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #109 Support Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #110 Support Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #111 Support Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #112 Support Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #113. No Recommendation
- Proposal #114 Support Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #115 Support Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #117 Support Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #118 Support Same comment as #73.

- Proposal #119 Support Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #120 Support Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #121 Support Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #122 Support Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #123 Support Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #124 Support The AAC supports brown bear tag fee exemption. Same comment as #12.
- Proposal #125 Support Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #126 Support Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #127 Support Same comment as #73.
- Proposal #128 Support The AAC supports brown bear tag fee exemption. Same comment as for #12.
- Proposal #129 Amend/Support We support this concept. It could be amended to restrict to "one brown/grizzly bear per permit site every four years".
- Proposal #130 Amend/Support We support the concept. This needs a discussion of 5AAC 92.044 and then action by the BOG.
- Proposal #131 Support 11-1-3  
This is a "draw a line in the sand" issue. Will allow adf&g to conduct control on federal land without permission. We may not like the outcome of a fight with the Feds.
- Proposal #132 13-2  
The heard will be extinct if predators are not addressed. Something needs to be done and the Feds are not going to do anything. Unimak may never have a viable heard. The State has better things to spend money on than Unimak Caribou.

Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee  
February 10, 2010, 7 – 10 PM, MTA Building, Palmer

**MINUTES**

**RECEIVED**  
**FEB 12 2010**  
**BOARDS**  
**ANCHORAGE**

- 7:00 PM: Call meeting to order, meetings will now be recorded
- Roll Call: eight members for quorum

Steve	Bartelli	present
Erick	Beckman	excused
Brian	Campbell	present
Mark	Chryson	present
Andy	Couch (secretary)	excused
Stephen	Darilek (chair)	present
Bennett	Durgeloh	present
Gerrit	Dykstra	present
Ken	Federico	present (left 9:00 pm)
Bill	Folsom (vice chair)	present
Melvin	Grove	present
Tony	Jones	present
Dan	Montgomery	excused
Guiseppe	Rossi	present
Max	Sager	present
Kathy	Thompson	present
Troy	Vincent	present

Student reps

Andy	Gocke	present
Stephan	Warta	present
Daniel	Warta	present

14 present

- Calendar of events:
  - BOG Interior Region comments due February 12<sup>th</sup>.
  - Report on BOG meeting.
  - Report on dip-netting lawsuit.
  - Discuss Region II split.

▪ Reports and Comments:

1. Recognize guests and/or department staff:

*Attn: Scott  
BOG Interior*  

---

*Shannon - BOF  
chitna dipnet*

Group Representatives: Wayne Kubat, Rod Arno, Bill Iverson  
ADF&G Staff Present: Dave Rutz Sam Ivy  
Law Enforcement: none  
Legislative Representatives: none

- 2. Other announcements and/or agenda items?
- 3. Public Comment.

Wayne Kubat - proposal 16, resident vs resident. Non residents spend more money than residents. 30% guides non-residents and 66% of assistant guides non-residents. Guide Concessions- 100 point questionnaire then violations are taken away. Needs work!

Rod Arno - Legislation, HB266 personal use fisheries has priority over everything but subsistence, next to no chance of getting out of committee. SJR 22 resolution asking the governor to intervene against federal take over of fishery management of Kenai and Copper Rivers, passed out of committee.

HB227 New Holitna River Basin Reserve. Concerned about access and opposed to this bill.

Big Game Commercial Services Board, HB249 Creates transporter areas. (air taxis) not much enthusiasm to get this out

SB 273, No Net Loss to hunting fishing areas. NRA/ Sportsman caucus drafted up. Generally allowed uses.

BOG Meeting - potlatch - lack of information out to the board and public. No information by any of the presenters. Dept input was lacking. Testimony was out of whack. BOG mad some really bad decisions due to lack of information. Decisions were made in haste and poor consul by dept of law given. Trying to make the feds do habitat control was a high point.

Kelly Brem - Guide various legislative proposals is disturbing to me because it is the legislature which is supposed to regulate hunting. Some of the worse regulations came because things may have backfired. Please resist these ballot box biology proposals. Things never turn out the way we want them to be. Proposal 16, oppose this you will be the next user group eliminated. Points out the need to regulate the number of guides.

• Old Business:

- 1. Discuss comments due by February 12, 2010 for the BOG Interior meeting

All motions to support proposals submitted by Steve Bartelli and seconded by Mel Grove.

The order that the proposals are listed is not chronological as BOG prefers to see our proposal results in order.

Proposal 11

Eliminate black bear sealing, goes against where they preach elsewhere

*BOG Interior Region*

This is one less restriction you got to deal with.

Motion passed 13-0  
Jr-0-0-3

Proposal 16  
Residential Preference  
Confusing  
Motion fails  
3-8-2  
Jr 0-3-0

Minority opinion, we think residents should have some more advantageous opportunities for sheep hunting

Proposal 18

Chisana Caribou Herd  
Only problems is it includes NPS and USFWS instead of the state.  
Establishes an IFQ for game. This may have passed if it wasn't for the "IFQ like" quota to be established.

Motion Fails  
0-13-0  
Jr 0-2-1

Proposal 22  
Extend moose season on tetlin res lands.  
The author has an exclusive hunt with the reservation  
Wildlife is a public resource regardless to whose land it is on.

Motion fails  
0-13-0  
Jr 0-3-0

Proposal 23  
Amended but to add 40 additional permits for archery hunts. The reduction of opportunities to hunt and trophy quality hunts. When we decrease the number of hunters in the field we have lost predator take as well. Maybe one taken by these archers.  
Amendment passed  
9-4-0  
Jr votes



3-0

Minority another special hunt for special weapons. Which I have opposed in the past.

Amended proposal passed

10-3-0

Jr 3-0-0

Proposal 36

Guide requirement for moose

Bad requirement. If there are too many no residents hunting in the area then make them hire a guide.

Guides don't favour a guide requirement. This is one area where it is road accessible and you can hunt with your friends. Not necessary for a guide to take you moose hunting

Motion fails

0-13-0

Jr 1-2-0

Proposal 37

20a hunting requirements.

Not sure why the same author as previous proposal as 36.

Current season in November. Why move it to regular season?

Motion fails

0-13-0

Jr 0-1-2

Proposal 39

The proposal is anti access

Moves it out of his back yard

Motion fails

0-12-1

Jr 0-2-1

Proposal 41

Length of season for muzzle loader hunts

As long as the population can sustain the harvest why not extend the season?

Season will be during the rut.

Motion fails 2-6-5

Jr 0-2-1

Proposal 106

**Meat Salvage requirements**

Bones weigh a lot and you waste less meat.

Was wrote to restrict non unit resident hunters.

If we vote this down then the hunter has a choice and let the hunter do what he wants.

Motion fails

2-11-0

Jr 0-3-0

Minority comment you don't waste that much meat and there are mostly river hunters.

**Proposal 114**

Antlerless moose in unit 14 A

As long as we have no reporting of potlatch we can't accept this proposal. We can't authorize this until we get potlatch in check.

What happens to the money we put in for the drawings?

If there is no hunting for cows in this area the potlatch hunters will have to move elsewhere.

ADFG states that as long as the AC authorizes the hunts we have to allow potlatch.

We are not supplied with the numbers, so why should we forfeit our share of the harvest?

15825 people apply to permit at \$5 each. App \$80,000 that the state will have to returned to the hunters applying for these draw permits.

Civil disobedience can cause problems and close the potlatches. So why hasn't the non reporting closed them?

As per the new interpretation of "hunting is prohibited" if we eliminate cow hunting in this unit the potlachers will have to go elsewhere.

I don't believe that if we reject this it will stop potlatch.

Tony Kavelok stated previously "this was only an ESTIMATE" for population numbers.

This will get their attention.

Public comment – public is unaware of the potlatch hunts and why this is happening.

Only way we can conserve the resource is by controlling the resource harvest. We do not have the numbers.

We should err on the side of caution.

Motion Failed

3-9-2

Jr 0-2-1

Note - No other antlerless moose authorizations were considered until the potlatch moose situation is resolved along with their racist interpretations of the law.

Proposal 124

Good idea. Let's take more brown bears in this area.

Motion passes

13-0-0

Jr 2-0-1

Max BOG Meeting 160 Community harvest reports NOT closed and enforcement is unable to do anything until ADFG requests something be done. BOG opened more units to potlatch areas than we have had in the past. Only open to Natives, and are unable to manage if they have no regard to reporting. In GMU 21 potlach take exceeds the sport take. (numbers from ADFG and tribal leadership)

Nothing good came out of it, worse Frank decision means that potlatch can hunt anywhere not subsistence.

- 2. Discuss Region II split. We support this idea. We should be separate from Anchorage. Voice opinion to Larson. Ach and Fairbanks ACs both support this as well. Opposition is in the funding.

- New Business:

- 1. Committee discussion on dip-netting and personal use legislation.

2 proposals have been generated by BOF 200 and 201, still not any closer to defining the subsistence way of life. We should oppose 200 and ask that it goes to a joint board. 201 needs to pass as the dip net fishery can be defined as a subsistence. Dip net fishery now has a priority. Comments due by 20<sup>th</sup> of March.

HB 227, AOC imposes restrictions on public domain.

Mel will write 3 letters to be approved by email

BOF  
→

Meeting adjourned 10:01 pm

Next meeting: February 24, 7-10 PM, MTA building in Palmer.

# NORTH SLOPE BOROUGH

## Department of Wildlife Management

P.O. Box 69  
Barrow, Alaska 99723

Phone: Central Office : (907) 852-2611 ext. 350  
                                  or: (907) 852-0350  
                                  FAX: (907) 852 0351  
Arctic Research Facility: (907) 852-0352



RAYNITA "TAQULIK" HEPA, DIRECTOR

January 29, 2010

Scott Crass, Publications Specialist II  
ATTN: Board of Game Comments  
Alaska Department of Fish & Game  
Boards Support Section  
P.O. Box 115526  
Juneau, Alaska 99811-5526

**VIA FAX: 907.465.6094**

Subject: Arctic Advisory Committee Comments on proposals to the Board of Game  
that will be heard at the March 2010 meeting

Dear Mr. Crass:

The Arctic Advisory Committee (Arctic AC) held a special meeting on January 21, 2010 via teleconference. A quorum was present including members: Enoch Oktollik (Chairman, Wainwright), Thomas Nukapigak (Vice Chairman, Point Lay), William Hopson (At-Large), Eli Nukapigak (Nuiqsut), and Charlie Nageak (Kaktovik).

The Arctic AC **supported Proposal 96** which would extend the mink and weasel season in Units 26B & 26C.

The Arctic AC **supported Proposal 99.**

The Arctic AC **supported Proposal 101** because it will reduce the potential for wanton waste by hunters that don't realize they can't pack out 2 caribou and maintain the quality of the meat.

The Arctic AC **supported and modified Proposal 103.** The committee supported extending the season to allow the harvest of velvet antlered bulls and barren cows only from May 1 – June 30 in Unit 26B remainder (south of 69°30' N). The committee modified the proposal to increase the total number of caribou harvested from 2 to 3 for resident hunters; however, cow caribou may be taken only from September 1 – April 30.

The Arctic AC **supported portions of Proposal 104 and opposed other portions of the proposal**. The Arctic AC **supported** increasing the bag limit from 10 to **5 caribou per day** for that portion of 26B north of 60°30'N and east of the west bank of the Kuparuk River to a point at 70° 10' N. lat, 149° 04'W. long., then west approximately 22 miles 70° 10' N. lat, 149° 56'W. long., then following the east bank of the Kalubik River to the Arctic Ocean. The Arctic AC **opposed** increasing the bag limit from 2 to 5 caribou for resident hunters and **opposed** increasing the bag limit from 2 to 5 for non-resident hunters. The committee **supports** increasing the bag limit from 2 to 3 and extending the season for velvet antlered bulls and barren cows will allow more opportunity for hunters. Increasing the bag limit to 5 would be excessive and the Arctic AC **opposes** this portion of the proposal.

The Arctic AC **supported Proposal 105** and believes that the BOG should adopt a conservative approach to managing this herd while still offering an increased opportunity to hunters by increasing the limit to 3 total caribou and by extending the season as they suggested for the amended Proposal 103.

The Arctic AC **opposed Proposal 107** because the moose population in this region is in decline.

Thank you for considering the Arctic Advisory Committee's recommendations and comments on these proposals.



Michael Pederson, Executive Manager  
Arctic Advisory Committee

Minutes from J-D F&G Advisory Committee Meeting  
Alaska Board of Game selected 2010 Proposals  
Friday January 8th 2010.  
Centennial Hall- Hickell Room

1: Call to Order: 6:30 by Chair Mike Peterson Committee members attending: Bill Bahleda, Jake Carte, Barry Brokken, Greg Brown, Ed Haney- Alt, Todd Wicks, Mike Bethers, Jenny Pursell, Chris Casey, (Quorum)

2: Agenda: Proposals 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,9,11,16,18,26,28,29,30,38,41,47  
Add proposal # 32,#46 to agenda. No objection 3.Election of Officer:

Secretary

No volunteers. Scott Crass of Board Support provided a device for audio recording. Written notes from meeting will be transcribed by Mike Peterson.

4: Announcement of open seat: Commercial Fishing.  
Seat remains open

5: Guests: Ryan Scott -S.E. Area Management Biologist  
Lt. Steve Hall- Wildlife Enforcement  
Scott Crass- Board Support.

Brief discussion on committee members who miss meetings.

6: Discussion: BOG changing to annual proposal deadline of May 10th of each year.  
SUPPORT-9 OPPOSE-0 ABSTAIN-1

Discussion: BOG moving to 3 year cycle.

Scott Crass: Board Support could do better planning. BOG could break each year into a regional area of meetings.

Mike P: more proposals submitted in a 3 year cycle?

Scott C: does not think so.

Mike B: would ACR process remain the same?

Scott C: yes

Dept: extra year might potentially help proposal process, see if proposals work.

Mike P: Seems staff driven would extra staff in office make a difference, lessen the work load?

Scott C: not the person to ask.

Greg B: how long been meeting every 2 years?

Scott C: since State went to two Boards, 1976 Barry B: becoming more uncomfortable with moving to 3 year. Each member of BOG sit in on one meeting. Nothing for the AC to discuss for two years ( SE issues). Conditions can change dramatically.

J.P: AC would be meeting on State wide issues Ed H: tend to agree that three years is a long time between meetings Mike P: if the Federal RAC's or Federal Subsistence Board meet annually,

3 years is a long time between State and Federal meetings.

**SUPPORT- 0 OPPOSE-10**

**PROPOSAL # 1:** Dept- Do not Adopt ( defer to 2012). & **PROPOSAL # 46-** defer to 2012 Bill B: No cross bow Hunter Ed course in Alaska. Proposal asking for something that does not exist.

Todd W: Enforcement Q- Is a hit with a cross bow considered a kill, even if animal not found?

Dept. Enforcement: yes.

Barry B: concern with pistol cross bow

Chris C: to Dept- no restrictions currently with scopes, laser sights, on cross bows?

Dept: no

Greg B: concerned that there is no mandated hunter safety course for cross bows, which could result in wounded animals.

**PROPOSAL# 1: SUPPORT-0 OPPOSE-9 ABSTAIN-1**

**PROPOSAL# 46 SUPPORT- 10 OPPOSE- 0**

PROPOSAL # 2:Dept; Do not adopt

Bill B: would like to see harvest tickets remain intact.

Barry B: harvest tickets are information gathering tool. Important part of management.

Dept: most important portion of the harvest tkt. is data from unsuccessful hunt,- how long hunting and where- key elements.

Todd W: Are harvest tkts voluntary?

Dept: yes. Harvest tkts also lets us know who is out there hunting, who our constituents were.

**SUPPORT- 4 OPPOSE- 6**

**PROPOSAL # 3:** Dept- housekeeping issue. Need to have a harvest report but do not need it with you.

**SUPPORT- 10 OPPOSE-0**

**PROPOSAL # 4:** Dept- Do not Adopt. The system that is in place works.

Todd W: 1) problem with word "require". 2) Unnecessary cost to the state Mike P: many surveys sent out?

Dept: in 2006, sent out surveys to 35% (3014) of total hunters. Approx.

65% returned. 20 year history of surveys.

Jenny P: believer in data, this is a state wide proposal.

**SUPPORT- 4 OPPOSE-6**

**PROPOSAL # 5:** Dept: no recommendation, allocation issue.

Jenny P: Oppose. 8 year old is in third grade. Safety an issue.

Bill B: Oppose. Regulations written so 5th grader can comprehend Todd W: Kids under 10 can still hunt using an adults harvest ticket.

**SUPPORT- 0 OPPOSE- 10**

**PROPOSAL # 6:** Dept.- Housekeeping

Mike B: agree that enforcement should be uniform.



**SUPPORT- 10 Oppose- 0**

**PROPOSAL # 7:** Dept- Take no action. Proposal wants Dept. to come up with system to track disability.

Ed H: If seniors are able to have a permanent license, would it be possible for disabled to have a permanent record of disability?

Greg B: How many affected?

Dept: fairly popular, and system in place fluid, works well. When filling out paper work, disabled person does not have to come to office.

Proxy hunter can with completed paperwork.

Jenny P: if system put in place, would it amount to less work for staff?

Dept: can't really answer, could see that less work might occur.

Ed H: Confidentiality clause might be an issue.

Barry B: Proposal asking Dept. to assume responsibility of proving disability. Dept. not required to maintain medical records.

**SUPPORT- 1 OPPOSE- 6 ABSTAIN-3**

**PROPOSAL # 9** Dept- do not adopt

Bill B: would like to add crossbows to language.

Dept: there is a program in place where crossbows can be added to archery only hunts.

Application and process handled at headquarters.

Bill B: would be nice if that information were more out there.

**SUPPORT- 1 OPPOSE- 9**

**PROPOSAL # 11** Dept- Proposal still in flux within Dept.

**PROPOSAL # 11(a)** Dept. amendment would substitute "caribou, deer or moose" with GAME ANIMAL.

Mike P: is this a subsistence issue? Will passage infer subsistence?

Dept: no. It gets away from subsistence by removing C&T use. Dept would also identify populations where they do not want permits issued.

[ committee voted on proposal 11 and 11a (dept. amendment) ]

**SUPPORT-8 OPPOSE-0 ABSTAIN- 2**

For the sake of time, Proposals # 16&18 were dropped from the agenda.

**Proposal #26:** Dept: Do not adopt.

Barry B.(trapping seat) agrees. Safety for user at issue. Larger animal, alive, could break snare and attack user. Breakaway snares used to trap wolves in moose country. If moose caught, breakaway device allows escape.

G.B: are incidental catches common?

Dept: notes two incidental catches in local area among "hundreds" of trapping days.

J.P: proposal for area where public setting traps for bears. Is their technique of setting snares a problem?

Dept: not comfortable answering question. Training may be necessary when applying for permit. Not sure.

Bill B. Are brown bears part of the equation in this area?

Dept: yes, but not targeted

Barry B: knows trappers in area. Believes they have experience.

**SUPPORT- 2 OPPOSE-8**

**Proposal #28:** Dept:- no recommendation, allocation issue.

Barry B: What would proposal achieve?

E.H: another way to limit non-resident hunting.

G.B: if maintaining moose population important why not eliminate non-resident hunting?

M.B: non-resident contribute economically to local area. Does the Dept have any figures to support this?

Dept:: no.

C.C: what was the total harvest and the numbers taken by non-residents?

Dept:: total bull harvest 800, non-resident took 11.

Public: if theory of predator control to allow for more meat for Alaskans, doesn't make sense to allow non-residents to take animals.

J.P: if non-resident wants to shoot ungulate then go to non-predator control area.

E.H: When non-resident hunts, guides might be used, jobs could be at stake. G.B: state spends \$1.2 million on predator control. Why not give some of that \$ to guides that might lose revenue from non-resident hunters?

### **SUPPORT-3 OPPOSE-6 ABSTAIN-1**

**Proposal's# 29&30:** Dept: (#29) non-resident harvest-no recommendation Allocation issue.(#29) Active predation control- Adopt. #(30) non-resident harvest-no recommendation allocation issue.

Bill B: 65% of hunting license revenue comes from non-residents.

Greg B: what % of above \$ used for predation control?

Bill B: unsure, and wants committee to exercise caution if thinking that non-res. do not contribute.

### **SUPPORT-3 OPPOSE-5 ABSTAIN-2**

**Proposal# 32:** Dept. recommends adopt. New predator control.

J. P: oppose proposal. Predator control cannot be implemented on Federal Land and left over state land small piece of puzzle.

Bill B: few years ago easy to hunt caribou in area. Now many bears and wolves.

Barry B: may be too late to save herd. Reports of wolves and bears killing caribou calves as soon as born.

Greg B: what started herd depletion?

Barry B: natural cycle? Over feeding? Who really knows?

J.P: too late for the state to put \$ into predator control waste of \$.

### **SUPPORT-6 OPPOSE-2 ABSTAIN-2**

Chair: For the sake of time proposals #38,#41,#47 dropped from agenda?

No objection.

Committee set time for next meeting Feb. 9th at 6:30. Location TBA.

Board Support handed out copies of a letter from Commissioner of Fish & Game to Mr. Pat Pourchot . The letter provided Mr. Pourchot with 10 Recommendations from the State regarding the Federal Subsistence Review. Chair followed up on comments at end of last's night meeting:

( 1-7-10 ) BB: Is it possible to get Forest Service positions on proposals before the Regional Advisory Council meet?

Forest Service: if we have a position on a proposal, we do not give it out before the RAC meeting Barry B: would really help AC to have the FS positions.(This was supported by several other members of the AC).

Mike P: Will do some checking to see about viability of next time meeting to discuss Federal Wildlife Proposals, doing so after the RAC meeting, when FS positions known, and before the FSB meeting.

Chair informed Committee of his phone conversation with Mr. Robert Larson (S.E. Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council Coordinator) on 1/08/10. Mr Larson feels it is very important for State AC to submit information to the RAC's. Mr. Larson explained that the local AC's are a wealth of institutional knowledge and a terrific resource and are invaluable. The RAC's can use that knowledge to deliberate the merits of a proposal when making a recommendation to the Federal Subsistence Board.

10: 30-Meeting Adjourned

Kotzebue Fish and Game Advisory Committee Tuesday, November 3, 2009  
7:00 pm, Northwest Arctic Borough Assembly Chambers

Draft Minutes

Chairman Pete Schaeffer called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Quorum established with Pete Schaeffer, Al Nanouk, Allen Upicksoun, Alex Whiting, Victor Karmun and Mike Kramer. Eugene Smith arrived shortly. Excused were Pierre Lonewolf, for work-related travel, and John Goodwin at the Ice Seal meeting.

Present for DFG:

Charlotte Westing and Jim Dau, Wildlife Conservation

Jim Magdanz, Division of Subsistence

Susan Bucknell, Boards Support

Also present, Marci Johnson, NPS; Tina Moran, FWS; Charlie Gregg, NWA Borough; Caleb Pungowiyi

The agenda was amended to add c) Annual Reauthorizations, under Wildlife; and to add b) NPS Caribou Study under New Business.

Wildlife

Charlotte Westing suggested linking reports with the relevant BOG proposals. She said they'd wrapped up fall composition counts of moose on the northern Seward Peninsula, working with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. They saw good bull/cow ratios, low cow/calf ratios. The population seems pretty stable but not growing. Eugene asked if they saw much mortality? Jim Dau said, no dead moose, but a muskox and a couple caribou.

Jim Dau said the WACH caribou count will be available by February or March.

**Proposal 23      Fails 0/7**

Charlotte reviewed that the hunt went to one bear a year in 2000, and in 2002 the dates expanded to include August. She said the data from last year's bear survey isn't final, but there's no indication of a decline. The proposal would only be in the Noatak National Preserve, which would add to the complicated patchwork of regulations.

Alex said that when the Kotzebue AC wanted one bear a year, it was not intensive management, it was just based on bear populations and what's sustainable. He said the proposal unfairly characterizes the AC action; we were using our own reasoning, not riding the state train on intensive management.

There was more discussion of bear harvest and bear populations. Alex moved and Mike seconded to reject the proposal.

**Proposal 24      Passes 7/0**

Charlotte said this is to change the dates for the DB767 non-resident drawing hunt on the northern Seward Peninsula. If adopted, the department would want it to be Unit-wide. It won't increase the number of permits, just lengthen the season.

Alex said he didn't think there are user conflicts that late in the season. Moved by Alex and seconded by Eugene.

**Proposal 18      Fails 0/7**

Charlotte reviewed that hunters would lose three months in the fall, and all of April; the bag limit would go from 20 to 10. She said there's not much harvest in the fall, but up to 20% of the wolves are taken in April. From all indications the department sees, there's no reason to restrict harvest.

Because in Unit 23, most wolves are taken under a combination hunting and trapping license, the bag limit change wouldn't affect people with the combo license, because the trapping bag limit is unrestricted. But the season date changes would affect people with the combination license.

Eugene moved and Allen seconded, to reject the proposal.

**Proposal 33**      **Fails 0/7**

**Proposal 20**      **Fails 0/7**

**Proposal 25**      **Fails 0/7**

**Proposal 26**      **Fails 0/7**

**Proposal 27**      **Fails 0/7**

**Proposal 28**      **Fails 0/7**

Jim Dau started with Proposal 26 as a vehicle to introduce all four proposals. He said the option to increase the bag limit in remote areas has been discussed and rejected at Unit 23 Working Group meetings in various villages. He reviewed the history that there was no change in the number of non-resident hunters when the limit went from five down to two, but when it went down to one, non-resident hunters were reduced by 40%.

Alex said we need to support the board's action in reducing the limit. Victor said we don't know what the herd is doing. Pete said we'd better act conservatively until we know.

Moved by Alex and seconded by Eugene to oppose all four proposals.

**Proposal 21**      **Passes 7/0**

**Proposal 22**      **Passes 7/0**

Jim Dau said these both lengthen the dates. They don't change that it restricts use of aircraft for hunting only, and they don't change the area.

Jim Magdanz pointed out that Proposal 22 changes the language from "public airports" to "publicly owned airports". There was no agreement on what that meant.

**Proposal 19**      **Passes 7/0**

Jim Dau said this would require the orientation for anyone who uses a plane to transport hunters. Troopers could check for the card showing they took it.

Victor asked if other units have anything similar? Jim said there's all sorts of mandatory orientation programs, but he's not aware of any specifically addressing user conflict.

Victor asked if it would be enforceable. Jim said troopers could cite a pilot, but probably wouldn't stop a hunt if the pilot didn't have the card.

Alex said, this makes it more definite. Mike asked about taking the test. Jim said they planned to offer it online, or people could come into the Kotzebue Fish and Game office. Perhaps the federal agencies could offer it too. There was discussion of how to deliver the orientation.

Alex said we need to support more information going out.

Moved by Eugene and seconded by Alex.

#### **Proposal 34      No action**

Jim Dau said that currently there's no direction to hunters on what to do with sick animals. Right now, you have to bring in the whole thing.

Charlie Gregg said he's leery of this. When hunters stay out more than four days, and the meat gets rank, they could just say it was diseased...

Allen said make it if you leave the meat, you leave the horns.

Alex said that the Arctic Advisory Committee doesn't have the same history of user conflict. That whole western coast between Point Hope and Barrow is pretty much just subsistence. I'd like to support them, but...

There was discussion how to relieve the burden of bringing in inedible meat without opening a door for waste; requiring people to bring a sample of diseased meat to the department, requiring the diseased carcass to be visible and flagged so troopers could check it. Allen said if a carcass is left out overnight it's just bones by morning.

Charlie Gregg asked if the proposal could be amended to apply to Unit 26 only. Jim Dau said sure. Another point is that the proposal is for all species, and it could be amended to apply only for caribou.

Pete pointed out that the furor over the Point Hope case has quieted down some now.

#### Proposal 9 discussion

Jim said that originally the board authorized same-day airborne for both Unit 22 and 23, so this might come around again for 23. Victor asked if it might spill over to moose and other animals. Jim said probably not.

Jim Magdanz said that the Northern Norton Sound AC supports this, partly to disperse hunting from the road system. Also, they don't believe there will be much take.

Al Nanouk said Unit 22 doesn't have much caribou. This will benefit commercial operators.

There was discussion of the history of same day airborne regulations and policy. Eugene said that this committee opposed this long ago. Jim Dau said at that time people petitioned the BOG to take it up out of cycle, and the board did, removing the same day airborne for 23 and keeping it for 22.

#### Reauthorizations

##### **Brown bear tag fee exemption                      Passed 7/0**

Charlotte said this means residents only need a hunting license to take a bear, for either the subsistence or the general hunt.

Eugene moved and Alex seconded.

##### **Antlerless moose season    Passed 7/0**

Charlotte said the RM880 permit includes an antlerless season beginning November 1st. The department feels that harvest is low, and this provides a good opportunity.



Eugene moved and Mike Kramer seconded to support reauthorization.

There was discussion of the RM880. Charlotte said it's working, and reporting is getting better every year.

Alex suggested doing better outreach because some people still miss out on getting the permit. Charlotte said the problem is keeping vendors in the villages so people can get the permit in villages. She said the federal system honors either state permit.

New Business Board of Game schedule changes:

Susan reviewed the changes under consideration.

Caleb asked if the BOG could juggle areas, because the Arctic and Western region together is such a big meeting area, from Bethel to Barrow.

Alex said three years is a long time between cycles. Pete reviewed ways to make changes if necessary, like agenda change requests and emergency proposals.

How would the four regions fit into a three-year cycle? Susan pointed out the chart on the back page of the Q and A handout.

New Business NPS Caribou Study

Pete Schaeffer asked Marci Johnson about the upcoming caribou study on the Seward Peninsula. Pete said there are significant concerns about how the collaring is going to happen. He said that in years past, Fish and Game had changed its methodology in response to concerns of residents. He said the committee learned of this study after the fact, like the NPS wolverine study also, and the sheep study, where there were sheep deaths they weren't told about.

Pete said at the next meeting the committee would like to hear about the study and how these things get decided. Pete said that the committee has gotten accustomed to being part of the process.

Next Meeting      Committee members agreed on Tuesday, January 12, 2010, to discuss BOF proposals, if Comm Fish and Sport Fish staff are available. Susan will contact them.

Pete asked Marci to pass that date on to Kyle Jolie, regarding getting information to the AC about the caribou study.

Meeting adjourned about 8:30 p.m.

Northern Norton Sound Fish and Game Advisory Committee Meeting  
Tuesday, October 27, 3:00 pm, 2009  
Kawerak New Board Room, Nome

Draft Minutes, 7 pages

AC members present: Chuck Okbaok, Teller; William Jones, Shishmaref; Charles Saccheus, Elim, Jack Fagerstrom, Golovin; Raymond Seetook, Sr., Wales, Tom Gray, White Mountain/Nome; and also from Nome, Roy Ashenfelter, Nate Perkins, Dan Stang, Charlie Lean, and Mike Quinn. Bob Hannon was travelling for work. Also missing were Adem Boeckman, Lance Cannon, and Vernon Rock of Brevig Mission.

Present for DFG were Tony Gorn and Letty Hughes, WC, Nome; James Magdanz, Division of Subsistence, Kotzebue; Susan Bucknell, Boards Coordinator, Kotzebue.

Brian Miller, AWT; Mike Wade, USFWS, Nome;

Ken Adkisson, NPS, Nome; Marci Johnson, NPS wildlife biologist, by phone from Kotzebue.

Julie Raymond-Yakobian, Kawerak; Rose Fosdick, Kawerak and Reindeer Herders Association; Tim Smith; Carl Merchant;

Chairman Roy Ashenfelter called the meeting to order about 3:10 p.m.

The agenda was amended, to link wildlife reports with relevant proposals, instead of reports first. Potential BOG schedule changes, and annual reauthorizations, were added to the agenda.

Minutes of last meeting were approved with no changes.

**Proposal 14 No Action 11/0** Mike Q./Chuck moved and seconded

Tony said that "22 D remainder" refers to different areas for different species, and the caribou hunt area was confused with the moose hunt area. Department recommendation is to take no action, because the proposer wanted the proposal withdrawn.

**Proposal 9 Passed 11/0** Mike Q. and Charlie Lean moved and seconded

Tony said the department's preliminary position is "no recommendation". Mike Quinn asked Jim Magdanz and Brian Miller for their divisions' positions on this. Jim said Division of Subsistence concurs with Wildlife Conservation on this one; Brian didn't have the Wildlife Troopers recommendation yet.

Tony asked Mike Wade for the federal perspective. Mike said that in Bering Land Bridge National Park and in Lake Clark National Park, there's a rule on the books that you can't shoot until 3:00 am the next day. Tony said in July and August most of the caribou in Unit 22 are in 22E, much of which is park land; if we change this, the language will have to honor the federal regulations on parkland.

Roy asked if there are issues with the current same-day airborne. Tony said the department has no way to track the harvest but he feels probably less than ten a year are taken this way. Roy asked if this is because few people have planes on skis; so what about in summer when you could land on the beaches? Tony and Mike Wade agreed it may sound easy, but there are a lot of challenges involved. The group discussed the regulation, that you have to be 300 feet from the plane and you can't harrass the animals.

Chuck asked if this would affect reindeer herders? -because Teller is trying to regrow their reindeer herd, and they've lost some reindeer to caribou hunters. This sparked considerable discussion. Tom Gray said the herders association wants to keep certain areas closed until certain dates, to protect reindeer herds. Several people thought this proposal wouldn't increase reindeer take very much. People can reach them by snowmachine anyway; it's the dates and seasons on caribou that protect reindeer. Tim Smith said regulations already allow people to fly and hunt in all these areas; the proposal only removes the requirement to camp overnight. He said this is the time of year it's most needed.

Tony asked about user conflict issues. Tom mentioned the possibility to have this sunset; if a guide started working the upper Kuzitrin hard, there could be conflict with subsistence hunters.

Charlie Lean said we have a widely spread herd, he doesn't mind spreading out the hunting, make it a little easier for others closer to town. Charles Saccheus asked for clarification about chartering a plane to get dropped off to hunt. He said the caribou are 50 miles outside of Koyuk and there's no way to get to them.

**Proposal 7 Fails 0/11** Mike/Chuck moved and seconded

Letty said the department recommends not adopting this for several reasons: Nowhere else in the state goes past March 31. Wolverines are more vulnerable in April, with the females moving in and out of dens, males more active and transients moving around more. There's not a lot of refugia in the hills. The department doesn't have a good population estimate, and this could increase harvest. Dan Stang said it could increase a lot, it could be devastation for the wolverines. Jack and others agreed there'd be increased take from people out on snowmachines.

*Roy at this point said that draft minutes will be circulated for approval prior to the BOG meeting. He asked advisory committee members to respond to the draft minutes, and if they don't respond, that will be taken as approval.*

**Proposal 6 Fails unanimously** Charlie/Mike moved and seconded

Charlie asked about the population trend in 22. His impression is that wolves are numerous. He saw skeletons of two young wolves apparently eaten by the pack, which to him indicates they are pushing carrying capacity.

There was discussion if wolves really do migrate with caribou herds.

Dan said around Council he's seeing and taking more wolves, and wolves are taking more moose and muskox.

**Proposal 33 Fails 0/11** Charlie L./Nate, moved and seconded

**Proposal 34 Fails 0/11** Mike/Chuck moved and seconded

Mike Q. asked Magdanz to introduce this one. Jim said that under this proposal, meat from diseased animals would not be defined as "edible meat" if reported to the department within 48 hours. One problem is that changing a definition belongs at a statewide BOG meeting, not a regional meeting. Jim noted that the 48 hour provision was an amendment being discussed by the department.

Mike Q. said currently you have to choose before you pull the trigger. Tim said this makes every hunter a pathologist. Brian Miller said DPS opposes this; to prosecute a wanton waste case requires showing intent and this proposal would make enforcement very difficult.

Nate asked about reporting inedible meat now? Magdanz said currently you have to salvage it. Charlie Lean said when he used to work at DFG, and people would bring flawed meat, the department would say okay, because they showed their intent. Charlie said this proposal was not specific enough.

Jim Magdanz told of photos from Kotzebue of a caribou shoulder with an enormous abscess inside which wasn't obvious to the hunter when he shot it. Mike Wade told of getting bad caribou that looked to be healthy when he shot it. He packed it out, but his wife wouldn't eat it.

**Proposal 11 Fails 1/9/1** Mike/Chuck moved and seconded

Tony explained that the department's concern is how many moose are taken, not who gets them. One area of the state has something like this, with simultaneous guided and non-guided hunts.

Mike Quinn said Proposal 11 is about Bob Hannon and the November hunt, when locals are not hunting. There's 10 nonresident permits. Bob's a local guide, a local business and the money stays in the community. Bob works by word-of-mouth and a little advertising. Another guide is using a booking agent who gets a hundred applicants, and that guide now gets all ten permits every year. Mike said the other guide doesn't live in Alaska. This proposal would require the client to have a signed contract with a guide before permits are applied for.

People liked the idea that this proposal would level the playing field. Tom Gray said he's licensed in that area, but he can't compete with booking agents, so this would be good for him. He thinks it's not fair for the region if all the permits go to one out-of-state guide. The state needs to straighten this out.

People discussed the wording. **Amendment** passed *"in addition a guide may sign off on only as many contracts as permits are available."* DFG staff pointed out again that currently, guides aren't required for moose in 22B.

People agreed they don't want to require guides, they just want to level the playing field among guides. There was considerable discussion of possible ways to amend the proposal. An amendment by Dan Stang, seconded by Tom Grey passed, to remove the first sentence of the proposal. Tony suggested again the idea of two separate drawing hunts, if people want to support the proposal. Jim Magdanz asked what's to prevent a client and guide having an informal agreement, and if the client is drawn, he hooks up with the guide. The proposal eventually failed for being too complicated. Mike Quinn said Bob Hannon and Tom Gray can go to the BOG and try to work something out.

### **Wildlife Reports, NPS**

Marci Johnson reported on the Park Service project collaring muskox in Krusenstern National Monument and Bering Land Bridge National Park. They see larger animals and better dentition in the Seward Peninsula animals. In March they'll be putting out more collars, and start getting GPS info out to the public soon. They hope to collect jaws from hunters. The collars will all come off in 2012 or 2013.

### **Proposal 8 Fails 1/9** Mike/Chuck, moved and seconded

Department recommendation is no action, as they have this authority under discretionary hunt conditions. Tony said discussion at previous AC meetings and muskox cooperators meetings ranged from complete trophy destruction to none at all. Currently the RX099 hunt, on the Nome road system, requires submitting muskox with boss horns within 72 hours, for the department to cut the horns. For the rest of Unit 22, trophy destruction is required if the horns leave the unit.

There was discussion that trophy destruction formerly meant cutting the tips, now it will be "at or above the eye", if the horns leave the unit.

Mike described a sculpture he saw made of muskox horns, which would have had to be destroyed to leave the unit. He said anything you do to horns, even cutting them from the head, is trophy destruction. The new requirement takes more than half the horn. He's concerned about subsistence hunters who want to use horns for anything other than taxidermy.

Charlie asked if the department takes other data when they cut the horns- isn't that one issue, concern about misidentification and reporting? Mike Wade asked the reason for the department retaining the cut pieces.

Tony Gorn said there is unprecedented hunting opportunity and people are using subsistence registration permits to get trophy mounts.

Tom asked, if he boiled and removed a whole horn, would that be legal under Mike's proposal? Other questions included; if a horn is separated from the skull, or if the skull is sawn in

half, is trophy value destroyed? Does department personnel need to do the actual destruction of the trophy value?

Jim Magdanz reviewed a 1998 BOG finding that there's no pattern of trophy use of these animals. He's not sure whether the 1998 finding discusses "craft" - maybe the BOG needs to address crafts in regulation. If subsistence need is less than allowable harvest, there can be a trophy hunt - which there already is in some areas, for the "mature bulls" population.

Roy pointed out that last spring this AC approved the new trophy destruction rules, and usually the AC likes to see how changes work through a cycle before changing things again.

**Proposal 16 Passes 6/5** Charlie Lean/Chuck, moved and seconded

Tony said current code requires up to 10% of muskox drawing permits in 22E be issued to non-residents; this removes the "up to".

There was discussion of how many animals are allocated and how many are taken. Committee members felt that because there are animals allocated but not taken, more should be made available in the drawing permit hunt, which has a success rate close to 100%.

Jim Magdanz reviewed that the amount necessary for subsistence (ANS) was originally set at 100. The harvest history has been more like 60. In 2007, the SP Muskox Cooperators Group recommended ANS of 250; the Board of Game in Bethel adopted a new ANS of 150 muskox. The BOG recognized that the harvest history occurred under the limitations of Tier II hunt restrictions. If subsistence harvests continue to be low under Tier I regulations, the BOG might lower the amount necessary for subsistence.

Roy Ashenfelter said his memory from the cooperators meeting is that residents of 22E wanted more muskox killed. William Jones said that is still true. William Jones and Raymond Seetook said that Shishmaref and Wales generally prefer caribou, reindeer and moose over muskox.

Tom Grey asked Tony if he has the authority to adjust the number of animals for the drawing hunt? Tony said he does, up to 60 animals. Tim Smith warned against increasing harvest now that bears are learning how to kill muskox.

Charlie Lean said the proposer wants to guarantee more animals for non-residents and for himself as a guide. It's an allocation between residents and non-residents, and he's not going to support it. The current wording is strong enough and the area manager does his best to approach 10%.

Tom Grey said proposals 16 and 17 won't really affect the hunt as Tony manages it. The way to fix the muskox issue is a whole different proposal that addresses the twenty animals in the drawing permit.

**Proposal 17 Passes 6/5 at 20% rate.**

Tony said the BOG will ask him why the AC is supporting nonresident over resident hunters? Tom said the message is to increase the number of drawing permits. Tony said that this proposal doesn't change the number of permits.

Dan Stang said the intention of the proposer is to increase the number of non-resident hunters because he makes far more money from them. Chuck said it would be good if the guides were from within the area, to keep more money in the unit.

Tony said he's aware of one outfit guiding in 22E, it's a Shishmaref guy and a Fairbanks guy.

Tom Grey said he's licensed to guide in 22B East, 22B West, and 22E.

Charlie pointed out the front page photo in the Anchorage Daily News today, and story in the sports section, about Seward Peninsula muskox. He said he can't figure out why the AC would favor non-residents over residents.

Discussion included that if residents weren't taking these animals, non-residents should be able to.

### **Muskox Management Issues**

Tony referred to a handout showing that since 2006, bull/cow ratios have declined from about 70 per 100 to about 30 or 35 per 100. Tony said that he was surprised how much and how fast big bulls declined. In response to a question from Nate, Tony said there's not nearly as much data on muskox populations as for moose or caribou. He's not sure what the ratio of bulls needs to be. They counted 71 mature bulls last year, and the harvest limit is 36, so that needs to be watched closely.

There was considerable discussion of population levels and sustainable harvest levels. Tony said before the last two years, harvest was about half what it is now. Most bulls harvested are mature bulls. There were comments that one reason people harvest mature bulls is they're easier to identify, and hunters want to make sure they don't shoot a cow. Tony said the department promotes harvest of three year old bulls, and he will spend as much time as anyone wants with hunters on muskox identification.

### **Proposal 12 Failed 3/8** Jack moved and Chuck seconded.

(The committee eventually supported, 9/1/1, a motion requesting Tony to increase the winter harvest to 8 moose, with the winter permits available in Golovin and White Mountain.)

Jack spoke on the reasons for the proposal. Very few people from Golovin have taken moose in the fall; they can't compete on the river because you need a jet unit for the river, and Golovin people live on a bay and don't use jet units. Jack said, we need protein. We used to get reindeer, but that's not available now. We want moose available for the winter hunt.

Tony said this proposal has three parts. The department opposes the season date changes. Moving the season dates back would exploit the big bulls moving around, going into the rut. 22C and 22D on the road system are closed then, so hunters would move down to 22B west, unless you shifted dates in all three areas. That's not possible in 22C because of very low bull/cow ratios, and very low large bull component; sliding the season would whack the few large bulls remaining.

Tom Gray suggested making "two brow tines or less" legal, to regulate size. Tony said the compromise is to move some bulls from fall to winter hunt. Jack said the winter quota used to be eight, now it's only five. Food and everything costs more in a village.

There was considerable discussion about having permits for that area be available only in White Mountain and Golovin.

**Residency discussion:** Dan Stang remarked on a large group of people in Council who live in the Lower 48, summer in Council, and maintain Alaska residency. He said the state needs to get on top of its residency laws. Brian Miller said people have asked him about this; it comes down to what's prosecutable. You can be gone 364 days a year, set up residence in other states, but as long as you don't vote or take benefits from elsewhere, and you retain a residence in Alaska, you can claim Alaska residency. There was discussion of why the requirements for resident hunting licenses aren't more like the requirements to vote, or get PFDs. (The committee talked about this again near the end of the meeting.)

Returning to the discussion on **Proposal 12**, Tony said he can change the permit quota ratio, and location where permits are given out, without BOG action, but with AC guidance. *A vote at this point showed 3 in favor/ 8 opposed to Proposal 12.*

Jack asked Tony for 8 winter permits, as a new permit for 22B west to be issued in White Mountain and Golovin. There was discussion if individuals can hold more than one permit at a time, and if "one moose per household" would apply.

Nate said this pulls three moose out of the fall hunt, reduces it to 15?

*At this point a motion on Jack's request to Tony carried 8/3.*

There was additional discussion and clarification. Jack offered that only the winter hunt permits should be picked up in Golovin/White Mountain, but not the fall permits. People asked whether that eight is a hard number, even if the quota changes, or is it a per cent of the quota? Tony said that several years back, this AC set the numbers at 18/5, for fall and winter, and now they can change it to 15/8. If the population drops, he'll come back to the AC for guidance.

Tony pointed out that since 2001, Golovin and White Mountain take 80% of the winter harvest, but they've taken only two bull moose, total, in the fall hunts since 2001.

*New motion: Winter hunt of eight moose, permits to be issued in Golovin/White Mountain, no changes to fall hunt except the number. This passes 9/1/1.*

**Proposal 15 Failed 0/11** Mike/Jack, moved and seconded  
People agreed with Mike and Nate that there's no reason to discuss this.

**Proposal 10 Failed 0/11** Mike/Jack, moved and seconded

Letty said this revisits a 2007 proposal. The department recommendation is do not adopt. because in late May and early June bears are vulnerable to hunting where they congregate on the herring run. Harvest in 22A almost tripled after regulations were liberalized; we don't want to increase the take more without knowing what the increased harvest is doing already. Tony said that 22A is the only part of Unit 22 that doesn't have a drawing permit mechanism to control the harvest.

Tom Gray said there was a real increase in harvest after the BOG authorized two bears a year. He opposes this until we know what's going on with the population.

Charlie Lean said that ice also interfered with the herring spawn, keeping the bears from congregating.

Mike Quinn asked why the department opposes this proposal when there's an extended date in other parts of the unit which also have herring spawn.

People wondered why Southern Norton Sound AC didn't support this proposal. Susan said one point from SNSAC was whether taking more big boars is having an unintended effect on the bear population.

Jack said he thinks that removing large boars that kill cubs is a concern, and there's very large bears in that particular area. A Boone-and-Crockett bear was taken right outside of Unalakleet recently.

Mike Wade said 10 or 15 years back he did bear surveys for BLM, at night, during the herring season, and he agreed there were lots of big bears in that area.

**Proposal 13 Carried 11/0** Chuck/Mike moved and seconded

Letty said there are other areas, 22B for example, with low recruitment on moose; the department doesn't want to shift the hunt away from those areas. With more snow in early May, more hunters would be out. Our moose are above management objectives, we've even got an antlerless hunt. Last year we took more bears than ever before, and more bears from that area than ever before. It all adds up to a department recommendation to not adopt.

Mike Q. asked people to look at the proposal on its merits. Even if moose are doing okay, what about muskox? Maybe the record bear harvest reflects high bear populations. There's a lot of bear problems.

Charlie said the graph shows harvest peaks early in the season, then tapers down. Is this just creaming the easy bears? If the season opens earlier, maybe that peak would just move earlier in the season, rather than be extended. Bear recruitment seems to be high, with multiple cubs. There were seven bears on the Pilgrim River weir at one time this summer.

Nate said as an AC member conveying information from the public, there's a lot of frustration with the season in 22C. The purpose of the proposal is to take out more bears.



Tim Smith said he also sees a lot of bears, sows with three cubs, but not a lot of adult males. He doesn't think this proposal will do what they want it to.

Tom Gray said most bear harvest is young boars or females. It would be good to align the dates of the bear hunts between subunits.

There were other comments mostly in support of the proposal.

#### Annual Reauthorizations

Tony asked the committee if they wanted to act now on the annual reauthorizations for the spring BOG:

#### **Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemption for Unit 22: Passed 10/1**

Mike Q. and Chuck moved and seconded to reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemption for Unit 22. Nate said he sees no reason not to support it.

Tom Gray said he's always opposed this, because when you charge \$25, you know who's interested in hunting; that's useful information for management, otherwise they have only harvest data. Mike Q. wants to keep the exemption, so anyone with a hunting license can legally take a brown bear if the opportunity arises.

#### **Reauthorize the antlerless moose season Passed 8/3**

Mike Q. and Chuck moved and seconded to reauthorize the antlerless moose season. The committee recognized that this doesn't mandate an antlerless moose season in 22, just leaves it in Tony's management toolbox.

Tony said they'll census 22C this spring and determine a cow hunt from that information, also from calf weights and other factors.

There was concern about the effects of recent heavy snow years, and of bears, on the moose population. Also the highly variable weight of moose calves. Tim said that younger bulls breeding will produce smaller calves. Tony said the lower harvest this year has got his attention.

#### **Residency requirements to get Alaska hunting license**

Dan Stang asked if anyone wanted to discuss the residency requirements, to bring something before the BOG. People thought it might be a legislative matter, but agreed to start by asking the BOG for clarification about residency requirements for hunting licenses. See earlier discussion under Proposal 12.

**Next meeting;** Monday, November 23, 2:00 pm, to comment on BOF proposals and potential BOG schedule changes.

#### **Prospective changes to BOG schedule**

Susan Bucknell asked if everybody picked up the Q&As about the proposed changes; the BOG is considering going to a three-year cycle, with one proposal deadline and one proposal book each year. Under that schedule, the Arctic regional BOG meeting might occur later in the winter. People were encouraged to attend a presentation on this during the BOG meeting in Nome. At the November 23 NNSAC meeting, they can submit comments for the statewide BOG meeting. Mike Quinn said that the federal system has gone to a two-year cycle for wildlife proposals, and that the two systems should be aligned.

Meeting adjourned about 9:00 p.m.

Noatak/Kivalina Advisory Committee Teleconference Meeting  
Friday, October 30, 2009, 7:00 p.m.  
draft minutes, 3 pages

**RC9**

Present at Noatak IRA office:

AC members Enoch Mitchell, Eli Mitchell, Melford Booth, Thurston Booth. Also Joe Luther and Hilda Booth.

Present at Kotzebue Fish and Game office, AC member Janet Mills. Also DFG staff Charlotte Westing, WC area biologist; Jim Dau, WC biologist; Susan Bucknell, Boards Support coordinator.

Quorum established about 7:10 p.m.

Susan Bucknell gave a heads up about the proposed Board of Game schedule changes.

BOG Proposals

Proposal 23 Fails 0/5

Charlotte reviewed the hunt history. She said harvest rates vary but average about 50 a year. Ages from skull sizes and teeth show no trend of decline. Proposal 23 doesn't differentiate between the subsistence hunt and the general harvest hunt. This proposal would change hunt conditions only inside the national park, adding to how complicated the regulations are. Mostly it's only locals who take more than one bear every four years.

The committee said there's lots of bears around there, and make it one a year for everybody.

Proposal 24 Carries unanimously

Charlotte said this wouldn't change the number of permits, just extend the season. Committee comment; it's just 21 days more.

Proposal 18 Carried 4/0/1

Charlotte explained that under this proposal, August through October, plus the month of April, would no longer be open for wolf hunting. Also the bag limit would drop from 20 to 10. She said harvest in Unit 23 is variable, overall about 60 a year, which is a conservative level. Wolf population seems to be pretty high, with no reason to reduce hunting.

Up to 20% of wolves are taken in April. Most wolves are taken under a combination hunting and trapping license, in Unit 23. Because trapping regulations have no bag limit, it's a moot point for most people to lower the hunting bag limit.

Janet asked if regulations are the same for resident and nonresident? And how is the wolf population doing? Charlotte said all indications are wolves are doing well.

Charlotte pointed out that trapping doesn't open until November, so this would limit take for everyone in the fall. Those with just hunting licenses would see their bag limit reduced to ten wolves.

Eli asked, if we have the combo licenses, we won't be affected? Charlotte said Right, the bag limit won't change, but you'd have a shorter season. Now it's open from August 1 to April 30.

Eli said the AC members in Noatak all supported Proposal 18. Janet abstained; Carried 4/0/1.

Jim Dau asked if Noatak people ever take wolves in September or October when they're out hunting game? -No. Charlotte pointed out they'd be losing April, is that okay? -Yes.

Charlotte clarified that if Proposal 18 goes through, you could take wolves in April under trapping regs. But if Proposal 33 goes through, you'd lose April under the trapping regulations. Janet said, maybe support 18 and oppose 33? Jim Dau said that would keep the spring season for trapping. Charlotte said a lot of people only get the hunting license, so they'd be restricted by 18. She reviewed that regulations allow "trapping" by rifle.

The Noatak committee discussed 18 and 33. Eli said that the majority supports 18. He verified that under 33 they'd lose the month of April, but would 33 affect the harvest limit? Charlotte said No, there's no limit under trapping regs. Jim Dau asked if Noatak people take wolves during April? Eli said not really.

Proposal 33 Carried

Proposal 20 Fails

Charlotte explained the department concern that this is into pupping season. Committee had little discussion.

Jim Dau discussed with the committee if they wanted to look at caribou proposals 25 - 28 separately or together.

Proposal 26 Fails

Hilda commented about hunters up in the hills looking like caribou through binoculars.

Proposal 25 Fails

Jim Dau reviewed that when the non-resident bag limit used to be 5 caribou, 98% took only two, or one, or zero. When the BOG reduced it down to two, the number of non-resident hunters didn't change. When it went down to one caribou a year, non-resident hunters decreased by 40%.

Enoch said that the bull populations seemed low this year, that might affect it. Jim said other villages said the same thing. Janet said, a lot of us didn't get caribou; I still need two, to last the year.

Proposal 27 Fails

Proposal 28 Fails

Proposal 21 and 22 Carried

Jim Dau said this changes only the dates for airplanes. Noatak discussed if this will deal with caribou herd movement being intercepted by hunters.

Proposal 19 Carries

Jim Dau said Proposal 19 comes from the Unit 23 Working Group. It would require all pilots to complete a one-time orientation about meat care, local hunting practices, and avoiding conflict; like don't circle caribou near the river, don't circle boats, -they're still working on the details. Perhaps something about loading migration corridors with lots and lots of hunters.

Hunters wouldn't be required to take the orientation and get the card, just pilots. It would be offered as a printed packet, on-line, and in the Fish and Game office in Kotzebue -possibly by the federal agencies, too.

#### Proposal 34 No Action

Jim explained that now the regulations say you can leave "bloodshot" meat, but don't say anything about if you shoot a diseased caribou. The proposal asks to modify the definition of edible meat. Jim said at a meeting in Point Hope people asked if this will worsen the problem of antler hunters leaving meat in the field. Now, you legally have to bring in the meat, even if it's got problems.

Noatak discussed the wording of the proposal. Jim said the proposal adds "meat that is inedible because of disease in the harvested animal". Hilda said that would give opportunity for waste by antler hunters. People asked if it applied to everybody, resident and non-resident? Comment: Non-residents would take advantage of this and just take the horns.

AC Representative to Nome BOG meeting: Chair Enoch Mitchell will go for the AC. Eli Mitchell will be the second person, the Northwest Arctic Borough will do his travel.

#### Reauthorize Brown Bear Tag Fee Exemption Carries

#### Reauthorize Antlerless Moose Season Carries

Charlotte said the take of cows is pretty low, maybe 5-10 a year. It's a valuable opportunity with a small harvest. Enoch asked if the moose population is pretty low? Charlotte explained that moose densities are naturally low in the unit and that the moose population appears stable. We've had this hunt for a long time, so this is the status quo. We're not worried about hurting the population, and this is a small harvest that can really make a difference for a few people.

Caribou Jaws Enoch asked Jim if he's getting caribou jaws? Jim said, not much, a lot of people didn't get a lot of caribou this year. He's received a few from Noorvik, and they got some off the banks at Onion Portage. He hopes to get jaws from 200 female and 200 male caribou. From the teeth, they determine ages. From the marrow, they can assess the health of the animal. From the jaw size, they can detect changes to the population before the herd begins to decline. He needs to know what month they were taken, and if male or female.

Jim said they'll pay to ship jaws to Kotzebue, and they could contribute something in return, such as gas to a culture camp. He asked people to save jaws for him, and said if people get enough, he'll just fly up and collect them.

Adjourn about 8:30.

Upper Kobuk and Lower Kobuk Fish and Game Advisory Committees RC10  
Joint Teleconference Meeting  
Monday, November 9 at 7:00 p.m.

Draft Minutes, 3 pages

Meeting convened about 7:30 with quorums for both committees:

Upper Kobuk: Alex Sheldon and Henry Horner in Kobuk; Frank Downey, Morgan Johnson and Marvin Joe Cleveland in Ambler.

Lower Kobuk: Raymond Stoney, Larry Westlake, Sr. and Glenn Miller in Kiana; Verne Cleveland in Noorvik and Bobby Wells of Noorvik calling in from Anchorage. DFG staff in Kotzebue: Charlotte Westing and Jim Dau, WC biologists; Susan Bucknell, Boards Support committee coordinator.

Board of Game Proposals

Charlotte Westing introduced proposals 23, 24, 18, 20, 33.

Members were polled individually on each proposal.

Proposal 23 Fails 0/10 Moved by Frank, seconded by Verne.

Charlotte Westing reviewed the history of brown bear regulations for the area and explained what the proposal would do. Raymond Stoney asked about the bear population. Raymond said he's noticed a slow decline over the last ten years or so. Glenn asked who was proposing it and where did they live? He works at Red Dog; seems to be a lot of bears up there. He thinks there's a lot in the Kobuk Valley too, but Raymond would know more.

Verne said one bear every four years won't work. Some Noorvik people get a bear ever year, that's what they live on. People asked how Noatak voted on this one -they failed it. Marvin said he'd go along with Noatak. Alex said he agrees, mentioned seeing a lot of bears, and said that's how we lose moose. Others also spoke in favor of leaving it at one a year.

Proposal 24 No Action

People asked what Buckland and Deering think about this. That committee didn't meet, so we don't know. Charlotte said that the department would recommend this be unit-wide if it passes. Larry said if you have an early fall, most of the bears are denned up by last week of October. He asked about who proposed it. Raymond Stoney said that most of the commercial operators are gone by the last week of October. He said that Bob Hannon would know if there's bears or not.

Proposal 18 Fails 0/10

Verne said keep it the same. Bobby asked if there's enough wolves to keep the limit at 20? Jim said the biology says yes. Moved by Marvin, seconded by Henry; committees voted unanimously to leave it the same.

Proposal 20 Fails 0/10

Larry said he's opposed; May is the month they have pups. Moved by Frank, second by Henry.

Proposal 33 Fails 0/10

One person commented that with climate change, there's no snow until late in the fall but springs are getting longer. Someone asked about the bag limit on trapping. Moved by Frank and seconded by Bobby, to keep it the same.

Proposals 25, 26, 27, 28 Failed 0/10

Jim Dau introduced the caribou proposals. Verne said keep it the same for another year. There was discussion if this would affect local hunters taking people out to hunt. Someone said one caribou is a lot to carry home for an out-of-state hunter, and some don't do even that.

Proposal 21 and 22 Carried 10/0

Raymond asked if this would affect subsistence users? Jim said if they use an airplane it would. Frank said when the first caribou are not allowed to come through, that affects the Upper Kobuk too. When the airplanes hold them back, that affects us up here.

Verne moved and Raymond seconded to support the extended dates.

Proposal 19 Carries 10/0

Jim said this would require pilots to take an orientation and get a certificate. Any new pilot a transporter hired would have to take it. Raymond asked about transporting by boat? -no, just for airplanes. Bobby said education is good. Moved by Bobby, seconded by Frank.

Larry asked if the orientation could include the height of airplanes? Jim said it could recommend, but the BOG can't regulate that. Larry said a couple years ago they were really hit on that, planes kept circling caribou. Jim said they want suggestions from the ACs, like plane altitudes, areas, densities. Frank said it would be good to have input. He mentioned the price of fuel for hunting, in the Upper Kobuk villages. Jim mentioned areas. Frank suggested a no-fly zone on the north side of the river in the fall; they should fly on the south side. Jim said they could recommend to stay above 2,000 when on the north side of the Kobuk but that only the FAA controls airspace. Larry said include the dates when it's in effect. He said they had a problem in Kiana this fall. It was hard to get tail numbers.

Jim said if this passes, he'll be in contact with them to get ideas.

Raymond asked if it could be in effect by next fall? Jim said possibly, it takes time to set up. Raymond said, let's push for that.

Annual Reauthorizations:

Brown Bear Tag Fee Exemption Passed 10/0

Charlotte said many areas of the state require a \$25 tag to take a brown bear.

Frank said it sounds good to just have the license and not need to buy the tag. There were questions about the residency requirement - it takes a year to qualify. And who is watching this? Charlotte gave the numbers for Alaska Fish and Wildlife Safeguard, 1-800-478-3377, Trooper Lorrington's number, 1-800-789-3222, and Jim and Charlotte at Kotzebue DFG office, 1-800-478-3420.

Henry moved and Marvin seconded to keep it the way it is.

Antlerless Moose Season Passed 10/0

Charlotte said the moose are doing okay and they think the population is generally stable. They don't feel there's much antlerless harvest, and it provides opportunity.

Moved by Verne, seconded by Raymond. Larry asked if this includes the September hunt? No, September hunt is just for bulls.

Larry said he would support this. Lot of times you don't get a bull, and a barren cow is good meat that time of year.

AC representatives to Nome BOG:

Raymond Stoney for Lower Kobuk AC

Frank Downey for Upper Kobuk AC

Next meeting: Tuesday, December 1st, 2009, 5:30 p.m. by teleconference. Agenda items will include Statewide BOG proposals, regional BOF proposals, and suggestions for the pilot orientation if Proposal 19 passes.

Adjourn about 9:00 p.m.

Copper River/ Prince William Sound Advisory Committee  
PO BOX 1663  
CORDOVA, ALASKA  
99574  
(907)424.3101

**Committee Action:** Approved 9-0

**Proposal 113**

**Proposal:** Reauthorize antlerless moose season GMU 6C

**Issue:** Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually.

**What will happen if nothing is done:** ADF&G will lose a management tool, local subsistence could be disrupted.

**Will the quality of the resource harvested or products produced be improved:** Yes

**Who is likely to benefit:** Species, subsistence users, sport hunters.

**Who is likely to suffer:**

**Other solutions considered:** Population objectives for GMU 6C is 400. This was established in 1995, and the gain from 300 to 400 was to grow by 2006. The most recent census in January 2009 found 360 moose with 19% calves. The antlerless hunts are currently administered by the USFS in Cordova through the Federal subsistence program. We feel it is important to reauthorize antlerless hunt in GMU 6C because if the population objectives are met in the near future, this tool will be needed to hold the population within the objective level.



Copper River/ Prince William Sound Advisory Committee  
PO BOX 1663  
CORDOVA, ALASKA  
99574  
(907)424.3101

Committee Action: Approved 9-0

Proposal 112

Proposal: Reauthorize antlerless moose season GMU 6B

Issue: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually.

What will happen if nothing is done: ADF&G will lose a management tool, local subsistence could be disrupted.

Will the quality of the resource harvested or products produced be improved: YES

Who is likely to benefit: Species, subsistence users, sport hunters.

Who is likely to suffer:

Other solutions considered: Desirable population levels are between 300-350 animals. The most recent census in 2008 found 240 animals, with 9% calves. This area is very prone to predation, especially by brown bears. The Board in the past has taken steps by liberalizing the brown bear season to help remedy this problem. It seems to have helped some with the calf survival doubling the past 10 years. Currently there is no planned antlerless hunt, but if the population continues to rebound, one will again. We feel reauthorizing antlerless hunts in GMU 6B gives ADF&G the management tool they need to control populations.

Copper River/ Prince William Sound Advisory Committee  
PO BOX 1663  
CORDOVA, ALASKA  
99574  
(907)424.3101

Committee Action: Approved 9-0

Proposal 111

Proposal: Reauthorize antlerless moose season GMU 6A EAST/WEST

Issue: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually.

What will happen if nothing is done: ADF&G will lose a management tool, local subsistence could be disrupted.

Will the quality of the resource harvested or products produced be improved: YES

Who is likely to benefit: Species, subsistence users, sport hunters.

Who is likely to suffer:

Other solutions considered: GMU 6 is split into two sections *East* and *West*. 6A East is considered a trophy area in accordance with the moose management plan. Bulls allowable for harvest for residents must be spike, fork, 50" or three or more brow tines. Bulls allowable for non resident harvest must be 50" and larger or three brow tines. 6A West Resident allowable harvest is any bull through registration. Non resident allowable harvest is any bull through drawing. Both areas desirable population levels are between 300-350 animals. The latest census in 2008 found 275 in 6A West with 7% calves, and 230 in 6A East with 7% calves. Both areas are highly susceptible to predation by both wolves and bears. We feel reauthorizing antlerless hunts in GMU 6AEAST/WEST gives ADF&G the management tool they need to control populations.