

Southcentral Region

Proposal Index

Cordova Area – Unit 6

- 127 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6A.
- 128 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6B.
- 129 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6C.
- 130 Modify the bag limit for hunting black bear in Unit 6D.

Anchorage Area – Unit 14C

- 131 Reauthorize existing antlerless hunt for Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER).
- 132 Re-authorize the antlerless moose season in the Twentymile/Portage/Placer hunt area in Units 7 and 14C.
- 133 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in the Anchorage Management Area in Unit 14C.
- 134 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Birchwood Management Area and the remainder of Unit 14C.
- 135 Reauthorize the antlerless portion of the any-moose drawing permit in the upper Ship Creek drainage in Unit 14C.
- 136 Reduce the permit allocation and modify the bag limit for Unit 14C Dall sheep.
- 137 Issue more tags for Chugach Park Dall sheep drawing (DS123).
- 138 Create a new drawing hunt in Chugach State Park closed areas for Dall sheep.
- 139 Re-open the “Ram Valley” area of the Eagle River Drainage sheep drawing tag (DS123).

Kodiak Area - Unit 8

- 140 Reduce the bag limit for deer in Unit 8 and modify the season dates.
- 141 Extend the season and increase the bag limit for goat in Unit 8.
- 142 In Unit 8, a wounded goat counts as the bag limit.

Kenai Peninsula Area – Units 7 & 15

- 143 Modify bag limit for moose to 50" or greater, 3 brow tines in Units 7 and 15.
- 144 Retain the current moose harvest regulations for Units 7 and 15 through 2014.
- 145 Enhance moose habitat and modify hunting seasons and bag limits for moose on the Kenai Peninsula.
- 146 Modify seasons and bag limits for general season moose hunts in Units 7 and 15 on the Kenai Peninsula.
- 147 Suspend aerial taking of wolves in Unit 15A and modify the population and harvest objectives for moose.
- 148 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Unit 15C.
- 149 Allow the harvest of up to 100 antlerless moose in Unit 15C.
- 150 Allow the use of motorized land vehicles during certain hours in the Lower Kenai Controlled Use area.
- 151 Re-institute closure of Palmer Creek/Lower Resurrection Creek areas in Unit 7 to moose hunting.
- 152 Remove the reference to brown bear drawing hunts on the Kenai Peninsula.
- 153 Modify the registration season dates and the bag limit for brown bear in Unit 15A and 15C.
- 154 Allow brown bear baiting in Unit 15 intensive management areas.
- 155 Allow for the incidental harvesting of brown bears over black bear bait sites in Units 15A and 15C.
- 156 Open a brown bear registration hunt in Units 7 and 15; and allow the incidental take of brown bear at black bear bait sites.

- 157 Modify the black bear salvage requirement for Units 7 and 15.
- 158 Increase the bag limit for black bear in Units 15A and 15C.
- 159 Open wolf, coyote and lynx hunting in Skilak Loop.
- 160 Open a no closed hunting season for wolf in Units 7 and 15.
- 161 Lengthen the spring season with a decreased bag limit for ptarmigan on the Kenai Peninsula.

Regional and Multiple Units

- 162 Open resident sheep seasons seven days before nonresident seasons for Southcentral Region Units.
- 163 Open resident sheep seasons seven days before nonresident seasons for Southcentral Region Units.
- 164 Open resident sheep hunting seasons five days before nonresident seasons for Southcentral Region Units.
- 165 Open resident hunting seasons seven to ten days before nonresident seasons for Southcentral Region Units.
- 166 Open resident hunting seasons seven days before nonresident seasons for Southcentral Region Units.
- 167 Open resident hunting seasons ten days before nonresident seasons, allocate 90 percent of harvest to residents, remove guide requirements, and increase tag and permit fees for the Southcentral Region.
- 168 Limit drawing permits to ten percent for nonresidents in Southcentral Region Units.
- 169 Allocate 90% of drawing permits to residents for Southcentral Region hunts and exclude nonresidents in hunts with less than ten permits.
- 170 Limit Dall sheep drawing permits to ten percent for nonresidents for Southcentral Region Units.
- 171 Develop a permit allocation formula for second degree of kindred hunters in Units 14C and 15.
- 172 Prohibit the taking of wolves March through November in the Southcentral Region.
- 173 Prohibit snaring of bears in the Southcentral Region.

- 174 Prohibit snaring of bears in the Southcentral Region.
- 175 Open a no closed hunting season for coyote with no bag limit for the Southcentral Region.

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
Southcentral Region Meeting
(Game Management Units 6, 7, 8, 14C, and 15)
March 15 – 19, 2013
Kenai Cultural Center
Kenai, Alaska

~TENTATIVE AGENDA~

NOTE: This Tentative Agenda is subject to change throughout the course of the meeting. This Tentative Agenda is provided to give a general idea of the board's anticipated schedule. The board will attempt to hold to this schedule; however, the board is not constrained by this Tentative Agenda. Persons wishing to testify must sign-up by the deadline. Public testimony will continue until those present at the meeting are heard; the board will continue working through its agenda immediately upon conclusion of public testimony. The following time blocks are only an estimate.

Friday, March 15, 8:30 AM

OPENING BUSINESS

Call to Order

Introductions of Board Members and Staff

Board Member Ethics Disclosures

Purpose of Meeting (overview)

STAFF AND OTHER REPORTS

PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY (upon conclusion of staff reports)

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

Saturday, March 16, 8:30 AM

PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY Continued

BOARD DELIBERATIONS (Upon conclusion of public testimony)

Sunday, March 17 – Tuesday, March 19, 8:30 AM

BOARD DELIBERATIONS Continued

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

ADJOURN

Special Notes

- A. This agenda is TENTATIVE and subject to change during the meeting. A list of staff reports and a roadmap will be available at the meeting. Scheduled updates will be available on the Board of Game website.
- B. Meeting materials are available at: www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=gameboard.meetinginfo or by contacting the ADF&G Boards Support Office in Juneau at 465-4110.
- C. A live audio stream for the meeting is intended to be available at: www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov
- D. The State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game complies with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). Individuals with disabilities who may need auxiliary aids, services, and/or special modifications to participate in this hearing and public meeting should contact 465-4110 no later than March 1, 2013 to make any necessary arrangements.

Cordova Area – Unit 6

PROPOSAL 127 - 5 AAC 85.045.(4) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6A as follows:

Seasons and Bag Limits (4)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
Unit 6 (A), all drainages into the Gulf of Alaska from Cape Suckling to Palm Point		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull by registration permit only; up to 30 bulls may be taken; or	Sept. 1-Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 drawing permits may be issued	Sept. 1-Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 5 drawing permits may be issued		Sept. 1- Nov. 30
Remainder of Unit 6(A)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or	Sept. 1- Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; up to 20	Nov. 15-Dec. 31 (General hunt only)	

antlerless moose may be taken

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers
or antlers with 3 or more
brow tines on one side; or

Sept. 1- Nov. 30

1 antlerless moose by
registration permit; up to 20
antlerless moose may be taken

Nov. 15-Dec. 31

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. We recommend continuation of the antlerless season to promote population stability. The desirable post-hunt population size in Unit 6(A) west of Cape Suckling is 300 to 350 moose. A census completed during January 2008 yielded a population estimate of 230 moose with 17% calves. An additional 45 moose were observed east of the census area in February 2012. The antlerless hunt has not been open since 2005 because the population has been below management objective.

The desirable post-hunt population size in Unit 6(A) east of Cape Suckling is 300 to 350 moose. A census completed during February 2008 yielded a population estimate of 275 moose with 8% calves. No antlerless hunts were held because of previous poor calf survival and population level below the management objective. However, if recruitment does improve, antlerless hunts may be needed to hold the moose population at objective levels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If antlerless hunts are eliminated in Unit 6(A), hunting opportunity will be needlessly lost.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Individuals who desire to hunt antlerless moose in Unit 6(A).

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who are opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050412662

PROPOSAL 128 - 5 AAC 85.045.(4) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6B as follows:

Units and Bag Limit (4)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
<p>...</p> <p>Unit 6(B) 1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows: 1 antlered moose by registration permit only; up to 30 antlered moose may be taken; or</p>	<p>Aug. 27- Oct. 31 (General hunt only)</p>	<p>No open season</p>
<p>1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 drawing permits may be issued for antlerless moose;</p>	<p>Aug. 27- Oct. 31 (General hunt only)</p>	<p>No open season</p>

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. Desirable post-hunt population size is 300-350. A survey completed during January 2012 indicated a population of 270 moose with 16% calves. Antlerless hunts have not been held during recent years because the population is below the management objective. However, if the population increases to the desired level, antlerless hunts may be needed to hold the population at objective levels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the moose population in Unit 6(B) increases and a season is possible, antlerless hunts will provide additional hunting opportunity.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Individuals who desire to hunt antlerless moose in Unit 6B.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who are opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050712664

PROPOSAL 129 - 5 AAC 085.045.(4) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6C as follows:

Seasons and Bag Limits (4)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
... Unit 6(C) 1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 40 permits for bulls and up to 20 permits for antlerless moose may be issued ...	Sept. 1-Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season.

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. The population objective is 400 moose. A census completed during February 2012 yielded an estimate of 600 moose, 21% of which were calves. Because the available antlerless harvest quota in Unit 6(C) is currently harvested under a federal subsistence season administered by the U. S. Forest Service, we have not held the antlerless hunt since the 1999-2000 season. We recommend re-authorizing the state antlerless hunt as a back up to the federal subsistence hunt. Continuation of the antlerless hunts will be necessary to hold the population at objective levels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity will be lost, and the population may exceed the objective, which is based on the availability of adequate habitat during severe winters.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters desiring to take a moose in Unit 6(C).

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050712665

PROPOSAL 130 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear. Modify the bag limit for hunting black bear in Unit 6D as follows:

One boar every regulatory year. One sow every two regulatory years. Hunters who harvest a sow black bear may not hunt black bear in Unit 6D the following regulatory year.

ISSUE: Black bear harvest in Unit 6D (Prince William Sound) is declining but still higher than pre-Whittier Road. It is unknown whether current harvest is sustainable. Since 2000 the season has been shortened twice, from June 30 to June 10 and from September 1 to September 10. This proposal is an alternative to reducing opportunity for hunters to be in the field and has the potential of enhancing the population and improving opportunity for hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Maybe nothing, maybe a significant reduction of hunter opportunity if the bear population declines. Reducing sow harvest, if possible, seems like the best goal. Reducing the season in September was aimed at reducing sow harvest as sow harvest was high during that period.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Reducing sow harvest will increase the number of offspring and improve opportunity for all hunters. Most species that are easily gender identifiable have restrictions aimed at protecting the breeding females. Although difficult, it is possible in many cases to make an educated guess on bear gender based on overall size of boars and in some cases the conformation of mature sows and their lack of size.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters if it increases the bear population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who advertently or inadvertently harvest a sow and wish to harvest black bears in Prince William Sound annually.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? One bear every two years. Rejected as overly restrictive at this time and encouraging boar only harvest has the potential to increase opportunity for hunters rather than reduce it.

PROPOSED BY: David Pinguoch EG042312694

Anchorage Area – Unit 14C

PROPOSAL 131 – 5 AAC 85.045 (12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize existing antlerless hunt for Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER) as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
...		
Unit 14(C), Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER) Management Area	Day after Labor Day —Mar 31 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day —Mar 31

1 moose by regulatory year by drawing permit, and by muzzleloading blackpowder rifle or bow and arrow only; up to 185 permits may be issued

...

Antlerless moose seasons must be re-authorized annually. During summer, an estimated 200-300 moose inhabit the Anchorage metropolitan area. This number can increase up to 700-1,000 moose during the winter, depending on the overall population size. Many of these moose come from the Ship Creek valley and Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson. Many of these moose move into the metropolitan area during December – January. Where high densities of moose occur, they cause severe overbrowsing in some areas and lead to increased incidences of collisions with motor vehicles and conflicts with humans. Maintaining antlerless moose hunts on JBER will help reduce human-moose conflicts, as well as reduce moose-vehicle collisions.

A November 2011 aerial Gasaway census yielded a population estimate of 335 moose, with a bull:cow ratio of 37 bulls per 100 cows and a calf:cow ratio of 14 calves per 100 cows in the Ship Creek Drainage and on JBER lands. This population has a history of rapid increase following mild winters. The number of antlerless permits issued is based on the population estimate, bull: cow ratios, as well as snow death and estimated winter mortality. In the 2011/2012 season, 67 either sex permits and 3 antlerless permits were issued and 21 cows harvested.

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

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will continue to overbrowse winter habitat and mortality of moose attributable to collisions with vehicles and starvation during severe winters will continue.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters and wildlife managers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to hunting antlerless moose, or opposed to hunting in general.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

None. These hunts have been successful in creating additional moose hunting opportunity in the state’s most heavily populated area with little or no controversy.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game and JBER EG050712672

PROPOSAL 132 - 5 AAC 085.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Twentymile/Portage/Placer hunt area in Units 7 and 14C as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(5) ... Unit 7, the Placer River drainages, and that portion of the Placer Creek (Bear Valley) drainage outside the Portage Glacier Closed Area, and that portion of Unit 14(C) within the Twentymile River drainage		

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits for bulls will be issued in combination with nonresident hunts, and up to 70 permits for antlerless moose will be issued	Aug. 20—Oct. 10 (General hunt only)
---	--

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by drawing permit only;
up to 60 permits for bulls
will be issued in combination
with resident hunts

Aug. 20—Oct. 10

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. A November 2011 aerial composition count of moose in the Twentymile, Portage, and Placer river drainages found 178 moose with a bull:cow ratio of 21 bulls per 100 cows and a calf:cow ratio of 29 calves per 100 cows. This population has a history of rapid increase following mild winters; consequently, in 2009, antlerless permits were issued for the first time since 2004. Thirty antlerless permits were issued for 2009, 2010, and 2011. Harvests for 2009, 2010, and 2011 were 25 bulls and 17 cows, 15 bulls and 15 cows, and 19 bulls and 8 cows, respectively.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population will probably increase and could suffer major losses during a severe winter. Habitat may be overbrowsed, reducing carrying capacity in subsequent years, and road and train kills will increase.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who obtain a drawing permit, wildlife viewers and motorists driving in the Portage area. Visitor use is high and viewing is an important activity in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who are opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050712671

PROPOSAL 133 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in the Anchorage Management Area in Unit 14C as follows:

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

(12)

...

Unit 14(C), that portion known as the Anchorage Management Area

Day after Labor Day -Nov. 30 (General hunt only)

No open season

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only, and by bow and arrow, shotgun, or muzzleloader only; up to 50 permits may be issued

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually. During summer, an estimated 200-300 moose inhabit the Anchorage metropolitan area. This number can increase up to 700-1,000 moose during the winter, depending on the overall population size. Many of these moose come from the upper Campbell Creek valley, which lies within Chugach State Park. Most of these moose move into the metropolitan area during December – January. Where high densities of moose occur, they cause severe overbrowsing in some areas and lead to increased incidences of collisions with motor vehicles and conflicts with humans. Maintaining antlerless moose hunts in the Anchorage Management Area will help reduce human-moose conflicts, as well as reduce moose-vehicle collisions.

Ten antlerless permits were issued for the upper Campbell Creek and McHugh Creek drainages in 2009, 2010, and 2011. Hunters took 5 cows in 2009, 5 cows in 2010, and 2 cows in 2011.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will continue to overbrowse winter habitat and mortality of moose attributable to collisions with vehicles and starvation during severe winters will continue.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who acquire permits for antlerless moose hunts. People who believe there are too many moose in the Anchorage Bowl.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to hunting antlerless moose, hunting moose in parks, or hunting in general.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None. This hunt has been successful in creating additional moose hunting opportunity in the state’s most heavily populated area with little or no controversy. It may also ameliorate over-browsing the limited winter range and reduce vehicle collisions and conflicts with residents in nearby urban areas.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050712668

PROPOSAL 134 - 5 AAC 085.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Birchwood Management Area and the remainder of Unit 14C as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
...		
Unit 14(C), that portion known as the Birchwood Management Area	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30
1 moose by drawing permit, by bow and arrow only; up to 25 permits may be issued		
...		
Remainder of Unit 14(C)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits may be issued	Day after Labor Day -Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Composition counts are not flown in the Birchwood Management Area. However, we believe that a small resident population of 10-15 moose, as well as an equal number of animals from the northern reaches of the Joint Base Elmendorf Richardson, frequents the area. Five bull permits were issued in 2009, 2010, and 2011. Archers took 2 bulls in 2009, 1 bull in 2010, and no bulls in 2011. Very little

public land exists in this management area and most of it is city parkland closed to discharge of weapons. Large parcels of land owned by Eklutna Native Corporation could not be hunted by permittees because no access permits were issued, and this land is quickly turning into subdivisions. The one large block of public land remaining in this hunt area is Beach Lake Park, where discharge of firearms and bows is not allowed by city park ordinance.

Composition counts are seldom flown in the Remainder of Unit 14C due to lack of funding. One hundred thirty-nine cows were counted during the fall 2001 trend counts in Knik/Hunter and Peters Creek count areas. The moose populations in these areas appeared to be at or above carrying capacity; however, to manage the moose population conservatively, lacking recent trend data, the number of antlerless permits was reduced from 20 to 10 in 2007, and then to 5 permits in 2010. Hunters in Knik/Hunter took 1 cow in 2008, 1 cow in 2009, 2010, and 2011. Permittees in Peters Creek took no cow moose in 2008 and 2009, 1 cow in 2010, and 1 cow in 2011.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The opportunity to harvest antlerless moose will be lost, and urban moose-human conflicts will likely increase.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Persons who acquire permits for antlerless moose hunts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to antlerless moose harvest or hunting in general.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050712669

PROPOSAL 135 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the antlerless portion of the any-moose drawing permit in the upper Ship Creek drainage in Unit 14C as follows:

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

(12)

...

Unit 14(C), that portion of the Ship Creek drainage upstream of the Joint Base

Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER)
Management Area

1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 50 permits may be issued; or	Day after Labor Day --Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day --Sept. 30
1 bull by registration permit only	Oct. 1—Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	Oct. 1—Nov. 30
...		

ISSUE: Moose use the upper Ship Creek drainage throughout the year. However, the highest density appears to be in fall and early winter when rutting and post-rut concentrations occur. In most years, accumulated snow packs force most of the moose out of the upper Ship Creek drainage in December. The moose move to lower-elevation wintering areas on the Joint Base Elmendorf Richardson (JBER), and other portions of the Anchorage Bowl. A November 2011 census on JBER and upper Ship Creek yielded a population estimate of 335 moose with a bull:cow ratio of 37 bulls per 100 cows and a calf:cow ratio of 14 calves per 100 cows. Fifty either-sex drawing permits were issued for upper Ship Creek drainage in 2009, 40 either-sex permits were issued in 2010, and 20 bull only permits were issued for 2011. Hunters took 10 bulls and 5 cows in 2009 and 8 bulls and 1 cow in 2010. No cows were harvested in 2011, as no antlerless permits were issued due to a population concern.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive. An either-sex drawing moose hunt should allow greater harvests in an area with limited access.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose will continue to be under-harvested, with concomitant problems in nearby urban areas and occasional large die-offs during severe winters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters and wildlife managers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None. A late-season registration hunt for any bull was held in 2007-2011 to harvest additional moose from upper Ship Creek drainage.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050712670

PROPOSAL 136 - 5 AAC 85.055(a)(7). Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep.
Reduce the permit allocation and modify the bag limit for Unit 14C Dall sheep as follows:

Department of Fish and Game biologists assigned to Unit 14C should be given greater discretion in determining the number of permits issued, and conditions placed on permits. Until the cause of the decline in the health of Dall sheep in Chugach State Park is better understood by qualified biologists, the total number of permits issued should be reduced by at least 50% and the full curl rule removed, or relaxed.

ISSUE: The decline in health of Dall sheep in Chugach State Park which is demonstrated in part by the decline in population of Dall sheep in Chugach State Park.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Until we know what the cause of the decline may be we cannot predict what will happen if the decline in health is not addressed.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposal is aimed at giving qualified biologists greater flexibility in managing the hunt of Dall sheep so that the health of Dall sheep may be improved.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and wildlife viewers alike.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Professional guides and the ADF&G will lose revenue if the number of permits is reduced.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A temporary ban on hunting of Dall Sheep in Chugach State Park was considered, but this has been rejected because we hope that if given the authority to micro manage the hunt, and the flexibility to experiment with removal of the full curl mandate, the department's wildlife biologists will do the right thing for our wildlife.

PROPOSED BY: Kneeland Taylor EG050112618

Proposal 137 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Issue more tags for Chugach Park Dall sheep drawing (DS123) as follows:

Units and bag limits	Resident Open season	Nonresident Open season
14 (c) DS123 area	<u>Aug. 10-Sept. 30</u>	<u>Aug. 10-Sept. 30</u>
1 ram with full curl horn or larger by DS123 drawing, <u>at least 3 tags will be issued, up to 6 tags may be issued</u>		
....		

Issue: DS123 was established several years ago to provide a very limited opportunity to harvest trophy Dall sheep in previously closed areas of Chugach State Park. Currently only one tag is given annually. Although this hunt was opposed by some that prefer sheep are not hunted in the Park, there have been no conflicts to date. My wife was lucky enough to draw this tag and I was

impressed at the number of mature legal rams in the area. There were at least six legal rams in the South portion of this area (Suicide Peaks) and, although we did not hunt the South Eagle River portion, pilots reported several legal rams also in this area. If Ram Valley is also re-opened this would add additional legal rams to the total. There has been an average of less than one ram taken from this area since it has opened. This area is also open for the Chugach Governor's tag and at least one ram has been taken from this area with the Governor's tag. It is unlikely that this area will be used regularly by the Governor's tag hunter because there is a high probability that larger rams are found elsewhere in the Chugach in any given year. This area is less than 1% of the total sheep habitat in the Chugach draw areas.

Sheep drawing tags are some of the most popular in Alaska and we should take every opportunity to expand opportunity, especially in areas near population centers such as Chugach State Park.

An alternative would be to split up this area and issue one or two tags for each section. Example: South Eagle River (1-2 tags), Ram valley (1 tag), Suicide Peaks (2 tags).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The majority of the rams in this area will continue to die of old age.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCT PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, presently there is very little harvest, no harvest in many years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sheep hunters. Those willing to make the effort to access this area after being lucky enough to draw the longest odds tag in Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Persuade the area biologist to issue more tags area. This has been discussed and was not well received.

PROPOSED BY: Aaron Bloomquist EG050712684

PROPOSAL 138 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Create a new drawing hunt in Chugach State Park closed areas for Dall sheep as follows:

Units and bag limits	Resident Open season	Nonresident Open season
<u>14 (C)</u>	<u>Day after Labor Day Sept 30</u>	<u>Day after Labor Day-Sept 30</u>
<u>Drainages:</u>		
<u>Falls Creek, South Fork of Eagle River, McHugh Creek, Campbell Creek (both forks), Rainbow Creek, Rabbit Creek</u>		

1 ram with full curl horn or larger by drawing, up to 6 tags may be issued, hunters may not take a ram within 1/2 mile of a maintained road.

ISSUE: These areas are near urban Anchorage and are bounded by currently open Dall sheep hunting areas. The adjoining area, DS123 was established several years ago to provide a very limited opportunity to harvest trophy Dall Sheep in previously closed areas of Chugach State Park. Currently only one tag is given annually. Although this hunt was opposed by some that prefer sheep are not hunted in the Park, there have been no conflicts to date.

Some of these areas are very near highly used areas and the Seward Highway. I chose the Day after Labor Day as the opener to minimize conflicts with other park users and to correspond with other seasons that are in very highly used areas of Chugach Park. I have also chose to include a 1/2 mile closed area from maintained roads mainly to eliminate hunting rams that are hanging out near the Seward Highway. Although animals are often taken very near highways in Alaska, this is an extremely dangerous stretch of road. A sheep hunter taking a ram from near the road could cause major traffic hazards.

The hunt should start with only one tag issued for the entire area and possibly increase if no problems arise, similar to DS123.

Sheep drawing tags are some of the most popular in Alaska and we should take every opportunity to expand opportunity, especially in areas near population centers such as Chugach State Park.

This is also one of the only areas on earth where a person with physical disabilities may have a reasonable chance to take a Dall ram. These areas are close enough to improved roads and trails that even someone that is wheelchair bound could participate in a hunt with a couple of motivated porters or assistants. The board may consider making this hunt available to those “permanently wheelchair bound or similarly disabled,” the same definition as the brown bear bait exemption.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The rams in this area will continue to die of old age and even occasionally be hit by cars.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCT PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, presently there is no harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sheep hunters. Those willing to make the effort to access this area after being lucky enough to draw the longest odds tag in Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? An alternative would be to split up this area and issue one tags for each section. An archery only hunt could be considered in the more highly used areas around McHugh Creek. Consider a hunt for those with disabilities only.

PROPOSED BY: Aaron Bloomquist

EG050712685

PROPOSAL 139 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Re-open the “Ram Valley area of the Eagle River Drainage for the DS123 sheep drawing tag as follows.

Units and bag limits	Resident Open season	Nonresident Open season
<u>14 (C) Ram Valley</u>	<u>Aug 10-Sept 30</u>	<u>Aug 10-Sept 30</u>
<u>1 ram with full curl horn or larger by DS123 drawing</u>		

...

ISSUE: DS123 was established several years ago to provide a very limited opportunity to harvest trophy Dall Sheep in previously closed areas of Chugach State Park. Currently only one tag is given annually. Although this hunt was opposed by some that prefer sheep are not hunted in the Park, there have been no conflicts to date.

It recently came to my attention that the overzealous Anchorage area biologist had closed a portion of this hunt area “Ram Valley.” My wife was lucky enough to draw this tag and I was disturbed to find that this area was closed without Board of Game approval.

This closure had nothing to do with this hunt but was justified because a ewe hunter had strayed into the area and illegally killed an ewe sheep. This seems to have caused the private landowner that owned the main access route from Eagle River Valley to deny access to the public. This is not the only access route. The illegal hunter accessed (according to the Anchorage area biologist) from Peters Creek over the top so it would stand to reason that others could do the same.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The area will remain closed because it is not likely for the area biologist to change her mind.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCT PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, presently there is no harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sheep hunters. Those willing to make the effort to access this area after being lucky enough to draw the longest odds tag in Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Persuade the area biologist to re-open this area. This has been tried and failed.

PROPOSED BY: Aaron Bloomquist

EG050712621

Kodiak Area – Unit 8

PROPOSAL 140 - 5 AAC 85.030 Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer. Reduce the bag limit for deer in Unit 8 and modify the season dates as follows:

For the area off the road system, change the limit to one buck for nonresidents. For the area off the road system change the limit to two bucks for residents. Change the nonresident season to October 1 – December 2. A large percentage of bucks drop their antlers the first few days of December.

ISSUE: Due to the extremely harsh winter of 2011-12 the deer population has dropped dramatically. Some estimates are 90% in areas. Presently multiple does and fawn(s) may be harvested by resident and nonresidents. Also (three) multiple bucks may be harvested by residents and nonresidents.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It will take significantly longer for the population to rebound to carrying capacity. It is presently at 10 – 20%. State managers do not have a budget to accurately study deer on Kodiak, so detailed information does not exist.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All future users of the resource. Specifically, resident subsistence hunters whose bag limit will remain at three by decreasing competition for the remaining resource. That's all residents of Unit 8.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Short-sighted individuals who are only interested in the present and not the health of the entire resource. Nonresidents who wanted to harvest multiple trophy bucks.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Change the resident season. It allows harvest before and after non-resident hunting for those who want the meat.

PROPOSED BY: Brian Peterson EG050712688

PROPOSAL 141 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat; and 5 AAC 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit. Extend the season and increase the bag limit for goat in Unit 8 as follows:

Unit 8

1. Extend season: Season dates for RG480 - August 20-March 20.
2. Increase bag limit - RG480 to two goat bag limit, only one in the field at a time.
3. Bag limit for RG480 does not count against other goat areas in the state.

ISSUE: Over population of mountain goats in area RG480

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued over population of mountain goats resulting in possible habitat destruction and potential health issues.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Increased opportunity for mountain goat hunting, hopefully increasing harvest thus curbing the population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The Kodiak Mountain Goat Committee is a joint committee of the Kodiak AC, ADF&G, USFWS, and the Kodiak Regional Subsistence Advisory Council. We are in agreement that everyone will benefit and it is in the best interest of the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1.) Same day airborne - enforcement problem with other areas. 2.) Allow harvest of nannies with kids -ethical problems.

PROPOSED BY: Kodiak Mountain Goat Committee EG042412550

PROPOSAL 142 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat; and 5 AAC 92.130. Restrictions to bag limit. In Unit 8, a wounded goat counts as the bag limit as follows:

On the Kodiak Archipelago if you wound a goat you may not pursue another goat for the remainder of the regulatory year (two goat bag limit areas excluded). Wounding means the animal was touched with a hunting projectile (arrow or bullet).

ISSUE: Ethical hunting practices/ wounding loss/ exceeding bag limits.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to wound goats and continue hunting or exceed the one goat bag limit thus taking away hunting opportunities for other goat hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Less emergency closures, more goats available for hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters pursuing mountain goats in Unit 8.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Kodiak Mountain Goat Committee EG042412549

Kenai Peninsula Area – Units 7 & 15

PROPOSAL 143 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify bag limit for moose to 50" or greater, 3 brow tines in Units 7 and 15 as follows:

The new regulation should state that in Units 7 and 15 a legal bull consists of one which has antlers 50 inches or larger, or with 3 or more brow tines on at least one side.

ISSUE: The restrictive antler size requirements that is causing a reduction in opportunity to harvest moose on the Kenai Peninsula. Moose harvests on the Kenai Peninsula went from 400 to 600 annually between the years 2000 and 2010 to approximately 30 in fall 2011. With these same restrictions and low bull recruitment due to heavy bear and wolf predation it is unlikely harvest numbers will increase much in 2012.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Kenai Peninsula will continue to see declining moose harvests and if a person wants a good chance at harvesting a moose will be forced to go to other areas of the state.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, changing the regulations so bulls with three or more brow tines on at least one side become legal will likely allow for another 30 to 40 moose to be harvested on the Kenai Peninsula, while still protecting enough bulls to grow the struggling bull:cow ratios.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All moose hunters who once again want to see healthy bull populations and better harvest rates on the Kenai Peninsula like there were seven or eight years ago.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who will want to shoot spike/forks, without realizing that there isn't enough calf production caused by heavy bear and wolf predation to support a spike/fork hunt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow spike antlered bulls, while keeping the 50-inch or four brow tine regulations. The previous statement is a second option, but I would rather see the reinstatement of the three brow tine regulations. I think the 50-inch or three brow tine regulations would be better for the moose population because of low calf survival. The yearling bulls need decreased hunting pressure on them, because the ones that do escape predation need to be able to grow past the yearling stage, after which they can mature and become better breeding bulls. I do not think calf survival rates are high enough to support a bull harvest, where antlers with spike/fork, 50-inch or three brow tines on at least one side are all definitions of a legal moose. If those regulations were allowed bull:cow ratios would drop to below 10:100 similar to what they did in the fall of 2010 (according to Alaska Department of Fish and Game aerial surveys). If harvests are to be increased back to 400 to 600 bulls annually, then high predation rates must be addressed in order to increase calf survival. Allowing 50-inch or 3 brow tine bulls to satisfy legal requirement will allow for some increased harvest, while still keeping it low

enough that the moose population can support it until low calf survival is addressed through liberalized predator hunting.

PROPOSED BY: Brian Blossom

EG032512519

PROPOSAL 144 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Retain the current moose harvest regulations for Units 7 and 15 through 2014 as follows:

The current regulation would remain in place through the 2014 moose hunting season.

ISSUE: This proposal seeks to extend the current moose harvest regulations in Units 7 and 15 for two additional seasons. The current regulations restrict harvest for the general hunting season to antlered bulls with an antler spread of 50-inches; or greater or at least four brow tines on one side. This regulation went into effect for the fall 2011 season and was expected to provide an adequate increase in bull/cow ratios in two successive seasons. While bull numbers seemed to be significantly enhanced after the first season of this regulation, a particularly hard winter in 2011/2012 has led to significant moose mortality. Moose populations are already in serious decline in most areas of the Kenai Peninsula and the gains made in the 2011 season seem to have been eradicated by the following harsh winter. With that it appears appropriate to extend the current regulations through the 2013 and 2014 seasons.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Kenai Peninsula moose population will continue to have minimal calf production due to the insufficient number of breeding bulls.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the regulation that is being requested to extend was adopted to promote a healthy bull/cow ratio, which has not been the case for a number of years. A healthy bull/cow ratio promotes calf production and thus, the resource continues to propagate.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Ultimately all who utilize moose as a significant portion of their diet.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? In the short-term, those who targeted spike/fork horn moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close the moose season entirely while bull/cow ratios come up to viable numbers. Bulls in the 50-inch or four brow tine class are relatively inaccessible and seemingly the number taken will not adversely affect the intent of the regulation.

PROPOSED BY: Kenai/Soldotna Fish and Game Advisory Committee

EG042012535

PROPOSAL 145 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Enhance moose habitat and modify hunting seasons and bag limits for moose on the Kenai Peninsula as follows.

- 1.) Enhance moose habitat by prescribed burns, crushing and pruning vegetation.
- 2.) 50-inch or 4 brow tines for a legal moose (no cow hunting allowed).
- 3.) Spike bull only if a bull to cow ratio has increased.
- 4.) A closed moose season for all nonresidents.
- 5.) Maintain the registration hunt for brown bears. September 1 - 30.
- 6.) Increase predator control on wolves to proper management levels.

ISSUE: The present state of the moose population on the Kenai Peninsula. The declining moose population and the low bull to cow ratio.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population will continue to decline to a dangerous level.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would allow the moose population to grow and add more bulls to be recruited into the population for better quality harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All moose hunters would benefit in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some hunters at first but all would benefit as the population grows to management levels.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Thomas Netschert

EG042412548

PROPOSAL 146 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify seasons and bag limits for general season moose hunts in Units 7 and 15 on the Kenai Peninsula as follows:

Consider making a change, based on ongoing survey work, that consists of one or a combination of several of the following changes to the moose season in Units 7&15 which will liberalize the current general season bag limit but have it be more restrictive than the spike-fork (SF), 50 inch or 3 brow tine restriction that was in place from 1987-2010. (Various possibilities will be presented after obtaining 2012 harvest and survey data, and data from ongoing moose research.)

- Retain the current restrictive bag limit but allow a certain number of drawing permits for any bull or for bulls with a specific antler configuration (i.e., spike bulls).
- Adopt a more liberal general season bag limit (i.e., fork- 50-inch or 4 brow tines) and also initiate a limited drawing hunt for bulls with the number permits determined by the Department of Fish and Game.

- Reinstatement of the SF-50 inch or 3 brow tine regulation but have the spike-fork portion of the bag limit be eliminated for 2 seasons when bull:cow ratios fall below objective levels (e.g., 20 bulls:100 cows) for 2 consecutive years.
- Change season dates to September 1-20 or other possible dates.
- Allow spike bulls to be taken instead of spike forks.
- Initiate a limited drawing hunt for cows in areas that can sustain the harvest.

ISSUE: Given a recent decline in bull:cow ratios across many areas in Units 7 & 15, the Board of Game temporarily restricted the bag limit of bulls in 2011 from SF-50 inch or three brow tines to only bulls with 50-inch or 4 brow tines. From 2011 survey information it appears that this restriction has increased the bull:cow ratio in most areas we surveyed. Additional fall 2012 information will be forthcoming which will help guide the decision process. A higher sustainable harvest that will not reduce the bull:cow ratio below objective levels will require a change in the current restrictive bag limit.

Since we still need an additional year of data to help model the changes in bull:cow ratios with the current restrictions, we have no specific plan outlined in this proposal. However, the options above outline a general framework that will allow for various potential seasons and bag limits, and their modeled consequences, to be discussed with local ACs and the board. Additional 2012 harvest and survey data are needed to fully model the efficacy of potential changes. Data that will be forthcoming will help build a series of options presented to ACs and the board for changing or retaining the harvest strategy and bag limit in Units 7&15.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Board of Game’s 2011 changes were designed to be temporary in nature and allow the bull cow ratio to increase and should be within objectives by the 2013 season. We will fail to take advantage of additional harvest opportunity if changes are not considered.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. An adjusted harvest strategy will allow for improved sustainable harvests and stability in the bull:cow ratio.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All people interested in having sustainable moose populations, whether hunters or non-consumptive users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The public that desires high bull:cow ratios. Additional harvest will stabilize the bull cow ratios within objectives.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Various solutions will be presented to the public, Advisory Committees and the Board of Game for consideration.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050412647

PROPOSAL 147 - 5 AAC 92.108. Identified big game prey populations and objectives; and 5 AAC 92.125. Intensive management plans. Suspend aerial taking of wolves in Unit 15A and modify the population and harvest objectives for moose as follows:

Suspend aerial wolf management. Change the intensive management objectives.

Unit 15A moose population objective [3,000-3,5000] to 2,000-2,900.

Unit 15A moose harvest objective [180-350] to 120-290.

ISSUE: Current intensive management (IM) objective, Unit 15A and aerial wolf management for Unit 15A.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Current IM objectives if met will put the health of the moose population in jeopardy and would not be sustainable. If aerial wolf management were to take place, it would likely have some increase in the moose population. But can the range support more moose at this time? Would we have a healthier moose population because of this action? I believe that the current data we have now suggest the range cannot support any more moose. We do not have the data that shows what impact predators have on calf mortality.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes it does. The need to review IM objectives should be reviewed periodically. In this case the objectives were made when habitat was in its best condition for supporting a large number of healthy moose. I believe for a short term goal, reducing the IM objectives would achieve several advantages. 1.) We would have a much healthier and more productive moose population. 2.) This would allow DWC to gather more recent and accurate data. DWC would be able to compile data on productive, calf weights, twinning rates, age of pregnancies, rump fat, calf mortality and composition. 3.) Would allow all applicable agencies to develop a short range and long range plan for habitat rehabilitation. 4.) After surveys are conducted to what levels predators or which predator's effect calf survival and moose productive. With this data we can determine what level of actions is necessary if any for predator management. If predators are found to have biological impact on productive and calf survival we can look at removing some restriction limitations, increase number of permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users of the resource. Consumptive user will have a healthier moose to harvest. As short term goals are met and habitat is increased more opportunity in harvest will result. The same is true for seeing moose. Moose would be in a healthier condition and not as venerable to winter die off.

Non-consumptive user would benefit from a short term reduction in IM objectives because a healthier more productive moose population would be notice by seeing moose in their non-hunting actives. Managers would not have to suggest, to use tools such as wolf or bear management controls.

I also believe as the habitat improves and if the data reflects bear have a significant take of moose calves, refuge managers would have to review their restrictions on bear and number of permits issued.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who believe humans taking wildlife resources, is unnatural management.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Last year’s action the Board of Game took. I believe the current plan will fail before the habitat issue is improved. I also believe the common denominator in the success of other predator management programs throughout the state was good to very good habitat. I believe this would be the first sub-unit that has a range condition of “poor habitat.” To try to increase moose population on a poor range will not be sustainable.

PROPOSED BY: Allen Barrette EG053112722

PROPOSAL 148 - 5 AAC 085.045.(13) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Unit 15C as follows:

Units and Bag Limits (13)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
Unit 15(C), that portion south of the south fork of the Anchor River and northwest of Kachemak Bay		
1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or	Aug. 20—Sept. 20 (General Hunt only)	No open season
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; the taking of calves, and females accompanied by calves, is prohibited; up to 100 permits may be issued	Aug. 20—Sept. 20	Aug. 20-Sept. 20
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. The Homer benchland in Unit 15C often holds high moose densities in winters when deep snow pushes the moose down into human populated areas. Even without deep snow, a high number of moose die due to malnutrition and negative interactions with humans are common as moose become more aggressive in their search for food around human residences.

In November 2011, 344 moose were counted and 26% were calves (39 calves:100 cows, 14 bulls:100 cows) in a partial survey of the hunt area. The winter of 2011-2012 was severe in much of Southcentral Alaska. The number of permits issued will depend on the Fall survey information for this area. Fifty permits were issued in each of the last 10 years resulting in an average harvest of 23 cows per year. We recommend reauthorization of the antlerless hunt.

In March 2012 the Board of Game authorized an intensive management program including aerial wolf control. The antlerless hunt boundaries are included in the defined control area. There has been considerable discussion relative to holding an antlerless hunt within a predator control boundary. The Department of Fish and Game will evaluate this antlerless hunt relative to the severe winter and implementation of the control program and make appropriate recommendations whether to issue permits. In addition if the hunt is to go forward we may recommend separating the moose management objectives from the predator control objectives.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Deep snow winters will result in a high number of moose deaths due to malnutrition and continued conflicts between aggressive moose and humans.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? A limited antlerless moose hunt may improve overall browse quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wildlife viewers and hunters receiving permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals opposed to hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050712673

PROPOSAL 149 - 5 AAC 5 AAC 085.045.(13) Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Allow the harvest of up to 100 antlerless moose in Unit 15C as follows:

Allow up to 100 antlerless moose to be harvested by drawing permits.

ISSUE: Bull/cow ratio in Unit 15C; allowing an antlerless harvest in Unit 15C.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Loss of some opportunity when we have a surplus of antlerless moose.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Using 2011 data, but depending winter survival (2011-2012) and fall surveys (population and composition). There could be opportunity to harvest some antlerless moose. Using “up to” language to give the Division of Wildlife Conservation the discretionary authority to provide some opportunity to harvest antlerless moose.

Because proposals have to be submitted up to ten months before the Board of Game can take action, some important data will affect the outcome or logic of this proposal. If the moose population is consistent from 2011 data, we are solidly in the middle of our IM population objective, and with the spike/fork component being added back into the population we still have an imbalance in our bull/cow ratio. So we would have some opportunity to harvest antlerless moose to help out the imbalance.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? If the moose population is growing, and the winter survival was better than projected, then those who harvest moose would benefit from this added opportunity. Also those who were harvesting the spike/fork component of the population, loss opportunity (due to board action) this could replace some of that loss opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to the harvest of antlerless moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? It is hard to consider other solutions ten months out, without proper data to justify them. I'll have to rely on written comments and give the Board of Game hard numbers.

PROPOSED BY: Allen Barrette EG050912717

PROPOSAL 150 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Allow the use of motorized land vehicles during certain hours in the Lower Kenai Controlled Use area as follows:

You may hunt, transport moose meat or hunters between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. or during the dark of night.

ISSUE: Age discrimination. The last 10 days of hunting “the best time to hunt” has turned into a young man’s sport. With few trees, to hang meat and no use of machines makes it almost impossible for a senior citizen to harvest moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Age discrimination will continue and senior citizens will continue having unequal access to harvesting a moose.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the quality of meat harvested would be improved, be less wanton waste, be less encounters with bears, and be less use of ATVs as a hunting tool “road hunting”.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Senior citizens.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? “Road hunters” or hunters who pursue moose with the use of ATVs, putting forth little ethical effort.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1.) A five day senior hunt offered immediately after the regular season with the use of ATVs. 2.) Keep things as they are, however, allow seniors unlimited ATV use. Both should be ruled out because of discrimination and the environment would continue to suffer.

PROPOSED BY: Ernest Suoja

EG050712689

PROPOSAL 151 - 5 AAC 92.510(a) Areas closed to hunting. Re-institute the closure of Palmer Creek/Lower Resurrection Creek areas (Unit 7) to moose hunting as follows:

Palmer Creek/Lower Resurrection Creek Closed Area.

Palmer Creek drainage to its confluence with Resurrection Creek, and Resurrection Creek drainage from the confluence with Palmer Creek downstream to Turnagain Arm, closed to taking of moose.

ISSUE: The Board of Game’s 2011 decision to open the Palmer Creek/Lower Resurrection Creek drainages to moose hunting, after the areas had been closed for over 30 years, which resulted in multiple user conflicts, conflicts with private property, and displacement of Hope residents and others during the hunting season. A detailed explanation of the problem follows:

Prior to 2011, the Palmer Creek/Lower Resurrection Creek drainages had been closed to moose hunting for over thirty years. This closure had the full support of the Hope Village Council, which is the governing body for Hope and Sunrise. Members of the Village Council include moose, bear, and caribou hunters, hunting guides, fishing guides, gold miners, white water rafters and kayakers, runners, hikers, berry pickers, mushroom pickers, wildlife viewers, and business people providing services to visitors, which is the major industry in the area.

Since the original closure, there has been substantial development in the lower Resurrection Creek drainage, and patterns of daily uses by Hope residents and visitors increased substantially in the Palmer Creek drainage, including hiking, biking, running, wood gathering, berry picking, mushroom picking, bear hunting, bird hunting, and wildlife viewing. In 2011, the Board opened both areas to moose hunting. A “road hunt” resulted on Palmer Creek Road and Resurrection Creek Road with four illegal bulls taken out of a total of six bulls harvested in both areas. The moose hunt created public safety issues and conflicted with the uses by Hope residents and others to such an extent that many long-time users felt displaced during the hunting season. The two areas are distinct and so were the problems.

Lower Resurrection Creek: In this proposal, Lower Resurrection Creek is that part of the Resurrection Creek drainage in Unit 7 downstream from the confluence of Palmer Creek with Resurrection Creek, about four and a half miles from Turnagain Arm. The confluence of the two streams occurs at the end of Resurrection Creek Road, which runs along the east side of Resurrection Creek to the trail head for the Resurrection Pass Trail to Cooper Landing.

Hope originated as a mining town in 1895 at the mouth of Resurrection Creek on Turnagain Arm. Prior to the 1960s, Resurrection Creek Road mainly provided access to the mining claims along Resurrection Creek. However, after the earthquake in 1964 led to widespread damage in the original town site, more and more residents, businesses, and community facilities were located along Resurrection Creek Road. In the last thirty years, the pace of that development has increased substantially. Now, property along both sides of Resurrection Creek Road has been developed, including homes, residential subdivisions, various businesses, and active mining claims, as well as public property devoted to community facilities such as the Hope School, the Hope Post Office, the Borough material site, and the Hope Airport. Land ownership maps on the Kenai Peninsula Borough website for the lower Resurrection Creek Valley help illustrate this.

The 2011 opening of moose hunting in this area resulted in many complaints by residents of trespasses occurring. There were two separate incidents where illegal bulls were shot in the yard of a resident and left to waste. In one case, the illegal bull was bloated by the time it was found, in the other a bear was feeding on the carcass. Other residents reported hunters along Resurrection Creek Road and in community areas like the Hope Airport.

The Village Council held a well attended meeting on April 21, 2102, to discuss the moose hunts in the Lower Resurrection Creek and Palmer Creek drainages. The meeting was also attended by the ADF&G biologist. At that meeting, several residents who were long time moose hunters expressed their belief that the harvest of six bulls from these two areas, four of which were illegal, would contribute to the ongoing decline of the moose population. These hunters believed the closed areas had provided a sanctuary for a few breeding bulls which had allowed additional moose for hunting in the open area of Resurrection Creek valley upstream from the Palmer Creek confluence. The area biologist was asked why the department and the board would open another area to moose hunting when that was the case. Numerous residents expressed their opinion at the meeting and after that, because of the proximity to homes and community facilities, it was irresponsible to open the Lower Resurrection Creek area to moose hunting.

The Hope Village Council believes the unfortunate results of the 2011 moose hunt in this area stem from a misperception about land ownership and use patterns in the lower Resurrection Creek valley and along Resurrection Creek Road. Since this area was first closed to moose hunting thirty years ago, numerous residents, businesses, and community facilities have been located there. Whatever the reason for the original closure, the Village Council now believes that it is impossible to hunt moose in the lower Resurrection Creek valley without either (1) trespassing on private property, including residences, residential subdivisions, active mining claims, and other businesses, or (2) hunting unsafely in a confined area, which is state or borough land, but is established for community purposes (ie. Hope Airport, Borough material site) and bordered by residences.

The Hope Village Council believes the Lower Resurrection Creek area should be closed again to moose hunting because the hunt is incompatible with the private property and uses of many residents living in, working in, and using the area for community purposes.

Palmer Creek: This area includes the Palmer Creek drainage from its headwaters at the Swetmann Mine to its confluence with Resurrection Creek. The valley was glaciated, so it has

steep sides and a narrow valley floor. Palmer Creek itself is a steep, rocky creek. Access to the drainage is by way of Palmer Creek Road, a gravel Forest Service road which transects up the middle of the valley on the east side of Palmer Creek. The drainage can be broken down into two parts: the lower valley, which does have stands of spruce and birch, and the upper valley which is mostly above timberline.

The dividing line between lower and upper Palmer Creek is generally considered to be at the Forest Service's Coeur D'alene Campground, three miles after the Palmer Creek Road enters the drainage. Because the lower valley is narrow and steep, the Palmer Creek Road provides a vantage point to view virtually all parts of this lower valley. This part of the valley has been heavily used by Hope residents and others for the past 30 years to hike, run, bike, camp, pick berries, gather wood, pick mushrooms, and view wildlife, which has mostly meant birds and some moose. These uses are increasing every year. For example, the University of Alaska ski team now trains before ski season by running on Palmer Creek Road and in the trails off the road, guided bird watching groups now frequent the valley, and in 2010-2011 the area experienced a significant increase in mushroom hunters from Anchorage during August and September. Until the 2011 hunt, residents and visitors did spend time in this part of the valley viewing bulls in rut. Black bear hunting by Hope residents and others does occur, but it is usually an activity conducted well away from the road, and to our knowledge there has never been a complaint about bear hunting. Caribou hunting is not really done in the lower valley because the few caribou in the area are in the upper drainage.

Palmer Creek Road continues from the Coeur D'alene Campground through the upper valley to the head of the drainage where historic lode mines operated many years ago. This part of the valley is almost entirely above timberline, and thus the road provides views of virtually all parts of the drainage. Along the road are many smaller camping areas established by the Forest Service along Palmer Creek. This area is also heavily used for hiking, running, camping, biking, berry picking, and mushroom picking. Caribou hunting by Hope residents and others does occur on the tundra covered and rocky ridges in the upper valley, which are typically an hour hike or climb up from the valley floor and the Palmer Creek Road.

To the knowledge of the Hope Village Council, four bulls were killed in the 2011 moose hunt in the lower Palmer Creek Valley. Two were legal and two were not. At the Hope Village Council meeting on April 21, 2012, various residents complained that the hunt was nothing but a "road hunt" for people from Anchorage or Kenai that led to the area becoming a "shooting gallery." The Village Council understands that there were several instances of parties stalking and competing for the same bull, with shots even being taken by one party while another was on a stalk. Two residents complained that the hunt was irresponsible given the level of other uses. Numerous residents have reported that they did not feel safe in the Palmer Creek drainage during the moose hunt. At the April 21, 2012, meeting, a large majority of the residents present indicated they had been displaced by the moose hunt from engaging in their typical fall uses of lower Palmer Creek valley. The Hope Village Council understands that the 2011 proposal to open Palmer Creek to moose hunting suggested the opening would create opportunities to hunt and float out. No one in the community of Hope is aware of anyone ever having floated the creek in a raft, canoe, or kayak, probably because it has a substantial waterfall in its lower reaches and then plunges downhill in the last mile to Resurrection Creek.

The Hope Village Council believes that the long time closure in Palmer Creek should be re-established because the hunt displaced numerous local residents and others from their traditional activities which have developed over 30 years, and resulted in many residents and others being fearful of being in the area during the hunt. Since this area was first closed to moose hunting thirty years ago, the uses by individual users other than moose hunters have increased substantially, and the hunt occurred at a peak time when many other users were accustomed to being there. Whatever the reason for the original closure, the Village Council now believes that it is impossible to conduct a moose hunt in the Palmer Creek drainage without the hunt displacing local residents and visitors.

The Hope Village Council believes the Palmer Creek drainage should be closed again to moose hunting because the hunt cannot be conducted without displacing many residents and visitors from use patterns developed over decades.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued trespasses, displacing of other users, and unsafe hunting.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Property owners in Resurrection Creek Valley. Residents of Hope and others who have long time established different uses of the Lower Resurrection Creek Valley and in the Palmer Creek drainage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Road hunters for two bulls.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Although it is possible to separate the areas, the Hope Village Council has not considered proposing to reinstate only the closure in the Lower Resurrection Creek valley because so many residents and others use the Palmer Creek drainage and would be displaced by a hunt continuing there.

PROPOSED BY: Hope Village Council EG050912705

PROPOSAL 152 - 5 AAC 92.061. Special provisions for brown bear drawing permit hunts.
Remove the reference to brown bear drawing hunts on the Kenai Peninsula as follows:

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

...

(b) In the [UNITS 7,] **Unit** 10[, AND 15] brown bear drawing permit hunt, a nonresident may apply for and obtain a permit only as follows:

(1) the department may issue a drawing permit under this section only to a successful nonresident applicant who meets the requirements of this section;

[(2) UNITS 7 AND 15, THE DEPARTMENT SHALL ISSUE A MAXIMUM OF 10 PERCENT OF THE DRAWING PERMITS TO NONRESIDENTS AND A MINIMUM OF 90 PERCENT OF THE DRAWING PERMITS TO RESIDENTS.]

...

ISSUE: At the January 2012 Board of Game meeting the Board of Game adopted a proposal that changed the Unit 7 and Unit 15 brown bear season from a drawing permit hunt to a registration permit hunt. With this change the references to Units 7 and 15 are no longer needed. This proposal requests that the board repeal references to Units 7 and 15 in 5 AAC 92.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The codified regulations will continue to have wording that is not needed and no longer applies to this regulation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? We expect this will result in less confusion when reading the codified regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone who references this section in the codified regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050412648

PROPOSAL 153 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Modify the registration season dates and the bag limit for brown bear in Unit 15A and 15C as follows:

Open up a registration brown bear hunt beginning April 1 and ending May 31, then restarting again September 1 to run until November 1st. The bag limit shall be one brown bear every regulatory year in intensive management areas 15A and 15C, and one brown bear every four regulatory years in non-intensive management areas on the Kenai Peninsula.

ISSUE: Low moose calf survival and struggling moose populations, the high brown bear population, and the limited hunting opportunities available to harvest some of these brown bears on the Kenai Peninsula.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The high concentration of brown bear will continue to prey heavily on moose calves causing low calf recruitment, and causing sustainable harvest levels of moose on the Kenai Peninsula to be well under management objectives.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, brown bears have been almost unavailable to hunters on

the Kenai Peninsula for the last dozen years, and human harvest is mainly reduced to DLPs around homes and roadways. The brown bear population has increased substantially over the last 20 years and there has been a lack of hunting opportunities offered in order to keep the brown bear population in check. I have personally seen some very large brown bears on the Kenai and have been unable to harvest any of these bears. There are a lot of bears in the nine to ten foot category, and if the seasons were available it would provide a chance for someone to harvest one of these trophy bears. Plus removing some of these bears from the population will help increase moose calf survival rates, not to mention probably brown bear cub survival rates. Going by 2011 ADF&G survey data from count areas 20, 21, and 24 in Unit 15C approximately 82 percent of cows counted didn't have a calf with them come November. It is my belief the large brown bear population is the primary cause of this statistic. Allowing the season to start September 1 instead of September 15 and October 1, which are the current fall season dates will give moose hunters a better opportunity to harvest a bear while they are in the process of moose hunting. It will also give hunters a chance to hunt brown bears as they come into moose kill sites.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Black bear baiters who have a hard time harvesting black bears over bait anymore because of all the brown bears that come around and chase the black bears away, people that have seen large brown bears and would appreciate the chance to harvest one of these bears, Kenai residents who would like to feel safe hiking around their neighborhoods without carrying a gun because of fear of running into an aggressive brown bear, and lastly all moose hunters who would once again like to have the chance to harvest bulls that fall under the spike/fork, 50-inch or three brow tine regulations. Currently bear and wolf predation is so heavy on calves, that recruitment is low enough the Kenai Peninsula moose population currently has a hard time sustaining a harvest of 100 bulls on the whole Kenai Peninsula.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? - People that don't care if there is a moose hunting season on the Kenai Peninsula.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There is the possibility of having just a general season brown bear hunt rather than a registration hunt based on a quota of bears, but due to the Kenai Peninsula brown bear population being managed as an island population it will probably always be managed on a quota system. Since the brown bears have been managed by a quota of 8 or 10 reproductive female brown bears for quite some time with no effects on the increasing brown bear population at all, it seems to be time to raise this quota in order to slow the growth of the population and help increase moose calf survival. I realize the Board of Game doesn't have the authority to raise the quota of female brown bears, but since the Division of Wildlife Conservation, State representatives of the Fish and Game Department, and local biologists will all be present at the 2013 Board of Game meeting it is a good time to discuss raising this quota. Seeing that quotas of eight to ten reproductive females have had no effect on the brown bear population, the quota should be raised to at least 20 reproductive females. It is feasible to not even have a quota in Unit 15A and 15C until they once again fall within harvest objectives for moose. Brown bear and wolf predation on moose needs to be addressed through more liberalized hunting seasons and methods, or the Kenai Peninsula moose population will continue to struggle and sustainable hunter harvests will remain well below management objectives.

PROPOSED BY: Brian Blossom

EG032512520

PROPOSAL 154 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Allow brown bear baiting in Unit 15 intensive management areas as follows:

Allow the harvest of brown bears at black bear bait stations in intensive management areas in Unit 15A and 15C.

ISSUE: The high brown bear population on the Kenai Peninsula and the difficulty they are causing hunters who hunt black bear at bait stations to be successful. The large population is also hard on the moose calf crop in the spring.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Black bear baiting on the Kenai Peninsula will continue to get more difficult, moose calf survival will remain low, and the overall moose population will continue to struggle.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will help moose calf survival and also allow black bear baiters to be more successful by harvesting some of the brown bears that come around black bear bait stations and chase all the black bear away. With the moose population struggling, it is a good time for Kenai Peninsula residents to supplement their winter meat supply with black bear, but this is becoming difficult in the spring at bait stations because of the high amounts of brown bear that come around and chase the black bear away. If a person makes a food barrel where brown bears can get to the food, then they beat and tear the barrel up and destroy the bait site.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose hunters, people who bait and hunt black bear, and residents that know the brown bear population has gotten too high.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who don't want brown bears to get shot.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None, the Kenai Peninsula has come to a point where brown bear populations must be managed better, so moose populations can recover and harvests can once again reach management objectives. The quota of 10 reproductive female brown bears on the Kenai Peninsula needs to be increased.

PROPOSED BY: Dave Blossom

EG041812532

PROPOSAL 155 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Allow for the incidental harvesting of brown bears over black bear bait sites in Units 15A and 15C as follows:

Allow for the incidental harvesting of brown bears over black bear bait sites. Brown bears will not be the target animal. However, when brown bears do come into black bear bait sites, hunters will have the means to appropriately sex the animal and ensure that a sow with cubs is not taken. The season would run from April 15 to June 30.

ISSUE: Hunting of brown bears has been expanded to a registration hunt starting October 1, 2012. While this is a solid move on the boards part in regards to predator control, as hunters, we need to ensure that reproductive aged sows are not killed during this hunt. Most hunters do not have the opportunity or skill to correctly sex these animals prior to harvesting them. While we do want to see the brown bear population put into check with the currently low moose population in Units 15A and 15C, hunters must correctly identify the appropriate bear for harvesting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If hunters kill too many reproductive aged sows, the brown bear hunt will be shut down during the current hunting season.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes it does. It will help prevent hunters from harvesting reproductive aged female brown bears. Hunters will have adequate time at the black bear bait sites to age and sex the animal that is moving through the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone will benefit from this proposal. It will be a solid means of selectively harvesting adult aged male brown bears.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Loren Reese

EG042712559

PROPOSAL 156 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear, and 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Open a brown bear registration hunt in Units 7 and 15 and allow the incidental take of brown bear at black bear bait sites as follows:

Open registration brown bear season for Units 7 and 15 from September 15 - May 30, bag limit - one bear every regulatory year. I would also like a stipulation added that allows for the incidental harvest of brown bears while hunting black bear bait sites. All regular black bear baiting rules would apply.

ISSUE: Increase the harvest opportunity for brown bears on the Kenai Peninsula.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The brown bear population will continue to increase. As it stands, each year we are experiencing increased numbers of human bear interactions, particularly in residential areas, along hiking trails, etc. Also, as one of the major predators of moose, by reducing their numbers, it will help improve the survival rate of adult and calf moose.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will increase our hunter harvest opportunities greatly, and also assist in recovering our struggling moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters that wish to harvest brown bears, and moose hunters, as this will assist in recovering our moose population. Also, non-consumptive users that enjoy seeing and photographing moose will have more opportunities to do so.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I also considered adding a clause to wave the tag fee and only have a 30-day sealing requirement. Since hunting brown bears tends to be a touchy subject for some, I felt this may send too much of a rogue message.

PROPOSED BY: Bob Ermold

EG043012589

PROPOSAL 157 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. Modify the black bear salvage requirement for Units 7 and 15 as follows:

For black bears in Units 7 and 15, either the hide and skull, or the meat must be salvaged and removed from the field.

ISSUE: The problem regards the requirement of salvaging and removing the hide and skull of black bears.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fewer hunters who enjoy eating black bear meat and black bear hunting will continue to hunt after they place a black bear rug or two on their wall. Fewer hunters participate in black bear hunting due to the requirement of salvaging and removing the hides and skulls.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It improves relations between black bear hunters and anti-hunters by salvaging, and not wasting the meat. It removes the trophy stigma.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who enjoy eating black bear meat and have no interest in salvaging black bear rugs and skulls which have no food value. The most common reason for hunters discontinuing hunting for black bears, is the fact they do not need any more bear rugs. Hauling out the weight of black bear skulls and hides for no reason other than satisfying a law, makes no sense. I love the taste of black bear meat, especially from

mountainous areas that require a major commitment for success. The added weight and effort needed to haul out the skull and hide, is the reason so many black bears are not taken when opportunities arise.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None. The current law effectively prevented me from taking a black bear 12 miles up a drainage. If I had not been required to salvage the hide and skull, I would have taken the black bear and salvaged the meat.

PROPOSED BY: Jim Hjelmgren

EG042112539

PROPOSAL 158 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear. Increase the bag limit for black bears in Units 15A and 15C as follows.

As part of an increased effort on behalf of the hunters to help stimulate the predator control program on the Kenai Peninsula, the new proposal would state: Allow for the harvesting of five black bears per regulatory hunting season in Units 15A and 15A. In Unit 15C, this would pertain to the area north of Kachemak Bay.

ISSUE: Units 15A and 15C are in an intensive management nightmare in regards to the moose population and predator control. The local Department of Fish and Game has been less than proactive in their approach to solve this issue and the Kenai Wildlife Refuge has been less accommodating in regards to working with the public and the department in helping to solve the crisis with the dwindling moose population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The residents will no longer be able to have a moose hunting season in Units 15A and 15C.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. By doing so, this would allow the hunters whom are willing to harvest predators, take five black bears each out of the equation. With the new restrictions for moose hunting, the number of hunters taking moose has significantly dropped. Having the ability to harvest five black bears will enable many families to fill their meat needs for the year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone. Hunters and non-hunters both will benefit from this. Ultimately, there will be an increase in the moose population if this proposal is passed and taken advantage of by the hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I can think of no one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered going unlimited on black bear with no sealing requirements. However, after thinking on it, I believe five would be the appropriate number to help improve the moose population.

PROPOSAL 159 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf; 5 AAC 85.060. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals; and 5 AAC 92.530. Management areas.

Open wolf, coyote and lynx hunting in Skilak Loop as follows:

Allow predator hunting on the entire Skilak Loop area from November 10 through March 31. Areas not open in the Skilak Loop area to predator hunting would be: 1/4 mile within Engineer and Hidden Lake Camp grounds - 1/4 mile from the upper and lower boat launches. Species allowed for harvest would be wolf, coyote, and lynx (lynx season runs from November 10 through January 31.) Individuals would be allowed, as they currently are in the open area of hunting of the Skilak Loop section, to walk in from the road.

ISSUE: The Skilak Loop area in Unit 15A is a 17 mile loop that currently allows hunting access for the first three to four miles on the right hand side of the road only. Traditionally, this area gets used most heavily during the months of May through October for folks getting camping and hiking. The Skilak Loop area has very minimal use during the winter months. Predator hunting is currently allowed on the right hand side of the road up to within a 1/4 mile of the Skilak Lake boat launch. This is about a total of four miles of hunting access only. There is very limited road access in Unit 15A for predator hunting all together.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be an underutilized hunting opportunity for people whom enjoy predator hunting. The cow moose hunt in this area was just closed due to very low population numbers for moose in this specific area. While there appears to be an adequate food supply for moose in the area, the population continues to drop due to predation from wolves, coyote, and bear. By not allowing full access to predator hunting in this area during the critical winter months, hunters are not being allowed to help balance the moose and predator populations.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? There is an abundance of fur bearers located in this area. By allowing predator hunting in this proposed area, individuals whom enjoy predator hunting would have greater opportunity to harvest fur bearers with currently allowed prescribed firearms.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Any individual who holds a valid hunting license that enjoys getting out predator hunting.

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

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I did consider proposing opening up the Skilak Loop area to general hunting. This proposal would have included the general hunting of bears in this area. However, after considering individuals and groups that use the Skilak Loop area during late spring, summer, and early fall months for camping and hiking, I chose to reject this proposal to keep these individuals from gaining maximum benefit from the area during this time frame.

PROPOSED BY: Loren Reese

EG033012521

PROPOSAL 160 - 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf. Open a no closed hunting season for wolf in Units 7 and 15 as follows:

Wolf: Units 7 and 15: No closed season.

ISSUE: This proposal seeks to enhance the opportunity for wolf harvest in Units 7 and 15 by adopting a “No closed season” regulation. With the current intensive management plan and predator control measures in place with the target goal of a significant reduction in the wolf population that includes aerial wolf hunting it seems at cross purpose to close the season at all. Wolves are difficult to hunt however; there are incidental opportunities for harvest that should be taken advantage of. No closed season; accomplishes that. This proposal would include a sunset clause that would insist the season revert back to the current regulation, August 10th - April 30th once wolf numbers are reduced to the desired number.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Opportunities to harvest wolves will be lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the reduction in wolf populations has been identified as a significant issue in the overall scheme of intensive management for moose populations on the Kenai Peninsula, this proposal furthers the ability to accomplish the mission and enhance moose numbers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who would like to harvest a wolf and ultimately all who utilize moose as a food source.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who oppose wolf hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other options seem appropriate.

PROPOSED BY: Kenai/Soldotna Fish & Game Advisory Committee

EG042312545

PROPOSAL 161 - 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Lengthen the spring season with a decreased bag limit for ptarmigan on the Kenai Peninsula as follows:

Units 7 & 15 ptarmigan. August 10th - February 28: 10 birds per day - 20 in possession;
March 1 - April 30: 5 birds per day - 10 in possession.

ISSUE: Ptarmigan season in Units 7 and 15 currently closes on March 31. The period between mid-December and early March is largely not huntable for foot hunters using hunting dogs. Snow conditions are difficult and often times dangerous due to avalanche concerns. Daylight

does not allow a snowshoe into the high country with any time to hunt, From mid-March into late April, snow conditions and daylight allow foot hunters to access the high country and take a few ptarmigan. The spring breeding season does not get underway until the snow is out of the high country at the end of April. In order to allow the foot hunter a fair opportunity to hunt ptarmigan in the spring this proposal would request an extension of the ptarmigan season that would close it on April 30 instead of March 31. In order to minimize any impact this extension would have it also proposes that from March 1 through April 30 the bag limit be five ptarmigan. There does not seem to be any viable subsistence utilization of ptarmigan in the winter months on the Kenai Peninsula. Ptarmigan are taken primarily by recreational snow machiners who encounter coveys and shoot them with .22 pistols or rifles. There is no real justification to have a ten bird limit on upland game birds that are subject to a fair amount of pressure, which the Kenai Peninsula ptarmigan currently are. Reducing the limit to five birds would actually be very reasonable for the entire season. There seems to be no data available on populations of ptarmigan in the Kenai Mountains but there is on the ground evidence that populations of ptarmigan are affected in the more accessible areas of the Kenai.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The current regulation effectively eliminates harvest by foot hunters during the majority of the open season, maintaining the current regulation will continue to minimize winter opportunities for foot hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal provides for an opportunity that does not currently exist and in doing so promotes the utilization of these birds while ensuring a continued healthy population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who prefer to hunt upland game without benefit of motorized vehicles.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? It does not seem that anyone would suffer. A five bird limit is still generous for upland game birds in any arena.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? An option would be to change the season/bag limit to read: Units 7 and 15: Ptarmigan August 10 - April 30 5 birds per day 10 birds in possession This is a reasonable limit on any upland game bird population. Upland hunters who spend time walking the high country of the Kenai Peninsula find that ptarmigan are not as prolific as a ten bird per day limit suggests. Many upland bird hunters have expressed the desire for a five bird limit in the interests of the resource. But many Alaskans believe in getting all they can as often as they can and thus it seems unlikely that a reduction in bag limit for the entire season would be embraced.

PROPOSED BY: Kenai/Soldotna F&G Advisory Committee

EG042012534

Regional and Multiple Units

PROPOSAL 162 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Open resident sheep seasons seven days before nonresident seasons for the Southcentral Region Units as follows.

Resident hunting season for Dall sheep shall be August 3rd to September 20th. Nonresident hunting season shall be from August 10th to September 20th. Drawing permit areas will start seven days earlier for Alaska residents and if there is a split season, the second half will be shortened by seven days for nonresidents such that residents can start the second half seven days prior to nonresidents.

ISSUE: The Board of Game needs to address the lack of full curl legal rams available to Alaska residents. While sheep populations have been stable to slightly declining, the availability of legal rams, much less trophy rams, has been significantly reduced and is in serious decline. Success rates for resident sheep hunters will never be on par with non-residents if not allowed an earlier jump from the efficiency of their guides.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaskan resident hunters will continue to suffer from the mismanagement of this species by the Board of Game. Alaskan youth will never have the opportunity afforded to their parents and grandparents to successfully hunt healthy populations of Dall sheep with ample populations of large rams. Alaska wildlife belongs to all Alaskans and these resources should be managed as such.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Resident hunters will have an improved quality of hunt and avoid conflicts with guides and their clients. Nonresident hunters will have an improved quality of hunt by avoiding conflicts with resident hunters. Transport services associated with sheep hunting will improve as this will lessen the bottleneck on transporters seen at the beginning of each season, especially during poor weather. This may also increase the safety of hunters and transporters by spreading out the season and users more. Current Alaska residents and future Alaskans may be more interested in hunting Dall sheep, its management, and the future of Dall sheep hunting if they had greater opportunity to locate and harvest a legal ram, much less quality rams.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska residents, Alaska youth, and future Alaskans. Dall sheep populations may also improve as more people may feel like they have a chance at successfully harvesting a quality ram and will be more interested in the management of the resource. This benefits Alaska, all of Alaska's game resources, and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, though some will say nonresident hunters, nonresident guides, and resident guides may suffer. Harvest records, however, show that resident sheep hunters are much less successful than nonresidents because of their guides. This is largely due to time guides can give to pre-season scouting, which is done mostly by fixed wing aircraft.

While success rates for resident hunters will hopefully increase, there is little reason to think that nonresident success rates will decline significantly. Pre-season scouting will still be available to guides. Sheep populations will not suffer directly - again because resident hunter success rates are consistently low. Future sheep populations, however, may suffer and receive little support or interest, if today's youth and future generations cannot hunt healthy populations of sheep, as is currently the case. You will be hard pressed to find any Alaska resident who is not a guide or associated with a guiding business, who does not favor this proposal. If not sure whether to favor Alaska residents over nonresidents, please look at any other state and how they manage their resources for the benefit of their residents and not for the financial benefit of a few.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: Close nonresident hunting of Dall sheep for five years or until healthy populations of sheep with sufficient populations of legal rams is re-established. Charge resident hunters nonresident harvest fees during this interim to offset any loss of funding from loss of non-resident tags. This would be the best management practice the Board of Game could do, as it would best serve current and future Alaska residents, and most of all best serve the Dall sheep population as a whole. I rejected this solution based on past performance of the board where political and financial interests of a few, trumped the best interests of Alaska residents, Alaska game resources, and Alaska itself.

PROPOSED BY: Jake Sprankle EG042412551

PROPOSAL 163 - 5AAC 85.055. Seasons and bag limits for Dall Sheep. Open resident sheep seasons seven days earlier than nonresident seasons for the Southcentral Region Units as follows:

Region II Units - Season Dates for Dall Sheep:
Resident: August 5 – September 20
Nonresident: August 12 – September 20

ISSUE: Preference For Alaska Residents - EARLY START DATE

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaskans will keep experiencing conflict in the field with commercial operators (guides) and overcrowding will diminish the quality of the hunt for residents. All of the western states have high allocations of game (usually 90%) for their residents and about 50% of Alaska's sheep are harvested by nonresidents, which would never be allowed in other states. The lack of a quality experience and the diminishing number of legal rams is causing a reduction in the number of Alaskans wanting to hunt and enjoy a resource we all own.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? More legal rams would be harvested by residents and our youth would have an opportunity to have a positive experience sheep hunting. All sheep hunters would not be trying to enter the field on the same day and the air taxi services wouldn't be so overloaded – generally a safer situation for all hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaskans – especially our youth. Nonresidents will also have a better experience because many residents will be out of the field when they enter creating more solitude for their hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Commercial operators will complain but they are using a resource we all own. Other states don't force nonresidents to use a guide and they have high game allocations for their residents (usually 90%). Nonresident guides can't legally hunt sheep, goats, and brown bears themselves but they enjoy and make money on a resource owned by all Alaskans. This is not anti-guide or nonresident but pro-Alaskan.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The Board of Game has been very kind to the guiding industry at the expense of the resident hunter. Nonresident tag fees bring a lot of money to the state and this helps support the Department of Fish and Game. How do other western states survive giving their residents high allocations of game? Other western states require nonresidents to apply for drawing permits (elk, deer, antelope, bear, sheep, goat, moose, cougar, etc.) 6 to 8 months in advance of the season, they have a preference point system, and high tag fees with no guide requirements. They make money to support their programs and give their residents very (usually 90%) high allocations of game. Nonresidents can come to Alaska the day before hunting season and buy a nonresident tag over the counter the day before the season at a fraction of the price other states charge. Why doesn't Alaska manage game for residents and our Department of Fish & Game like other states? If the board doesn't start showing some preference to residents, Alaskans need to contact the governor and their representatives asking them to confirm board members who put residents as priority #1 or vote for politicians that support a preference for Alaska residents.

PROPOSED BY: Tom Lamal and Darcy Etcheverry EG043012577

PROPOSAL 164 - 5 AAC 85.055. Seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Open resident sheep hunting seasons five days before nonresidents for Southcentral Region Units as follows:

Region II Units - Season Dates for Dall Sheep:
Residents: August 5th to September 20th
Nonresidents: August 10th to September 20th

ISSUE: The Board of Game needs to address the serious problem of overcrowding at the start of sheep season and the lack of legal rams for the resident hunter. Alaska wildlife is 1st and foremost for the Alaskan resident.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The conflicts between resident and nonresident hunters will continue to increase and the overall successful hunting experience for both use groups will decline.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Both the resident and the nonresident hunters will have an

improved hunt by avoiding conflicts between the two groups. This will also improve safety by not having everyone rush into the field in the same time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaskan residents

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? In my opinion one would suffer, but the nonresident and resident guides will say that they will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? NA

PROPOSED BY: Leonard Jewkes EG042912575

PROPOSAL 165 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Hunting seasons and bag limits. Open resident hunting seasons seven to ten days before nonresident seasons for Southcentral Region Units as follows:

Resident hunting seasons begin 7-10 days before nonresident seasons.

ISSUE: Inequitable hunting opportunities for Alaskan residents. Most hunting states provide an early and/or extended hunting season for resident hunters. Alaska does not. We need to keep our residents fed and active in the management of our game, not depend nor allow the high dollar hunters from outside who support every small portion of our economy through the use of guide services. The local hunters are the folks who live here year around and keep the dollars local. We need to focus our game management on Alaskans.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaskan hunters will become disenchanting and revolt.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, just the quality of the hunt

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There really isn't any other solution, except to ban nonresident hunters completely, and that's probably not going to fly

PROPOSED BY: Shaune O'Neil EG042712556

PROPOSAL 166 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits. Open resident hunting seasons seven days before nonresidents seasons for Southcentral Region Units as follows:

Whatever opening date is determined for any species the new regulation would indicate the opening for nonresidents would be seven days later.

ISSUE: Big game hunting seasons open seven days before nonresidents for all species of big game.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This will allow resident hunters to have access to game populations without interference from nonresidents who may be utilizing professional guide services or hunting on their own. Opening day numbers would be thinned out, hunter transporters will be able to cater to more people, or at least spread the movement of people over more days and primarily allow residents a less chaotic hunt.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would improve the quality of the hunting experience for the Alaskan resident. Our State Constitution indicates the wildlife resources belong to the people of Alaska. It should only be considered as fair for the people to have access to our wildlife resource without interference from nonresidents. Other states use staggered starts with nonresidents and the difference should be the same in Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone will benefit from this proposal. Residents will have the opportunity to access game in a less crowded field. Nonresidents would have the same type of experience. With opening day being thinned out the remainder of all hunting seasons would be much smoother.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I can't see any group suffering from this proposal. Hunting pressure would be thinned, commercial services would be spread out and Alaska would be in line with many of the other hunting states.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions considered.

PROPOSED BY: Terry Marquette EG042812565

Note: The Board of Game does not have the authority remove guide requirements for hunting certain species nor to increase tag and permit fees.

PROPOSAL 167 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Season and bag limits. Open resident hunting seasons ten days before nonresident seasons; allocate 90 percent harvest to residents; remove guide requirements, and increase tag and permit fees for the Southcentral Region as follows:

Start ALL resident hunting seasons for ALL species 10 days prior to nonresident hunters. Remove the guiding requirement for sheep, goats, and brown bears. Raise ALL nonresident harvest tags and permit fees. Allocate 90% of harvests to residents and 10% to nonresidents.

ISSUE: I would like the Board of Game to address the problem of favoring guides and their nonresident clients over the needs of Alaskan residents. Specifically, I would like the Board of Game to address the declining hunting opportunities residents are facing and the competition we face from the guiding industry in filling our freezers.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Residents will continue to see their hunting opportunities. The Board of Game and the guiding industry will continue to claim that nonresident hunters provide monies for the management of our game and bring in much needed dollars to the State when in fact they don't. Residents live here, spend their money YEAR round, buy services and goods YEAR round and support a multitude of businesses in their pursuit of game. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game spends about \$42 million dollars per year in support of the commercial fishing industry, yet only receives about \$16 million in revenue from the commercial fishing industry. Clearly, if the Department of Fish and Game--and the Board of Game --were concerned about much needed dollars, we can find savings in other avenues.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? We live here and these are OUR resources. Not the Feds, not nonresidents, and surely not the guides. The Board of Game needs to start to manage our wildlife for Alaskan residents and we have seen for too long now, declining populations of our game and most especially, declining hunting opportunities for us and our children. The future does not look bright if we continue--if you, the Board of Game, continue, to manage our wildlife species the way you have. We have an excellent Department of Fish and Game--some of the best and brightest biologists in the world--yet your actions, and in many cases, lack of action--has made them ineffective as managers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskan Residents--and that's all that really matters. That and our game resources. This should be the metric for each and every decision you make. Does it help the Alaskan resident--current and future? Your last meeting on the Interior failed in this regard on several fronts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunting Guides and the Guiding Industry and that is fine with the vast majority of ALASKANS.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Continue on the same management path as you have--and that is unacceptable. It is time to put Alaskans first. It is time to think of future Alaskans--specifically, our children. These are our game resources--we expect you to manage them for our benefit and for our children's benefit. The Board of Game--current and past-- has failed to do this, and I reject this as being acceptable.

PROPOSED BY: Jake Sprankle EG043012586

PROPOSAL 168 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits Limit drawing permits to ten percent for nonresidents in Southcentral Region Units as follows:

Nonresidents will only be granted 10% of the hunting permits offered for any big game hunting permit drawing.

ISSUE: In Region II (Southcentral Region) nonresidents will be limited to receiving no more than 10% of the permits issued for any hunt drawing.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The wildlife resources of Alaska belong to the residents of Alaska first and foremost. It is only fair that the bulk of hunting draw permits go to Alaskan residents first and a smaller portion be extended to nonresidents. Extending ten percent of any hunting draw coincides with the percentage extended by other states for hunting permit draws. Without this nonresident limitation, Alaskans who desire to use this resource pay the application fees (which are non-refundable) and consequently get bumped by a nonresident are being denied access to their own resource.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal secures the Alaskan resident as having first priority status for acquiring big game permits through the drawing process.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The Alaskan resident will benefit from this proposal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No others considered.

PROPOSED BY: Terry Marquette EG042812564

PROPOSAL 169 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits. Allocate 90% of drawing permits to residents for Southcentral Region hunts and exclude nonresidents in hunts with less than ten permits as follows:

A minimum of 90% of drawing permits will go to Alaska residents for all species. If a certain Unit has less than 10 permits available nonresidents are not eligible to participate in that drawing.

ISSUE: Drawing permit preference for Alaska residents – All species.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaska needs to put a cap of 10% on nonresident participation in drawing permits. This will put us in line with the other western states that have preferences for their residents which is usually 90% for drawing permits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? An Alaskan preference for drawing permits will improve the quality of the

hunt for resident hunters and give more opportunities to our youth. This will take away a lot of the conflict with sheep, goats, and brown bear where nonresidents are forced to hire a guide.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaskans.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The commercial operators (guides) will complain on sheep, goats, and brown bears but the other western states don't force nonresidents to use a guide for any species. The guides don't support preference points for residents or a high allocation of permits going to resident hunters. The commercial operators are using a resource we all own and residents would like the Board of Game to adopt proposals that reduce conflict in the field between guides and resident hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The Board of Game has been very kind to the guiding industry at the expense of the resident hunter. Nonresident tag fees bring a lot of money to the state and this helps support the Department of Fish and Game. How do other western states survive giving their residents high allocations of game? Other western states require nonresidents to apply for drawing permits (elk, deer, antelope, bear, sheep, goat, moose, cougar, etc.) six to eight months in advance of the season, they have a preference point system, and high tag fees with no guide requirements. They make money to support their programs and give their residents very (usually 90%) high allocations of game. Nonresidents can come to Alaska the day before hunting season and buy a nonresident tag over the counter the day before the season at a fraction of the price other states charge. Why doesn't Alaska manage game for residents and our Department of Fish and Game like other states? If the Board of Game doesn't start showing some preference to residents, Alaskans need to contact the governor and their representatives asking them to confirm board members who put residents as priority #1 or vote for politicians that support a preference for Alaska residents.

PROPOSED BY: Tom Lamal

EG043012581

PROPOSAL 170 - 5 AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep drawing permit hunts. Limit Dall sheep drawing permits to ten percent for nonresidents for the Southcentral Region as follows:

Drawing by permit only with 90% of the permits going to residents and 10% of the permits for nonresidents. The total number of permits for any one given area will not exceed harvest of 40% of the legal rams in the hunting area.

ISSUE: I would like the board's full consideration to consider moving ALL Dall sheep hunting in Region II to drawing permit only, limiting the number of nonresident permits to 10% or less of the total permits allowed for any specific area. The 10% allocation of this state owned resource to nonresidents should be more than adequate and provide a preference for the residents of the state that own the resource.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Several of the problems already exist and are getting worse. The state is not managing the resource to the fullest potential both monetarily

and for trophy quality or age structure to promote better hunting and more funding available to manage. Many areas saturated with guides and nonresident hunters are becoming more and more exclusive for guides to lock down access by threat and air taxis flying in the area trying to keep hunting areas they think they own private. Area conflicts are increasing with hunters and guided nonresident hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, both the resource harvest will improve age structure and quality of the trophies hunted and limit hunter conflicts. Increased management dollars to promote a healthier number of sheep and better understanding of actual sheep numbers by regular census taking.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunter in general will benefit with less user conflicts and improved trophy quality and opportunities. Providing a quoted for both residents and nonresidents should allow for plenty of opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Better planning for all users to apply for a permit would not be considered suffering, just making an adjustment. Guides may feel they are suffering with a limited client base, because now they can do most anything they want.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Limit the amount of nonresident sheep hunters to a simple ten % permit quota of the resource take in each area based on the last ten year harvest average to drawing permit and leaving all current harvest tag only areas still open to residents. I feel the drawing permit system needs more participation to generate additional revenue for the state to improve state wide sheep management.

PROPOSED BY: Doug Lammers EG042912570

PROPOSAL 171 - 5 AAC 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures.
Statewide provisions. Develop a permit allocation formula for second degree of kindred hunters in Units 14C and 15 as follows:

We suggest that nonresident drawing permit hunt success be established on a 75 and up to 25% basis with the up to 25% provided to second degree of kindred hunters for Units 14 and 15.

ISSUE: Second degree of kindred allocation within drawing permit hunts. In many cases where nonresident hunter opportunity has been limited to drawing permit hunts and guide required species, there are very few permits available. Professional hunting guides have to maintain their business overhead and land use authorizations based on the hope that they will have clients who draw a permit. Second degree of kindred drawing permit success is growing. This factor works against a guide business owner whose clients also compete for these permits. We would like the Board of Game to develop an allocation formula that provides for second degree of kindred opportunity but also allows for a guide business owner to have knowledge that there are permits available for guided hunting opportunity.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Second degree of kindred drawing permit success will continue to marginalize or eliminate guide business owners and their contribution to the State of Alaska.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, guided hunting provided a very important part of the rural Alaska economy. Second degree of kindred hunters have a much higher level of no-show which leaves opportunity wasted for other hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Professional guide business owners who need some assurance that they will have a chance for their clients to draw permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some second degree of kindred hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo: does not provide for a viable business plan.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Professional Hunters Association Inc. EG050412640

PROPOSAL 172 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping, 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf, 92.125. Intensive management plans. Prohibit the taking of wolves March through November in the Southcentral Region as follows:

Wolf take is prohibited in all Southcentral Region Units prior to November 1 and after March 1 for the Southcentral Region. That is, wolf take is prohibited between March 1 and November 1.

ISSUE: Currently, state law allows taking of wolves in some Units prior to November 1, while pups remain dependent on their parents. As well, state law in some Units allows taking of wolves after March 1, after mating has usually occurred and while females may be pregnant. The Board of Game should end this practice, as take prior to November 1 and after March 1 can result in substantially higher numbers of wolves lost to the population - pups - than are accounted for in harvest statistics. This unaccounted for loss of pups and breeding adults - which is likely very significant - causes a loss of additional recruitment to the population. As well, wolf hides are not in prime marketable condition prior to November in most areas, and thus taking wolves prior to November constitutes a waste of the resource.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If wolves continue to be taken prior to November 1, while pups remain dependent on parents; or after March 1, when many adult females are pregnant, wolf populations will continue to lose reproductive capacity and recruitment, causing an overall loss of population and erosion of family structure. This is a waste of a valuable resource.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. As stated above, hides of wolves taken prior to November 1 are of lower market value, and this is a clear waste of the resource. As well, the loss

of dependent pups prior to November 1, or unborn pups from females taken after March 1, constitutes a clear and unnecessary loss of recruitment to wolf populations in all Units.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wolf populations, wolf family structure and integrity, viewers of wolves, and science. As well, trappers and hunters will benefit as the proposal will result in an increase in wolf populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Few, if any. The proposal will enhance wolf populations, which would then be more available for harvest by hunters/trappers from November - March.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Rick Steiner

EG043012605

PROPOSAL 173 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping, and 5 AAC 92.125. Intensive management plans. Prohibit snaring of bears in the Southcentral Region.

Snaring of bears, black and grizzly, would be prohibited in the Southcentral Region. The only exceptions would be for state wildlife personnel under specific emergency situations where a bear or bears have become a public nuisance or danger. Even then, it should be used only as a means of relocating the bears.

ISSUE: Snaring of bears, both black and grizzly, is being instituted in various areas of the state either on a public-activity basis or an experimental basis. With the classification of black bears as a furbearer subject to trapping, there is an incentive to take them in large numbers regardless of gender or the presence of dependent offspring. The result for an species with an extremely low reproductive rate is that both the present and the next generation are subject to removal from the population without any real regard to management. Bears caught in snares will be killed and any management changes to that situation would only take place after the damage is done.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? For one thing, wildlife management in Alaska as viewed by both residents and nonresidents, will decline further in credibility and public acceptance. There is no real justification for this method or increased take, a position held by many Alaskans. Yet, it is being proposed by a handful of interested parties who have no reason other than yet another way to kill bears. Bear-baiting, which is repugnant to many, both hunters and non-hunters, gives enough opportunity that snaring is not justified. Too, enforcement by the wildlife division of the Alaska State Troopers is apt to be spotty at best. Presently, we have less than 100 wildlife troopers for the entire state. They are already stretched very thinly in terms of manpower and resources just trying to maintain the hunting/trapping regulations already in effect. To expect them to additionally take on the burden of having to inspect a flood of snaring sites is likely to overwhelm their capabilities and lead to poorly-maintained sites without any real enforcement. Additionally, there are the dangers to hikers and other non-consumers using the land who may come upon a situation where one bear is caught while its siblings or mother remain free in the area, creating the very real possibility of severe injuries or fatalities. The humaneness often touted as a feature of these snares is debatable. For

an animal that has never been restrained to suddenly be unable to move more than a few feet in any direction is very likely to produce a considerable and stressful reaction. As the present proposals allow three days between checking snares, this means any bear caught will be going that entire period without water or food or the ability to protect itself against any other predator. That's assuming the snares are checked according to schedule. Therein again rises the problem of enforcement. Should a sow with cubs be caught, the cubs will be stressed severely by their mother's response. Equally, if a cub is caught, there will be an extremely stressed bear sow roaming the area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? With liberal bear hunting seasons and bag limits, the widespread use of bait-stations, the onslaught against bears in Alaska has been increasing. This is a species with a low reproductive rate yet it has high value as a tourism draw with bears being one of the big three species most often cited as viewing opportunities. Rather than indiscriminate killing of bears, they should be managed with a view towards their vital role in a healthy environment. It is much easier not to create problems at the onset as opposed to trying to repair damage after it has been done.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Viewers of wildlife, both resident and nonresident, will benefit from the opportunities these animals present. In 2008, the entire revenue from hunting/trapping fees and licenses totaled \$124 million while the revenue from tourism was over \$538 million. Additionally, the ethical hunter that believes in fair chase will benefit by not having to deal with snare sites and the attendant problems and dangers thereof. The indiscriminate killing of bears would negatively impact healthy, sustainable bear populations, a situation affecting both hunters and non-hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Remove bears from the furbearer classification. I do not reject this; I heartily endorse it. With snaring in place, the opportunity for a black market in bear gall bladders is greatly enhanced as is the waste of bears. There is not a huge demand for bear pelts and not all bears taken by this method will have suitable pelts. The probability of wastage is high.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Alliance EG042912576

PROPOSAL 174 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping, and 5 AAC 92.125. Predation control areas implementation plans. Prohibit snaring of bears in the Southcentral Region as follows.

Snaring of bears is illegal in the Southcentral Region (Game Management Units 6, 7, 8, 14C, and 15).

ISSUE: The Department of Fish and Game simply does not have the data to insure that bears will not be overharvested by the use of snaring, especially combined with an absence of bag

limits, open seasons, and newly approved methods of take. Bear snaring is controversial and not tolerated by the public as and acceptable method of take. Authorizing a bear trapping season in Alaska, especially in areas bordering National Parks and Preserves is inappropriate and will invariably have a negative impact on bear populations in our National Parks and Preserves as well as present and unacceptable safety risk to the public. Bear snaring in areas of high use is not only dangerous, but is not the best and highest use of this resource. Wildlife viewing is an important part of our state's economy and brings valuable economic development to many communities and businesses around the state. Though touted as safe, humane and effective way to kill bears, we, along with thousands of Alaskans would disagree. Bear snaring has not been legal in Alaska since statehood for many good reasons, including the following:

Safety: Allowing bear snaring stations as close as 1/4 of a mile from residences, roads and trails is anything but responsible and safe. There is no way for the public to know where bear snaring is taking place. The Department of Fish and Game currently does not provide a map or locations where bear snaring bait stations are located, thereby putting the public at risk of inadvertently encountering a free-roaming adult or sibling of a bear caught in a snare as they recreate during the summer.

Humane: The practice of baiting a bear and snaring it is anything but humane. Unless there is someone attending the site (which is not required) and can kill the bear immediately upon capture, we seriously doubt that a bear doesn't suffer as a result of being snared. Indeed, the ADF&G has had to kill several brown bear due to injuries received from struggling to free itself in just a few hours of being caught in a snare in Unit 16. The fair chase ethic that many Alaskans abide by is affronted by the practice of bear snaring. Bears have been, and remain, an iconic species that deserves better treatment than this.

Effective: Bear snares are indiscriminate, allowing the capture of brown bears, sows with cubs and cubs. This method of culling is not only socially unacceptable but is inconsistent with modern wildlife management practices. Bears have a relatively low reproductive rate and the taking of sows with cubs and cubs has been universally discouraged over the years. With the singular focus of the Department of Fish and Game to boost ungulate populations, there is still little evidence that intensive management works over the long term. Many areas where intensive management has been conducted has resulted in reduced twinning rates, reduced growth of calves, increased age of first reproduction, and poor body condition including starvation in extreme situations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It is likely that bears will become a diminished resource as a result of the new policy. More people and pets will be faced with a public safety issue. The tourism industry will suffer. The classification of bears as furbearers is a wasteful and inappropriate use of the resource. Bears could become food-conditioned, thereby creating a potential hazard for people.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, bear snaring is an indiscriminate method of take. A trapper can still harvest a bear under a trapping license by using a firearm and bait station to attract a free roaming bear. Under this method, a trapper can be selective in harvesting the bear

and avoid taking non-target species and cubs or females with cubs. Bear snaring is a wanton waste of our resources.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans and visitors who value wildlife and sound biological management of our wildlife resources, and who want the opportunity to view wildlife in our national and state parks.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer. This practice only promotes waste and disrespect for wildlife.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Reverse the decision to classify black bears as a furbearer.

PROPOSED BY: Valerie Connor EG050212623

PROPOSAL 175 - 5 AAC 85.060 Hunting season and bag limit for coyote. Open a no closed hunting season coyote for with no bag limit for Southcentral Region Units as follows:

Coyote hunting – no closed season; no bag limit.

ISSUE: Standardize hunting regulations in regard to coyote. Make coyote hunting open year round with no closed season or bag limit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Confusion over season.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, reduces predation by coyote.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sheep hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Year round trapping – too many problems.

PROPOSED BY: Steve Flory, Sr. EG050912716
