

Proposal 135

Clarifies whether game taken for certain religious ceremonies is to be used solely within the State of Alaska

- Department: Neutral
- Department Proposal (requesting clarification of intent)

Background

Proposal 135

- The board determined that game taken for cultural and educational purposes must be used solely within the state of Alaska
- It is not clear whether the board intended the same restriction to apply to game taken for certain religious ceremonies
- Sometimes game taken under a cultural and educational permit are subsequently used in religious ceremonies

Background

Proposal 135

- Past staff reports and ethnographic reports have noted use of game harvested in Alaska in traditional religious ceremonies in Canada, and out of state guests at memorial potlatches in Alaska traditionally return home with gifts of moose or caribou meat."

Proposal 135

Clarifies whether game taken for certain religious ceremonies is to be used solely within the State of Alaska

- Department: Neutral
- Department Proposal (requesting clarification of intent)

Proposal 139

This proposal would remove the harvest ticket requirement and require harvest reports for certain non-permit hunts.

- Department: Oppose
- Public Proposal

Background

Proposal 139

The image shows a 'MOOSE HARVEST OVERLAY' form for the 2013-2014 season. The form is divided into several sections. The top section is for personal information, including the hunter's name, address, and contact details. The middle section is for the harvest report, which includes a section for the harvest ticket (M13-XXXXXX-XX) and instructions on how to validate it. The bottom section is for the harvest report itself, which includes a section for the harvest report (M13-XXXXXX-XX) and instructions on how to complete it. The form is annotated with red arrows and text boxes explaining the different sections.

MOOSE HARVEST OVERLAY
2013-2014
EXPIRES JUNE 30, 2014
2013-GMXXX-XXXXXX-XX

MOOSE HARVEST REPORT
NON-TRANSFERABLE
2013-2014
EXPIRES JUNE 30, 2014
2013-GMXXX-XXXXXX-XX

Annotations:

- Red arrow pointing to the top right section: *This portion stays with the vendor and is returned to Fish & Game for hunt administration.*
- Red arrow pointing to the middle section: *Use this number when referencing your harvest report.*
- Red arrow pointing to the bottom section: *Complete this portion in the field if your hunt is successful.*
- Red arrow pointing to the bottom right section: *Complete and return this portion after your hunt. You may also report online at <http://hunt.alaska.gov>*

Comments

Proposal 139

- The harvest ticket is a fundamental component of management
- It is a fundamental tool for enforcement
- No way to verify whether the required report was obtained prior to hunting
- Effort data would be compromised if hunters don't bother to get reports before hunting
- Seasons and bag limits for numerous hunts would have to be restricted to ensure harvest is consistent with sustained yield

Proposal 139

This proposal would remove the harvest ticket requirement and require harvest reports for certain non-permit hunts.

- Department: Oppose
- Public Proposal

Proposal 141

This proposal requires that locking tags be attached to a part of the harvested animal that is required to be salvaged

- Department: Support
- Alaska Wildlife Troopers Proposal

Background

Proposal 141

- Currently, the regulations do not require a hunter to attach a locking tag (where required) to a part of the animal that has to be salvaged
- A hunter could attach the tag to a part of the animal that does not have to be salvaged and leave it in the field
- This would negate the purpose of the locking tag and it would not function as intended

Comments

Proposal 141

- Adding the following language to 5AAC 92.012 would ensure locking tags function as intended
- “(e) : In any hunt where a numbered, non-transferable locking tag is required a person taking big game shall immediately affix the locking tag to the portion of the animal required to be salvaged from the field and the person shall keep the tag affixed until the animal is prepared for storage, consumed or exported.”

Proposal 141

This proposal requires that locking tags be attached to a part of the harvested animal that is required to be salvaged

- Department: Support
- Alaska Wildlife Troopers Proposal

Proposal 142

This proposal seeks to remove the requirement to show any game, or any apparatus designed to be, and capable of being, used to take game to peace officers or department employees.

- Department: Oppose
- Fairbanks AC

Background

Proposal 142

- Currently (5AAC 92.012)
 - (b) Upon request from an employee of the department or a peace officer of the state, a person may not refuse to present for inspection any license, harvest ticket, permit, or tag, any game, or any apparatus designed to be, and capable of being, used to take game.

Comments

Proposal 142

- Current regulations allow enforcement officers to ensure hunters and trappers are following all applicable regulations.
- If adopted, there would be no way to verify compliance with bag and size limits and if legal equipment was used to take game.
- Seasons and bag limits for numerous hunts would have to be restricted to ensure harvest is consistent with sustained yield

Proposal 142

This proposal seeks to remove the requirement to show any game, or any apparatus designed to be, and capable of being, used to take game to peace officers or department employees.

- Department: Oppose
- Fairbanks AC

Proposal 143

This proposal would eliminate the requirement for raw fur shipping permits (5AAC 92.025).

- Department: Neutral
- Fairbanks AC Proposal (Proposal 144 is identical)

Background

Proposal 143

- This regulation was adopted 29 years ago and has not been changed.
- Since then, federal regulations have increased oversight of shipping of furs and other wildlife parts, rendering the raw fur export permit obsolete.
- Sealing requirements and trapper surveys are adequate for management.

Proposal 143

This proposal would eliminate the requirement for raw fur shipping permits (5AAC 92.025).

- Department: Neutral
- Fairbanks AC Proposal

Proposal 144

This proposal also eliminates the requirement for raw fur shipping permits (5AAC 92.025).

- Department: Take no action based on proposal 143
- Department Proposal

Proposal 145

This proposal seeks to increase the number of hunters allowed to apply for party hunts from two to at least three.

- Department: Neutral
- Public Proposal

Background

Proposal 145

- Department administrative procedures have always allowed for a maximum of two people to apply together as a party (not in regulation).
- Each additional party applicant results in a reduction of odds of being drawn
- A large party could take most of the permits from some hunts
- Cost to expand is minimal as long as all hunts have the same limit to party size

Proposal 145

This proposal seeks to increase the number of hunters allowed to apply for party hunts from two to at least three.

- Department: Neutral
- Public Proposal

Proposal 146

Removes the reference to proof of a guide-client contract and guide use area registration at the time of application for drawing hunts

- Department: Support
- Department Proposal

Background

Proposal 146

- Current regulation requires a non-resident to contract with a guide registered for the draw hunt area prior to applying for specific sheep, goat, brown bear, and moose hunts
- The hired guide is supposed to be registered for the GUA with the Dept. of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development at the time of the application and for the draw hunt year
- ADF&G does not have the authority to regulate contracts or guide use areas and has very limited capacity to access this information during the draw
- The currently described requirements and regulation are un-enforceable and therefore ineffective

Proposal 146

Removes the reference to proof of a guide-client contract and guide use area registration at the time of application for drawing hunts

- Department: Support
- Department Proposal

Proposal 81

Establish a nonresident Dall sheep drawing permit hunt for the Tok Management Area in Units 12, 13C, and 20D, with conditions.

- Department: Neutral
- Public Proposal deferred from Region III meeting

Proposal 147

Adoption of this proposal would add five species of birds to the list of animals allowed to be possessed, imported, exported, bought, sold or traded without a permit from the department.

- Department: Neutral
- Public Proposal

Background

Proposal 147

- **Zebra finch *Taeniopygia guttata*** – common pet species, readily breeds in captivity, feral in U.S. and other countries. No conservation concerns in its native range.
- **Society finch *Lonchura striata* var. *domestica*** – common pet species, readily breeds in captivity, feral in U.S. and other countries. No conservation concerns in its native range.
- **Gouldian finch *Erythrura gouldiae*** – common pet species, readily breeds in captivity, feral in U.S. and other countries. Near threatened in wild due to habitat loss. Native to northern Australia.
- **Spice finch *Lonchura punctulata*** – common pet species, readily breeds in captivity, feral in southern U.S. and other countries. No conservation concerns in its native range.
- **Strawberry finch *Amandava amandava*** - common pet species, readily breeds in captivity, large range in the wild. No conservation concerns in its native range.

Evaluation

Proposal 147

- Surviving in the wild in Alaska? Possibly. Some species may be able to survive year round in southern portions of the state.
- Capable of causing genetic alteration of a species indigenous to Alaska? Unknown for all requested species.
- Capable of causing a significant reduction in the population of a species indigenous to Alaska? Unknown; probably not a significant concern.
- Capable of transmitting a disease? Unknown; the risk of disease is probably similar to other pets and domestic fowl.
- Present other threats to the health or population of a species indigenous to Alaska? Unknown;

Comments

Proposal 147

- Common captive-bred pet species in Lower 48 and Canada
- Likely imported to Alaska with immigrating families
- Previous proposal denied because it did not name specific species

Proposal 147

Adoption of this proposal would add five species of birds to the list of animals allowed to be possessed, imported, exported, bought, sold or traded without a permit from the department.

- Department: Neutral
- Public Proposal

Proposal 148

Adoption of this proposal would add the genus *Phodopus* to the list of animals allowed to be possessed, imported, exported, bought, sold or traded without a permit from the department.

- Department: Neutral
- Public Proposal

Background

Proposal148

- This proposal would add all species of the genus *Phodopus* to the “clean list”.
- Campbell’s dwarf hamster (*P. campbelli*),
- Djungarian hamster (*P. sungorus*),
- Roborovski hamster (*P. roborovskii*)
- Wild populations inhabit mountainous forests, steppes, and semi-deserts of Mongolia and adjacent areas of China, northeast Kazakhstan, and the southern part of the West Siberian lowlands

Evaluation

Proposal148

- Capable of surviving in the wild in Alaska? Possibly. They are tolerant of extreme weather in their native habitats.
- Capable of causing genetic alteration of a species indigenous to Alaska? Unknown for the requested genus.
- Capable of causing a significant reduction in the population of a species indigenous to Alaska? Unknown. They could possibly compete with voles or other small mammal species for resources.
- Capable of transmitting a disease to a species indigenous to Alaska? Unknown; the risk of disease is probably similar to other domestic small animals.
- Otherwise present a threat to the health or population of a species indigenous to Alaska? Unknown

Comments

Proposal148

- Recommend adopting all three species individually rather than the genus.
- Golden hamsters (*Mesocricetus auratus*) are currently on the “clean list”, but are now listed as vulnerable by the International Union for Conservation of Nature
- The proposed hamsters are very common pets
- Likely imported to Alaska with immigrating families

Proposal 149

This proposal clarifies when *Muridae* rodents are allowed as pets, and when an emergency permit may be issued to allow un-caged rodents to enter the state due to extreme circumstances.

- Department: Neutral

Background

Proposal 149

- Regulation 5 AAC 92.141(a) prohibits harboring or transporting all live *Muridae* rodents
- It conflicts with regulation 5 AAC 92.029(b), which allows some *Muridae* rodent species on the clean list
- The conflict results in confusion for pet owners and dealers, law enforcement agencies, and shippers—including airlines and the Alaska Marine Highway System
- Regulation 5 AAC 92.141 also lacks a provision authorizing the commissioner to issue a permit to import, harbor, or transport live un-caged *Muridae* rodents (for example seizure of the vessel *Bangun Perkasa*).

Comments

Proposal 149

- The proposed language in RC will de-conflict and clarify regulations 5AAC 92.141(a) and 5AAC 92.029(b)

Proposal 149

This proposal clarifies when *Muridae* rodents are allowed as pets, and when an emergency permit may be issued to allow un-caged rodents to enter the state due to extreme circumstances.

- Department: Support
- Department Proposal

Proposal 150

This proposal clarifies that it is illegal to advertise wolves for sale. (Advertising is currently prohibited for wolf hybrids)

- Department: Support
- Alaska Wildlife Troopers

Background

Proposal 150

- 5 AAC 92.030 prohibits transporting, selling, advertising or otherwise offering for sale, purchasing, or offering to purchase a wolf hybrid.
- 5 AAC 92.029 already prohibits possession, importation, release, exportation, or assisting in importing, releasing, or exporting, live game
- It is unclear whether a wolf can be advertised for sale.

Proposal 150

This proposal clarifies that it is illegal to advertise wolves for sale

- Department: Support
- Alaska Wildlife Troopers

Proposal 156

Seeks to modify the definition of processed for human consumption to address meat spoilage and waste.

- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by public

Background

Proposal 156

- Current 5 AAC 92.990(54) "processed for human consumption" means prepared for immediate consumption or prepared in such a manner, and in an existing state of preservation, as to be fit for human consumption after a 15-day period;
- Proposed 5 AAC 92.990(54) "processed for human consumption" means prepared for immediate consumption or [PREPARED] preserved in such a manner, [AND IN AN EXISTING STATE OF PRESERVATION], to prevent edible meat from spoiling, rotting or going to waste, as to be fit for human consumption after a [15] day period.

Proposal 156

Seeks to modify the definition of processed for human consumption to address meat spoilage and waste.

- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by public

Proposal 157

Seeks to modify the definition of salvage by providing the instructions on how to prevent meat spoilage. It is unclear if the proposal seeks to require all edible meat to be preserved, rather than eaten fresh.

- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by public

Background

Proposal 157

- Current 5 AAC 92.990(49) "salvage" means to transport the edible meat, heart, liver, kidneys, head, skull, or hide, as required by statute or regulation, of a game animal or wild fowl to the location where the edible meat, heart, liver, or kidneys, will be consumed by humans or processed for human consumption in order to save or prevent the edible meat, heart, liver, or kidneys, from waste, and the head, skull or hide will be put to human use;
- Proposed 5 AAC 92.990(49) "salvage" means to transport **in as cool a temperature, as quickly as possible and protected from any heat source** the **freshly killed** edible meat, skull, or hide, as required by statute or regulation, of a game animal or wild fowl to the location where the edible meat will be [CONSUMED BY HUMANS OR] processed for human consumption in order to [SAVE] **preserve** or prevent the edible meat from **spoiling, rotting or going to** waste, **until consumed by humans,** and the skull or hide will be put to human use;

Proposal 157

Seeks to modify the definition of salvage by providing the instructions on how to prevent meat spoilage. It is unclear if the proposal seeks to require all edible meat to be preserved, rather than eaten fresh.

- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by public

Proposals 158, 160, 161

Identical proposals that seek to align the definition of edible meat of a brown bear with that of a black bear

- Department: SUPPORTS the reduced complexity of the regulations and is NEUTRAL regarding specific salvage requirements.
- 158, 161 proposed by public
- 160 is a Department proposal

Background

Proposals 158, 160, 161

- Currently the edible meat of a brown bear is aligned with that of big game ungulates, while the edible meat of a black bear is defined separately.
- These proposals seek to align the edible meat of a brown bear with that of a black bear.
- Adoption of any of these proposals will help clear confusion regarding what is required to be salvaged, depending on which type of bear is harvested.

Proposals 158, 160, 161

Identical proposals that seek to align the definition of edible meat of a brown bear with that of a black bear

- Department: SUPPORTS the reduced complexity of the regulations and is NEUTRAL regarding specific salvage requirements.
- 158, 161 proposed by public
- 160 is a Department proposal

Proposals 159, 56, 57, 58

These proposals seek to remove the meat salvage requirement for brown bears taken over bait.

- Department: Neutral
- proposed by public

Background

Proposals 159, 56, 57, 58

- In areas where brown bears are allowed to be harvested at bait stations, hunters are required to salvage the edible meat of those brown bears.
- The only other time hunters are required to salvage the edible meat of a brown bear is under the conditions of a subsistence registration permit.

Background

Proposals 159, 56, 57, 58

- Brown bears are allowed to be harvested at bait sites in Units 7, 12, 13D, 15, 16 (during the spring season only), 20C, 20E, and 21D.
- February 2014 meeting in Fairbanks the board added Units 20A, 20B, 24C, 24D, and 25D (effective July 1, 2014).

Proposals 159, 56, 57, 58

These proposals seek to remove the meat salvage requirement for brown bears taken over bait.

- Department: Neutral
- proposed by public

Proposal 162

Clarifies brown bears can be taken over bait under the conditions of a permit issued under 5 AAC 92.044.

- Department: Supports
- Department Proposal (requesting clarification of regulations)

Background

Proposal 162

- In 2012 the Board allowed the take of brown bears at bait stations but did not change 5 AAC 92.230 to allow those practices.
- As a result 5 AAC 92.044 and 5 AAC 92.230 are in conflict.
- Adoption of this proposal will clarify brown bears can be taken over bait under the conditions of a permit issued under 5 AAC 92.044.

Proposal 162

Clarifies brown bears can be taken over bait under the conditions of a permit issued under 5 AAC 92.044

- Department: Supports
- Department Proposal (requesting clarification of regulations)

Proposal 163

Seeks to allow the use, as bait, of the meat and bones of bears not required to be salvaged.

- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by public

Background

Proposal 163

- Legally taken game that are not required to be salvaged as edible meat can be used as bait if removed from the kill site.
- Adoption of this proposal will have no effect because what the proposal asks for is currently allowed.
- 5 AAC 92.210 Game as animal food or bait
and
- 5 AAC 92.990(4) definition of bait.

Proposal 163

Seeks to allow the use, as bait, of the meat and bones of bears not required to be salvaged.

- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by public

Proposal 164

This proposal would require the department to produce an annual report compiling all information concerning each predation control area in the state.

- Department: Neutral
- Public Proposal

Background

Proposal 164

- 1) define the goal and justification for predator
- 2) identify the annual financial cost of predator management/predator control for each area
- 3) include a quantitative assessment of the scale of reduction in predator numbers and increases in prey numbers by species;

Background

Proposal 164

- 4) include a cost/benefit analysis:
- 5) include, for each area, how well the program ensured that predators, as well as prey, were being maintained on a sustained yield basis; and
- 6) state the cumulative effects of predator control on the predators in the subject unit/subunit/management area and any change in the means and methods of hunting/trapping.

Comments

Proposal 164

- The department already produces interim (August) and Annual (January-March) IM reports to the board.
- The reports contain all of the requested information (including costs) except a cost-benefit analysis
- Cost-benefit analyses would be premature at this point
- Cost-benefit analyses require expertise that we do not have.

Proposal 164

This proposal would require the department to produce an annual report compiling all information concerning each predation control area in the state.

- Department: Neutral
- Public Proposal

Proposal 165

Seeks to remove unnecessary black bear regulations in predator control areas.

- Department: SUPPORTS
- Department Proposal (requesting removal of unnecessary regulations)

Background

Proposal 165

- Removes 2 pieces of 5 AAC 92.116.
 - 5 AAC 92.116(a)(1) is now allowed under general hunting regulations (covered by 5 AAC 92.200).
 - 5 AAC 92.116(a)(2) is now allowed under general hunting regulations (covered by 5 AAC 92.044).

Proposal 165

Seeks to remove unnecessary black bear regulations in predator control areas.

- Department: SUPPORTS
- Department Proposal (requesting removal of unnecessary regulations)

Proposal 180

Seeks to prohibit the use of remote controlled airborne devices for taking game.

- Department: SUPPORTS
- Board proposal

Background

Proposal 180

- Regulations need to be updated periodically to keep up with increasingly available technology in the attempt to promote fair chase hunting practices.
- If this issue is not addressed there is the potential for overharvest due to the advantage the technology provides.
- Current regulations prohibiting the take of game the same day the hunter has been airborne do not cover the use of remote controlled airborne devices.

Proposal 180

Seeks to prohibit the use of remote controlled airborne devices for taking game.

- Department: SUPPORTS
- Board proposal

Proposal 177

Allow the use of snow machines in Unit 23 to track and pursue caribou, wolves and wolverines

- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by Board of Game at the request of the Kotzebue Advisory Committee

Background

Proposal 177

- Illegal to drive, herd, harass, or molest game with any motorized vehicle including snow machines statewide
- Exceptions: (position hunter)
 1. Units 22 and 23-caribou
 2. Units 9, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25C and 25D excluding some federal lands-wolves and bears

Background

Proposal 177

- Harass means to repeatedly approach an animal in a manner which results in the animal altering its behavior
- Cause and effect-snowmachine approaches, animal alters behavior, violation occurs

Proposal 177

Allow the use of snow machines in Unit 23 to track and pursue caribou, wolves and wolverines

- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by Board of Game at the request of the Kotzebue Advisory Committee

Proposal 133

- Require an International Bowhunter Education Program (IBEP) or equivalent certification to hunt big game with a bow and arrow in Alaska.
- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by public

Background

Proposal 133

- An IBEP or equivalent certification is required for
 1. big game, weapons-restricted hunt
 2. Apply for archery only drawing hunts
 3. black bears, over bait in Units 7 and 14-16.
- Can use archery without IBEP in hunt areas open to all weapon types.
- Proposal would establish requirements for archery which are not required for other methods.

Background

Proposal 133

- In 1987, IBEP course and proficiency test, required.
- Success rates improved and wounding loss decreased.
- IBEP courses are currently available in all areas of the state.
- Online Bowhunter Course has about 150 active instructors

Proposal 133

- The proposal seeks to require an International Bowhunter Education Program (IBEP) or equivalent certification to hunt big game with a bow and arrow in Alaska.
- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by public

Proposal 134

- Align regulations for all bears taken over bait by archery
- Department: Support
- Proposed by Department of Fish and Game

Background

Proposal 134

- An IBEP or equivalent is required for black bears over bait in Units 7 and 14-16.
- No IBEP for brown bears over bait

Comments

Proposal 134

1. Remove the IBEP requirement for taking bears over bait with a bow.
2. Align the requirements for brown bear with the current requirements for black bear (Units 7 and 14-16).
3. Require IBEP certification statewide for taking of both black and brown bears over bait with a bow and arrow.

Proposal 134

- Align regulations for all bears taken over bait by archery
- Department: Support
- Proposed by Department of Fish and Game

Proposal 112

Create a youth drawing permit hunt for antlerless moose in Unit 20B

- Department: Neutral
- Department Proposal at Board request

Background

Proposal 112

- 2001-legislature modifies AS 16.05.255
- 2002-Unit 20B moose, 20D-BRYHMA moose
- 2004-Unit 20B moose hunt repealed
- 2011-Unit 14A drawing hunt for moose
- 2011-Unit 8, Kodiak general season for deer
- 2013-Unit 5, Yakutat general season for deer
- 2013-Fortymile drawing hunt for caribou
- 2013-Unit 16B for moose

Background

Proposal 112

Statute requirements

- Big game, except muskox and bison
- Before school and other hunting seasons
- Shared bag limit
- Age 8-17
- Both resident and nonresident youth allowed
- Accompanied by adult
 1. Resident youth-resident adult 21+
 2. Nonresident youth-resident adult 21+, parent or legal guardian

Background

Proposal 112

- 2002 Unit 20B hunt repealed-only one in compliance
- Other hunts required creation of special management areas to capture requirements.
- Recent new hunts reviewed
- New definitions to clean up hunts, eliminate management areas, closer compliance

Background

Proposal 112

- 2012 Region III, the Board encouraged the department to identify hunting opportunities for youth in the Interior.
- Unit 20B-new hunt Feb. 2014, deferred statewide components
- Adoption of definition, bag limit language and hunter education component
- Allow the elimination of management areas

Proposal 112

Create a youth only drawing hunt for moose in Unit 20B.

- Department: Neutral
- Department Proposal

Proposal 166

Seeks to create a definition of transporter that covers all persons that assist hunters for compensation.

- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by public.

Background

Proposal 166

- Transportation for big game hunters is under the authority of the Big Game Commercial Services Board which has an existing definition of transporter
 - This leaves the Board of Game with the authority to adopt this definition for small game and waterfowl only.

Proposal 166

Seeks to create a definition of transporter that covers all persons that assist hunters for compensation.

- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by public.

Proposal 167

Establish a definition for “guide” and “assistant guide”.

- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by public

Background

Proposal 167

- Define guide, assistant guide, registered guide, big game guide, waterfowl guide etc. to avoid confusion in regulations
- Proposed definition: Guide and assistant guide means those present, assisting or directing during the hunting activity for compensation that are not a paying client.
- No definition for guide or assistant guide for small game
- Reference Title 8 statutes that address guide and assistant guide licenses and the definition of "guide." (BGCSB)

Background

Proposal 167

(3) "big game hunting services" means a service for which the provider of the service must obtain a registered guide-outfitter, class-A assistant guide, or assistant guide license; "big game hunting service" includes guiding services and outfitting services;

(9) "guide" means to provide, for compensation or with the intent or with an agreement to receive compensation, services, equipment, or facilities to a big game hunter in the field by a person who accompanies or is present with the big game hunter in the field either personally or through an assistant, in this paragraph, "services" includes

(A) contracting to guide or outfit big game hunts;

(B) stalking, pursuing, tracking, killing, or attempting to kill big game;

(C) packing, preparing, salvaging, or caring for meat, except that which is required to properly and safely load the meat on the mode of transportation being used by a transporter;

(D) field preparation of trophies, including skinning and caping;

(E) selling, leasing, or renting goods when the transaction occurs in the field;

(F) using guiding or outfitting equipment, including spotting scopes and firearms, for the benefit of a hunter; an

(G) providing camping or hunting equipment or supplies that are already located in the field;

(11) "outfit" means to provide, for compensation or with the intent to receive compensation, services, supplies, or facilities, excluding the provision of accommodations by a person described in AS 08.54.785, to a big game hunter in the field, by a person who neither accompanies nor is present with the big game hunter in the field either personally or by an assistant;

Background

Proposal 167

- 5 AAC 92.013. Migratory bird hunting guide services.
- ...
- (c) For purposes of this section,
 - (1) "migratory bird hunting guide" means a person who provides migratory bird hunting guide services;
 - (2) "migratory bird hunting guide services" means to assist, for compensation or with the intent to receive compensation, a migratory bird hunter to take or attempt to take migratory birds by accompanying or personally directing the hunter in migratory bird hunting activities;
 - (3) "person" includes a business entity.

Proposal 167

Establish a definition for “guide” and “assistant guide”.

- Department: Neutral
- Public Proposal

Proposal 168

Definition of “brow palm”

- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by Alaska Wildlife Troopers

Background

Proposal 168

Brow palm referenced but not defined.

- “brow tine” means a tine emerging from the first branch or **brow palm** on the main beam of a moose antler; the **brow palm** is separated from the main palm by a wide bay; a tine originating in or after this bay is not a brow tine;

Background

Proposal 168

- Difficult to determine end of brow palm and beginning of main palm
- Difficult to define brow tines in those cases.
- Struggle to develop an improved definition for first branch or brow palm.

Proposal 168

Definition of "brow palm"

- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by Alaska Wildlife Troopers

Proposal 169

Establish a definition for “broken” in reference to full-curl sheep horns

- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by Alaska Wildlife Troopers

Background

Proposal 169

"full-curl horn" of a male (ram) Dall sheep means that

- ...
- (B) both horns are broken, or
- ...
- "broken" is not defined in regulation
- Common definition-separated into parts or pieces by being hit, damaged, etc.
- Definitions-specific enough for hunters and AWT

Background

Proposal 169

- 727–812 sheep were sealed annually from 2009–2012.
- 6–8 legal due to “both horns broken.”
- Could consider eliminating sheep with both horns broken as legal animals in hunts with horn restrictions.

Proposal 169

Establish a definition for “broken” in reference to full-curl sheep horns

- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by Alaska Wildlife Troopers

Proposal 170

- Modify the definition of “full-curl horn” to aid in determining if a sheep is legal.
- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by public

Background

Proposal 170

- Provide additional method of judging full-curl in field
- Fewer sublegal rams will be harvested
- More understandable and enforceable regulation

"full-curl horn" of a male (ram) Dall sheep means that

- (A) the tip of at least one horn has grown through
 1. 360 degrees of a circle described by the outer surface of the horn, as viewed from the side, or
 2. the plane of the bridge of the nose, as viewed from the side, and determined using the Department of Fish and Game's standardized "sheep horn jig"; or
- (B) both horns are broken, or
- (C) the sheep is a least eight years of age as determined by horn growth annuli;

Background

Proposal 170

- Substantially increase the proportion of legal sheep for harvest
- Reduce the number of large rams surviving to rut.
- Potential for shortened seasons/restrictions
- Future proposals related to hunter preferences for sheep seasons and bag limits.

Proposal 170

Modify the definition of “full-curl horn” to aid in determining if a sheep is legal.

- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by public

Proposal 171

Add provision to the definition of “full curl horn”

- all sheep harvest would be legal until
 1. department modified method of determining full curl, and
 2. method documented and widely available
- Department: Oppose
- Proposed by public

Background

Proposal 171

Add new section to definition making all rams legal until standardized procedure has been developed and documented.

"full-curl horn" of a male (ram) Dall sheep means that

- ...
- (D) any ram is legal until the Alaska Department of Fish and Game has a specific, repeatable method that all state employees are mandated to use to determine if a set of sheep horns is legal or sublegal. Also, this method will be in writing with graphics included and this paper will be available at all times to the public from any Alaska Department of Fish and Game office that seals sheep horns, and available on the Department website.

Background

Proposal 171

- Bag limit would be one ram until the department modifies method of determining full curl.
- Harvest under current seasons would not be sustainable.
- “Any ram” hunts provide opportunity for hunters uncomfortable judging full curl
- Department and law enforcement officials continue to address this issue
- No better methods have been developed.

Proposal 171

Add provision to the definition of “full curl horn”

- all sheep harvest would be legal until
 1. department modified method of determining full curl, and
 2. method documented and widely available
- Department: Oppose
- Proposed by public

Proposal 172

Remove black bears from classification as a furbearer.

- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by Alaska Wildlife Alliance

Background

Proposal 172

- Black bears were classified as furbearers in March of 2010. No trapping bag limits and no trapping seasons have been established anywhere in the state for black bears.
- There will be no change to the harvest of black bears by adopting this proposal because trapping seasons have not been established for black bears.
- Eliminating black bears as furbearers will not prohibit snaring in predator control areas because the provision for allowing bears to be snared is contained within the predator control plans.

Proposal 172

- Remove black bears from classification as a furbearer.
- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by Alaska Wildlife Alliance

Proposal 173

Modifies the definition of bag limit and defines mortally wounded.

- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by the Alaska Bowhunters' Association

Background

Proposal 173

Change the definition of bag limit to specifically exclude the word "take" because the definition of "take" is very broad.

- bag limit means the maximum number of animals of any one game species a person may **harvest (kill and reduce to his possession)** [TAKE] in a unit or portion of a unit in which the taking occurs; an animal disturbed in the course of legal hunting does not count toward a bag limit. **Animals known to be mortally wounded and lost may count against the bag limit for certain species and in certain units.**"

Background

Proposal 173

- 2004-an animal disturbed in the course of legal hunting does not count toward a bag limit. Phrase added in response to similar proposal.
- AS 16.05.940(34), "take" means taking, pursuing, hunting, fishing, trapping, or in any manner disturbing, capturing, or killing or attempting to take, pursue, hunt, fish, trap, or in any manner capture or kill fish or game

Background

Proposal 173

- Define “mortally wounded” to mean “an animal struck with a hunting projectile which dies as a direct result of being struck with the hunting projectile.”
- Current definition in bag limit section:
“wounded” means there is sign of blood or other sign that the animal has been hit by a hunting projectile.

Background

Proposal 173

- Wounded animals are counted as the bag limit in:
- Units 1-5 and 8, a wounded black or brown bear counts against the person's bag limit for the remainder of the regulatory year;
- In Unit 8, a wounded elk counts against the person's bag limit for the remainder of the regulatory year.
- In the rest of the state, hunters are strongly encouraged to make every reasonable effort to retrieve and salvage wounded game.

Proposal 173

Modifies the definition of bag limit and defines mortally wounded.

- Department: Neutral
- Proposed by the Alaska Bowhunters' Association

Proposal 174

This proposal would allow nonresident falconers to capture raptors and export them to their state of residence.

- Department: Neutral
- American Falconry Conservancy

Background

Proposal 174

- This proposal has been before the board several times
- It was last before the board in 2012 where RC132 was generated
- Various falconry groups, individuals and ACs have weighed in on this issue
- We have put together a permit program that addresses as many concerns as possible and simplifies the process as much as possible

Permit Conditions

Proposal 174

- Take is limited to nonresidents who are U.S. citizens.
- The bag limit is one raptor per year.
- A valid, Alaska nonresident hunting license is required for the year when the take will occur.
- Total nonresident take is limited to up to seven (7) birds annually.
- A randomized registration system will be used to determine permit winners if the number of applicants exceeds the number of permits available.

Permit Conditions

Proposal 174

- Take is limited to passage raptors.
- The season is from 15 August – 31 October.
- Each successful applicant must notify the department of the location and species they will attempt to take.
- The department shall specify other permit conditions to be consistent with the federal falconry framework and Alaska Falconry Manual, and export requirements.
- The department shall adopt additional permit conditions necessary to operate this program, including but not limited to reporting requirements, presentation of permits from the falconer's state of residence, closed areas, and restrictions on the use of lure birds per the clean list.

Proposal 174

This proposal would allow nonresident falconers to capture raptors and export them to their state of residence.

- Department: Neutral
- American Falconry Conservancy