

ACR #3 – Eliminate harvest tickets in all hunts that require a locking tag and create mandatory reporting requirements.

SUBMITTED BY: Aaron Bloomquist

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.

5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets and reports

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM.

Hunters are being burdened by citations and other expenses due to an antiquated and very poorly managed harvest ticket system. Hunters from other states are not used to needing three items (license, tag and harvest ticket), especially when they have spent hundreds of dollars on their tags. Hundreds of these hunters show up each year without harvest tickets. Many get to the field and are either cited or need to spend hundreds or thousands of dollars to fly back and get the proper FREE harvest ticket. Resident and nonresident hunters are constantly getting the wrong year's harvest tickets because ADF&G does not keep up with what is available on their website. As of the writing of this proposal on 4/13/2022 the only moose, caribou and sheep tags available on the ADF&G website are for LAST year. Anyone that got their harvest tickets already online have non-valid tickets! This is certainly hundreds of people.

WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER?

Eliminate all harvest tickets in all hunts that require a locking tag and replace them with required online reporting after the hunt. Failure to notch a harvest ticket, forgetting/not knowing to get a harvest ticket, and having the wrong harvest ticket are the most common infractions cited by Alaska Wildlife Troopers. Most of these are simply unnecessary and simple oversight by the hunters. A harvest ticket is 100% redundant and unnecessary when a locking tag is required to be affixed to the animal. I would prefer the other ACR to get rid of all of them but this is a compromise.

STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

Both #1 & #2 apply. There is another point that is valid and that is that these are costing public individuals hundreds of dollars each in fines, and other expenses to remedy the situations so they do not get fined. These people are not idiots. I have been around many extremely successful individuals that have made these mistakes.

- 1) To correct an error in regulation.**
- 2) These situations were not anticipated when ADF&G went to online harvest tickets and licensing. ADF&G has promised to remedy the situation through several years and have not due to internal department power struggles.
- 3) To correct an effect of a regulation that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted.**

See above

- 4) Does the request identify a biological concern for the population or a threat to meeting objectives for the population?
- 5) Does the request identify an unforeseen, unexpected event or effect that would otherwise restrict or reduce a reasonable opportunity for customary and traditional wildlife uses, as defined in AS 16.05.258(f)?
- 6) Does the request identify an unforeseen, unexpected resource situation where a biologically allowable resource harvest would be precluded by delayed regulatory action and such delay would be significantly burdensome because the resource would be unavailable in the future?

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE?

STATE WHY YOUR ACR IS NOT PREDOMINANTLY ALLOCATIVE.

IF THIS REQUEST IS ALLOCATIVE, STATE THE NEW INFORMATION THAT COMPELS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER AN ALLOCATIVE PROPOSAL OUTSIDE OF THE REGULAR CYCLE.

STATE YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISSUE THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS ACR.

STATE WHETHER THIS ACR HAS BEEN CONSIDERED BEFORE, EITHER AS A PROPOSAL OR AS AN ACR, AND IF SO, DURING WHICH BOARD OF GAME MEETING.