Log #	Advisory Committee
AC01	Stony Holitna
AC02	Anchorage
AC03	Edna Bay
AC04	Matanuska Valley
AC05	Upper Lynn Canal
AC06	Juneau-Douglas
AC07	Kenai/Soldotna
AC08	Craig
AC09	Tok Cutoff / Nabesna Road
AC10	Sitka
AC11	Homer
AC12	GASH
AC13	Middle Yukon
AC14	McGrath
AC15	Susitna Valley
AC16	Seward
AC17	Upper Tanana Fourtymile
AC18	Central Peninsula
AC19	Cooper Landing
AC20	Unalaska / Dutch Harbor
AC21	Copper Basin
AC22	Delta
AC23	Eagle
AC24	Minto - Nenana
AC25	Fairbanks
AC26	Nushagak
AC27	Kodiak
AC28	Wrangell

Stony Holitna Fish & Game Advisory Committee
Comments on Proposals
Board of Game Statewide Meeting
Winter, 2012

SHAC members were most vocal in support of Proposals 107 & 131,
and in opposition to Proposals 48, 49, 92, 93, 94,97, 108, 113, 126, & 127.

Proposal 48 – Oppose unanimously. The state law allows sale of black bear parts. If the federal govt. wants any policy prohibited on park land, it can usurp state authority over fish and game in Alaska once again. The NPCA should be talking to the feds rather than wasting the time of the Alaska BOG.

Proposal 49 – Oppose unanimously. This would give invasive authority over taxidermists similar to federal authority over Federal Firearms License holders. It is unnecessary, and creates another ream of paperwork for the taxidermist. Under present regulation, the Dept. of Public Safety already has "unobstructed access" to the records of licensed taxidermy businesses.

Proposal 51 – Oppose unanimously. SHAC opposes this because it is a discretionary regulation that is micro management.

Proposal 52 – Support unanimously because of the reasons given under"Issues."

Proposal 92 – Oppose unanimously. Most trappers are hunting as well as trapping when traveling on their lines. There is no reason a trapper can't take a moose, caribou, beaver, wolf, wolverine, or any other animal if the season is open, and he has a license. Whether it's a spruce chicken, ungulate, canine, furbearer, big game or small game, should not matter. This is "Science **NOT**!"

Proposal 93 –Oppose unanimously, for the same reasons as are given for **Proposals 48 and 92.**

Proposal 94 – Oppose unanimously. These predators take a toll on all sorts of birds and their eggs, including waterfowl and grouse. They compete with man, as well as each other. Wolverine is the only specie of the four that can't easily overpopulate an area very quickly. In **Proposal 92,** NPCA has already demonstrated that it hasn't a care for trappers in the field – under "Who is likely to benefit?," they voice concern for the trappers' livelihood. This is also opposed for the same reasons as are given in **Proposal 48.**

Proposal 95 – Support unanimously. There are very few falconers in Alaska, and SHAC sees no reason not to provide the opportunity for these folks to pursue small game using this method.

Proposal 96 – Support unanimously. SHAC supports this method of hunting. Some areas are restricted to hunting with shotguns near more populated areas for safety issues, due to the decreased range compared to rifles. The same thing is true of bows.

Proposal 97 - Oppose unanimously. This proposal says someone might break the law using artificial light. Someone might break the law without it too. It's silly. **Proposal 48** comments apply also.

Proposal 98 – Oppose unanimously. The wording of this proposal covers all electronics. A hunter would be barred from having an animal call, GPS, satellite phone, hearing enhancer, remote cameras, etc. How Marvin hunts is his own choice. Why does he feel the need to force others?

Proposal 99 – Oppose unanimously. Would support if amended to be only for transport by airplane.

Proposal 100 – Support unanimously. Coyotes are prolific, and destroy small game populations, while competing with other species wherever they are found

Proposal 101 – Support unanimously, for the same reasons listed in **Proposal 100.**

Proposals 102, 103, & 104 – Support unanimously. The reasons given in these proposals are similar. The risks are not worth the benefits.

Proposal 107 – Support unanimously. Ungulate calf survival rate is low in many areas of Alaska, and black bears are a major user group.
Bag limits differ for other species differ according to population of that species in any given GMU. It should be no different for black bears.

Proposal 108 – Oppose unanimously. For reasons given in comments above – **Proposal 48 -** This is a Fed problem – why should the state join in their nonsense. **The proposer does give a good reason to allow harvest rather than prohibit – "to increase harvest opportunities for moose and caribou"**

Proposal 109 – Oppose unanimously, for the same reasons given in **Proposal 107.**

Proposal 110 – Oppose unanimously. This is a statewide meeting. As the proposers point out under "Issue," "Southeast Alaska has unique issues pertaining to black bear hunting" They should address these issues at the Regional meeting.

Proposal 112 – Support unanimously. Identifying an animals sex through DNA makes the evidence of sex regulation unneeded and obsolete.

Proposal 113 – Support unanimously. The rationale for this proposal is explained well under the "Issue" & "What will happen if nothing is done?"sections. It couldn't be more clear or simple.

Proposal 114 - Support unanimously for all the reasons given.

Proposal 115 – Support unanimously for the reasons given.

Proposal 116 – Support unanimously for the reasons given. "Issue," &"What will happen if nothing is done?" explain it all.

Proposal 117 – Support unanimously. There is no compelling reason for a resident hunting black bear to need a guide present.

Proposal 118 – Oppose unanimously. Not statewide. If this policy is needed or wanted in Southeast – present it at the regional meeting.

Proposal 119 – Support unanimously, for the reasons given.

Proposal 120 – Support unanimously, for the reasons given. No need for a pred. control permit in a predator control area.

Proposal 121 – Oppose unanimously, for the same reasons given for other proposals by the NPCA. Tell it to the Feds, not the state

Proposal 122 – Support unanimously for the reasons given.

Proposal 123 – Support unanimously for the reasons given.

Proposal 124, 125, 126 - Oppose unanimously for the same reasons given in comments on other NPCA proposals.

Proposal 127 – Oppose unanimously because SHAC read the proposal, and it's nonsense. There is no valid reason to adopt, and every reason not to.

Proposal 128 – Support unanimously This proposal makes sense, and limits the # of mistakes forgiven.

Proposal 129 – support unanimously. The ADF&G commissioner should have the ability to act in protection of he public welfare and to protect wildlife populations without fear of a lawsuit.

Proposal 130 – Support unanimously ADF&G wants the muskox population protected.

Proposal 131 – Support unanimously & strongly. The wolf population in 19A has been reduced and the habitat will support large stocks as there were in past years. Both black and brown bear populations are high, and calf survival rate has been low.

Proposal 132 – Support for the reasons given. In the past ACRs have been used to present a proposal for one region at a different regional BOG meeting. Sometimes the issue had just been voted on, and then it has been given a new number, traveled to another part of the state for a different regional meeting, and passed.

Anchorage Fish & Game Advisory Committee

Comments to the ALASKA BOARD OF GAME re: Statewide Regulations January 13-18, 2012

On December 6, 2011 the Anchorage Fish & Game Advisory Committee conducted their monthly meeting. At this meeting 11 members were present to review the following proposals.

Falconry, Other Permits

Proposal 38 Action: Support 11- Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Modify the falconry regulations and the Alaska Falconry Manual to meet the federal standards for certification by the USF&WS.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 39 Action: Support 11 - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Modify the state falconry regulations and the Alaska Falconry Manual to comply with new federal falconry standards.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 40 Action: Support 9 - Support 2 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Allow nonresident falconers to capture raptors in Alaska.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal. Two oppose because there doesn't appear to be a need for additional harvest.

Proposal 41 Action: Support 11 - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Review the regulation for permits to take game for cultural purposes.
Discussion: Agree with review.

Proposal 42 Action: Support 11 - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Modify the ADF&G authority for issuing public safety permits.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 43 **Action:** Support **9 - Support 1 - Oppose 1 - Abstain**
Description: Review and modify nuisance beaver permits to allow beaver flow devices.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 44 **Action:** Oppose **2** - Support 7 - Oppose 2 - Abstain
Description: Modify the ADF&G discretionary authority for Governor's tags.
Discussion: Members agree with the Governor's tag program. However, they feel recipients should only be permitted to hunt during general season dates associated with the specific hunt.

Sale of Big Game, Big Game Trophies

Proposal 45 Action: Support 11 - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Align state regulations on subsistence bartering with statutory authority.

Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 46 Action: Support 10 - Support 0 - Oppose 1 - Abstain
Description: Allow the sale of big game trophies.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal. AAC recommend the development of a tracking mechanism to ensure rightful owners are selling their trophies.

Proposal 47 Action: Support 11 - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Allow the sale of trophies acquired through legal action such as divorces.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 48 Action: Oppose 0 - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Prohibit the sale of bear parts harvested on National Park Service lands.
Discussion: Don't agree with issues stated in proposal.

Proposal 49 Action: Oppose 2 - Support 9 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Require logbooks for taxidermists and provide authority to the Alaska Wildlife Troopers to inspect taxidermy paperwork.
Discussion: Don't agree with issues stated in proposal. Authorities should be required to have a search warrant to examine a taxidermy business.

Discretionary Permit Conditions

Proposal 50 Action: Support 11 - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Review and potentially repeal discretionary hunt conditions and procedures applied to permit hunts across the state
Discussion: Need to check with each condition for appropriateness.

Proposal 51 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 10 - Oppose 1 - Abstain
Description: Allow ADF&G to require the latitude and longitude of kill locations on a harvest report for drawing and registration hunts.
Discussion: Opposing members felt that ADF&G already gathers enough information from harvest tickets. Another concern is the ability for hunters to accurately determine the latitude and longitude of kill locations using topographical maps.

Proposal 52 Action: Support **11 - Support** 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Clarify ADF&G discretionary authority to require antler locking tags for certain permit hunts.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Anchorage Fish & Game Advisory Committee
Comments to the ALASKA BOARD OF GAME for Statewide Regulations

Archery, Crossbow Regulations

Proposal 53 Action: Support as amended 9 - Support 2 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Establish statewide standards for crossbow equipment used to take big game.
Amendment: [(E) NO OPTICAL SCOPES OR ELECTRONIC DEVICES MAY BE ATTACHED TO THE CROSSBOW]
Discussion: Support with a amendment. Don't agree with section (E). Hunters using a crossbow should be permitted to use optical scopes or electronic devices attached to their crossbow. Permitting these attachments would increase accuracy.

Proposal 54 Action: Oppose **0 - Support** 11- Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Expand the definition of bow to include crossbows.
Discussion: Do not agree that crossbows should be classified as archery equipment.

Proposal 55 Action: Support **11** - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Create a regulatory definition for crossbow.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 56 Action: Support **11** - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Adopt crossbow standards and allow disabled hunters to use crossbows in archery hunts
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 57 Action: Support **11 - Support** 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Allow archers to use mechanical/retractable broadheads for all big game.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal. Recommend bow draw weight be a minimum of 65 pounds.

Proposal 58 Action: Support **11 - Support** 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Allow archers to use mechanical/retractable broadheads for all big game
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal. Recommend bow draw weight be a minimum of 65 pounds.

Proposal 59 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Require the use of a lighted nock on arrow for moose and bear hunting
Discussion: Archery hunters should have their option to use or not use a lighted nock.

Proposal 60 Action: Take No Action **0** - Support 0 - Oppose 11 - Abstain
Description: Clarify legal type of compound bow.
Discussion: No need to discuss this proposal.

Proposal 61 Action: Take No Action **0** - Support 0 - Oppose 11 - Abstain

Description: Modify the requirement for legal bow:
Discussion: No need to discuss this proposal.

Permits, Permit Allocations

Proposal 62 Action: Support **11 - Support** 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Restrict the number of drawing permits a resident may apply for.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 63 Action: Support **11 - Support** 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Increase the number of drawing permits for each species that a person may apply for.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal. This is an effective tool to increase funding for ADF&G.

Proposal 64 Action: Oppose **0 -** Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Limit drawing permits to only two permits per year
Discussion: Drawing permit winners should be able to utilize all permits secured. They applied for the permits and therefore should be allowed to use them.

Proposal 65 Action: Oppose **0 - Support** 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Limit drawing permit winners to only two permits per year.
Discussion: Drawing permit winners should be able to utilize all permits secured. They applied for the permits and therefore should be allowed to use them.

Proposal 66 Action: Support **11 - Support** 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Allow a maximum of 10 percent for the Alaska drawing permits to be awarded to nonresident hunters.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 67 Action: Support **11 - Support** 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Limit drawing permits to 10 percent for nonresidents, no nonresident permits if less than 10 permits available.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 68 Action: Support **11 - Support** 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Allow a maximum of 10 percent for the Alaska drawing permits to be awarded to nonresident hunters
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 69 Action: Support **11 - Support** 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain

Description: Establish bonus point/preference system for draw hunts.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 70 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Allow nonresident deployed military personnel to defer drawing permits.
Discussion: Fully support **Alaskan resident military** being permitted to defer to the following year.

Statewide Big Game Seasons

Proposal 71 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Open resident seasons one week before nonresident seasons in all intensive management areas.
Discussion: Don't see a need to increase the length of hunting seasons.

Proposal 72 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Open big game general seasons seven days earlier for residents, five days earlier in drawing hunts.
Discussion: Not necessary due to limited hunting pressure in area due to drawing hunt.

Proposal 73 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Open all big game seasons one week earlier for residents than nonresidents.
Discussion: Don't see a need to increase the length of hunting seasons.

Proposal 74 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Open all big game seasons one week earlier for residents than nonresidents.
Discussion: Don't see a need to increase the length of hunting seasons.

Proposal 75 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Open early youth hunt for all big game, ten days before other seasons; require hunter education.
Discussion: Keep season set as they are. There is ample opportunity for youth to hunt with their parents during the general hunting season.

Proposal 76 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Open early youth hunt (10-17 years) for all big game statewide and require accompanying adult to forfeit bag limit.
Discussion: Keep season set as they are. There is ample opportunity for youth to hunt with their parents during the general hunting season.

Proposal 77 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain

Description: Require hunters to use only one type of method; either firearm or bow; require a tag.
Discussion: Hunters should not be limited to only one type of method to take game.

Statewide Sheep Seasons and Permit Allocations

Proposal 78 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Open resident sheep seasons seven days earlier than nonresident seasons.
Discussion: Keep season set as they are.

Proposal 79 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Open resident seasons one week before nonresident seasons for Dall sheep hunting.
Discussion: Keep season set as they are.

Proposal 80 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Change the nonresident season and amount of permits available.
Discussion: Keep season set as they are.

Proposal 81 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Allow an earlier Dall sheep hunting season for residents.
Discussion: Keep season set as they are.

Proposal 82 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Begin the resident sheep season seven days earlier than nonresidents.
Discussion: No need to change season dates.

Proposal 83 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Begin the resident sheep seasons ten days earlier than nonresident seasons.
Discussion: No need to change season dates.

Proposal 84 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Open resident sheep seasons five days earlier than nonresident seasons.
Discussion: No need to change season dates.

Proposal 85 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Begin resident Dall sheep seasons five days earlier.
Discussion: No need to change season dates.

Proposal 86 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 10 - Oppose 1 - Abstain
Description: Begin the youth hunting season for Dall Sheep five days earlier than residents.

Discussion: Keep season set as they are. There is ample opportunity for youth to hunt with their parents during the general hunting season.

Proposal 87 Action: Support **11 - Support** 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Convert all nonresident sheep seasons to drawing permit hunts and limit to 5 percent of total permits.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 88 Action: Support **11 - Support** 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Convert all nonresident sheep seasons to drawing permit and limit to 10 percent of total permits
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 89 Action: Support **11 - Support** 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Convert all sheep hunts to drawing only, 90% for residents.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 90 Action: Support **11 - Support** 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Allocate two percent of all sheep drawing permits to nonresidents, close nonresident season if harvestable surplus is less than 50.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 91 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Nonresident next of kin sheep tags come out of the resident pool in Units where there are a limited number of nonresident sheep tags.
Discussion: Nonresidents should apply for and receive nonresident tags.

Statewide Other Game Seasons

Proposal 92 Action: Oppose **1** - Support 9 - Oppose 1 - Abstain
Description: Allow only the use of traps and snares for taking wolf and wolverine. Prohibit the use of firearms except for dispatching trapped animals.
Discussion: Current regulations are appropriate; no need to change. Supporting member thinks that trapping and hunting regulations should be distinct.

Proposal 93 Action: Oppose **2** - Support 9 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Allow only the use of traps and snares for taking wolf and wolverine on National Park Service lands and prohibit the use of firearms except for dispatching trapped animals.
Discussion: Current regulations are appropriate; no need to change.

Proposal 94 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Prohibit the taking of wolf, fox, wolverine, or coyote during May, June and July on National Park Service lands.
Discussion: Current regulations are appropriate; no need to change.

Proposal 95 Action: Support **11 - Support** 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Open several management areas to the taking of small game by the use of falconry.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 96 Action: Support **11 - Support** 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Open areas to archery hunting, if shotguns are allowed.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Methods and Means

Proposal 97 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Prohibit the use of artificial light for taking game on all lands managed by the National Park Service.
Discussion: No need to change current regulations.

Proposal 98 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Prohibit the use of hand held electronics in taking game.
Discussion: To vague regarding the description of "electronic device"

Proposal 99 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Hunters using a licensed transporter cannot harvest an animal on the same day being transported.
Discussion: Don't agree with issues stated. Unaware of a problem with deer and black bear overharvest due to hunters being able to harvest these species same day airborne.

Proposal 100 **Action:** Support as amended **8** - Support 2 - Oppose 1 - Abstain
Description: Allow the use of laser sight, electronically-enhanced night vision scope, or artificial light for taking coyotes.
Amendment: except in the taking of coyotes **and wolves** from October 1 through June 30.
Discussion: The AAC wanted to include wolves. See above amendment.

Proposal 101 Action: Support **11** - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Allow same day airborne taking of coyotes statewide.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 102 Action: Support as amended **10** - Support 0 - Oppose 1 - Abstain
Description: Prohibit the use of pack animals other than horses while hunting goat or sheep.
Amendment: To exclude only those animals that carry sheep or goat diseases.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal, with amendment.

Proposal 103 Action: Support **11** - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Prohibit the use of felt soled wading boots while hunting game.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 104 Action: Support **11** - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Prohibit the use of deer or elk urine for use in taking game.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Sealing and Bag Limits

Proposal 105 Action: Support **11** - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Clarify the definition of wounded as it applies to the restrictions to bag limits.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 106 Action: Oppose **3** - Support 7 - Oppose 1 - Abstain
Description: Count wounded muskox, bison, sheep and goat that are not recovered as bag limit.
Discussion: Members did not agree with issues stated in the proposal. Members prefer to see mortally wounded in place of wounded.

Proposal 107 Action: Support **8** - Support 3 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Eliminate the statewide bag limit for black bear.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 108 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Prohibit the harvest of cubs and sows accompanied by cubs on National Park Service (NPS) lands.
Discussion: Don't agree with issues stated in proposal. Prefer to leave current regulations in place.

Proposal 109 Action: Support **11** - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Clarify and remove complicated and restrictive regulations and ADF&G discretionary provisions pertaining to black bear hunting.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Evidence of Sex, Transfer & Possession

Proposal 110 Action: Support **11** - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Require the hunter to keep sex attached to the meat if it (the skull) needs to be sealed.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 111 Action: Support **11** - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Clarify the sex organs, or portions of, that must remain attached for proof of sex.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 112 Action: Support **9** - Support 2 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Eliminate the evidence of sex regulation.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 113 Action: Support **11** - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Remove the reference to federal agent under the transfer and possession regulation.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Black Bear Baiting

Proposal 114 Action: Support **9** - Support 1 - Oppose 1 - Abstain
Description: Allow black bear to be taken same day airborne within 1/4 mile of bait station.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 115 Action: Support **9** - Support 1 - Oppose 1 - Abstain
Description: Eliminate the personally accompany requirement for guides using bait stations and require a guide-client agreement.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 116 Action: Support **7** - Support 3 - Oppose 1 - Abstain
Description: In addition to the 10 bait sites in total, guides and assistant guides may also have two personal sites each; guides and assistant guides may hunt all sites for personal use without guide client agreements.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 117 Action: Support **9** - Support 1 - Oppose 1 - Abstain
Description: Remove the requirement for guides to personally accompany resident clients at a black bear bait station.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 118 Action: Support **11** - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Clarify and modify the permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait and scent lures

Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 119 Action: Support **11** - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Establish a codified location for permitted black bear bait stations and establish seasons for all of Alaska.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 120 Action: Support **9** - Support 0 - Oppose 2 - Abstain
Description: Eliminate black bear baiting as a method requiring a predator control permit in predator control areas.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 121 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Prohibit black bear baiting on all National Park Service lands.
Discussion: Don't agree with issues stated in proposal. No need to change current regulation.

Proposal 122 Action: Support **11** - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Allow the use of scent lures for black bear baiting while floating.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 123 Action: Support **11** - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Allow the use of scent lures for black bear baiting while floating.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Trapping

Proposal 124 **Action:** Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Require trap identification for all Units on lands managed by the National Park Service.
Discussion: Current regulations are appropriate.

Proposal 125 Action: Support **11** - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Require a 72 hour trap check for all traps and snares set on National Park Service lands.
Discussion: Current regulations are appropriate.

Proposal 126 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Prohibit the trapping of black bears in all National Park Service managed lands.
Discussion: Board of Game should maintain authority to establish trapping seasons as necessary.

Proposal 127 Action: Oppose **0** - Support 11 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Prohibit the taking of a black bear by trap or snare.
Discussion: Board of Game should maintain authority to establish trapping seasons as necessary.

Proposal 128 Action: Support **11** - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Establish a tag and fee to allow trappers to retain incidental catch.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Intensive Management

Proposal 129 Action: Support **11** - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Clarifies responsibilities of Department of Fish and Game commissioner.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Proposal 130 Action: Support **9** - Support 2 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Authorizes a predator control program in Unit 26(B).
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal. Those opposed wanted to have a feasibility report.

Proposal 131 Action: Support **11** - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Authorize a brown bear control program in Unit 19A.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

Miscellaneous

Proposal 132 Action: Support **11** - Support 0 - Oppose 0 - Abstain
Description: Modify the Agenda Change Request Policy.
Discussion: Support for reasons stated in proposal.

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
January 13-18, 2012
STATEWIDE REGULATIONS

DESIGNATED REPORTER: Edna Bay Advisory Committee

PROPOSAL 38 **ACTION: No Comment**
DESCRIPTION: Modify the falconry regulations and the Alaska Falconry Manual to meet the federal standards for certification by the USF&WS.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 39 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Modify the sate falconry regulations and the Alaska Falconry Manual to comply with new federal falconry standards.
DISCUSSION: Support the Dept. of Fish & Game

PROPOSAL 40 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Allow nonresident falconers to capture raptors in Alaska.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 41 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Review the regulation for permits to take game for cultural purposes.
DISCUSSION: Need to clarify the issues referred to.

PROPOSAL 42 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Modify the ADF&G authority for issuing public safety permits.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 43 **ACTION: No Comment**
DESCRIPTION: Review and modify nuisance beaver permits to allow beaver flow devices.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 44 **ACTION: (2) In Favor (5) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Modify the ADF&G discretionary authority for Governor's tags.
DISCUSSION: Favor - Enhances the value and use of the permits.
Oppose – Existing seasons are adequate.

PROPOSAL 45 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Align state regulations on subsistence bartering with statutory authority.
DISCUSSION: Agree for the need to align state and federal regulation, but we are concerned about the potential for abuse.

PROPOSAL 46 **ACTION: (3) In Favor (2) Oppose (2) Abstain**
DESCRIPTION: Allow the sale of big game trophies.
DISCUSSION: Favor – Prepared trophies are personal property. There are already enough regulations on the books for management of this issue.
Oppose – Oppose the sale of trophies or taking animals for trophy.

PROPOSAL 47 **ACTION: (5) In Favor (2) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Allow the sale of trophies acquired through legal action such as divorces.
DISCUSSION: Favor – A person could be burdened by disposal of unwanted trophies.
Oppose – A matter of ethics.

PROPOSAL 48 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the sale of bear parts harvested on National Park Service lands.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 49 **ACTION: (1) In Favor (6) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Require logbooks for taxidermists and provide authority to the Alaska Wildlife Troopers to inspect taxidermy paperwork.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 50 **ACTION: (3) In Favor (3) Oppose (1) Abstain**
DESCRIPTION: Review and potentially repeal discretionary hunt conditions and procedures applied to permit hunts across the state.
DISCUSSION: Already enough regulations on the books.

PROPOSAL 51 **ACTION: (2) In Favor (5) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Allow ADF&G to require the latitude and longitude of kill locations on a harvest report for drawing and registration hunts.
DISCUSSION: Favor – Do not feel it is burdensome.
Oppose – Sets a precedent for future harvest requirements of all animals.

PROPOSAL 52 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Clarify ADF&G discretionary authority to require antler locking tags for certain permit hunts.
DISCUSSION: Clarifies existing law.

PROPOSAL 53 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Establish statewide standards for crossbow equipment used to take big game.
DISCUSSION: Crossbows do need to be defined.

PROPOSAL 54 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Expand the definition of bow to include crossbows.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 55 **ACTION: No Comment**
DESCRIPTION: Create a regulatory definition for crossbow.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 56 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Adopt crossbow standards and allow disabled hunters to use crossbows in archery hunts.
DISCUSSION: Proposal too vague.

PROPOSAL 57 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Allow archers to use mechanical/retractable broadheads for all big game.
DISCUSSION: Too many unreliable mechanicals out there.

PROPOSAL 58 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Allow archers to use mechanical/retractable broadheads for all big game.
DISCUSSION: Too many unreliable mechanicals out there.

PROPOSAL 59 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Require the use of a lighted nock on arrow for moose and bear hunting.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 60 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Clarify legal type of compound bow.
DISCUSSION: Unnecessary proposal.

PROPOSAL 61 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Modify the requirement for legal bow.
DISCUSSION: Unnecessary proposal.

PROPOSAL 62 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Restrict the number of drawing permits a resident may apply for.
DISCUSSION: Unnecessary proposal.

PROPOSAL 63 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Increase the number of drawing permits for each species that a person may apply for.
DISCUSSION: Unnecessary proposal.

PROPOSAL 64 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Limit drawing permits to only two permits per year.
DISCUSSION: Unnecessary proposal.

PROPOSAL 65 **ACTION: No Comment**
DESCRIPTION: Limit drawing permit winners to only two permits per year.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 66 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Allow a maximum of 10 percent for the Alaska drawing permits to be awarded to nonresident hunters.
DISCUSSION: Too restrictive for nonresidents.

PROPOSAL 67 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Limit drawing permits to 10 percent for nonresidents, no nonresident permits if less than 10 permits available.
DISCUSSION: Agree with the latter part of the proposal, but do not want to see general restriction on nonresident permits.

PROPOSAL 68 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Allow a maximum of 10 percent for the Alaska drawing permits to be awarded to nonresident hunters.
DISCUSSION: Agree with the latter part of the proposal, but do not want to see general restriction on nonresident permits.

PROPOSAL 69 **ACTION: (3) In Favor (2) Oppose (2) Abstain**
DESCRIPTION: Establish bonus point/preference system for draw hunts.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 70 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Allow nonresident deployed military personnel to defer drawing permits.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 71 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Open resident seasons one week before nonresident seasons in all intensive management areas.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 72 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Open big game general seasons seven days earlier for residents, five days earlier in drawing hunts.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 73 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Open all big game seasons one week earlier for residents than nonresidents.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 74 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Open all big game seasons one week earlier for residents than nonresidents.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 75 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Open early youth hunt for all big game, ten days before other seasons; require hunter education.
DISCUSSION: Opens the door for abuse.

PROPOSAL 76 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Open early youth hunt (10-17 years) for all big game statewide and require accompanying adult to forfeit bag limit.
DISCUSSION: Opens the door for abuse.

PROPOSAL 77 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Require hunters to use only one type of method; either firearm or bow; require a tag.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 78 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Open resident sheep seasons seven days earlier than nonresident seasons.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 79 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Open resident seasons one week before nonresident seasons for Dall sheep hunting.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 80 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Change the nonresident season and amount of permits available.
DISCUSSION: Best proposal – gives residents preference.

PROPOSAL 81 **ACTION: See comments on Proposal 80**
DESCRIPTION: Allow an earlier Dall sheep hunting season for residents.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 82 **ACTION: See comments on Proposal 80**
DESCRIPTION: Begin the resident sheep season seven days earlier than nonresidents.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 83 **ACTION: See comments on Proposal 80**
DESCRIPTION: Begin the resident sheep seasons ten days earlier than nonresident seasons.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 84 **ACTION: See comments on Proposal 80**
DESCRIPTION: Open resident sheep seasons five days earlier than nonresident seasons.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 85 **ACTION: See comments on Proposal 80**
DESCRIPTION: Begin resident Dall sheep seasons five days earlier.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 86 **ACTION: See comments on Proposal 80**
DESCRIPTION: Begin the youth hunting season for Dall Sheep five days earlier than residents.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 87 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Convert all nonresident sheep seasons to drawing permit hunts and limit to 5 percent of total permits.
DISCUSSION: Too extreme.

PROPOSAL 88 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Convert all nonresident sheep seasons to drawing permit and limit to 10 percent of total permits.
DISCUSSION: Too extreme.

PROPOSAL 89 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Convert all sheep hunts to drawing only, 90% for residents.
DISCUSSION: Too extreme.

PROPOSAL 90 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Allocate two percent of all sheep drawing permits to nonresidents, close nonresident season if harvestable surplus is less than 50.
DISCUSSION: Too extreme.

PROPOSAL 91 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Nonresident next of kin sheep tags come out of the resident pool in Units where there are a limited number of nonresident sheep tags.
AMENDMENT: Leave the regulation the way it is.

PROPOSAL 92 **ACTION: (1) In Favor (6) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Allow only the use of traps and snares for taking wolf and wolverine. Prohibit the use of firearms except for dispatching trapped animals.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 93 **ACTION: (1) In Favor (6) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Allow only the use of traps and snares for taking wolf and wolverine on National Park Service lands and prohibit the use of firearms except for dispatching trapped animals.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 94 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the taking of wolf, fox, wolverine, or coyote during May, June and July on National Park Service lands.
DISCUSSION: Statute already exists.

PROPOSAL 95 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Open several management areas to the taking of small game by the use of falconry.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 96 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Open areas to archery hunting, if shotguns are allowed.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 97 **ACTION: No Comment**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the use of artificial light for taking game on all lands managed by the National Park Service.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 98 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the use of hand held electronics in taking game.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 99 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Hunters using a licensed transporter cannot harvest an animal on the same day being transported.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 100 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Allow the use of laser sight, electronically-enhanced night vision scope, or artificial light for taking coyotes.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 101 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Allow same day airborne taking of coyotes statewide.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 102 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the use of pack animals other than horses while hunting goat or sheep.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 103 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the use of felt soled wading boots while hunting game.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 104 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the use of deer or elk urine for use in taking game.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 105 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Clarify the definition of wounded as it applies to the restrictions to bag limits.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 106 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Count wounded muskox, bison, sheep and goat that are not recovered as bag limit.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 107 **ACTION: No Comment**
DESCRIPTION: Eliminate the statewide bag limit for black bear.
DISCUSSION: Confusing proposal – needs clarification.

PROPOSAL 108 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the harvest of cubs and sows accompanied by cubs on National Park Service (NPS) lands.
DISCUSSION: State regulations already covers this.

PROPOSAL 109 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Clarify and remove complicated and restrictive regulations and ADF&G discretionary provisions pertaining to black bear hunting.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 110 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Require the hunter to keep sex attached to the meat if it (the skull) needs to be sealed.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 111 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Clarify the sex organs, or portions of, that must remain attached for proof of sex.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 112 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Eliminate the evidence of sex regulation.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 113 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Remove the reference to federal agent under the transfer and possession regulation.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 114 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Allow black bear to be taken same day airborne within 1/4 mile of bait station.
DISCUSSION: Not in favor of bait stations.

PROPOSAL 115 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Eliminate the personally accompany requirement for guides using bait stations and require a guide-client agreement.
DISCUSSION: Not in favor of bait stations.

PROPOSAL 116 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: In addition to the 10 bait sites in total, guides and assistant guides may also have two personal sites each; guides and assistant guides may hunt all sites for personal use without guide client agreements.
DISCUSSION: Not in favor of bait stations.

PROPOSAL 117 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Remove the requirement for guides to personally accompany resident clients at a black bear bait station.
DISCUSSION: Not in favor of bait stations.

PROPOSAL 118 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Clarify and modify the permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait and scent lures.
DISCUSSION: Not in favor of bait stations.

PROPOSAL 119 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Establish a codified location for permitted black bear bait stations and establish seasons for all of Alaska.
DISCUSSION: Not in favor of bait stations.

PROPOSAL 120 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Eliminate black bear baiting as a method requiring a predator control permit in predator control areas.
DISCUSSION: Not in favor of bait stations.

PROPOSAL 121 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit black bear baiting on all National Park Service lands.
DISCUSSION: Not in favor of bait stations.

PROPOSAL 122 **ACTION: (7) In Favor**
DESCRIPTION: Allow the use of scent lures for black bear baiting while floating.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 123 **ACTION: No Comment**
DESCRIPTION: Allow the use of scent lures for black bear baiting while floating.
DISCUSSION: Same proposal as 122.

PROPOSAL 124 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Require trap identification for all Units on lands managed by the National Park Service.
DISCUSSION: Redundant

PROPOSAL 125 **ACTION: (0) In Favor (7) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Require a 72 hour trap check for all traps and snares set on National Park Service lands.
DISCUSSION: Redundant

PROPOSAL 126 **ACTION: No Comment**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the trapping of black bears in all National Park Service managed lands.
DISCUSSION: State regulates already.

PROPOSAL 127 **ACTION: (6) In Favor (1) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the taking of a black bear by trap or snare.
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 128 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Establish a tag and fee to allow trappers to retain incidental catch.
DISCUSSION: It allows a tracking mechanism.

PROPOSAL 129 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Clarifies responsibilities of Department of Fish and Game commissioner.
DISCUSSION: Support clarification for Fish & Game.

PROPOSAL 130 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Authorizes a predator control program in Unit 26(B)..
DISCUSSION: Support clarification for Fish & Game.

PROPOSAL 131 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Authorize a brown bear control program in Unit 19A.
DISCUSSION: Support clarification for Fish & Game.

PROPOSAL 132 **ACTION: (7) In Favor (0) Oppose**
DESCRIPTION: Modify the Agenda Change Request Policy.
DISCUSSION: Support clarification for Fish & Game.

Mat Valley Fish & Game Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes of October 26, 2011

Attn: Scott BOG Statewide ME comments

MTA Building in Palmer
Meeting Called to order at 7:05 by Vice Chair Dan Montgomery

Members present: Mark Chryson, Erik Beckman, Andy Couch, Max Sager, Tony Jones, Dan Montgomery, Ben Allen, Brian Campbell, Gerrit Dykstra, Bennet Durgeloh

Members Absent Excused: Bill Folsom, Mel Grove, Guiseepe Rossi, Keith Westfall, Kathy Thompson

ADF&G staff - Tim Pellitier

Representative Mark Neuman -- announced meeting concerning Mat-Su Valley Fisheries with ADF&G at 5p.m. - 9 p.m. at the Legislative Information Office on Nov. 1.

(The meeting minutes from October 19th (Prop 40 – 50) are included in these minutes to keep BOG Statewide discussions together).

Proposal 40 Opposed 0-7-2.

Proposal 41 It is our intent that requirements for these permits be tightened. According to local ADF&G biologist most permits he knows about are issued for harvest of either moose or caribou out of season -- some for use out of state. Permits may be turning into something besides use for educational purposes -- perhaps simply used as a means to expand certain groups harvest opportunities. Many AC members feel there are already enough opportunities to harvest moose or caribou without providing additional harvest permits with little guidelines.
Support 9-0-0.

Proposal 43 Opposed 0-9-0.
Proposal 44 Allow ADF&G discretionary authority for Governor's hunt permits.
Support 9-0-0.

Proposal 46 would allow personal sale of game trophies.
Support 9-0-0.

Proposal 47 Allow for the sale of trophies.
Failed 4 - 3- 2.

Proposal 48 would create special regulations for park service lands -- members felt that such additional regulations were not needed.
Opposed 0-9-0.

Proposal 49 AC would like to see current regulations upheld.
Opposed 0-9-0.

Proposal 50. Discretionary hunt conditions applied by ADF&G can discriminate against individuals and certainly allocate state resources to certain user groups with very little input from

email to Scott 12-2

the public. Move to table to time certain -- for last meeting in November (30th). Support to Table 7-2-0.

Andy Couch mentioned that many of the proposed permit hunt provisions may be seen both positively and negatively by the same individuals depending upon how they were used by ADF&G. Bill Folsom said the AC could provide comment for support and opposition to each point.

Minutes from October 26th - going through game proposals 51 - 109

Proposal 51 would require hunters to report degrees and minutes of latitude and longitude for some permit hunts. AC and public was opposed to making this a requirement. One member said in area where many animals were killed in one area would only make a larger mess if animals taken by other hunters in the vicinity might be confused with whose were whose. Opposed 0-11-0.

52 would make discretionary authority for ADF&G to require locking tags on antlers of specific hunts. One AC member mentioned he was opposed to requiring trophy destruction in any hunts. Mark asked if nonresidents already had such a requirement -- ADF&G response yes.
Support 7-4-0.

53. Would require standards for crossbow submitted by ADF&G. One member mentioned he was opposed to standard E which would not allow scopes or electrical sights with a crossbow. Members thought it was wrong to not have the good aiming devices which could allow better and cleaner kills.
Motion was amended to eliminate option E. Amendment passed 10 - 1 -0.
Motion Support as amended 11-0-0.

54. Would allow use of crossbows and would further expand the definition of a bow for all archery hunts. AC members felt this made archery hunts considerably more efficient.
Opposed 1 - 10 -0.

55. N/A see proposal 53.

56, Would allow use of crossbow in archery hunts by disabled hunters. ADF&G opposed. There is already a permit process that allows such use.
Motion Opposed 2-6-3.

57 and 58 would allow mechanical broadheads for all big game. Tony Jones mentioned that mechanical broadheads at one time had considerable more failure, but newer ones are more accurate and work better -- he mentioned his support for these proposals. ADF&G position do not adopt -- as that had been their position in the past. Some animals these are currently legal method of take. One member expressed his wanting to have efficient and clean kills. Tony mentioned that hunters can currently use mechanical broadheads or field points when becoming certified to hunt already. Support proposals 57 and 58 9-0-2.

59. Would require lighted knocks for archery hunters hunting moose and bear.
Opposed 0-11-0.

60 & 61 would redefine legal bows on a more restrictive basis.
Opposed 0- 11-0.

62. Proposal poorly written -- meaning unclear. Opposed 0-11-0.

63. Would allow hunters to apply for 6 rather than 3 drawing permits for each species. One member felt this would increase his chances of drawing a permit in the areas he wanted to hunt. Another member felt that if all hunters applied to 6 opportunities chances would remain the same -- but ADF&G might get more money to manage game. One member wondered why some people get multiple permits for different species of game -- while other hunters don't get any permits for any species. Dan Montgomery stated that ADF&G already has liberal opportunities for drawing. Andy Couch mentioned if the number of applicants increased for all hunts then an individuals chance of getting drawn for any specific hunt would only decrease. A member mentioned that in other states drawing fees return to those not drawn.
Opposed 2- 8 - 1.

64. Would allow hunters to win only two drawing hunts in one year but rank which permits they would prefer if two they were chosen for more than two opportunities. More specific than 65.
Support 9-0-2.

65. N/A see 64.

66, 67, 68 would allow a maximum of 10 percent of drawing permits to out of state hunters in all drawing hunts. Bennett's concern was that in area's where Alaskans may not want all the permits he would prefer that nonresidents not be restricted to only up to 10% of the permits. Erik Beckman mentioned that nonresident draws in some of the western states are much more restrictive than Alaska as far as allowing nonresident opportunity in drawings when residents want that opportunity. Bennett felt proposal was too broad for him to support. Mark Chryson made the point that in open to hunt non-drawing areas all nonresidents could still hunt.
Opposed 4-6-1.

Proposal 69 would establish a bonus point / preference system for obtaining permits. Andy Couch spoke in favor of a concept the AC has supported in the past.-- Stephen Barnelli wondered if such a system would increase attempts by anti - hunters to win permits. Dan Montgomery spoke in support -- ADF&G could farm out the project to someone with more computer smarts if ADF&G staff are not smart enough to figure it out.
Support 10-0-1.

Proposal 70 would all nonresident military to defer a drawing permit. ADF&G did not know if there was a method for deferring -- some AC members did not want additional permits not awarded -- but in fact a use of all permits by specific individuals.

Support. 10-0-1.

71. would allow residents a one week early season priority over nonresidents in all intensive management areas. pros and cons were discussed. Some residents would want to hunt earlier and some would want to hunt later.
Support 6-5-0.

72, 73, 74. would require seasons for residents to open one week prior to specific hunt opportunities for nonresidents. Some AC members wanted to see this advantage. Others felt in some areas with abundance of game this was not an issue. According to Dan these are blanket proposals that do not consider specific opportunities.
Opposed 5-5-1.

75. Would open a youth hunt for all big game 10 days early.
Opposed 0-11-0.

76. Would open early youth hunts statewide for all game species.
Opposed 0-11-0.

77. Opposed 0-10-1.

78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85 Would allow resident sheep hunting in advance of the nonresident season. Support 6-4-1.

86. Opposed 0-11-0.

87. Opposed 0-11-0.

88. Converting all nonresidents to a draw would make business much
Opposed 0-11-0.

89. Opposed 0-11-0.

90. Opposed 0-11-0.

91. This would give some nonresidents a nonresident priority.
Opposed 1-10-0.

92. Opposed 0-11-0.

93. Opposed 0-11-0.

94. Opposed 0-11-0.

95. Support 9-0-2.

96. Would allow use of archery hunting in areas where shotguns are allowed.
Support 11-0-0.

97, Opposed. 0-11-0.

98. Opposed 0-11-0.

99. Oppose 0-11-0.

100. Support 10-0-1.

101. Support 11-0-0.

102. Amendment to exclude the use of goats, sheep, llama, and alpacas only from sheep or goat hunting. proposal amended by author of proposal Amendment passed 11-0-0.
Amended proposal Supported 11-0-0.

103. Support 10-1-0.

104. Would prohibit the use of deer or elk urine for taking game. One AC member argued in favor of continued use. Chronic wasting has been experimentally introduced into moose.
Support 10-1-0.

Andy Couch is planning to miss the Nov. 2 meeting to coach a volleyball team -- Ben Allen or another member will need to take minutes -- come prepared.

NEXT MEETING NOV. 2 at downstairs Palmer MTA Building location

Meeting adjourned at 10 p.m.

Matanuska Valley Fish & Game Advisory Committee Minutes of November 9, 2011

Meeting began at 7:00 pm at the Matanuska Telephone Association Building in Palmer.

Members Present:
Ben Allen, Andy Couch, Bill Folsom, Mel Groves, Dan Montgomery, Bennett Durgeloh, Eric Beckman, Brian Campbell, Tony Jones, Jr. Member Daniel Warta

Members absent: Stephen Bartelli, Max Sager, Kathy Thompson, Jeff Tuttle, Keith Westfall, Gerrit Dykstra, Giuseppe Rossi, Mark Chryson

Tim Peltier and Lem Butler with ADF&G, Rod Arno - Alaska Outdoor Council, and Jennifer Ehmann.

Agenda motion to accept: Accepted with no objection.

Motion was made by Ben Allen with second by Dan Montgomery to accept all proposals on the agenda.

Board of Fisheries Proposals – PWS area

Proposal 51 Would reconsider the Copper River district subsistence fishery considering the phrase, "subsistence way of life." The AC supports the concept of all Alaskans should have an opportunity to participate in subsistence fisheries. Motion failed -- 0-8-0 with 1 junior member also in support.

Proposal 54 and 55 would return the Chitna dipnet fishery to a subsistence fishery -- same as the fishery upstream in the Glenallen area and the fishery down stream in the Copper River District. We would like to see all Alaskans have easy access to a subsistence fishery along the river. Subsistence priority applies to all Alaskans regardless of where they live. Motion passed 8-0-0 with 1 junior member also in favor.

Proposal 56 by ADF&G would create more restrictive regulations on the Chitna location of the Copper River dipnet fishery. The AC believes regulations should be consistent for subsistence users in the Glenallen, Chitna, and Copper River DIstricts. Motion failed 0-7-1 with 1 junior member also opposed.

Proposal 57- 67 -- No Action -- see 68.

Proposal 68 Seeks to reduce harvest of lake trout during the spawning season by providing a spawning time closure along with further reducing by catch of lake trout by closing net fishing in specific areas and requiring that lake trout be released when caught in the subsistence net fishery. The Matanuska Valley AC opposed the recent creation of a lake net fishery, for fear there would not be enough fish to biologically support such a fishery without impacting the resource. The number of Advisory Committee and public proposals addressing this issue show the public's concern with the impacts of harvesting slow growing lake trout with nets. Motion passed unanimously 8 -0-0. Jr. member was also in favor.

Attn: Scott
BOG SW – page 2-3

emailed to Shannon/Scott
11-28-11

69 - 71. No Action - see 68

Considering proposals 72, 73, 74, 75 -- the AC prefers consistent bag limits for all Alaskans up and down the river -- we prefer the designation as a subsistence fishery as to proposal 55. Motion passed Unanimously 8-0-0 with 1 junior member as in favor.

Proposal 114 and 115 would reduce the hatchery production of chum salmon in Prince William Sound. The AC would like to support production of wild fish over hatchery salmon -- these proposals only seek to apply a past promised reduction. Motion passed 8-0-0 with 1 junior member also in support.

Proposal 116 would disallow home pack for commercial fishermen. Some members felt this would do little for reducing harvest or supporting conservation of fish. Other members felt that this might allow average Alaskans a better opportunity to harvest salmon. Motion passed 4-3-1.

Proposals 117 and 118. Motions passed 8-0-0 and with 1 jr member also in support.

Proposal 129 Would adjust the bag limit on lake trout to allow harvest of smaller fish so that the larger fish are not supporting all of the harvest . Motion passed 8-0-0 with one junior member also in favor.

1. No action see 129.

Andy Couch made a motion to support Proposal 138. 2nd by Ben Allen. Would reopen Tolsona Lake to burbot harvest. Motion passed 8-0-0 and 1 jr member in favor.

Break.

After Break considering GAME PROPOSALS – Statewide Cycle B

No Action on 105 and 106.

Proposal 107 would eliminate the statewide black bear limit -- so that larger harvests could be provided in areas that would support it. Motion passed 8-0-0 and 1 junior member in support.

Proposal 108 opposed 0-8-0 and 1 junior member opposed.

Proposal 109 is an effort for more consistent seasons and larger black bear limits statewide. Motion passed 5-2-1. Opposed felt there were areas of the state where No Closed season and a 3 bear limit would be to liberal.

Proposal 110 passed 5-0-3.

Proposal 111 ADF&G position do not adopt -- not necessary to regulation. Motion failed 0-8-0 with 1 junior member also in support.

Proposal 112 Would eliminate the requirement to leave evidence of sex attached. Motion failed 0-8-0 with 1 junior member also opposed.

Proposal 113 Would remove regulation that provides federal agents authority to enforce state game regulations. This could apply to endangered game species. One AC member felt he did not know what voting for or against the regulation would do -- so he was not comfortable voting on the issue. Motion passed 5-1-2 with 1 junior member abstaining.

Proposal 114 would allow same day airborne harvest of black bear within 1/4 mile of a bait station. ADF&G position do not adopt. Would be hard to distinguish between hunters possibly hunting other species same day. ADF&G would want to consider the issue on a area by area basis. One member felt there should be a specific area close to a bait station where same day airborne black bear hunting would be allowed. Motion passed 8-0-0 with 1 junior member also in support.

Proposal 115 Motion passed 5-1-2 with 1 junior member in support.

Proposal 116 would allow guides to have two personal black bear bait sites in addition to 10 guide site. Two ADF&G representatives at the meeting could not clarify what is currently legal because of the "murkiness of the baiting regulations." Motion passed 5 -1-2 with junior member abstaining.

Proposal 117 passed 5-0-3 with 1 junior member in support.

Proposal 118 Seeks to modify and clarify black bear baiting regulations. ADF&G has a position of amend and adopt. One member felt a guide would not be guiding if he dropped a hunter at a bait station he maintained so did not want to support. Motion passed 5-1-2 with 1 junior member in favor.

Board Comments -- Bennett announced he will be not running for election when his term expires.

Game proposal 50 to be heard at next meeting with Bill providing additional game proposal numbers for AC and public to review before the next meeting. Fishing proposal 43 also to be consider -- any person with request to consider additional proposals. Need assign member to attend BOF meeting for Copper River / Prince William Sound -- will also be on next week's agenda.

Next meeting will be Tuesday Nov. 15 7 p.m. at MTA Building.

Meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.
Minutes recorded by Andy Couch

Matanuska Valley Fish & Game Advisory Committee
Minutes of November 23, 2011

Attn: Shannon
BOF PWS
AC comments

Members Present: Bill Folsom, Andy Couch, Bennett Durgeloh, Brian Campbell, Eric Beckman, Mark Chryson, Gerrit Dykstra, Tony Jones, Keith Westfall, Jeff Tuttle, Dan Campbell, Daniel Warta Jr. member, Stephen Warta former junior member talked about his junior term expiring as he turned 18 years old today.

Members Absent: Ben Allen, Stephen Bartelli - excused, Giuseppe Rossi, - excused Max Sager, Kathy Thompson - excused,

Motion to Accept agenda Mel Grove 2nd Dan Montgomery -- no objection

(F 11-25-11 D)

Motion to approve Nov. 10 minutes by Gerit Dykstra 2nd Dan Montogmery.

Changes were made to list Gerrit Dykstra on the list of those present -- evidently one of the other members listed as present was absent -- as our vote counts were off by one person. Mark Chryson also mentioned his absence was excused. Corrected minutes approved 11- 0 - 0 and 1 junior in favor.

C-1 Rod Arno not present. ADF&G staff not present.

Andy Couch moved to accept proposals as listed on the Committee's agenda 2nd by Mel Grove -- motion passed with no objection.

Fisheries Proposal 43 -- Mel Grove mentioned that the commercial restriction should be only for long line / bottom fished hooks -- and specifically should not restrict the commercial shrimp fishery. Mel mentioned that he rarely fishes within the sound on his sport halibut charters, because of low numbers of halibut available. Andy Couch mentioned that the proposal may be mainly aimed at restricting commercial halibut fishing within the entire sound -- which is not regulated by the state. Also the area that would he restricted is a very large area where a particular gear user would be cut out of the fishery entirely. Eric said that quite a bit of commercial effort could occur outside the sound -- but that he supported a regulation that would restrict commercial long lining within the sound that could harvest cod, rock fish, and halibut near shore -- an area where public anglers with smaller boats would primarily be fishing. Motion passed 9-2-0 1 junior member in favor.

Dec. 2 - 7 Representative to BOF -- Mel Groves agreed to go and was unanimously approved by AC Members to go to Valdez and represent the Committee at the Copper River / Upper Susitna River / Prince William Sound Board of Fisheries meeting.

The rest of the meeting the committee discussed game proposals.

Attn: Scott BOG AC comments - SW mtg
p 2-5 (same Inst Reg)

RECEIVED
NOV 2 : 2011
BOARDS
ANCHORAGE

Board of Game

Proposal 50 -- Tony suggested eliminating point 4, 6, 8 and 10. Eric suggested eliminating 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 18, 21, 24. Andy Couch mentioned not wanted to eliminate specific hunts simply because we do not like some of the possible permit restrictions. Dan Montgomery mentioned that he'd seen these discretionary conditions and procedures used -- but not all conditions for each hunt. Eric thought there was too much discretion for using the conditions or procedures. Mel wanted to go through conditions brought up by members point by point. Committee members agreed with a desire to see conditions and procedures kept to a minimum as much as possible, and also that such conditions and procedures be limited entirely to permit hunts and not general hunts. Bennett mentioned not liking the format of reviewing all permit hunt conditions at one times - without specific information. Motion failed 4 -7.

Proposal 119 seeks to structure bear baiting season to specific dates through out the state. Aaron Bloomquist mentioned that fall baiting seasons may not be allowed throughout all areas of the state, but that if they were approved they could follow the standard length requested in the proposal. Motion passed 11-0-0 and 1 junior member in favor.

Proposal 120 seeks to allow normal black bear bait hunting with only a black bear baiting permit in black bear predator control areas. This would allow a normal hunt under normal baiting permit conditions and also a predator control hunt under a control permit. Specifically only one permit would be needed to participate in one type of hunt -- this should provide some clarity and a reduction in paper work in what has been a confusing issue for hunters. Motion passed 10 - 1-0 and 1 junior member in favor.

Proposal 121. Just because lands are managed by the National ParkService does not mean that bear baiting should not be allowed. The Parks service manages lots of land where black bear baiting has minimal impact on other users. Several members mentioned the huge amounts of land managed by the Parks Service, and objections to closing such a large are to black bear baiting. Proposal addresses too large of an area. Motion failed 0-11-0 1 with 1 junior member opposed.

Proposal 122 and 123. Andy Couch mentioned that he did not see the effectiveness of floating along with bait in a boat -- by the time bears detected the bait the hunters would likely be floating further downstream and away from the bears. Motion failed 5-4-2.

Proposal 124 Motion failed 0-11-0 with 1 junior opposed See comments concerning amount and remoteness of lands managed by National Park Service in committee's comments on Proposal 121.

Proposal 125 and 126 The Committee wants to see Alaska lands managed consistently with most areas open to hunting and trapping. Motion failed 0-11-0 and 1 junior member opposed.

Proposal 127 would prohibit hunting or trapping black bear under a trapping license. One member questioned allowing black bear trapping or snaring under general provisions. Motion failed 0-11-0 and 1 junior member opposed.

Proposal 128. One AC member as a representative of a trapping association was opposed to this proposal and thought it could give trappers a black eye and have negative repercussions. Trappers do not need to trap animals out of season for profit -- incidental illegal harvests should be turned into state. Motion failed 0-11-0 with 1 junior member opposed.

Proposal 129. Defines and clarifies ADF&G Commissioner's role in predator control. Motion passed 10 - 0-1 with 1 junior member in favor.

Proposal 130 Would allow predator control in order to reduce predation on declining musk ox population-- musk ox population has been going down continually and significantly in recent history. Motion passed 11 - 0 - 0 and 1 junior member in favor.

Proposal 131 Motion passed 10-0-1 with 1 junior member in favor.

Committee took a break to return by 8:30 p.m.

Proposal 132 Would apply more criteria to agenda change requests submitted to the Board of Game, and would more precisely specify when agenda changes could be accepted. Specifically agenda change requests would need to be submitted earlier, and allocation could not be the primary purpose to accept an agenda change request. Motion passed 10- 0 -1 and 1 junior in favor.

Proposal 133 would open resident season one week earlier than nonresident seasons in all intensive management areas of Region III. Some members felt the proposal was too broad covering too much area an too many species. This proposal could reduce some resident hunting opportunities. Motion failed 0-11-0 with 1 junior opposed.

Proposal 134 Dan Montgomery mentioned that nonresidents opportunity may already be less than 10 percent for most Region III permit hunts. Motion failed 0- 8-3 with 1 junior member in favor.

Proposal 135 Dan Montgomery mentioned that nonresident opportunity is already less than 10%. Motion failed 0-8-3 with 1 junior member opposed.

Proposal 136 would start all Region III sheep hunts 7 days earlier for residents than nonresidents. Andy Couch spoke that this would allow residents an opportunity to harvest -- in a situation where nonresident hunters already harvest sheep at a higher rate. Dan mentioned that this would provide a week longer hunting season. Andy mentioned that horn restrictions were the primary means of controlling sheep harvests rather than season length. Motion failed 5-4-2 with 1 junior opposed.

Proposal 137 -- Difficult language which could increase rather than reduce nonresident harvest. Poorly written -- would create difficult situations to manage. Motion failed 0-11-0 with 1 junior member opposed.

Proposal 138 -- Do not agree with requiring all Dall sheep hunting in region by drawing permit. Motion failed 0-10-1 with 1 junior opposed.

Proposal 139 -- would limit sheep permits for nonresidents to 5%. Poorly written in some areas the nonresidents would be the only ones required to have a permit so how could they be limited to 5% of permits. Motion opposed 0-11-0 with 1 junior member opposed.

Proposal 140 -- Committee supports brown bear tag exemptions in areas with surplus brown bears to harvest -- and especially in areas were predation may be limiting ungulate production. Motion passed 11-0-0 with 1 junior in favor.

Proposal 141 Would provide an opportunity to trap black bears. One member felt nonresidents did not need to be provided an opportunity to trap black bears. Another member felt that having a resident companion only 16 year old in order for a nonresident to participate was not appropriate either. Another member supported providing a nonresident who met the requirements to participate.
Dan moved to *amend the motion to exclude nonresident participation.*
Amendment passed 7-3-1 with 1 junior opposed.
Motion passed as amended 7-2-2 with 1 junior abstaining.

Proposal 142 would prohibit black bear trapping in the interior. Committee is in favor of providing black bear trapping /snaring opportunity. Motion passed 11-0-0 with 1 junior in favor.

Proposal 143 and 144 Committee liked the idea of allow same day airborne hunting of black bear over bait. Motion passed 11-0-0 and 1 junior in favor.

Proposal 145 This would create an unneeded regulation. This proposal would cover even nonsubsistence areas. Where ANS are established or review for wolves we suggests minimal number levels that reflect the actual subsistence use.
Motion failed 0-11-0 and 1 junior member opposed.

Proposal 146 One AC member trapper mentioned that he viewed this opportunity to deal with problem coyotes as a positive. Two trappers agreed that they did not necessarily want an opportunity to trap coyotes for hides in the middle of summer. It was mentioned that salvage requirement of hides should not be required if this regulation is enacted. One member mentioned opposition to summer hunting / trapping and preferred only harvesting coyotes at times when pelts were in better condition.
Motion to *amend proposal to not require salvage of coyote hides during the season currently closed to trapping* made by Jeff and 2nd by Tony Jones.
Amendment passed 10 - 1-0 with 1 junior member passed.
Amended motion passed 9-1-1 with 1 junior member in favor.

Proposal 245 -- AC approval of Unit 13 antlerless moose hunt. Mark Chryson wanted to know how many hunters were successful on a cow hunt. Dan mentioned that there has not been an antlerless hunt in Unit 13 for many years, but that in general success may be about 50% as some permit winner will not even hunt. It was mentioned that ADF&G had listed an opportunity for

10 permits in the 2012 permit supplement -- so even though the permit condition listed in the regulation book would allow up to 200 permits, ADF&G would only be giving out 10 antlerless permits for Unit 13A. Committee supported allowing this limited anterless moose hunting opportunity. Motion passed 9- 2- 0 1 junior member also in favor.

Board Comments --

Eric spoke to using common sense -- and felt that committee sometimes had gone beyond that measurement.

Tony Jones -- Happy Thanksgiving.

Bill Folsom announced Next Meeting Wednesday November 30 7 p.m. at MTA Building in Palmer. game proposals 147 - 207 to be on agenda. December meetings currently scheduled for Dec. 14 and 21.

Minutes taken by Andy Couch

Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes of December 21, 2011

Meeting Called to order at MTA building in Palmer at 7 p.m. by Bill Folsom.

Members Present: Bill Folsom, Andy Couch, Brian Campbell, Eric Beckman, Mark Chryson, Gerrit Dykstra, Keith Westfall, Dan Montgomery, Stephen Bartelli

Members Absent: Giuseppe Rossi, - excused, Kathy Thompson , Bennett Durgeloh - excused, Jeff Tuttle, Mel Grove, Tony Jones - excused, Max Sager, Ben Allen- excused, , Daniel Warta, Jr Member

Attn: Scott BOG
SW - p 2
Int p 2-3

ADF&G staff: Tim Peltier,

Member of the Public present -- Peter Zalenski, Israel Payton

Motion to approve agenda and 2nd. Andy mentioned he wanted to talk to the committee about the opportunity to submit game proposals, Approved with no objection.

Former-

Andy Couch made a motion to approve / support the position of the Fairbanks AC letter concerning self - reported illegal moose harvest. 2nd by Eric Beckman. Andy Couch mentioned that the Fairbanks AC letter position would allow self-reported hunters who killed an illegal moose to only be issued a violation -- with no fine and no restitution. Andy said he would like to see a stipulation that the violation go away as well. Eric Beckman said in his research of illegal moose kills there was no provision for the state to take the hunter's animal. Eric also passed around a policy from Colorado where the state makes a determination and then may allow hunters to keep the accidentally taken illegal animal. Bill Folsom mentioned that he would like to see a change made, so that hunters would not leave illegal moose in the field for fear of being prosecuted -- even if they did the right thing and turned themselves in. Stephen Bartelli mentioned that he had heard of many people being prosecuted very severely for accidental illegal harvest. Brian said judging illegal moose is easier with brow tine moose or spike / fork moose, but more difficult with 50 inch moose. Dan mentioned that there would need to be some way to track the situation -- if not a fine, some other deal. Dan talked about a situation that happened to him while hunting where he had a video of an accidental kill. Cliff Judkins said he agreed with seeing some type situation where self-reported accidentally taken illegal animals could be dealt with in a softer fashion. Bill suggested going before the Game Board and seeing if they would support this effort.

Andy Couch, Dan Montgomery, and Eric Beckman, Stephen Bartelli, Bill Folsom will work on a Matanuska Valley letter on self - reported illegal moose kills stating our position of the issue.

Motion made to approve the minutes from Dec. 14 meeting by Mark Chryson 2nd by Stephen Bartelli. Approved with no objection.

Final Changes to the Committee's letter to ADF&G concerning emergency regulations for Northern Cook Inlet king salmon -- approved with one objection.

Andy moved to reconsider sheep proposals #78-85 2nd by Brian Campbell Motion to reconsider approved 5 -4-0.

Dan mentioned that many hunting guides would be out competing with the public for any sheep earlier in the season. So resident non guides would gain very little opportunity to increase harvest. Dan also mentioned that many legal rams are not taken every year based on the fact that all rams become legal at the age of 8 years and many rams are not harvested until they are older than 8 years. Andy Couch mentioned that he believed guides would take advantage of an earlier opportunity to hunt themselves -- so others residents might not gain much from this proposal. Eric asked how many guides actually hunt for sheep themselves. Dan did not know, but mentioned some individual guides who had not harvested sheep, who would be hunting if they had an opportunity when they could not guide. Stephen mentioned that he understood the idea that more sheep may be legal. Israel Payton mentioned that he did not believe all guides would go sheep hunting and he saw no reason not to provide this extra opportunity for others. Mark Chryson mentioned being out in the field and having trouble with guides hunting other species.

Motion opposed 4-5-0.

Proposal 195 -- Andy mentioned that Mel Grove was not present to talk to the issue like the committee was hoping -- in addition he did not know much about the area -- so he would not be hunting in the area. Stephen Bartelli asked if the Board of Game could eliminate a proxy hunt. No reason the Board could not take such action according to Dan. Motion passed 8-0-1.

Proposal 238 --Intensive management for moose in Unit 9B. Motion supported 9-0-0.

239 - 254 Reauthorizing antlerless moose hunts. Andy mentioned that in Unit 14A an antlerless hunt running Jan. 1- Feb 25 would defeat the opportunity to hunt cows only during the winter -- as even the bulls would be antlerless and get harvested at that time. In addition for the late hunt he mentioned wanting to cut the area size down so that all the hunters would not be allowed hunt in the entire area -- and potentially over harvesting moose from a couple small areas.

Stephen Bartelli made an ***amendment to remove the Jan. 1 - Feb 25 hunt in proposal 246.*** 2nd by Dan. Amendment passed 7-2-0. Amended motion supported for all proposals 9-0-0. Note Committee had also previously approved #245

Committee took a brief break.

Proposal 255 Mark asked why this needed to happen. Tim said it allows hunters to harvest a brown bear without having to purchase an additional tag beforehand. Would reauthorize brown bear fee exemptions. Motion support 9-0-0.

Bill Folsom asked who would be willing to represent the Committee before the Board of Game in Anchorage. He said he would also send an e-mail out asking committee members who were not at this meeting if they would like to represent the committee.

Cliff mentioned the Board would like to see specific comments from the AC about proposals instead of an AC report on up or down votes. Dan mentioned the AC member representing the committee should focus on some specific proposals rather than going for all of them.

Dan mentioned wanting to consider what the Committee wants to support for the next proposal process which has a deadline of April 15.

Andy Couch mentioned that the intensive management plan for Unit 15B on the Kenai Peninsula was based on one year of not achieving the moose harvest and bull to cow ratio objectives -- but in Unit 14B even though the Board had requested ADF&G develop an intensive management implementation plan several years ago.

Cliff mentioned the Committee might want to bring the issue up again. Bill mentioned working with ADF&G on the issue.

Bill Folsom mentioned a possible proposal to outlawing full metal jacket bullets for hunting big game.

Dan asked if the Committee would be supportive of a proposal to charge fees for big game harvest tickets.

Cliff said the Board of Game would be attending a meeting with the park service and requesting their attendance at the BOG meetings if they would like to participate in the Game regulatory process.

Andy talked about offering new moose proposals

Mark mentioned wanting to do something other than spike / fork / 50 moose -- and that in ranching a rancher doesn't go out and kill every prime breeding bull.

Committee Elections are scheduled for our next meeting: 7 p.m. at Wasilla High School Theater on January 4, 2012. Following Committee member elections will be elections of Committee officers.

Meeting adjourned at 9:35.

Minutes Upper Lynn Canal Fish and Game Advisory Committee 12/16/2011

Called to order 5:05 pm

Memebers present: Al Gilliam (AG), John Katzeek (JK), Dave Werner (DW), Tim McDonough (TM), Randy Jackson (RJ), John Tronrud (JT), Luke Rauscher (LR)

Members absent: Sean Mclaughlin, Dean Risley

ADFG staff present: Rich Chapell, Randy Bachman, by teleconf. Ryan Scott, Anthony Cruppi

Audience: Donny Turner, Larry Benda, Norm Hughes

Minutes of 11/18/11 meeting approved as amended

No agency reports, no public comment

Old Business: **Board of fish proposals** 163, 323 and 324 Randy Jackson reported that the seiners had withdrawn proposal 291 and USAG had withdrawn proposal 323 so they were not addressed.

M/S RJ/AG oppose proposal #163 motion passes 5 in favor, 1 opposed
M/S RJ/AG oppose # 325 and #326 motion passes unanimously

New Business: **Board of game proposals**

M/S AG/RJ support #44 motion passes unanimously
M/S AG/RJ oppose #46 motion passes unanimously
M/S AG/RJ oppose #47 motion passes unanimously
M/S AG/Rj oppose all proposals made by Jim Stratton, National Parks Conserv. Assoc. motion passes unanimously This would include proposal #s 48, 93, 94, 97,108, 121, 124, 125, 126
M/S AG/RJ support # 49 motion passes unanimously
M/S AG/RJ support #50, 51, 52 motion passes unanimously
M/S AG/JT support amended proposal # 53 motion passes unanimously
M/S AG/RJ oppose #57 motion passes unanimously
M/S AG/TM support #59 motion fails
M/S RJ/AG support #63 motion passes unanimously
M/S RJ/JK take no action #65-70 motion passes unanimously
M/S JK/RJ take no action #71-77 motion passes unanimously
M/S JK/RJ take no action #78-91 motion passes unanimously
M/S AG/RJ oppose #92 motion passes unanimously
M/S AF/RJ oppose #98 motion passes unanimously
M/S AG/JK oppose #100 motion passes unanimously
M/S AG/RJ amend to include mules and support #102 motion passes unanimously
M/S AG/RJ support #103 motion passes unanimously
M/S AG/RJ support #104 motion passes unanimously
M/S AG/RJ oppose #105 motion passes unanimously
M/S JK/RJ oppose #106 motion passes unanimously

M/S JK/RJ oppose #107 motion passes unanimously
M/S AG/RJ oppose #111 & 112 motion passes unanimously
M/S AG/RJ oppose #114 motion passes unanimously
M/S RJ/AG oppose #115 motion passes unanimously
M/S AG/RJ support #128 motion passes unanimously
M/S AG/RJ support #129-131 motion passes unanimously

Next meeting scheduled for Jan. 27th 5 pm council chambers. Agenda to include board input to Connelly Lake Hydro project, improving wild fish stock in local rivers, long range rifle hunting.

Adjourned 7:40 pm

Juneau Douglas F&G Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Board of Game Proposals 2011/2012 Cycle

October 26, 2011 Glacier view Room UAS Campus

Attending: Thatcher Brower, Greg Brown, Chris Conder, Barry Brokken, Mike Peterson (chair), Bill Bahleda, Jenny Pursell, Eric Clark, Jason Kohlhase

Guests: **National Park Service**

Albert Faria (907)-697-2621 Albert_Faria@nps.gov

Gus Martinex (907)- 697- 2628 gus_martinez@nps.gov

Fish and Game

Ryan Scott- SE Regional biologist

Alaska Wildlife Troopers

Lt. Steve Hall

Two High School Students auditing the AC meeting for Sara Hannan's "My Government" Class

Katie Strehler & Anna Gregovich

Quorum established- 6:30

Proposal 240-Existing antlerless moose hunts in Gustavus

Proposal 239- Existing antlerless moose hunts in Berners Bay

239 -Looking for re-authorization- no hunt since 2006- currently closed

Promising signs in Berners Bay- 2010 calf crop very good- 50% survival throughout the year- twinning rate fairly high- Dec 3, 2010 - last survey done - 72 moose counted: estimate around 90

Greg Brown: move to pass proposal 239 and 240 by unanimous vote

Seconded

Proposal passes (Yes: 9 No: 0)

Proposal 38- Falconry- Ron Clark wants AC to be aware of upcoming changes

State has proposal 39- differences: number and diversity of species that can be kept by falconry and the annual report that must be submitted- falconry association and state have similar positions

Mike: committee is not compelled to take action- move to vote

Unanimous vote for no action (Yes: 9 No: 0)

Proposal 43- Review and modify nuisance beaver permits to allow beaver flow devices.

Recommend change in management in beavers and change in permit for taking beavers out of season

BofG don't have a way to approach policy issues

Juvenile sockeye salmon rearing above beaver dams were larger than those rearing in open water systems.

USFS- want to make beavers a focal species

BofG would request FofG to update knowledge base- come up with a stronger management policy

Mike to Ryan (ADFG): a little early for state to look over proposals- personally agree with proposal

Chuck Caldwell (Public): Trout Unlimited board- supports the relationship of beaver dams and fish health

Brown: Current regulation since 1989- is the proposal asking to modify management?

Ryan: Yes-this would supplement the regulation- we would regulate trapping beavers outside of season

Barry: Concerned with the cost of implementing different beaver management options on personal property- not comfortable to require this of private property owners

Chris: Call to question, seconded

Yes: 6 No: 3

Proposal passes

Greg: Why is the National park service interested in State proposals?

Gus: Different through ANILCA- rather than create new laws for wildlife, work together with state

Proposal 92- Free-roaming duel management species- big game and fur bearer- wolverine and wolf- prohibit a trapper's use of a firearm in taking free-roaming game.

Author concerned about liberal taking of game- restricting harvest of wolverine and wolf by firearm and only by permit holders would promote wildlife sustainability

Ryan: BofG agree that few wolverine taken by firearm, majority are taken by trapper- fur animal falls under trapping management- traps, snares-

Bill: Is it likely that someone would be in possession of a trapping permit without a hunting license?

Ryan: The seasons overlap (trapping and hunting)

Barry: With a trapping license you can use a firearm

Ryan: No limit bag limit for harvesting a wolf/wolverine under a trapping license- would undermine our sustain yield principle- This would limit a person if you were checking a trap line without a hunting license you would not be able to take an animal restrained in a trap.

Mike: If this were to pass- if a trapper chose not to have a hunting license you would not have a rifle with you?

Ryan: No. Except for dispatching trapped animals

Barry: Fur-bearers- harvested under trapping license, fur animal- under the hunting license.

Jenny: Author of proposal is concerned with the accumulative effect of hunting free roaming wolves and wolverines while trapping statewide.

Greg: Motion to call the question , Jenny 2nd

Yes: 6 No: 3

Proposal Passes

Proposal 94- Prohibit the taking of wolf, fox, wolverine, or coyote during May, June and July on National Park Service lands.

Restricting harvest to months when pelts are highest quality- allows trappers to harvest- trappers can continue to trap during May, June and July but not in park service lands

Ryan: With park service lands – the state supports recommendation for different species as if there were not different land owners- we are working on a general management scheme for populations- if different entities have different concerns they have the ability to be more restrictive- state has regulation in place for state-wide wildlife.

Greg: Should State be involved with the proposals with park service lands?

Ryan: No.

Jenny: is it true that state and federal entities try to work together on policies of land management that are quite different- these two entities should take positions in order to be able to collaborate on issues?

Ryan: Yes.

Greg: How should the AC put these proposals on the table?

Park Service: We will bring the proposals to our annual meeting- meet with state to collaborate on various regulations that are currently being regulated or proposed to be regulated.

Greg: Is that a public meeting?

PS: no- but if any proposal is considered- we are required to open up for public meetings about an issue.

Mike: Should we remove PS proposals and move on to state proposals?

PS: Each park has federal regulations, ANLICA regulations and specific park regulations

Greg: how would the BoG deal with these issues when it falls under the Park Service?

Mike: If the BofG chooses to pass the proposal it will go to each preserve, will have the opportunity to look at the proposal and choose to support/not support

PS: 94 applies to all park lands- each NP unit has their own compendium- if this is passed it will apply to all preserves in Alaska.

Jenny: does it apply to national wildlife refuges in Alaska?

PS (Gus): two separate agencies

PS: if any specific question- can take questions in to present

Chris: form subcommittees to review certain proposals

Greg: What the BofG will do with these proposals- are they going to pass them themselves?

Barry: BofG will have many more resources and time to look at proposals

Mike: Suggests removing PS proposals

Ryan: Suggests that you use the resource here (two members from Park Service)

Mike: We are going to suspend those proposals that have to do with NPS- move on to 98, 99, 114 and 127- after meeting if we have time we will review NPS proposals and ask questions to park service

Proposal 98- Prohibit the use of hand held electronics in taking game.

Ryan: Very vague proposal- doesn't identify the focus of concern- communications and safety measures would be included in this proposal. There are legitimate uses of electronics for hunting.

Yes: 0 No: 9 unanimous vote

Proposal fails

Chair's notes: after vote of Proposal # 98, committee member Jenny Pursell made a motion to reconsider their vote. She stated that her hand was up before the initial vote but the chair did not see it. Had she been noticed it was her intent to request that the committee consider a "No Action". The motion to reconsider was seconded, the motion for reconsideration failed: Yes: 2 No: 7

Proposal 99 - Hunters using a licensed transporter cannot harvest an animal on the same day being transported.

Issue: illegal pursuit by clients of transporters- this would be much easier for protection to enforce

Illegal harvest levels of black bear would be decreased

Ryan: Been before bofg before- failed before b/c if you are a transporter you can't help the hunter with the hunt- if everybody would follow the rules it would work. Rules are already in place- it really is an enforcement issue.

Jason: How many animals are taken on initial fly in day during guided trip?

Lt. Hall: most of transporters operate by boat

Ryan: If you charter a flight on a beaver to Admiralty you can't hunt big game (deer not included in Southeast) the same day, however if you are on a boat you can hunt the same day.

Jason: if a guide uses own transportation- this proposal will not affect that operation

Lt. Hall: this would only apply to a license transporter who can accommodate clients. There are two different licenses for big game guide and transporting- if you operate under a transporter license. If you have a guide license you won't be affected by this proposal.

Jenny: Do you believe this proposal would be helpful for enforcement?

Lt. Hall: The regulations for transporters already restrict a transporter from providing assistance to a hunter- limited to transportation. Pretty extreme change on the business side- it would be easier to enforce.

Greg: Can I possess a transporter license and a guiding license at the same time?

Lt. Hall: Yes

In favor of proposal

Yes: 2 No: 6 Abstain: 1

Proposal fails

Proposal 114- Allow black bear to be taken same day airborne within 1/4 mile of bait station.

Ryan: SE Ak very few people use airplanes to get to bait site- no baiting in Juneau – in Haines and Yakutat. The concept is that you are delaying the fact that they are going to be able to hunt at their bait station.

Bill: Will this be implemented in areas of bear protection?

Ryan: This is already allowed in places that there is bear protection.

Jenny: Relevant to discuss and take vote

Greg: I don't like bait stations- not an ethical chase.

Bill: I support hunters who bait- particularly archers- baiting has been shown to be ethical and a useful hunting tool.

Jenny: It would be difficult to enforce and would likely lead to abuse of the airborne hunting.

Move to vote in favor of proposal

Yes: 0 No: 7 Abstain: 2

Proposal fails

Proposal 127- Prohibit the taking of a black bear by trap or snare.

Ryan: To use traps or snares the animal has to be classified as fur-bearers. Black bear have been re-classified as fur-bearers.

Jenny: This proposal is one that is pro-active- it is possible at some point in time that there could be methods and means in game management units in which snares and traps could be used. Concerned that in Southeast there is a decreasing black bear population, specifically in southern Southeast. Concerned with public safety risk.

Greg: Safety issues- idea of snaring ¼ mile of residences is of concern.

Barry: Where would I find these regulations for fur bearing trapping.

Ryan: There are no seasons or bag limits as of yet. Because there is no seasons or bag limits you cannot take black bears with this method. This will be discussed and possibly implemented March 2012. Bears are managed differently dependent on where you are state- in SE we manage of them as a big game species to be hunted and harvested. We have conservation concerns here in SE- trapping is probably not needed here.

Barry: Statewide proposal- being managed pretty intensively for population reduction- I don't think that the bofg would blanket this proposal over all areas of the state.

Chris: A tool to control black bear populations in certain areas- however certain holes- indiscriminate in trapping- ask for no action.

Bill: Likes no action- entrusting a group of people to make policy changes- don't support it.

Greg: Could we accomplish the same thing by having more aggressive hunting (areas of bear control)?

Ryan: Not comfortable answering that. In the areas that these are implemented in – big areas, it is hard to get enough hunters out there- use tools to regulate populations. Also, not sure of what kind of qualification program, however people would have to be trained and qualified to be able to trap/snare.

Bill: related situation to Maine's trapping season for bear- it is a tool.

Chris: motion- Take no action on 127

Yes: 8 No: 1

Motion to take no action on 127 passed

Board of Fish Meetings

SE/Yak shell/crab-59 proposals by Dec. 30

SE/Yak finfish- Jan (Feb is comment period)

Statewide Dungeness crab- March

Elections for new committee meetings in January (Chair Notes: Elections are scheduled for December 16th).

Questions for Gus and Albert about NPS land and trapping

Proposal 94 revisited- Prohibit the taking of wolf, fox, wolverine, or coyote during May, June and July on National Park Service lands

Barry: 2 units statewide open- 10 Aleutian chain, 9 southern end of Alaska peninsula through June 30th for wolves

Mike: Have to have a permit to trap on a permit?

Gus: Yes- does it have to meet certain criteria to trap on a preserve- follow state regulation and may be more restrictive

Mike: Author states that the taking of animals in may june and july is contrary to park service policy. Is that true?

Albert: I can't answer that. The policy that the park service has for the preserve in terms of hunting- is the state

Greg: This is contrary to the policies that the Park Service would apply to any other place other than Alaska- policies different in Alaska.

Bill: This about wolves out on the peninsula right?

Ryan: I thought this too- focused on various predator programs- the majority of our trapping regulations and seasons don't allow in may, june and july.

Albert: If there are any specific questions which we cannot answer- you can send it via email.

Greg: How do we address something to specific to NPS in Alaska?

Albert: Can always address the specific park- it would be addressed to regional director in Anchorage

Not yet set date for next meeting- sometime in December to go over selected shellfish proposals.

Minutes submitted by Michael Kohan

Approved by AC December 16th 2011

Mike Peterson - Chair

Bethel Area:

Proposal 14 **Action: Unanimous oppose**
Description: Closes non-resident fur animal hunting seasons for certain species within the Arctic Region Units.
Discussion: No evidence of biological justification for this proposal. Non-resident fur animal hunters compose a very small portion of those hunting this region. They invest a fair amount of money to engage in hunting in a region unlike any other. There is no reason to deny non-residents this opportunity. Subsistence users have ample opportunity to harvest fur animals and non-residents are just too few to seriously consider that they are hampering their efforts.

STATEWIDE BOG MEETING

Proposal 48 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Prohibit the sale of bear parts harvested on National Park Service lands.
Discussion: This proposal appears to be one of many intended to curtail legal hunting on NPSL at the expense of Alaska enforcement. There is already too much federal intervention in Alaska game management and in the interest of Alaska's hunting and fishing heritage, this infernal interference should not be recognized.

Proposal 49 **Action: Support**
Description: Require logbooks for taxidermists and provide authority to the Alaska Wildlife Troopers to inspect taxidermy paperwork.
Discussion: Support is based on a belief that any professional license/log book and or requirement regarding the taking/sealing of animals should be an open book. Just as in presenting a hunting or trapping license this should not be an encroachment unless there are issues. Those in opposition are "rubbed" the wrong way by the ability of law enforcement to inspect without benefit of warrant and believe if there is suspect issues, a warrant is easy enough to obtain.

Discretionary Permit Conditions

Proposal 50 **Action: Support**
Description: Review and potentially repeal discretionary hunt conditions and procedures applied to permit hunts across the state
Discussion: Those in support feel the proposal will allow a review of permit conditions that have evolved into what appears to restrict some opportunities that should not be restricted and that place undue requirements on resident hunters.
1 Abstention has no opinion

Proposal 51 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Allow ADF&G to require the latitude and longitude of kill locations on a harvest report for drawing and registration hunts.
Discussion: This proposal was opposed by a slim margin. Those in opposition felt it is too demanding, those in support feel it is reasonable.

Archery, Crossbow Regulations

Proposal 53 **Action: Unanimous Support**
Description: Establish statewide standards for crossbow equipment used to take big game.
Discussion: The committee feels there is a lack of standardization, which in turn invites practices that may not be in the best interests of the resources being pursued with the crossbow.

Proposal 54 **Action: Unanimous oppose**
Description: Expand the definition of bow to include crossbows.
Discussion: This proposal seeks to introduce a method that is not consistent with the ideology of archery hunting. Places an advantage that is not conducive to the resource in special season openings.

Proposal 56 **Action: Take no action**
Description: Adopt crossbow standards and allow disabled hunters to use crossbows in archery hunts
Discussion: This proposal was brought forward and after discussion it appears that other proposals will adopt standards and there is already provisions in place to allow for disabled hunters to use crossbows in archery only seasons.

Proposal 57 **Action: Unanimous support**
Description: Allow archers to use mechanical/retractable broadheads for all big game.
Discussion: This proposal allows for archers to utilize advanced technology regarding retractable broadheads for all big game in Alaska. Initially this regulation allowed retractable broadheads for the smaller big game species, which at the time seemed appropriate. Technological advancement in these types of broadheads deems them a reasonable and affective proposition for all big game. The initial regulation concerned penetration via the use of light weight projectiles. This has advance and is no longer the case.

Proposal 62 **Action: Draw**
Description: Restrict the number of drawing permits a resident may apply for.
Discussion: Much discussion led to considering a withdrawal of the motion. Eventually a call for the vote ended with a 3 support, 3 oppose and 2 abstain vote.

Proposal 63 **Action: Support**

Description: Increase the number of drawing permits for each species that a person may apply for.
Discussion: Supporters of this proposal see it in conjunction with proposal #64. Allowing the application for additional permits is a revenue producer and allows more attempts by individuals to gain a permit. In conjunction with proposal #64 no one will be able to draw actually receive more than two permits per annual hunting season. Most see this as a win/win proposal.
2 Opposing votes view the proposal as allowing too many permits.

Proposal 64 **Action: Unanimous support**
Description: Limit drawing permits to only two permits per year
Discussion: This proposal is a long overdue limit on the number of permits any one individual may draw in a given season. Year after year hunters have watched in frustration as numerous individuals have drawn three permits. Realistically most individuals cannot utilize three permits in a season. This proposal places a reasonable restriction and allows more hunters the opportunity of drawing at least one permit. This proposal goes well with proposal number 63.

Proposal 67 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Limit drawing permits to 10 percent for nonresidents, no nonresident permits if less than 10 permits available.
Discussion: Opposition is based on the reality that non-residents are a prime source of revenue for management of Alaska's fish and game resources. Restricting their ability to draw permits in an unbiased drawing system is counterproductive to the wildlife resources in question. Those opposed believe there should be a "home town" advantage.

Proposal 68 **Action: Take no action**
Description: Allow a maximum of 10 percent for the Alaska drawing permits to be awarded to nonresident hunters
Discussion: Based on the comments on proposal No. 67.

Proposal 69 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Establish bonus point/preference system for draw hunts.
Discussion: This proposal generated a fair amount of discussion. In the end it appear that a point system will reach a point of diminishing returns that after a few years in place will make it virtually impossible for a new hunter to have any hope of drawing, thus decreasing revenue and going against the entire concept of fair play in a drawing system. One does not receive "bonus points" for every attempt at pull tabs, it just does not set right.

Proposal 70 **Action: Support**
Description: Allow nonresident deployed military personnel to defer drawing permits.
Discussion: Consensus feels that military personal are sacrificing for the country and therefore should be given this consideration. Two members abstained, no opinion.

Statewide Big Game Seasons

Proposal 71 **Action: Oppose**

Description: Open resident seasons one week before nonresident seasons in all intensive management areas.

Discussion: This blanket proposal for intensive management areas covers too much ground and if it is in fact necessary or desirable for biological reasons in a given area should be considered for that particular area. One member abstained with mixed feeling about the concept.

Proposal 77 **Action: Oppose**

Description: Require hunters to use only one type of method; either firearm or bow; require a tag.

Discussion: Majority of the committee feels the archery season is an opportunity enhancement for all hunters. There is not enough special archery seasons at the present time to adopt this proposal. With that the committee recognizes the future could change that. One abstaining member felt ill advised to vote.

Statewide Sheep Seasons and Permit Allocations

Proposal 78 **Action: Unanimous oppose**

Description: Open resident sheep seasons seven days earlier than nonresident seasons.

Discussion: Sheep are a trophy animal, few are hunting sheep purely for consumption purposes. To restrict non-residents for the first seven days of the season would effectively be thumbing our collective noses at what is a very most significant contributor by license fees to game management in Alaska.

Proposal 79 **Action: Unanimous oppose**

Description: Open resident seasons one week before nonresident seasons for Dall sheep hunting.

Discussion: Sheep are a trophy animal, few are hunting sheep purely for consumption purposes. To restrict non-residents for the first seven days of the season would effectively be thumbing our collective noses at what is a very significant contributor by license fees to game management in Alaska.

Proposal 80 **Action: Unanimous oppose**

Description: Change the nonresident season and amount of permits available.

Discussion: Comments for this proposal essentially mirror those in #78 & #79. The non-resident economic contribution while hunting these trophy animals should be considered. Resident hunters pay $25.00 and may hunt small game and 8 species of big game. Perhaps a resident harvest ticket fee for these trophy animals would make proposals such as this more palatable.

Proposal 81 **Action: Unanimous oppose**
Description: Allow an earlier Dall sheep hunting season for residents.
Discussion: See comments for proposals 78-80.

Proposal 82 **Action: Unanimous oppose**
Description: Begin the resident sheep season seven days earlier than nonresidents.
Discussion: Again, the Dall's sheep is a trophy animal and the non-resident economic contribution should be considered. There are certainly other states that promote early seasons for resident hunters but in the majority of those cases it involves small game/waterfowl. Additionally, resident hunters in virtually every other state pay more to hunt a whitetail or mule deer than Alaska residents pay to hunt small game and 8 species of big game, including the coveted Dall's sheep.

Proposal 83 **Action: Unanimous oppose**
Description: Begin the resident sheep seasons ten days earlier than nonresident seasons.
Discussion: Comments mirror those in proposals 78-82. The Dall's sheep is a trophy animal and the non-resident economic contribution should be considered. There are certainly other states that promote early seasons for resident hunters but in the majority of those cases it involves small game/waterfowl. Additionally, resident hunters in virtually every other state pay more to hunt a whitetail or mule deer than Alaska residents pay to hunt small game and 8 species of big game, including the coveted Dall's sheep.

Proposal 84 **Action: Unanimous oppose**
Description: Open resident sheep seasons five days earlier than nonresident seasons.
Discussion: Comments mirror those in proposals 78-83. The Dall's sheep is a trophy animal and the non-resident economic contribution should be considered. There are certainly other states that promote early seasons for resident hunters but in the majority of those cases it involves small game/waterfowl. Additionally, resident hunters in virtually every other state pay more to hunt a whitetail or mule deer than Alaska residents pay to hunt small game and 8 species of big game, including the coveted Dall's sheep.

Proposal 85 **Action: Unanimous oppose**
Description: Begin resident Dall sheep seasons five days earlier.
Discussion: See comments for proposals 78-84.

Proposal 86 **Action: Unanimous oppose**
Description: Begin the youth hunting season for Dall Sheep five days earlier than residents.
Discussion: The opposition for this proposal is the same as with previous proposals that would drastically change the dynamics and therefore the economic contribution by non-resident trophy sheep hunters.

Proposal 87 **Action: Unanimous oppose**

Description: Convert all nonresident sheep seasons to drawing permit hunts and limit to 5 percent of total permits.

Discussion: Comments from proposals 78-86 apply. If there is in fact a biological need to restrict sheep hunting then perhaps other options should be considered.

Proposal 88 **Action: Unanimous oppose**

Description: Convert all nonresident sheep seasons to drawing permit and limit to 10 percent of total permits

Discussion: See comments from proposals 78-87.

Proposal 89 **Action: Unanimous oppose**

Description: Convert all sheep hunts to drawing only, 90% for residents.

Discussion: See comments from proposals 78-87.

Proposal 90 **Action: Unanimous oppose**

Description: Allocate two percent of all sheep drawing permits to nonresidents, close nonresident season if harvestable surplus is less than 50.

Discussion: See comments from proposals 78-87.

Proposal 91 **Action: Unanimous oppose**

Description: Nonresident next of kin sheep tags come out of the resident pool in Units where there are a limited number of nonresident sheep tags.

Discussion: See comments from proposals 78-87.

Statewide Other Game Seasons

Proposal 92 **Action: Unanimous oppose**

Description: Allow only the use of traps and snares for taking wolf and wolverine. Prohibit the use of firearms except for dispatching trapped animals.

Discussion: There is no biological justification for this proposal and it appears to be an attempt to restrict hunting, which would also eventually restrict trapping. If firearms utilization for these species were detrimental to the overall health of the population then the State of Alaska would address the issue. It is not and therefore this proposal has no validity.

Proposal 93 **Action: Oppose**

Description: Allow only the use of traps and snares for taking wolf and wolverine on National Park Service lands and prohibit the use of firearms except for dispatching trapped animals.

Discussion: There is no biological necessity for this regulation and it appears to be an intent to further encroach on legal hunting and trapping on NPSL and as a state regulation it would be the responsibility of Alaska to enforce. Seasons, bag limits and methods and means should never be dictated by a line on a map**.**

Proposal 94 **Action: Oppose**

Description: Prohibit the taking of wolf, fox, wolverine, or coyote during May, June and July on National Park Service lands.

Discussion: No biological justification, this is simply another attempt to limit hunting on NPSL and to force Alaska law enforcement to deal with it. Alaska game regulations are fashioned to manage the species in question for the best possible utilization while sustaining populations. There are times when taking animals in non-typical seasons is justified and desirable.

Methods and Means

Proposal 97 **Action: Oppose**

Description: Prohibit the use of artificial light for taking game on all lands managed by the National Park Service.

Discussion: This proposal is contrary to Alaska regulations, which allow the use of artificial light when taking animals under a trapping license. This is a recognized method that promotes taking of predatory species that are nocturnal, which in the cases it is legal is a desirable and affective method. There is no biological reason to restrict this method because it happens to fall in NPSL. The attempts to curtail hunting and trapping efforts on NPSL are transparent and disturbing.

Proposal 99 **Action: Unanimous oppose**

Description: Hunters using a licensed transporter cannot harvest an animal on the same day being transported.

Discussion: This proposal is unrealistic given the dynamics of some of the game being hunted. As an example, deer hunting from boats.

Proposal 100 **Action: Support**

Description: Allow the use of laser sight, electronically-enhanced night vision scope, or artificial light for taking coyotes.

Discussion: Majority of the committee feel a dead coyote is a good coyote and any way that will enhance the harvest is a good thing. The opposing vote believes this crosses ethical lines that are not justified, the coyote has not and is unlikely to reach epidemic numbers that would justify these methods. Three abstentions who have no opinion

Proposal 102 **Action: Unanimous oppose**

Description: Prohibit the use of pack animals other than horses while hunting goat or sheep.

Discussion: The committee recognizes the issues and the dangers to sheep populations however, as written this proposal would restrict mules, dogs, etc… There appears to be a justification for a restriction but it needs more thought and a better proposal before adopting.

Sealing and Bag Limits

Proposal 105 **Action: Unanimous oppose**
Description: Clarify the definition of wounded as it applies to the restrictions to bag limits.
Discussion: Proposal is virtually impossible to enforce and there is no evidence that suggests a hunter would be absolutely able to identify a mortal wound in the field.

Proposal 108 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Prohibit the harvest of cubs and sows accompanied by cubs on National Park Service (NPS) lands.
Discussion: Management units prescribing the taking of cubs or sows with cubs are done with a very specific biological justification to decrease predatory impact on ungulates use for human consumption. This proposal is simply another attempt to restrict hunting and to force Alaska to enforce rules they have no need or desire to do.

Evidence of Sex, Transfer & Possession

Proposal 110 **Action: No action**
Description: Require the hunter to keep sex attached to the meat if it (the skull) needs to be sealed.
Discussion: After being brought forward and discussed the committee elected to take no action. There seems to be a need/desire for modification of the existing regulations however; it seems to require a more in depth look to make a rational decision.

Black Bear Baiting

Proposal 116 **Action: Unanimous oppose**
Description: In addition to the 10 bait sites in total, guides and assistant guides may also have two personal sites each; guides and assistant guides may hunt all sites for personal use without guide client agreements.
Discussion: Committee feels there is no need to further enhance bait station opportunities for guided bait hunting endeavors.

Proposal 118 **Action: Withdrawn**
Description: Clarify and modify the permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait and scent lures
Discussion: Motioned forward and then after discussion was withdrawn.

Proposal 121 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Prohibit black bear baiting on all National Park Service lands.
Discussion: Baiting is the most effective method of managing populations of black bears in lowland brush country. Black bears occur and require population management on NPSL as

much as anywhere. Means of managing game populations does not change because a line is superimposed on a map. Nor is it reasonable or desirable to have separate regulations for the same game populations. Wildlife conservation is managed by the State of Alaska and methods and means are set to facilitate the best possible utilization of the resource. Alaska is Alaska and its wildlife population should not be managed by lines on a map. These efforts to curtail traditional hunting opportunities and sound wildlife management are transparent and offensive.

Trapping

Proposal 124 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Require trap identification for all Units on lands managed by the National Park Service.
Discussion: Not a statewide regulation and there is no justification for Alaska to be responsible for enforcing a regulation they have chosen not to adopt for general trapping endeavors.

Proposal 125 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Require a 72 hour trap check for all traps and snares set on National Park Service lands.
Discussion: This proposal is obviously presented by those who know nothing of trapping. Numerous traps and snares are "kill" sets and there is no justification for setting a 72 hour time limit for checking them. Leg hold traps that are not "kill" traps are checked by trappers in accordance with experience with the animals targeted. This proposal has no basis of any sort.

Proposal 126 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Prohibit the trapping of black bears in all National Park Service managed lands.
Discussion: If the trapping of black bears is deemed necessary for a given region/population then a superimposed boundary on a map does not change that need. Another attempt to curtail legal hunting/trapping opportunities and management.

Proposal 128 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Establish a tag and fee to allow trappers to retain incidental catch.
Discussion: This proposal seems like an invitation to harvest animals and keep them out of season.

Interior Region BOG meeting comments

Proposal 252 **Action: Support**
Description: Re-authorizes the antlerless moose season in the Skilak Loop Management area of Unit 15A.
Committee supports keeping this proposal alive even though it has little chance of being implemented.

Proposal 253 **Action: Support**

Description: Re-authorizes the antlerless moose hunt on Kalgin island in Unit 16B.

The antlerless moose season on Kalgin Island is a viable means of keeping the moose population in check. With no natural predators on the island moose numbers would quickly rise to starvation levels without this hunt.

Proposal 254 **Action: Support**

Description: Re-authorizes the antlerless moose season in a potion of Unit 15C.

This hunt is a reasonable utilization of available resources.

Proposal 258 **Action: Support**

Description: Opens a registration permit hunt for brown bear on the Kenai Peninsula in lieu of the current drawing hunt system.

Discussion: This proposal is intended to increase the harvest of a brown bear population on the Kenai Peninsula that has grown out of proportion to its element. Repeated pleas from the public to do something about the exploded population of brown bears have gone unanswered for too long. The current policy in place that allows for a minimal amount of harvest through the drawing permit system has been ineffective in controlling the brown bear population on the Kenai. Bear populations are virtually impossible to accurately survey and thus, the policy has remained very conservative. With that, the amount of anecdotal, not to mention documented encounters with brown bears and the public leads to this proposal. Individuals who have lived and hunted on the Kenai for 40-50 years know without question that the brown bear population is higher than it had ever been in memorable history. The study or whatever took place that made them a species of concern has no validity, there were no accurate counts then, just as there are not now. What there is, is an overwhelming realization by the residents of the Kenai Peninsula that there are too many brown bears. There has been an extraordinary number of bear/people encounters and at the present population rates, there will be more. When there was a regular hunting season there were virtually no bear/people issues. Black bear hunters utilizing bait as a hunting method on the Kenai have been severely curtailed largely because brown bears move into bait stations and thus make it virtually impossible to harvest black bears, which have also increased in numbers. Additionally, studies have repeatedly shown that bears, black and brown are the most significant mortality factor for moose calves. While we propose to aerial hunt wolves as a moose enhancement measure without in turn checking the bear population seems at cross purpose.

Craig F&G Advisory council meeting Dec. 5, 2011

Quorum in attendance
Doug Rhoades, Ellen Hannan, Steve Stumpf, William Farmer, Fred Hamilton, Charles Haydu, Bill Russell, Corky Timpe, Mike Douville

Public in attendance: No one

7pm Meeting called to order

Minutes discussed and accepted from last meeting held 3-29-2011

Discussed the following proposals:

Shellfish Proposals Dec. 5, 2011				
Proposal #	Support	Oppose	Abstain	Comments
140	0	9	0	
145	9	0	0	
165	9	0	0	
174	0	9	0	***"Support as amended"*** Keep the season as it currently is 8 am – 4pm.
179	0	9	0	We feel it's wrong to kill one species to save another.
180	9	0	0	
182	9	0	0	We feel this will stop illegal divers from stockpiling product prior to the openings.
193	9	0	0	This will close o loophole for noncompliant divers.
195	9	0	0	***"Support as amended"*** We feel 50 is too many while 10 is too few. We support a limit of 25 daily.
Board of Game Proposals Dec. 5, 2011				
67	8	1		Steve Stumpf opposed this proposal feeling there was not enough information to allow or deny a specific percentage of tags to non-residents.
89	0	9	0	
92	0	9	0	
104	9	0	0	

Following votes on the above proposals we briefly talked on a couple of Finfish issues.

Set the next meeting for elections and discussing Finfish proposals for January 9, 2012 @ 6pm. City Hall.

Ended meeting at 8:45pm

Tok Cutoff/Nabesna Road Fish & Game Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes of December 19, 2011

Meeting began at 5:10 pm.

Members Present: Thumper Williamson, Bill Albaugh, Cole Ellis, Ernie Charley, Wayne Schafer, Ole Bates

Public Present: Teresa Albaugh, Jim Beeter, Christy Ellis

Staff Present: Becky Schwanke, Sherry Wright

Elections were held with the following results: Ernie Charley – 3 year Chistochina seat; Thumper Williamson – 3 year Undesignated seat; Jim Beeter – 1 year Undesignated seat

Thumper Williamson was elected to finish out Thelma Schrank's secretary term. Ole Bates was elected to finish out Thumper Williamson's Chair term. Regular officer election will be held next year.

Board of Game Statewide Proposal Discussion

Prop 41 **Action: Support as amended 7-0**
Discussion: Prefer in state only – doesn't believe any of our game should go out of the state for any reason. The **amendment** "as needed" would be acceptable as long as the game stays in the state. Amendment approved.

Prop 48 **Action: Opposed unanimous**
Discussion: The National Park can control activity on federal park lands.

Prop 50 **Action: No action**
Discussion: Language needs to be clarified. This proposal was put in place for review. Specific language regarding the type of radio is included in the hunt permit conditions.

Prop 51 **Action: No action**
Discussion: Don't believe a person should be required a GPS for some hunts. This would be included in the permit conditions.

Prop 62 **Action: Opposed unanimous**
Discussion: There's no reason to restrict the number of permits a person applies for. You are only allowed three per species now. This was poorly written.

Prop 71-86 **Action: Opposed unanimous**
Discussion: Air taxis may profit and the local guides would be left with little to harvest. The guides are the last subsistence hunter – the people who live off hunting. Many people also use and need the meat. Don't like preferring one user group over another. There are ample options for a variety of users. If you are a hunter, you are going to be out scoping for your harvest.

Prop 87-90 **Action: Oppose unanimous**
Discussion: These are too restrictive.

Prop 91 **Action: Oppose unanimous**
Discussion: Even if non-resident is next of kin, the law provides for that opportunity.

Prop 92-94 **Action: Opposed unanimous**
Discussion: Currently can use a firearm to dispatch an animal caught in a trap. Don't want that changed.

Prop 97 **Action: Opposed unanimous**
Discussion: There is already a law against using artificial light.

Prop 98 **Action: Opposed unanimous**
Discussion: This is very vague. It is common to use hand held electronics during predator hunting.

Prop 102 **Action: Support as amended**
Discussion: There is a concern of using domestic sheep or goats as pack animals and inadvertently introducing disease to the wild stocks. Dogs, llamas and alpacas are OK. Amendment of restricting only domestic sheep or goats. Amendment approved.

Prop 105 **Action: Opposed 6-0-1**
Discussion: Would not put mortally in front of wounded.

Prop 108 **Action: Opposed unanimous**
Discussion: The National Park can control activity on federal park lands.

Prop 116 **Action: No action**
Discussion: Prefer status quo. Not sure what the proposer is trying to get.

Prop 117 **Action: No action**
Discussion: Prefer status quo.

Prop 121 **Action: Opposed unanimous**
Discussion: The National Park can control activity on federal park lands. Why should we agree to close anything on Park Service lands.

Prop 124 **Action: Opposed unanimous**
Discussion: This is not practical to put tags on every trap.

Prop 125-126 **Action: Opposed unanimous**
Discussion: The National Park can control activity on federal park lands.

Prop 127 **Action: No action**
Discussion: Currently no law in place.

Prop 128 **Action: Support unanimous**
Discussion: This would help trappers improve reporting.

Board of Game Interior Region Proposal Discussion

Prop 186 **Action: Oppose unanimous**
Discussion: The committee concept was misrepresented, as well as their name. The emphasis was that reporting would improve. Most people do report. The committee also does not agree with changing Unit 11 regulations to match Unit 12.

Prop 187 **Action: Support as amended**
Discussion: The wording would significantly alter the remainder of Unit 12 area.
AMENDMENT: It should be specific to only along the Nabesna Road and season should be the same as Unit 11.

Prop 245 **Action: Support 7-1**
Discussion: This authorization is required by AC's. There are 10 antlerless moose permits allowed and it is a management tool. The moose populations continue to increase in Unit 13.

Prop 255 **Action: Support unanimous**
Discussion: An annual approval necessary to increase opportunity.

Wayne Schafer is approved to represent the Tok Cutoff/Nabesna Road AC at the Statewide BOG meeting.

Next meeting is tentatively set for February or March.

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

Sitka Fish & Game Advisory Committee

Tad Fujioka, Chairman

214 Shotgun Alley, Sitka, AK 99835

Below is an excerpt of the Game-related portion of the meeting of the Sitka AC held on Nov 17 2011.

The following people are referred to by initials in the discussions:

AC members:
Tad Fujioka-trapping/chairman, Tory O'Connell-alternate/secretary, John Murray-power troll, Jerry Barber-Hand troll, Randy Gluth-hunting, Brad Shaffer-at-large, Aaron Bean-(day) charter, Jack Lorrigan-subsistence, Dick Curren-longline

ADF&G:
Sue Bowen

PROPOSAL 41 **ACTION: amended motion passes 9-0**
DESCRIPTION: Cultural Game Harvest Permits.
AMENDMENT: ***This permit may not be given to for-profit corporations and game harvested under the permit many not be taken out of state.*** Passes 9-0
DISCUSSION: JL MTA, RG 2nd
BS – I don't like the idea that Corporations would be treated like a tribal government. I don't think it is appropriate to comingle for-profit corporations with a cultural based entity.
JL – I have issues with this one – a door would be opened to corporations which could then include Cabela's or Shell oil. The corporations should be working with /through the clans or the tribes.
TO – I think we should amend this proposal that would be explicit that we don't want corporations taking game. If a corporation needs game for a cultural meeting the local tribe would have to apply for the permit. The way that this proposal is worded, it isn't an up or down, the Dept is asking for direction.
AB – the corporation would have to work with the tribe anyway
SB – the dept has given permits to allowed use of moose to be transported out of state for consumption at corporation dinners. There was some uncertainty as to whether or not this was what the BOG intended. We want some more specific guidelines.
JL MTA: Permit to take game for cultural purposes. ***This permit may not be given to for-profit Corporations and game harvested under the permit many not be taken out of state.***
BS – 2nd
RG – hasn't there been permits issued in the past for potlatches, funerals, normal tribal events? Isn't that what these permits are for?
JL – there are mortuary permits for potlatches. That is a different type of permit. Also, we want to make sure that the board is aware that in SE the responsibility for getting game for these sorts of events lies with the clan leader, not the tribal leader. They are different. Another thing- I think that

the Dog Point Fish Camp might be incorporated. They need to be able to continue getting these cultural permits. That's what their whole program is about.
TO- We said no to for-profit corporations. Dog Point is non-profit, right? They aren't like Sealaska or anything like that.
BS-This AC objects to the issuance of these permits to for-profit corporations.

PROPOSAL 44 **ACTION: fails 0-9 (emphatically)**
DESCRIPTION: Modify the ADF&G discretionary authority for Governor's tags.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: JL MTA, RG 2nd
This tags are given to an organization and the Department will get some of the money from the auction tag. Safari Club and AOC gets these.
AB – who knew this existed.
JL- does this have to do with the Bison Hunt ? They will raise money by auctioning this tag off, and use it to fund litigation against subsistence rights.
TO – NO! Absolutely NOT!
JL –What she (TO) said!!
RG – how many tags total are given?
SB – up to 6 per year: 2 sheep, 2 bison, 2 bear. This proposal isn't about issuing the tags themselves. The Legislature approved that already. It is to allow hunting out of season to make the tags more valuable.
JL – I am opposed to entities using our game animals to raise money to fight us. There are reasons for the seasons and there shouldn't be any exceptions. This is turning into a fiefdom - turning into the king's deer.
BS – in other states they have these tags for auctions or raffles and make a lot of money selling the tickets-10's of thousands of dollars- more if there is known to be a particularly large-antlered animal in the area that the tag is for. In Alaska, there are still nonresident registration hunting opportunities for sheep that are rare to non-existent in other states. We still provide unsurpassed opportunity to a wealthy non-resident hunter.
TO – The Department should be ashamed of this proposal. We are categorically opposed to it.
BS?

PROPOSAL 45 **ACTION:passes 8-0-1**
DESCRIPTION: Align state regulations on subsistence bartering with statutory authority.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: JM – MTA, JB 2nd
SB – This came from subsistence division. This is in conflict with subsistence statutes which supercede regulations.
TF – there was a proposal that addressed this a few years ago for deer in 1D. It was not well written, and not well received by the board. Apparently the author of that proposal knew what he was talking about though. Too bad he didn't get recognized for it at the time.
JL – Tlingits have traded seaweed and seal with interior natives for moose for centuries – That' why they called the trade routes grease trails – bartering is traditional.
JB?

PROPOSAL 46 **ACTION:no action**
DESCRIPTION: Allow the sale of big game trophies.

AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 47 **ACTION:no action**
DESCRIPTION: Allow the sale of trophies acquired through legal action such as divorces.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 48 **ACTION:no action**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the sale of bear parts harvested on National Park Service lands.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 49 **ACTION: fails 4-5**
DESCRIPTION: Require logbooks for taxidermists and provide authority to the Alaska Wildlife Troopers to inspect taxidermy paperwork.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:
SB – it is apparently difficult for FWP to have access to taxidermist shops. This was brought up last board cycle by the troopers who were not very well represented at the BOG meeting. The taxidermists were very opposed. The troopers said that they would withdraw the proposal for the time being to allow them to work with the taxidermists to come to a solution. It doesn't look like they did though, this is the same proposal as last time. Probably they are going to revise it to take the taxidermist's objections into consideration.
AB – this sounds unconstitutional
TO – I don't have trouble with FWP having access, this is an issue with lodges as well but I don't know if this is one degree too far along; They need to have reporting requirements though.
BS – there has to be reasonable cause for a search, but there should be a paper trail and requirements for following game through the paper work process.
RG – the violation should be caught in the field- not in the taxidermy shop.
JB – I didn't see this as an open door, I saw this as a requirement that those taxidermists keep a record, they should be doing that anyway for their own protection– the hunter is likely the violator but the bust can be more easily made at the taxidermist. I think taxidermists should be required to keep a log. This proposal doesn't say that the troopers can search the premises without a warrant, just look at the log. You show the trooper your logbook. You don't have to let them in the backroom.
JB – MTA
AB – 2nd
TO – I support the proposal because there should be access to these animals. I don't think most taxidermists are criminals and the proposal justification is offensive but I think this is a start. The constitutionality of this will be addressed in the courts.
RG – I am not in support – this can't be a big problem like the volumes of fishing violations. The police will crowd the constitution on this if they can. Give them an inch, they will take a mile.
AB – they should have to fill out a warrant. I have a little law enforcement background. It's not that hard. The troopers are in town and have access to the judge. The taxidermy shop isn't going anywhere.
JB – I see this paperwork as a way to get to the person in the field. I don't see where it says they can inspect the business, it just says that they can inspect the paperwork during business hours.

JM – I appreciate what everyone is saying about stepping over boundaries, I have to agree with TO - they have free access to fishing business. I don't look at FWP as overstepping their boundaries, I have only ever been boarded once in decades of fishing. They were very professional.
AB – "reasonable" means they can get a warrant.
JL ?

PROPOSAL 51 **ACTION: passes 4-2-3**
DESCRIPTION: Allow ADF&G to require the latitude and longitude of kill locations on a harvest report for drawing and registration hunts.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: RG MTA, JB 2nd
RG – where is GMU 20
SB – this is around Fairbanks.
TF – Does the proposal intend that minutes be recorded as just an integer number- or do they really want decimal minutes? The reason that I ask is that 1minute is about 1 mile. I don't need a GPS to tell you where I was within a mile. I can tell that by looking at good map, but if you ask for 1/10 or 1/100 of a minute, then I'll need to carry a GPS. I don't think that a hunter should be required to buy or carry a GPS. I don't see what is gained by knowing where the animal was killed with that level of precision. These animals move around don't they? If the same animal had been shot yesterday, or tomorrow it would have been somewhere slightly different, but so what?
SB – I don't know – this is an area with a very high moose population and they want more moose taken, they may not require it to be that accurate.
JB – I have hunted there and it is an area that is great for hunting cows.
?

PROPOSAL 52 **ACTION: fails 0-7-2**
DESCRIPTION: require locking tag for permit hunts
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:
JB – MTA, JM 2nd
SB – The area biologist has overlapping permit hunts and drawing hunts and folks are always reporting illegal harvest, they want something visible so that the any-bull racks are easily identified and not thought to be sub-legals.
RG – If this is specific to just one or two areas, can't they make the proposals for just there? I'm not supportive of this in other areas.
SB – this is discretionary so they wouldn't have to do it, but they could do it in other areas if this passed.
JB?

PROPOSAL 54 **ACTION: fails 1-5-3**
DESCRIPTION: Expand the definition of bow to include crossbows.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:JB MTA, RG 2nd
JB: I think crossbow is much different than other bows and doesn't belong here.
RG – there is a tremendous arc so your range is limited, I'm not sure what I think about this. I can see the argument for calling a crossbow a type of bow. Heck, some people hunt with spears. Their choice. There isn't a big advantage to using a crossbow.
JM – is this kind of like electric reels? Is it an advantage?

JB – There is some advantage. You don't get tired holding the drawn bow. You could cock it and carry it ready to shoot for hours. Can't do that with a regular bow. but this isn't like electric reels.
RG – some older folks do use crossbows, if there is a 2 week archery season in head of the rifle season, this could be good for them.
TF – If the reason that a given hunt is archery-only is just for safety, I would support it. If the reason for the archery hunt is to give bow hunters a separate & easier opportunity, then I can't support the proposal for those hunts.
JL?

PROPOSAL 55 **ACTION:no action**
DESCRIPTION: Create a regulatory definition for crossbow.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 63 **ACTION: passes 6-1-1**
DESCRIPTION: Increase the number of drawing permits for each species that a person may apply for.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:JB – MTA, JL 2nd
JB – I think more chances are better. JL – do the odds get better or is this just a way for the state to make more money.
AB – will it help residents?
SB – well we have a lot of resident only hunts but this applies to both residents and nonresidents
TF-A few years back they wanted to increase the fee to put in for a drawing hunt in order to raise revenue. This just looks like another way for the dept to raise money.

PROPOSAL 65 **ACTION: passes 8-0**
DESCRIPTION: limit drawing permits to 2 per year
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: JB MTA, BS2nd**,**
JB – I like that one, Seems like there is a sense of fairness
BS – it is hard to actually hunt more than 2 permitted hunts per year and others lose the opportunity. This would spread the opportunity. When you have too many hunts scheduled in the fall- assuming that you have to spend at least some time at work too, there is the feeling that you have to rush things. The hunts aren't enjoyed as much. It can lead to meat wastage if you don’t' have time to take good care of the meat.
?

PROPOSAL 66 **ACTION: no action-due to support of 67**
DESCRIPTION: Allow a maximum of 10 percent for the Alaska drawing permits to be awarded to nonresident hunters.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 67 **ACTION: passes 8-0**

DESCRIPTION: Limit drawing permits to 10 percent for nonresidents, no nonresident permits if less than 10 permits available.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: JB MTA, AB 2nd. JB – I'm in favor of this because I think there is too much competition for some of these hunts. I prefer this proposal of the several that are similar because it clearly states that there wouldn't be any non-residents given tags if the number of huntable animals is so small that less than 10 tags are available. The other proposals leave some wiggle room.
DC – I think there should be some kind of preference for Alaskans; a lot of us still hunt to eat.
BS – in many of the other Western states this is practiced. We wouldn't be doing anything that out-of-state hunters aren't already used to.
RG – There are a number of proposals here indicating a resident preference, this one is for all drawing hunts. I would like to see a resident preference but do not support elimination of nonresidents completely – 10% isn't many, but a sheep hunt isn't a village hunt-there are lots of residents applying for those sheep tags so maybe it is still fair.
BS – Musk ox might be an issue here.
JB – cow moose hunts in 20B would be affected.
SB – most cow moose hunts are residents only already; moose, caribou, deer, and elk are protected for resident preference by statute
BS – 10% cap on sheep is the big issue. The increasing demand is all being driven by the commercialization of individual sport hunting. Alaska is the last place that a non-resident can get a sheep under a registration hunt. It is a big thing now to bag a grand slam of sheep. If you have money, you can go to Alaska and get the 1st of your 4 sheep. Guides know this is coming so there is a big focus on sheep population. No other state allows such liberal sheep hunting.
TO?

PROPOSAL 68 **ACTION:no action-based on support for 67**

DESCRIPTION: Allow a maximum of 10 percent for the Alaska drawing permits to be awarded to nonresident hunters.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 69 **ACTION: fails 0-8**

DESCRIPTION: Establish bonus point/preference system for draw hunts.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:TF – this has come up a couple of times in the past. It was Board sponsored then. We supported it the first time -based mostly just on the assumption that the BOG would only sponsor a good proposal; we didn't give it much discussion. The second year that it came up we had some time to think about. After realizing that it had a real potential to increase the number of non-residents applying for these permits, we didn't supported it.
JB – MTA
RG -2nd
JB – Yep- it's back again. I still don't like this proposal.
TF – Most of us were here for this proposal last year. I will just reference our discussion from last time so I don't repeat the same speech since I'm chairing the meeting this time around.
RG – once the state gets into this point system you can't back out – it is too complicated
JB ?
****

Excerpt of Minutes from Sitka AC meeting Oct 23 2010:

Discussion of Proposal 46: Institute Bonus Point System for drawing hunts

Outcome: Fail 1 for 6 against 1 abstain

MTA/2nd

TF: Last time when this proposal came up, I saw that it was proposed by the BOG and seemed to make it more likely that I might draw a rare tag so I fully supported it without giving it a whole lot of thought. There wasn't much discussion at this table here, so I think that most of us did that. After the vote and after hearing from some other folks outside of the AC, I think that I made a mistake. I will not be supporting it this time around. I say that because now I recognize that there will be some negative secondary effects that I did not recognize the first time. Specifically, this proposal provides a great advantage – an exponential advantage- to those who have the time and organizational ability to put in for these hunts year after year. Many of us are fortunate enough to be able to say, ah, it's only $10. What's the big deal? But, it is $10 every year and it is a commitment to spend the money every year. If you miss one year, you are back at the beginning. Also, there is no assurance that the drawing fee will remain this low. There was a proposal a couple of years back to raise this fee. Some hunters can't afford to commit this money years in advance. This proposal gives advantages to those with money. Anytime that happens, it should be expected that those with money will move to take that advantage. In this particular situation, this means giving an advantage to non-resident hunters over residents and to urban residents over rural residents. I don't think that these are good things.

Furthermore, this proposal severely disadvantages any hunter under ten years old since you need to be at least 10 to enter the drawing. Whenever they are finally old enough to enter they will be some years behind the rest of the hunters in the drawing. I don't think that this is fair.

RG: I am nervous about the complexity of this proposal. Anything this complex may have other complications that we aren't aware of. I read the argument against this written by Doug Corl, a guide from Petersburg and found it quite convincing.

EJ: Very eloquent Tad. You've convinced me to change my mind from last time too.

PM: The dept has no position on this. This will be quite controversial. That's one of the reasons for the 50%/50% split. In some states you can even buy bonus points. I don't think that we would want to go that route.

TF: Actually, that's included in the proposal. Item 6 allows an applicant to pay the drawing fee while opting to not be included in the drawing for that year, but only to gain the bonus points for the future. That's one of the reasons that I found this so offensive. It is exactly selling bonus points!

I read this advertisement for a service to join this organization that will file your permit application on time. It is directly appealing to non-resident hunters to "get in on the bottom floor" of the Alaska bonus point system. Getting a bunch more non-resident applications in the pool is exactly what we don't want if we want to increase our own odds of getting drawn.

JH: (guide rep) I'm not totally convinced that there aren't some potential benefits in giving out-of-state folks some more opportunity. Maybe 50%/50% is too much, maybe it should be reduced to 75%/25%. I think that I want to see continued out-of-state interest in Alaskan hunting since it is good for the guides. I would be willing to support this to some extent.

? called

End of excerpt

****

PROPOSAL 70 **ACTION: passes 8-0**
DESCRIPTION: Allow nonresident deployed military personnel to defer drawing permits.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: JB – I'd like to support the military
JB – MTA
BS – 2nd
TF – any biological concerns?
SB – these are drawing permits so they have already accounted for the mortality.
RG – if they are going overseas to fight for our country they should have a bit of privilege

PROPOSAL 71 **ACTION: see 74**
DESCRIPTION: Open resident seasons one week before nonresident seasons in all intensive management areas.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 72 **ACTION: see 74**
DESCRIPTION: Open big game general seasons seven days earlier for residents, five days earlier in drawing hunts.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 73 **ACTION:see 74**
DESCRIPTION: Open all big game seasons one week earlier for residents than nonresidents.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 74 **ACTION: passes 8-0**
DESCRIPTION: Open all big game seasons one week earlier for residents than nonresidents.
AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: AB – MTA, RG 2nd
JB- Of all of the proposals along this line, I like this one best because it says that the non-resident season will open later, rather than having the resident season open earlier. I don't think that I want to see more pressure be put on the animals.
TF – are there many seasons that are less than 1 week?

SB – no; not in regulation anyway
TF-Some are closed in less than a week by EO, but if the demand for those hunts is that great then maybe they ought to be resident-only anyway.
?

PROPOSAL 75 **ACTION:N/A-see 76**
DESCRIPTION: Open early youth hunt for all big game, ten days before other seasons; require hunter education.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 76 **ACTION: passes 6-1-1**
DESCRIPTION: Open early youth hunt (10-17 years) for all big game statewide and require accompanying adult to forfeit bag limit.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:BS MTA, JB 2nd BS – I like this proposal in that it will keep adults from manipulating their kids for tags – if parents can't hunt then this wouldn't be an incentive to shoot your moose and your son's too.
TO – I'm not sure I understand how adults could manipulate the system even now, if it's a separate season. You have to be a youth to hunt in a youth season.
SB – that is what this proposals intends.
RG – I would like to support this because it is a good idea to allow an early season to let a youth to hunt. A lot of openers are pretty competitive. If your kid gets a moose your family don't need a 2nd one. I support successful youth hunts.
TF- The way that this is written it is unclear whether the adult would have to forfeit their bag limit even if the young hunter didn't kill an animal.
SB- The way we understand it, if the youth didn't harvest, the adult could still hunt later in the seaosn.
JB – I don't like the "all big game statewide" language.
BS – I think that this only refers to existing early youth hunts- the parent would have to forfeit their tag in those hunts.
AB – I can't support this because of the Kake moose hunts. I have family there. They mostly eat moose and the family eats two per year. This could keep them from getting a second.

PROPOSAL 77 **ACTION:N/A**
DESCRIPTION: Require hunters to use only one type of method; either firearm or bow; require a tag.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 78 **ACTION:N/A due to support for 74**
DESCRIPTION: Open resident sheep seasons seven days earlier than nonresident seasons.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 79 **ACTION: N/A due to support for 74**
DESCRIPTION: Open resident seasons one week before nonresident seasons for Dall sheep hunting.

AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 80 **ACTION: N/A due to support for 74**
DESCRIPTION: Change the nonresident season and amount of permits available.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 81 **ACTION: N/A due to support for 74**
DESCRIPTION: Allow an earlier Dall sheep hunting season for residents.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 82 **ACTION: N/A due to support for 74**
DESCRIPTION: Begin the resident sheep season seven days earlier than nonresidents.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 83 **ACTION: N/A due to support for 74**
DESCRIPTION: Begin the resident sheep seasons ten days earlier than nonresident seasons.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 84 **ACTION: N/A due to support for 74**
DESCRIPTION: Open resident sheep seasons five days earlier than nonresident seasons.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 85 **ACTION: N/A due to support for 74**
DESCRIPTION: Begin resident Dall sheep seasons five days earlier.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 86 **ACTION: N/A due to support for 76**
DESCRIPTION: Begin the youth hunting season for Dall Sheep five days earlier than residents.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 87 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Convert all nonresident sheep seasons to drawing permit hunts and limit to 5 percent of total permits.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 88 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Convert all nonresident sheep seasons to drawing permit and limit to 10 percent of total permits.
AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 89 **ACTION: N/A due to support for 76**
DESCRIPTION: Convert all sheep hunts to drawing only, 90% for residents.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 90 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Allocate two percent of all sheep drawing permits to nonresidents, close nonresident season if harvestable surplus is less than 50.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 91 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Nonresident next of kin sheep tags come out of the resident pool in Units where there are a limited number of nonresident sheep tags.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 92 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Allow only the use of traps and snares for taking wolf and wolverine. Prohibit the use of firearms except for dispatching trapped animals.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 93 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Allow only the use of traps and snares for taking wolf and wolverine on National Park Service lands and prohibit the use of firearms except for dispatching trapped animals.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 94 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the taking of wolf, fox, wolverine, or coyote during May, June and July on National Park Service lands.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 95 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Open several management areas to the taking of small game by the use of falconry.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 96 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Open areas to archery hunting, if shotguns are allowed.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 97 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the use of artificial light for taking game on all lands managed by the National Park Service.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 98 **ACTION: N/A- brief discussion below**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the use of hand held electronics in taking game.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:SB- I think that this is about rangefinders.
TF- Oh?- I was thinking GPSs.
AB- radios?
SB- I guess maybe there was more to this than I had thought.
TF- I think that overall I prefer this philosophy to the dept-mandated GPS proposal 51.

PROPOSAL 99 **ACTION: passes 8-0**
DESCRIPTION: Hunters using a licensed transporter cannot harvest an animal on the same day being transported.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:RG – MTA, JB 2nd
RG – Sue can you discuss problems in POW and Kake – isn't this a black bear hunt issue?
SB – we have tried to get transporters regulated under the guide regulations, but it is a gray area. We weren't able to get a handle on them. Now all nonresidents that are taking black bear (in SE) will have to have a guide or draw a permit
RG – move to withdraw?
JB – doesn't hurt to address it.
BS – I have had personal experience on Kuiu Island, there is a lot of abuse.
?

PROPOSAL 100 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Allow the use of laser sight, electronically-enhanced night vision scope, or artificial light for taking coyotes.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 101 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Allow same day airborne taking of coyotes statewide.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 102 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the use of pack animals other than horses while hunting goat or sheep.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: SB – it is still being discussed, it is about passing disease from exotics to sheep.

PROPOSAL 103 **ACTION: passes 7-1**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the use of felt soled wading boots while hunting game.

AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: JB MTA, BS 2nd JB – if you can't fish in them, why should you be allowed to hunt in them?
RG – you are covering the same ground so it should be consistent.
TF- I thought that it many have been overkill for fishing. The need is even more questionable for hunting.
?

PROPOSAL 104 **ACTION: passes 8-0**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the use of deer or elk urine for use in taking game.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:JM MTA, RG 2nd**.** JM – am I missing out on something? Who does this?
RG – it is a huge problem in the lower 48 – chronic wasting disease come from cow urine and it could be problem.
TO?

PROPOSAL 105 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Clarify the definition of wounded as it applies to the restrictions to bag limits.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 106 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Count wounded muskox, bison, sheep and goat that are not recovered as bag limit.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 107 **ACTION: fails 0-8**
DESCRIPTION: Eliminate the statewide bag limit for black bear.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: JM MTA JB 2nd – Is this an interior thing? SB – in some areas there is a 5 per year limit like in McGrath, but this proposal would get rid of the state bag limit – if you hunt in a unit with 2 and then go to another unit with less bear you can't take them – this would allow more take.
JB – They just recently changed the rules so that you can sell black bear hides. This promotes commercial harvest of parts – I don't support it.
RG – The Dept has decided in some of these areas that have high black bear population that 5 is hard enough harvest? SB – some of these areas are not accessible so bag limits are not limiting.
?

PROPOSAL 108 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the harvest of cubs and sows accompanied by cubs on National Park Service (NPS) lands.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 109 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Clarify and remove complicated and restrictive regulations and ADF&G discretionary provisions pertaining to black bear hunting.

AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 110 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Require the hunter to keep sex attached to the meat if it (the skull) needs to be sealed.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 111 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Clarify the sex organs, or portions of, that must remain attached for proof of sex.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 112 **ACTION: fails 0-8**
DESCRIPTION: Eliminate the evidence of sex regulation.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:JB MTA, BS 2nd JB: There are so many hunts in this state that are sex-specific including deer.
BS – you can usually tell what sex the animal is just by size, I think that I agree with this proposal, it is a relict regulation. The meat would be in better shape if you didn't have to leave organs attached.
RG – in many areas down here there is a spike fork /50" regulation for moose – a young bull could easily be the same size as a cow. DNA evidence may be possible, but it is expensive and slow. You can't do it in the field. I don't usually feel that the troopers need any additional help, but I have a hard time justifying support for this proposal.
JB – I would too because of all the nonresidents. Once the meat is out of state it is beyond the reach of the troopers.
AB – I agree with RG, it eliminates arguments in the field.
TO?

PROPOSAL 113 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Remove the reference to federal agent under the transfer and possession regulation.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 114 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Allow black bear to be taken same day airborne within 1/4 mile of bait station.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 115 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Eliminate the personally accompany requirement for guides using bait stations and require a guide-client agreement.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 116 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: In addition to the 10 bait sites in total, guides and assistant guides may also have two personal sites each; guides and assistant guides may hunt all sites for personal use without guide client agreements.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 117 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Remove the requirement for guides to personally accompany resident clients at a black bear bait station.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 118 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Clarify and modify the permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait and scent lures.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 119 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Establish a codified location for permitted black bear bait stations and establish seasons for all of Alaska.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 120 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Eliminate black bear baiting as a method requiring a predator control permit in predator control areas.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 121 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit black bear baiting on all National Park Service lands.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 122 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Allow the use of scent lures for black bear baiting while floating.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 123 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Allow the use of scent lures for black bear baiting while floating.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 124 **ACTION:**

DESCRIPTION: Require trap identification for all Units on lands managed by the National Park Service.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 125 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Require a 72 hour trap check for all traps and snares set on National Park Service lands.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 126 **ACTION:**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the trapping of black bears in all National Park Service managed lands.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 127 **ACTION:no action**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the taking of a black bear by trap or snare.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 128 **ACTION: comment only**
DESCRIPTION: Establish a tag and fee to allow trappers to retain incidental catch.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:BS- TF- you are trapping rep. What do you think of this one?
TF- I like the philosophy behind the proposal. Three tags might be overly generous- it could be taken advantage of; However, it says that this is beyond the BOG's authority- so it is probably not worth spending our time on it tonight.

PROPOSAL 129 **ACTION:no action**
DESCRIPTION: Clarifies responsibilities of Department of Fish and Game commissioner.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 130 **ACTION:no action**
DESCRIPTION: Authorizes a predator control program in Unit 26(B)..
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 131 **ACTION: no action**
DESCRIPTION: Authorize a brown bear control program in Unit 19A.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 132 **ACTION: no action**
DESCRIPTION: Modify the Agenda Change Request Policy.
AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 239 **ACTION: no action**
DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in Berner's Bay.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:
SB – want to keep antlerless hunts on the books because hard to get new ones on the books. There won't be one this year.

Homer F&G Advisory Committee
Oct 25, 2011

6:00 P.M.
Members Present: Marvin Peters (Chair), Trina B. Fellows (Sec), Tom Young (Vice), Michael Craig, George Matz, Joey Allred, Dave Lyon, Gus Van Dyke, Thomas Hagberg, Pete Wedin & Gary Sonnhuber.

Excused: James Meesis, Skip Arvil, Tabar Ashment & Lee Martin.

F&G Biologist: Thomas McDonough – Homer, Mark Burch ADF&G/DWC Reg#2

AWT: Trent Chwialkowski & Paul Mconnel.

F&WS –Kenai NWR: Steve Miller.

Homer News: Michael Armstrong

Public: 18 people

Proposal 35 & 36 1 Favor 9 Oppose 1 Abstain

Comments by public:
More moose needed for hunters – Opposed to aerial wolf hunting – wolves needed for tourist attraction – improve habitat first – vehicles kill hundreds of moose each year. Wolves kill moose calves – tourist take more pictures of moose – address black & brown bear also – moose winter habitat by Beluga Lake has no [illegible] – not enough time to read & digest – out of cycle – inadequate public notice – address Moth infestation/ no wolf studies – will habitat improve after wolf control – wolf used as a keystone –canary in coal mine – this intensive management proposal has nothing to do with science and all to do with politics – need predator studies – address carrying capacity – no emergency – stop poaching – need more enforcement- wait another year and see how antler restriction in 2011 turns out – use money for studies of moose, wolves, bears – mixed land ownership- nutritionally stressed already - meeting in Barrow is out of range for people of Homer.

Comments by Advisory Board:
1 favors proposal as written.

1 abstains: A few minutes to study proposal is not enough time. Why just wolves? Studies needed on bear population – habitat – vehicle kill.

9 Oppose: Not needed – carrying capacity –there is not a lack of animals just a lack of bulls - need to encourage trapping and hunting of wolves & bears –can't support with just 1 hour to read – wait for 2013 and revisit – not sound science just political.

Meeting Adjourned

GASH AC Teleconference 12.5.11

Meeting teleconference called to take the place of an Anvik meeting that was weathered out

Members Present:
Stan Walker, Grayling; Steve Deacon, Grayling; Cliff Hickson, Anvik; Ken Chase, Anvik; Arnold Hamiltion, Shageluk; Kathy Chase, Holy Cross; Rebecca Edwards, Holy Cross; Bruce Werba, Holy Cross; Roger Hamilton, Shageluk

Staff Present:
Eric Newland (ADFG), Amanda Wiese(ADFG), Tom Seaton(ADFG), Josh Peirce(ADFG), Roger Seavoy(ADFG), Jerry Hill (FWS- Innoko), Bo Sloan(FWS- Innoko), Nissa Pilcher(ADFG)

Meeting called to order at 10:15 am. This meeting is to take the place of the face to face meeting that was to happen in Anvik that was called off due to weather, which was a rescheduling of the meeting from an October 28th meeting that was put off due to weather.

Discussion on agenda- what do present-

Decided that Election of Anvik members; Concerns from public and AC members; Introduction of Biologist and Wood Bison Update; Update on the WIRAC meeting; were decided to be put off until the next face to face meeting due to either it being necessary to be face to face or these issues not beign time sensitive

Eric Newland gave a presentation on the summer and fall season Yukon Run, including sonar counts, salmon counts, and commercial fishing numbers. It was noted that the first pulse was not fished, and the Yukon fishermen are commended for that. It was a good Chum year for the fall run, but the summer Chinook season was poor. The aerial survey result that was conducted on the Anvik River was discussed. Then the fishing timing was discussed for this year, and it was mentioned that we need a better run this next year. Another concern was brought up was by switching to a 7" net, we moved from a braided net then monofilament- which was sent to the AC via an exchange program (TCC- Ken; Holy Cross Quick Pac fisheries not monofilament), which hurt the non target fish and tore up the fish that were kept, and then moving to a smaller mesh caught the big ones by the nose, and killed them, but the net didn't secure them, so most were lost when the net was checked.

Ken Chase discussed the WIRAC meeting in Aniak in early October in regards to WP10-68. Bo Sloan was called on to go over some points on the proposed federal hunt, and it was noted that the deliberations for this proposal have been put off to the March FSB meeting due to one of the RAC's that is affected by this proposal hasn't had the opportunity to deliberate on it. Bruce Werba commented on that all the GASH communities need to make a good showing to get permits for the winter hunt and follow the reporting guidelines to show that we need the all the permits , and that we used all of the 40 moose

within our communities. Bo noted that a proposal needs to be addressed to the WIRAC to how the moose should be allocated if those four communities are allowed C&T for this winter hunt. Discussion on the importance of reporting on the green harvest tickets, that when the Innoko Refuge issues the winter permits, it is mostly on the honor system. It is very important to fill out the green harvest tickets as well as the winter permits to show how many animals are needed in the GASH area. Bruce noted that many of the out of the area hunters that appear in this area show up time and time again that are hunting on their own tickets, then their wives, then their kids. Bo noted that those people are essentially stealing from you and as much as you might not like it, it is your responsibility to turn them it- you need to police your own ranks because not only is it in your best interest, it is in the animals' best interest. Ken noted that the GASH AC has been one of the longest operating AC in this region, and he was approached by elders that acknowledged this, and for working their butts off to keep the moose population in this area up.

Ken has two letters to address. One was from a member of the public from Grayling with a concern about someone in the community trapping without a license on private land. Stan Walker said that they had had an issue with someone this last fall, but it had been taken care of as far as he knew. Ken noted that it was a recent letter, and Stan noted that he didn't realize that it was still an issue. The AC, including the Grayling folks decided that enforcement should be involved at this time.

It was decided to discuss the BOF proposals should be left till the face to face meeting

Comments for the 2012 BOG Statewide meeting

Proposal 92- **Action: Not Supported**

Allow only the use of traps and snares for taking wolf and wolverine and prohibit the use of firearms except for dispatching trapped animals

Do not like this proposal at all. Majority of animals taken by firearms in this area- if we see a pack of wolves while out checking our trap line, don't want to wait for them to be stuck in our traps, we like being able to harvest them opportunistically.

Unanimous- Not in Favor

Proposal 99 **Action: Supported as Amended**

Hunters using a licensed transporter cannot harvest on the same day transported.

Most members of the AC already thought that this was law currently. There seems to be a disconnect between what occurs in south east, where black bears and deer as hunted as noted in the proposal, and what happens in the Interior with hunters and transporters are very different. Let's keep the guiding and transporting separate. The proposal is meant well, but is worded in a way that this AC does not like. It is unreasonable to expect a hunter to sit around all day after getting dropped off by a transporter until daybreak the next day to begin hunting.

Amendment- The hunter is not allowed to take an animal while in the company of a transporter. Once the hunter and transporter part company, the hunter is legally allowed to hunt
Unanimous- In favor as amended

Proposal 103 **Action: Support**
Prohibit the use of felt soled wading boots while hunting game.
The idea is a good one, but rubber boots carry a lot of gunk in them- dirt and seeds, they are dangerous to walk on and a lot noisier while hunting. If the concern is cross contamination, should find another way to address this issue. The AC supports the invasive weed concern, but doesn't really like the state telling us what to wear, but for the sake of invasive weeds we will support it.
Unanimous- Support

Proposal 107 **Action: No Action**
Eliminate the statewide bag limit for black bear
AC chose to take no action on this proposal

Proposal 113 **Action: Not Supported**
Remove the reference to federal fish and wildlife agent under the transfer and possession regulation.
Confusion on the exact intent of the author of this proposal. The there are few enforcers to help protect the resources in GMU 19 as is without limiting what they can do as per this proposal.
Unanimous- not supported

Proposal 127 **Action: No Action**
Prohibit the taking of a black bear by trap or snare
Josh mentioned that at this time there was no season on black bears, so this might not be an issue at this moment in time. The AC mentioned that bears take even more moose calves then wolves, hides aren't worth a whole lot, consumption of bear meat is pretty varied, but ultimately low in this area, cost of boat gas is high, the incentive for people coming in from outside is low since black bears are accessible on the road system. Black bear population seems to be declining with an influx of grizzly bears. This could be another tool for the toolbox.
The AC chose to take no action at this time

Proposal 128 **Action: No Action**
Establish a tag and fee to allow trappers to retain incidental catch
With all the different trapping seasons for all the different furbearers it is hard to keep up. At this point in time the AC would like to consider the specific proposals that are coming before the Board at the Interior BOG meeting that is dealing with trapping season changes for individual species

GASH AC committee voted to try to meet again in February 1, 2012 in Anvik, weather permitting.

Excerpt from the Middle Yukon Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes from December 2012

Middle Yukon AC
Nulato Community School, Nulato, AK
December 12, 2011

Called to order at 12:00 pm due to late planes.
Roll Call

Paddy Nollner (Galena); Benedict Jones & Patrick Madros (Koyukuk), Michael Stickman & Robin George (Nulato); Kevin Saunders, Richard Burnham, Thomas Negalska, & Justin Esmailka (Kaltag)

Various members of the Nulato public,
Agency Staff Present
Glenn Stout and Nissa Pilcher (ADFG); Darren Hildabran (DPS)

Douglas Patsy and and Robin George nominated and elected to fill 2 vacant Nulato Seats, still missing one seat at this time

John Staam from the Ruby AC came over from Galena to attend the meeting

Proposal 52 **Action: Support**
Clarifies department discretionary authority to require antler locking tags for certain permit hunts
It was noted that the department already does this, and that this will make this authority easier to enforce.
Unanimous support

Draft Minutes from McGrath AC Teleconference

Thursday, October 27, 2011

12:15 pm

Members Present:
Ray Collins, Chair-McGrath
Lewis Egrass-McGrath
Steffen Strick-McGrath
Mark Cox-McGrath
Kevin Whitworth-McGrath
Clinton Goods- Takotna
George Gregory- Nikolia
Nick Petruska-Nikolai

In addition Daniel Esai (who could not make the meeting due to work) call the chair earl to state he was opposed to any changes in the issuing of permits as proposed in Proposal 6. It is not broken and doesn't need fixing. Any increase of hunters from outside the area will impact the current recovery of moose numbers.

Comments on BOG Arctic/Western BOG meeting

Proposal 6 **Action: Unsupported**
Description: Eliminate the requirement to pick up moose registration permits weeks or months prior to the season in remote villages in Region V (Units 18 and 23); make all registration permits available in season from designated vendors. ***(This proposal will also be considered under the Unit 23 management area.)***
Amendment: None
Discussion:

- Local people in these areas are dependent on the resource, and while there is currently enough to go around, increasing the availability of permits has the potential to drastically increase the number of hunters which would be detrimental to the whole resource
- We feel that if hunters have enough money to fly into this area specifically to hunt, they can hunt on general season tickets, other registration hunts, or drawing hunts, not these specific registration hunts. This change would impact local hunters that need these moose to subsist on. With the high cost of fuel in rural Alaska, local hunters are limited to how far away from their homes they can already hunt, without having to deal with added competition from people who live outside 19D.
    - On a side note, an AC member observed 5 good sized bulls being taken in 19D on the river this hunting season by non-locals with no harvest ticket. McGrath does not currently have an enforcement officer, and other areas know this. An increase in hunters with no enforcement officer is not a good mix.

- With the improved and lengthened runway at Takotna, the ability to fly in boats and 4wheelers is now a possibility. The workers that came out to make the improvements on the runway went hunting in 19D and were talking about doing just that. This ability already exists in McGrath.
- Passing of this game regulation would take away a valuable tool that the managers use to manage the moose population. While there is currently a sustainable harvest, an increase of hunting pressure could negatively impact the bull:cow ratios in GMU 19D
- Locals went through a 5 year memorandum on moose hunting the not too distant past. The communities here did without moose in order to bring the population up. Local hunters paid the price , while other hunters that are now interested in coming into 19D to hunt did not have to give up their moose. Already over 20% of these permits go to people willing to come out here and get the permits who later return to hunt, and that number will increase if this proposal passes. There is a huntable surplus of moose in the area of 19D that is outside the permit area. This area does not require a permit and can sustain added pressure.

Motion moved and seconded to adopt
Vote taken
0 in favor; 8 opposed
Motion Defeated Unanimously

The following proposals are to be taken up at the Statewide BOG meeting in Anchorage 2012

Proposal 93 **Action: Unsupported**
Description: Allow only the use of traps and snares for taking wolf and wolverine on National Park Service lands and prohibit the use of firearms except for dispatching trapped animals.
Amendment: None
Discussion:

- The McGrath AC believes this would be a horrible proposal to pass
- This proposal would affect very few people, but those people would be effected greatly
- There is no biological reason- if there was, it should be addressed by changing season dates and/or bag limits.
- The trappers that operate on park lands operate far away from the beaten path, which means that the viewing wildlife aspect of parks near more accessible areas would not be affected.
- If this proposal is extended to all federally managed land, it would be very problematic. Some communities, for example Galena and Holy Cross, are surrounded by federal lands. The trappers who reside there currently use this method of taking furbears quite a bit, and removing the trappers abilities to remove animals this way would impact their livelihoods as well as moose and caribou populations, there-by effecting the freezers and pocketbooks of the locals that depend on the moose and caribou in the area
- All trappers who have traditionally taken wolves and wolverine with a rifle when the opportunity presents itself could be affected if this is used as a precedent by those who oppose trapping.
- With the park lands spreading across Alaska, this could wind up being a very bad game regulation for the whole state.

Motion moved and seconded to adopt
Vote taken
0 in favor; 8 opposed
Motion Defeated Unanimously

Proposal 131 Action: Support
Description: Authorize a brown bear control program in Unit 19A.
Amendment: None
Discussion:

- It works for us, so it should benefit those folks.
- With an increase of moose down there would help those hunters be able to take the moose in their own area instead of having to travel too far, including into 19D.

Motion moved and seconded to adopt
Vote taken
8 in favor; 0 opposed
Motion Supported Unanimously

Next McGrath face-to-face AC meeting
February 10th (Roger in Fairbanks 13th-17th, comment deadline on the 17th for Interior BOG meeting)
Possible Agenda items:

- Antlerless Moose reauthorization
- AYK Proposals
- Comment on Interior BOG proposals
  Tentative
  - 19D Biological Update
  - Innoko Update

Susitna Valley Fish & Game Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes of November 30, 2011

Prepared by Bruce Knowles

A meeting for the Susitna Valley AC was called to order. There were only four members present and two Visitors. Since there were not enough members for a quorum, members present decided to work on proposals for the upcoming Board of Game. Each proposal was discussed and voted on.

Proposal and/or proposals were introduced motion from Jerry Sousa and a second Todd Kingery

Proposal 43: Permit to take beavers to control property damage: Too restrictive as written, easier methods should be approved to allow for quick action
Support 0 **Opposed 4** Abstain 0

Proposal 46 & 47
Support 2 Opposed 2 Abstain 0 : Opposition was expressed to selling of trophies.

Proposal 48: Prohibit sale of bear parts harvested in National Park Service Lands
Support 0 **Opposed 4** Abstain 0: this would be very difficult to enforce and feeling was that it wasn't needed

Proposal 49: Provide authority for Wildlife Troopers to inspect taxidermy businesses
Support 4 Opposed 0 Abstain 0 : Increase in wildlife protection is needed and should be for fish also.

Proposal 51: Discretionary permit hunt and conditions and procedures.
Support 0 Opposed 0 Abstain 0: ***Motion table until next meeting need more information. Will hunt info such as latitude and longitude be released to public?***

Proposal 52: Dept. authority for locking tags
Support 4 Opposed 0 Abstain 0: Should be expanded to any fish that has a seasonal limit with no replacement if lost.

Proposal 53: Establish statewide standard for crossbows: TO many people can't pull a bow due to injury or age.
Support 4 Opposed 0 Abstain 0

Proposal 54-56: Expand definition of bows to include crossbows: TO many people can't pull a bow due to injury or age.
Support 4 Opposed 0 Abstain 0

Proposal 56: Adopt crossbow standards for disable person to use crossbow: TOO many people can't pull a bow due to injury or age.

Support 4 Opposed 0 Abstain 0

Seward Fish & Game Advisory Committee Meeting
Minutes of November 10, 2011
City of Seward Council Chambers

Meeting called to order at 7:00 pm by Chairman McCracken

Members Present: Jim McCracken, Robin Collman, Dianne Dubuc, WC Casey, Bob White, Doug McRae, Ame Hatch, John Flood, Jim Hubbard, , Mark Clemens, Jim Herbert
Quorum present [8 required, 11 present].

Members Absent Excused: Corey Hetrick, Ezra Campbell, and Trent Foldager

Members Absent Unexcused: Chris Bolton, Dr. Matt Hall, and Carl Locke

Public Present: Tim McDonald, Jeanette Hanneman, Tom Prochazka, John French, Tom Buchanan

ADF&G Staff: Dan Bosch

Approval of Agenda: approved with addition of comments by McDonald

Approval of Minutes: minutes of the previous two meetings were approved with corrections provided by White and McCracken for the 10/20/2011 meeting. Final versions to be sent to Sherry Wright.

Correspondence/Communications: Dubuc reported on participation in a Geographic Strategic Resource [GSR] meeting earlier in the day to identify locations of special interest between Cape Puget and Nuka Point that would need protection in the event of an oil spill or other hazardous material event. Twenty key locations were identified. The work is sponsored by PWS Citizen's Advisory Committee.

White said the Flood Board is working with the Kachemak Bay Land Trust to use "in lieu of money" to purchase wetlands in the Salmon Creek – Clear Creek area. The goal is to protect habitat and provide a buffer for flooding. Other parcels would be purchased with other funds for gravel extraction and as a way to dredge out the river channel. He also said two new 17 foot wide culverts are installed in Salmon Creek near Nash road with funds form the Watershed Forum. This will make life easier for adult and juvenile salmon and do a better job of moving large volumes of water through the area.

Seward Fish & Game Advisory Committee Meeting
Minutes of November 10, 2011
City of Seward Council Chambers

Presentations-Reports – Bosch gave a brief report on his stream walking activities since the last meeting. He is trying to get comparable data to surveys done in the 1972-1989 period when the surveys were done on a regular basis. He noted live and dead fish in numerous streams including First Lake and Sheffler Creek. Again he extended an invitation to visit the new hatchery in Anchorage. They have just moved kings into an incubation tank. Rainbows are doing well. He reminded us that it will be a four year process to bring the whole facility up to speed. He is impressed with the automation of the feeding process. He will assist us with PWS proposal review in a few minutes.

McDonald informed the AC that there was a strong run of late silvers going up Resurrection River and Salmon Creek this fall. At the next Cook Inlet Aquaculture Association meeting he will propose that only 10 signatures be required to get a name on the ballot instead of the current 20. Given a small number of active permits [~15] and the total number of permits [~80] he feels the system does not encourage participation by people. It becomes a political popularity contest. He hopes this proposal would encourage participation by Seward area permit holders.

McDonald also raised the issue of invasive species entering Resurrection Bay in coal ship ballast water. With increased traffic and coal shipments, he felt we were in real danger from invasives such as green crab and mitten crab.

John French from PWSRCAC elaborated on CG regulations and efforts in Valdez regarding ballast water and invasive species. He spoke to the potential treatment of the water with hypochlorite and how that might also be a danger to local species.

Dubuc said historically the AC has been concerned about this matter and written the governor. She feels there has been discharge of ballast water at the dock and is uncertain of the accuracy of procedures and logbook entries. The CG and ADEC are not aggressively enforcing ballast water rules.

McCracken said you only have to be wrong once to deal with the consequences of unwanted gifts.

Old Business – none.

Seward Fish & Game Advisory Committee Meeting
Minutes of November 10, 2011
City of Seward Council Chambers

New Business – The majority of the meeting was dedicated to the deliberation of PWS fish proposals to be acted on by the Board of Fish in March 2012 and Statewide Game proposals to be acted on January 2012. A summary of the comments by advisory members pertaining to proposals considered follow along with the vote of AC members present. The vote format is for-against-abstain. The maker and the second to the motion to consider are noted. There were no members of the public who wished to comment on any proposal. Chairman McCracken did not vote on the proposals and focused on running the deliberations.

Authorization of travel to Board meetings:

Authorize Vice Chair Dubuc to attend the March 20, 2012 meeting of the BoF as the representative of the Seward AC. Motion by Casey, second Hatch.
Vote 10-0-0.

Authorize AC member Campbell to attend the January 13 BoG meeting as the representative of the Seward AC. Motion by Casey, second Collman.
Vote 10-0-0

Prince William Sound Proposals – Comments due by November 18, 2011

Proposal 44 Hubbard/Hatch 6-3-1
Discussion lead by Hubbard who is an active participant in the longline fisheries. Notes increase in rockfishes offshore and assumes the same may be true in PWS. Notes this person is one of the few or only deep water shrimp trawler in the Sound and is asking that money from his mandatory retention of rockfish and black cod go to the fishermen, in this case him, instead of the state. Proposer wants the current 10% by catch to be raised to 30% for fishermen. Noted GHL of 150,000# has not been reached for rockfish. Who gets the money?

Proposals 45, 46, 47 – No Action

Proposal 48 Dubuc/White 9-0-1
Locally there are large numbers of sexually immature spiny dogfish that negatively impact other sport and commercial fisheries. Feel increasing the limi would have benefits. Acknowledge that they are slow to reach sexual maturity [males 20 years, females30 years according to Bosch]. Also seem to see large

Seward Fish & Game Advisory Committee Meeting
Minutes of November 10, 2011
City of Seward Council Chambers

Proposal 49 Hatch /Clemens 10-0-0
Clean up language. Housekeeping

Proposals 50 – 79 – No Action
Limited discussion. Often we chose to take no position on an allocative issue, were uncertain of the outcomes suggested by the maker of the proposal, or did not have sufficient information.

Proposal 80 Hatch/White 10-0-0
We agree that a boat is not a buoy

Proposal 81 Dubuc/Hatch 10-0-0
We agree that the intention is to not let drift gill nets become set nets intentionally or unintentionally. A loophole that needs be closed.

Proposal 82, 83, 84 Hatch/Dubuc 10-0-0
We saw no effect on the harvest of salmon by these proposals. The use of cork line and lead line border strips in salmon seines is an evolution of gear design that makes the gear easier to haul with 'wheel' power blocks and then replace only the strip rather than 100 mesh deep panels. We agree that the use of these prefabricated panels should not be counted in the current definition of measurement of the overall depth of seines. Recommend revising the definition.

Proposal 85 Dubuc/Clemens 1-5-4
Discussion of the elimination of the 75 fathom, 7 inch lead for all seines in PWS seems significant change. It would decrease congestion and increase maneuverability in certain tight fishing areas. People can remove the lead now if they wish. Cape haulers are better with the 225 fathom nets. Shorter nets would be of benefit to smaller vessels that would not have the extra gear on deck. Overall felt the status quo was best with individuals making their own choice under existing rules.

Proposal 86 and 87 – No Action

Proposal 88 Hatch/Hubbard 9-0-0 one briefly absent
See no change to actual management. Simplified description facilitates announcements

Seward Fish & Game Advisory Committee Meeting
Minutes of November 10, 2011
City of Seward Council Chambers

Proposal 90 Hatch/Clemens 10-0-0
More precise definition of the district with latitude and longitude

Proposal 91 Hatch/Clemens 10-0-0
Clean up ambiguous boundaries; clarification

Proposal 92 –no action

Proposal 93 Hatch/Clemens 10-0-0
Do not agree that commercial operators should suffer loss of fishing area

Proposal 94 –no action

Proposal 95 Hatch/Casey 9-0-1
Gives more protection to salmon in shallow waters of Sheep Bay. Logical. Simplifies management by increasing protected waters.

Proposal 96 Dubach/Clemens 0-9-1
Salmon do not celebrate the Fourth of July. It is optional for fishermen. Support the commercial operators.

Proposal 97 Casey/Collman 8-0-2
Housekeeping

Proposal 98 Hatch/Clemens 7-0-3
Seems to facilitate timely harvest of chum salmon cost recovery at hatchery.

Proposal 99 Hatch/Dubuc 9-0-1
Allows a larger area defined by a three point line. Easier to fish the limited area. It is a place where individual fishermen could use a 150 fathom long seine to minimize congestion.

Proposals 100-106 – no action

Proposal 107 Hatch/Dubuc 0-9-1
Allocative. We do not agree with this radical reallocation.

Seward Fish & Game Advisory Committee Meeting
Minutes of November 10, 2011
City of Seward Council Chambers

Proposal 109 Hatch/Dubuc 0-6-4
Needs more evaluation. Consider alternatives.

Proposal 110 –no action

Proposal 111 Hatch/Dubuc 0-9-1
Allocation. Do not agree with modifications to the cost recovery plan currently in place.

Proposal 112 Hatch/Clemens 8-0-2
Allocation.

Proposal 113 Hatch/Hubbard 0-8-2
Believe this is not a significant problem. Know proving spotting from an aircraft would be difficult in this era of cell and sat phones. Leave it alone.

Proposal 114 and 115 Hatch/Dubuc 0-9-1
Similar proposals but see it as allocative. Do not buy the argument that the PWS hatcheries are a "false 'commercial' entity." Disruption of the status quo. Negative implications for investments by the fishermen and the hatcheries.

Proposal 116 Dubuc/Hubbard 0-7-3
See homepack as a traditional use of the resource by commercial fishermen. Do not see it as a problem. See the motivation of the Fairbanks group but we take the opposite side.

Proposal 117 – 124 -no action

Proposal 125 Collman/Clemens 8-0-2
Seems good means to protect the cutthroat trout population given the unknown status of the population. Lingering effects of the Exxon Oil Spill still uncertain.

Proposals 125-138 – no action
We wonder if proposal #71 was actually supposed to be #131. Regardless we taken no action.

Proposal 371 Hatch/Dubuc 10-0-0
Proposal submitted by our advisory committee. Will allow better information to

access to shrimp grounds for personal use from the port of Seward. Resource appears to be healthy.

Statewide Game Proposals to be Considered January 13-17, 2012
Brown Covered Book

Proposals 46 and 47 White/Herbert 0-10-0
We do not like the idea if a person's "wall is full" that they might sell trophies. It implies market hunting. Individuals can give away unwanted mounts and hides.

Proposal 56 White/Hubbard 6-0-4
See the use of crossbows as common in other states. Do not have any significant advantage over other high tech bows. Would allow certain people with handicaps or infirmities to participate in an archery hunt.

Proposal 59 White/Clemens 7-0-3
Seems an excessive and expensive requirement for bow hunters targeting bear and moose. As an option for hunters it is acceptable, but not a requirement.

Proposal 65 Dubuc/Clemens 9-0-1
Seward AC proposal seeking to allow better distribution of a limited number of drawing hunting permits among an ever growing number of hunters. Given the cost of many hunts it seems extravagant to be participating in a large number of drawing permit hunts. Seek equitable distribution of hunting opportunities.

Proposals 71-74 McRae/White 0-10-0
We see these proposals as disenfranchising a lot of people. This type of staggered start has been used in Canada to the great disadvantage of the group starting late. Will result in a negative economic impact on guides and businesses that rely on non-resident hunters. One AC member never felt he was at a disadvantage hunting the regular season when in the field with non-resident hunters.

Proposals 92 – 94 White/Dubuc 0-9-1
See this as severely limiting the harvest. Some members feel there is already enough of a problem with predators and want to see no reduction in methods and

We do not see this as a problem. Members are familiar with the use of mules as pack animals. We were shown a picture of a dog acting as a pack animal. Llamas are able to climb higher and work in rougher country than horses.

Proposal 103 Dubuc/Herbert 10-0-0
We endorse a uniform ban on felt soles for hunting, fishing, mining etc. due to the danger of transporting invasive species. Alternative foot gear is currently available that works as well if not better than the old fashioned gear. We have been a support of not using felt soles in the past and this is a matter of consistency for our AC.

Proposal 114 McRae/White 7-0-3
Members believe a person flying to a black bear baiting station is utilizing the plane as transportation since she/he is focused on the black bear that is within the ¼ mile of the bait station. They are not searching the country for a target animal. The abstentions think that it blurs the line between spotting and transportation.

Citizens Comments and Response – We outlasted the public and no one was left in the audience to comment on the meeting

Next Meeting – Based on a request by Sherry Wright, we will schedule our next meeting for Friday, January 27, 2012. She will oversee the annual election of the members of the AC committees on the Kenai Peninsula that week.

The members of the Seward AC whose terms expire at the end of 2011 and whose seats will be open are: Dubuc, Foldager, Hatch, Herbert, Hetrick, Locke, and McRae.

We note that the Seward AC has passed 2 motions authorizing travel by two members to the Board of Game and Board of Fish per the current policy of the Boards Support Section. See page 3 of these minutes.

Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 2230 hours.
Minutes and comments prepared by Herbert 11/11/11

November 22, 2011 Upper Tanana Fortymile Advisory Committee Meeting

Discussion of Statewide Proposals;

Prop 44 Oppose 0-7

Frank E; This similar to resident sheep hunters wanting a jump on everyone else. They already have advantages TMA Can hunt both seasons

Danny G; They can hunt later, if they want to, but not early

Prop 45 Support 7-0

Frank E. No problem Yukon River residents have always done it

Prop 46 Support 7-0

Frank E.; Trophies should be the same as trapping fur s and selling it. Trophies should be personal property and people should be able to sell their personal property

Danny G.; Other states allow it and there hasn't been problems

Frank E.; There are restrictions, seasons, and bag limits. There are stiff fines for selling illegally taken animals.

Prop 47 Support 7-0

Prop 49 Support 7-0

Justin Rodgers (telephonically) Discussed AWT's reasoning behind this proposal

Frank E. ; Doesn't feel taxidermist should have to ask for a hunting license. Frank would support this if the Taxidermist are not required to collect additional info. Best Government = Least Government

Support w/modification to not require taxidermist to ask for hunting license or require taxidermist to have to fill out a special log provided by the department Taxidermist should be allowed to keep their own records as they always have individually.

Prop 50 Support 5-2

Discretionary authority- modify the following –remove the wording "trophy value of an animal taken under a subsistence permit may be nullified by the department under #5" #13 – reduce the age to age 7

Prop 51 Oppose 0-7

This should not be allowed under discretionary authority. It should be addressed by the Board on a case by case basis under Regulation- and only where it is really necessary for management purposes

Props 57 and 58 Support 7-0

Mechanical broadheads cut bigger holed and more humane and effective and modern mechanical broadheads are very dependable.

Prop 65 Support as modified (see below) 7-0

Prop 66, 67, 68 Opposed 0-7
Should be done on a case by case basis, not applied statewide

Prop 71 & 77 Oppose 0-7
Should be addressed on a case by case basis and not statewide

Prop 78- 86 Oppose 0- 7
Sheep is a trophy hunt Non residents

Prop 91 Oppose 0 – 7
Sec degree of kindred- Non residents are still non residents They should not be lumped into resident pool

Prop 92,93,94,97,98, Oppose 0- 7
They are ridiculous!

Prop 99 Opposed 0- 7
Should be considered by the Board on a case by case basis, should not be handled statewide

Prop 100 Support as modified 7- 0
Will be a limited harvest- additional opportunity Add fox and wolves to this proposal

Prop 101 Support 7-0
Additional opportunity

Prop 102 Oppose 0- 7
This is an issue of the state veterinarian to address.

Prop 103 **Oppose 0- 7**
Have the state vet deal with this

Prop 104 Support 7- 0
Need to keep Chronic Wasting Disease out of Alaska

Prop 108 Oppose 0- 7
This is ridiculous- would limit ability to take 3 year old bears that are young adults Greatly reduce opportunity.

Prop 110 Oppose 7- 0

Prop 124, 125, 126, 127 Oppose 0 – 7
Unnecessary restrictions and stupid Trapping proposals make no common sense

Prop 128 Oppose 0 – 7
Could be abused

Prop 129 Support 7- 0

Prop 130 Support as modified 7- 0
Modify to include penning up a portion of the surviving muskox to use to repopulate the muskox population once bears are removed. Similar to how the Chisana Herd Recovery Program was carried out
Torsten Bentzen, Biologist, discussed the agenda change request he wrote for the Nabesna Road Moose proposal the UTFAC submitted (Prop 186)
Torsten clarified Prop 186 antler restriction for non residents- that it should restrict non residents from taking spike fork bulls. The AC agreed this was their intent.
Torsten discussed the moose harvest data request for Dave Stancliff

Next meeting January 10th

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

RECEIVED
DEC 30 2011
BOARDS
ANCHORAGE

Attn Scott
AC Commun
BOG-SW
2012

AC NAME: Central Peninsula

LOCATION (town): Ninilchik

DATE (of meeting): 12/19/11

MEMBERS PRESENT: Steve Vanek, David Martin, Doug Blossom, John McCombs, Mike Schuster, Bob Clucas, Gary Delman, Teague Vanek, Greg Encelewski, Jeff Berger

MEMBERS ABSENT EXCUSED:
Max Fjelstad

MEMBERS ABSENT UNEXCUSED:

QUORUM PRESENT: YES ✓ **NO** ___

AGENCY STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Selinger - ADF&G game biologist.
Steve Miller - Kenai Nat'l wildlife Refuge deputy
Ted Spraker BOG member

Time Meeting Called to Order: 7:10 PM

Old Business and New Business (See following pages)

Time Meeting ~~Adjourned~~ recessed: 10:10 PM will wed Dec. 21, 2011

David R Martin, Chairman
Signature, Committee ~~Secretary~~

FROM : DAVID R MARTIN PHONE NO. : 907 567 3306 DEC. 30 2011 02:13AM P2

STATE OF ALASKA

Sean Parnell, Governor

David Martin, Chair
PO Box 468
Clam Gulch, AK 99568
907-567-3306
dmartin@alaska.net

Central Peninsula Fish & Game Advisory Committee

Sign in Dec. 19, 2011 meeting Ninilchik

Steve Vanek	Ninilchik
David R Martin	Clam Gulch.
Doug Blomen	Clam Gulch
John McCombs	Ninilchik
Jeff Selinger	ADF&G Soldotna
Steve Miller	Kenai NWR
Larry Cobb	Ninilchik
Mike Schultz	Ninilchik
Jeff C Mason	Clam Gulch
Gary Deiman	Ninilchik AK
Jacque Vanek	Ninilchik, Ak
Greg Encelewski	Ninilchik AK
Ilwen J Berger	Ninilchik, AK
Jeff Berger	Ninilchik, AK

FROM : DAVID R MARTIN PHONE NO. : 907 567 3306 DEC. 30 2011 02:13AM P3

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

AC NAME: Central Peninsula

LOCATION (town): Ninilchik

DATE (of meeting): 12-21-11 (recessed meeting from 12-19-11)

MEMBERS PRESENT: Steve Vanek, Dave Martin, Bob Clutae, John McCombs, Jeff Berger, Gary Delmar, Mike Schuster

MEMBERS ABSENT: Doug Blossom, Ron VANEK, Max Feldstat, Greg Enatelewski

QUORUM PRESENT: YES ✓ **NO** ___

AGENCY STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Saligan, Ted Spraker

Time Meeting Called to Order: 7:K PM

Old Business and New Business (See following pages)

Time Meeting Adjourned: 9:15 PM

Steve Vanek

Signature, Committee Secretary

FROM : DAVID R MARTIN PHONE NO. : 907 567 3306 DEC. 30 2011 02:13AM P4
page 4 of 17

Central Peninsula Fish & Game Advisory Committee
Date: 12-21-11 Meeting Attendance Sign in Sheet

Name/Organization	Mailing Address City, Zip Code	Interests (optional - see below)	Email/Phone
Steve Vanek	Nikiski		
David Schmidt	Clam Gulch		
John McComb	Nikiski	all except 11	
TED Spraker	Soldotna		
Jeff Selinger	Soldotna		
Robert O Clavens	CLAM GULCH		
Jeff Bergen	Nikiski		Dccp@PTIAWARE.net
Mike Schmidt	Nikiski		
Gary Deimen	"		

Interest Groups: 1 - Trapping 2 - Sport Fishing 3 - Subsistence 4 - Hunting 5 - Commercial Fishing
6 - Photography 7 - Guiding 8 - Processing 9 - Personal Use 10 - Outdoorsperson
11 - Association/Corporation 12 - Conservationist

FROM : DAVID R MARTIN PHONE NO. : 907 567 3306 DEC. 30 2011 02:14AM P5

VOTER RECORD/COMMENT

ADVISORY COMMITTE: Central Peninsula

DATE: 12/19/11 **PAGE** 5 **OF** 17

Board of BOG **Comments for** State wide

Please use this format to record the votes and comments of members regarding proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary to spend time on that proposal.

Proposal #	Support	Oppose	Abstain	Summary of Discussion (include minority view)
35	9	0	0	Our AC has been in the fore front of implementing intensive management plans in all of Unit 15. We don't have time to wait and study. Only 32 bulls were harvested in 2011. This doesn't not satisfy the needs of hunters to feed their families or forego a historic recreational customary activity. There is not a habitat problem. There is a high predation problem from high numbers of wolves, black bear and brown bears. Our AC supports taking any and all means possible to bring all prey species down to a ~~manageable~~ manageable level that will allow a high harvest of moose at a high sustainable level. We need to do this on a fast track time frame to meet this goal. There is no reason to delay or procrastinate in reducing prey levels.
36	9	0	0	See comments on #35
41	0	9	0	This should not be allowed State-wide. It should only be allowed on an immediate area basis only. Could easily expand, get out of hand and be abused to the detriment of the general public.

FROM : DAVID R MARTIN PHONE NO. : 907 567 3305 DEC. 30 2011 02:14AM P6

VOTER RECORD/COMMENT

ADVISORY COMMITTE: Central Peninsula

DATE: 12/19/11 **PAGE** 6 **OF** 17

Board of BOG **Comments for** Statewide

Please use this format to record the votes and comments of members regarding proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary to spend time on that proposal.

Proposal #	Support	Oppose	Abstain	Summary of Discussion (include minority view)
42	10	0	0	We had a tenth member of the AC show up at this time. We agree with the Department.
43	0	10	0	We agree with the Department. Should be able to trap the beaver. There are no conservation concerns on beavers.
44	0	10	0	There should be no special season, methods or means for a Governor's tag recipient just because a person can afford to pay a lot for the permit. The State has a 12 billion dollar budget it can afford to fund ADF&G.
45	10	0	0	Agree with the Department.
46 & 47 we took together				
	9	1	0	We agreed with alot of the issues stated and felt that the Board should facilitate the designing of a method and law to sell mounts. This issue will not go away and can be designed to prevent abuse and commercialization in the plan. The no vote didn't want mounts to be sold.

FROM : DAVID R MARTIN PHONE NO. : 907 567 3306 DEC. 30 2011 22:15AM P7

VOTER RECORD/COMMENT

ADVISORY COMMITTE: Central Peninsula

DATE: 12/19/11 **PAGE** 7 **OF** 17

Board of BOG **Comments for** State wide

Please use this format to record the votes and comments of members regarding proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary to spend time on that proposal.

Proposal #	Support	Oppose	Abstain	Summary of Discussion (include minority view)
48	0	10	0	Leave as is. Current regs are working ok.
49	1	9	0	These opposed don't object to good records being kept but felt this is an extension upon the public businesses as abusive intrusion occurs in the fishing cannery industries. The supporter support the proposal
50	10	0	0	We agree in should be reviewed and revised as necessary.
51	1	9	0	Opposed felt it would be an unnecessary burden on hunters and the current landmark definitions are good enough because animals naturally move around anyways. Support agree with the Report.
52	4	6	0	Failed Those opposed felt it was unnecessary and would only be an additional burden. Those in favor agreed with the Prop.

FROM : DAVID R MARTIN PHONE NO. : 907 567 3306 DEC. 30 2011 02:15AM P8

VOTER RECORD/COMMENT

ADVISORY COMMITTE: Central Peninsula

DATE: 12/19/11 **PAGE** 8 **OF** 17

Board of BOG **Comments for** Statewide.

Please use this format to record the votes and comments of members regarding proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary to spend time on that proposal.

Proposal #	Support	Oppose	Abstain	Summary of Discussion (include minority view)
53	Amended			9 yes 1 no on amended Prop. 53. The amendment that takes the word [NO] out of (E). E would then read "optical scopes or electronic devices may be attached to the crossbow." Our justification is that the hunting objective is to make a clean accurate kill shot and lessen poor shots that wound animals that possible die later and are wasted. Using scopes & electronic devices will help place more accurate kill shots. The opposed agreed with the Department's amended proposal & position.
54	5	5	0	Supporter agreed that a crossbow should be reclassified as archery equipment. Those opposed felt that a crossbow is in a class by itself and should remain so. If reclassified then a crossbow could be used in all archery hunts with earlier starting seasons than gun hunters and this would not be fair to the gun or bow hunters on a Statewide basis.

FROM : DAVID R MARTIN PHONE NO. : 907 567 3306 DEC. 30 2011 02:16AM P9

VOTER RECORD/COMMENT

ADVISORY COMMITTE: Central Peninsula

DATE: 12/19/11 **PAGE** 9 **OF** 17

Board of BOG **Comments for** Statewide.

Please use this format to record the votes and comments of members regarding proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary to spend time on that proposal.

Proposal #	Support	Oppose	Abstain	Summary of Discussion (include minority view)
55 & 56		NO	Action	See #53
57	through	61		We didn't address these proposals because no one had an interest or expertise. Our AC doesn't make it a habit to mind other people's hunting business.
62	No	Action		See #63
63	8	2	0	Those in favor support the Depart's position. They did not think it was unfair and a person ought to be able to put in more. Those opposed thought it was unfair and should be kept at 3. Most all members favored an accumulative point system.
64	1	9	0	Opposed see #63 justification. The one in support though it would give him a better chance to get a permit.
65	No	Action		See #64

FROM : DAVID R MARTIN PHONE NO. : 907 567 3306 DEC. 30 2011 02:16AM P10

VOTER RECORD/COMMENT

ADVISORY COMMITTE: Central Peninsula

DATE: 12/19/11 **PAGE** 10 **OF** 17

Board of BOG **Comments for** Statewide.

Please use this format to record the votes and comments of members regarding proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary to spend time on that proposal.

Proposal #	Support	Oppose	Abstain	Summary of Discussion (include minority view)
66 through	68			Failed Those opposed didn't
	3	7	0	support the percentage division
				for non-residents and residents. Leave
				as is. Those in favor support
				the present division.
69	10	0	0	The BOG needs to address this
				issue and come up with a point
				system then give it a try. You
				can always throw it out if it
				doesn't work.
70	10	0	0	This only makes sense & seems
				logical. It won't hurt or displace
				anybody.
71	0	10	0	No Leave as is. Residents &
				non-residents should have same
				opening & closing dates. No special
				privileges.
72 through	74	NO Action See #71		
75	0	10	0	No leave as is. Youth can
				hunt regular season. This would
				open up an avenue for adults to
				use youth to hunt outside the
				regular season.

FROM : DAVID R MARTIN PHONE NO. : 907 567 3306 DEC. 30 2011 02:17AM P11

VOTER RECORD/COMMENT

ADVISORY COMMITTE: Central Peninsula

DATE: 12/19/11 **PAGE** 11 **OF** 17

Board of BOG **Comments for** Statewide.

Please use this format to record the votes and comments of members regarding proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary to spend time on that proposal.

Proposal #	Support	Oppose	Abstain	Summary of Discussion (include minority view)
76	NO	Action		See #75
77	0	10	0	No leave as is. Should not change
78-91				We did not act on this section of these proposals because we didn't have the interest nor the knowledge of the issues. Our AC doesn't butt into other peoples issues that don't effect us.
92	0	10	0	Hunting with firearms is a historic method for harvesting wolves and wolverines. Hunting seasons practice conservation & biological management. This would eliminate intensive management practices.
93	0	10	0	See 92 comments.
94	0	10	0	This would prevent intensive management [redacted] from being achieved in a timely manner. There is no conservation concerns on predators when implementing intensive management plans.
95				We did not act on this proposal.

FROM : DAVID R MARTIN PHONE NO. : 907 567 3306 DEC. 30 2011 02:18AM P12

VOTER RECORD/COMMENT

ADVISORY COMMITTE: Central Peninsula

DATE: 12/19/11 **PAGE** 12 **OF** 17

Board of BOG **Comments for** Statewide

Please use this format to record the votes and comments of members regarding proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary to spend time on that proposal.

Proposal #	Support	Oppose	Abstain	Summary of Discussion (include minority view)
96	10	0	0	This makes sense and seems logical.
97.	0	10	0	See comment on #94
98	0	10	0	Should be able to use GPS, electronic callers etc. Current regulations already prohibit radios when hunting some big game species.
99	0	10	0	Not needed. Loss of a hunting day for no good reason. Burdensome and over regulated.
100	5	2	0	Those in favor stated there is no reason not to allow the use of these devises. There is an abundance of coyotes. No conservation concerns. Coyotes rebound quickly. Coyotes kill moose & other big game calves in the early birth stage. We need to encourage people to hunt coyotes. Possibly consider getting a permit. The two opposed didn't want the use of these devices.
We	Recessed till	Dec. 21, 2011 & reconvened with 7 members.		
~~100~~				
101	7	0	0	Yes see support comments in #100

FROM : DAVID R MARTIN PHONE NO. : 907 567 3306 DEC. 30 2011 02:13AM P13

VOTER RECORD/COMMENT

ADVISORY COMMITTE: Central Peninsula

DATE: 12/21/11 **PAGE** 13 **OF** 17

Board of BOG **Comments for** Statewide.

Please use this format to record the votes and comments of members regarding proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary to spend time on that proposal.

Proposal #	Support	Oppose	Abstain	Summary of Discussion (include minority view)
102	Amended			We support but amended to include moles. We agree with the issue statements. We should do everything to avoid introducing foreign diseases. Once they are here it is too late.
	7	0	0	
103	7	0	0	Yes very much so. The BOF has restricted the use of felt soled wading boots. The BOG needs to also. We must do everything to prevent invasive species & diseases.
104	7	0	0	Should also prohibit moose urine. We need to do everything we can to keep diseases out of our wildlife populations. Agree with Dept.
105	1	6	0	Failed. Those opposed agreed with the departments comments. The supporter agreed with the proposer's issue section
106	1	6	0	Those opposed said leave the current regulations as is. They work. Supporter agreed with proposer.
107	7	0	0	Seems logical. No conservation issues with black bear. No reason not to eliminate bag limit.

FROM : DAVID R MARTIN PHONE NO. : 907 567 3306 DEC. 30 2011 02:19AM P14

VOTER RECORD/COMMENT

ADVISORY COMMITTE: Central Peninsula

DATE: 12/21/11 **PAGE** 14 **OF** 17

Board of BOG **Comments for** Statewide

Please use this format to record the votes and comments of members regarding proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary to spend time on that proposal.

Proposal #	Support	Oppose	Abstain	Summary of Discussion (include minority view)
108	0	7	0	Not Necessary. This hampers and prolongs intensive management plans and objectives. Congressional Record says to manage for abundant big game for use by men for food and lands for recreation
109	0	7	0	Should be set unit by Unit and area by area. Not State wide
110	7	0	0	We support the Department's amended version.
111	0	7	0	Current regulations are working no need to change them.
112	1	6	0	Too expensive for proponent Current regs working fine Supporter agree with proposer.
113	7	0	0	agree with proposer
114	7	0	0	makes sense. We agree
115 through	117	NO	Action	See #118
118	7	0	0	We support as amended by the department

FROM : DAVID R MARTIN PHONE NO. : 907 567 3306 DEC. 30 2011 02:19AM P15

VOTER RECORD/COMMENT

ADVISORY COMMITTE: Central Peninsula

DATE: 12/21/11 **PAGE** 15 **OF** 17

Board of BOG **Comments for** Statewide

Please use this format to record the votes and comments of members regarding proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary to spend time on that proposal.

Proposal #	Support	Oppose	Abstain	Summary of Discussion (include minority view)
119	0	7	0	Should not be in a state wide proposal. Should be Unit by Unit.
120	7	0	0	Makes sense. Why do you need a predator control permit just because area became a predator control area.
121	0	7	0	No reason for this. No conservation concern. Without baiting blackbear harvest would greatly decrease forgoing a large part of the harvestable surplus.
122	1	6	0	Leave as is. don't change Support agreed with proposer.
123	NO	Action		See #122
124	0	7	0	We agree with the Department's position. Current Reg working fine.
125	0	7	0	Agree with Depart.
126	0	7	0	Agree with Depart.
127	0	7	0	Agree with Depart.

FROM : DAVID R MARTIN PHONE NO. : 907 567 3306 DEC. 30 2011 02:19AM P16

VOTER RECORD/COMMENT

ADVISORY COMMITTE: Central Peninsula

DATE: 12/21/11 **PAGE** 16 **OF** 17

Board of BOG **Comments for** Statewide

Please use this format to record the votes and comments of members regarding proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary to spend time on that proposal.

Proposal #	Support	Oppose	Abstain	Summary of Discussion (include minority view)
128	0	7	0	This would lead to abuse No necessary. enforcement nightmare
129	7	0	0	Agree with the department.
130	7	0	0	Agree with the department
131	7	0	0	Agree with the department.
132	7	0	0	Agree with the department
252	7	0	0	We need to keep this hunt on the books. If only takes a little bit of paper work. If it is off the books then when the moose populations rebound it would be impossible to reestablish this hunt with the Feds on the Refuge. Not worth taking the chance.
253	5	2	0	Supporters agree with local biologist that the's hunt harvested moose that would keep local populations higher than local habitat and lead to starvations. Those opposed don't believe habitat is an issue because Depart. doesn't have any current habitat surveys. No accounting of number of starvations. Last 5 winters have been mild. Only 29 cows

FROM : DAVID R MARTIN PHONE NO. : 907 567 3306 DEC. 30 2011 02:20AM P17

VOTER RECORD/COMMENT

ADVISORY COMMITTE: Central Peninsula

DATE: 12/21/11 **PAGE** 17 **OF** 17

Board of Game **Comments for** Statewide

Please use this format to record the votes and comments of members regarding proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary to spend time on that proposal.

Proposal #	Support	Oppose	Abstain	Summary of Discussion (include minority view)
253	continued.			harvested in 2011 out of 60 permits with supporting intensive management we can't support this bear hunt.
254	7	0	0	Agree with Depart with no predators on Kalgin Island this hunt is mandatory to manage the population at carrying capacity to prevent massive starvation from over population.
258	10	0	0	we strongly support this proposal Brown bear encounters, DLP&R etc indicate a abundant population. With the dramatic decline in the moose population caused by wolves, black and brown bears the current permit system is not efficient or effective. The permit system must be replaced with a registration hunt and an increased liberal limit on brown bear harvest.

Cooper Landing Fish and Game Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes of November 1, 2011

Members Present: Robert Gibson, John Pearson, Erick Fish, William Coulliette, Ed Holsten, Erick Fish, George Heim, Mike Adams, Kyle Kolodziejski, James Givens and from the public, Bill Stockwell,

Attn: Scott Crass
BOG-Western Arctic
AC comments

Quorum Present: Yes

Agency Present: Stephen Miller, Jeff Selinger

Meeting Called to Order: 7:00 pm

Old Business: None

New Business

Board of Game Arctic/Western Region Proposals

Proposal 35: 3 favor, may allow for more moose harvest; 6 opposed, non-effective when habitat is the issue, potential down-fall, money would be better spent on improving habitat

Proposal 36: 2 favor; 7 opposed, wolves don't seem to be the limiting factor

Elections: postponed until next meeting 1/26/2011

Kenai River Collaborative Public Process: All support leaving/putting carcasses back into the river and opposed removing them from the system. Grinders aren't the answer, due to issues with anglers not using them, abusing them with other items, and the expense of manning and maintaining them. Night closures may work but not below the mainstem Russian. We support leaving the carcass biomass in the ecosystem and education of coexisting with bears.

Subsistence Hunt: All support Robert writing up a proposal to extend the late October/November Moose hunt to include unit 15C for qualified rural residents of Cooper Landing and a second proposal to hunt the Kenai Caribou herd.

Meeting Adjourned 9:22pm

ATTN: Please include for BOG Statewide meeting AC Comments

FAX COVER SHEET

Unalaska/Dutch Harbor Advisory Committee
Frank Kelty
PO Box 162
Unalaska, Alaska 99685
Phone (907) 581-7726
Fax (907)581-4469
Unalaska Cell (907)359-7753
Anchorage Cell (907) 903-8183
E-Mail fkelty@ci.unalaska.ak.us

To: Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game
Attn Board Support Section

Date: 12-29-2011

Fax: 1-907-465-6094

From: Frank Kelty, Chairman Unalaska/Dutch Harbor AC

Subject: Comments on Board of Game Proposals 63, 67,75, and 104 for the Statewide Regulation Cycle B schedule. Board of Game meeting on January 13-17, 2012 in Anchorage, AK.

Thank You

Frank Kelty

Pages 2 including the cover sheet

UNALASKA/DUTCH HARBOR FISH AND GAME ADVISORY COMMITTEE
P.O. BOX 162 UNALASKA, AK 99685

December 29, 2011

Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Boards Support Section
PO Box 115526
Juneau, AK 99811

Subject: Unalaska /Dutch Harbor AC comments, on Alaska Board of Game proposals for the Statewide Regulations Cycle B schedule Board of Game meeting on January 13-17, 2012 in Anchorage Alaska.

Proposal 63 under Amend 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hurt conditions and procedures. Increase the number of drawing permits for each species that a person may apply for. Motion to support proposal 63 by Dick Peck, second by Don Graves discussion, committee felt that the increase in applications was warranted Unalaska AC voted 7-0 to support proposal 63.

Proposal 67 under 5AAC 92.050. Require permit hunt conditions and procedures. Limit drawing hunt permits to 10 percent for non-residents hunters; if less than 10 permits available no nonresident's permits will be issued. Motion to adopt Dick Peck second Don Graves, discussion centered on resident priority for these drawing hunts, the majority felt it is justified to have a priority for Alaska residents, especially since it is and Alaskan resource. It was also mentioned of the potential loss in revenue for some guiders who do business with non-resident hunters, many on the committee felt resident hunters also spend allot of dollars with guides and have high travel expenses as well to hunt on prime areas of the state. The motion to support passed 6-0

Proposal 75 under 5AAC Chapter 85 Seasons and bag limits. Open youth hunt ten days before other seasons; require hunter education. Motion to support by Don Graves second by Frank Kelty, discussion, focused on concern on the potential of abuse by hunters using youth hunters to get a head start on big game trophy hunts. The motion to support failed 5-2.

Proposal 104, 5AAC 92.080 Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions, prohibit the use of deer and elk urine in taking game. Motion to support by Don Goodfellow second Don Graves, discussion this was an ADFG proposal; discussion most thought this proposal would cut down on the potential of abuse and giving some hunters and advantage. Motion to support passed 7-0

Frank Kelty Chairman Date 12-28-11

Copper Basin Fish & Game Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes of December 20, 2011

Meeting began at 6:25 pm.

Members Present: Alysia White, Chuck McMahan, Jim Odden, Mike Roscovius, David Bruss, Bruce Dickerson, Roy Ewan, Brad Henspeter, Karen Linnell, Mel Matthews, Dave Sarafin

Members Absent Excused: Fred Williams, Nick Jackson, Nathan Woodcock, Loren Bell

Members Absent Unexcused: Don Horrell

Public Present: Jim Marchini, Leif Sorhe, Gloria Stickwan, T. White, Joe Gregory, Bob Fithian,

Staff Present: Becky Schwanke, Frank Robbins, Sherry Wright

Elections were held with the following results: Nathan Woodcock resigned from the committee. Gakona/Gulkana – Chuck McMahan for 3 year seat; Glennallen – Mike Roscovius for 3 year seat; Copper Center – Alysia White for 3 year seat and Brad Henspeter for 1 year seat; Don Horrell for 3 year Tazlina seat; Jim Marchini and Elmer Marshall were elected for 1 year alternate seats. Chuck McMahan was elected Chair; Mel Matthews was elected Vice Chair; Karen Linnell was elected Secretary.

Public Comments

Bob Fithian: Appointed to a council for Wildlife Conservation and Hunter Heritage. 2 items he wanted to see: a Park Service Representative and 13343 Executive Order – 10 year plan for conservation that includes cooperation between state, federal and native corporations. They recently formed AFWA sub-committee to discuss issues common to the states wildlife management. State / Federal agency divisions continue across the nation. Defining the historical doctrines so that driving statutory language matches the intent. Defining problems and resolutions – adoptions of policies that are not in keeping with sustained yield or abundance based management. State management goals have remained the same, but federal policies have eroded much of the state management efforts. Bi-partisan efforts may be able to help resolve some of the state/federal agency issues. BLM policy re: shooting on public lands were not in keeping with hunting heritage of America. After 4 months of recommendations, Secretary Salazar wrote a memo stopping those new policies. The council does have some strength and Bob is interested and willing to assist the local AC.

Discussion of any ideas for upcoming Central Region BOG meeting. There are things pending in court regarding community harvest, so depending on how those go, we may need to come up with something.

Discussion of Susitna Dam - (now being calleds Zoatana Hydroelectric project). Becky gave some data about the different species and research efforts going on. Monitoring of the uses of those areas also are intended, access issues and are radio collaring moose in the projected area. There are several maps (north of Fog Lake on the Susitna and run east of Jay Creek – will be the size of the lake, 35 miles long and 2 miles wide).

STATEWIDE BOARD OF GAME PROPOSAL COMMENTS:

Falconry, Other Permits

Proposal 41 **Action: Support unanimous 12-0**
Description: Review the regulation for permits to take game for cultural purposes.
Amendment: Remove the language of taking meat outside of Alaska.
Discussion: Support the proposal except for outside of Alaska. Public was opposed because the cultural permits was set up for the opportunity to teach the youth for their culture. It shouldn't include meetings. Culture camps set up throughout the region would not expect to use that for an annual meeting. It would be considered an inappropriate use. Potlatches that occur for 2 – 3 days are totally outside of the cultural camp permits. We are concerned about waste and abuse, but are not concerned about the people of the Copper Basin valley. They work with the department on the educational permits and unless there are some biological reasons to limit harvest, there is no reason to limit harvest on those. One member told about trying to get an educational permit – he had the Prince William Sound charter operators providing species that he used to teach local school children. It was unobtainable for him when he tried to use the stomach contents of a halibut and was told he must stop immediately. Specimens were donated to the schools for dissection projects. We have a new commissioner. There is a need to educate the youth on hunting safety and hunting heritage. The application includes where a group wants to go and what they are looking to harvest, as well as the event that went along with it.

Proposal 44 **Action: Support 10 –2**
Description: Modify the ADF&G discretionary authority for Governor's tags.
Discussion: Discretionary permits given to an organization that is perpetually suing the Board of Game and seeking actions against subsistence uses is wrong in principle. Many of the Governor tags are going to specific conservation issues. FNAWS monies mostly go into sheep benefit. 90% of the money goes to the state and 10% goes to the organization. Monies come back to the general fund, not the specific species. The tags are not getting utilized as they should be compared to other states and the attempt of this proposal is to increase the value of those tags. Tags are given out based on population objectives and the Governor works with the department to determine what species and where in the state they can harvest. Don't agree with leniency of seasons and can have the same opportunity to hunt as others that have applied and been drawn. Anything that takes away from existing guide laws should not be allowed. Support was that there are only 2 animals and the opportunity for the state to generate revenue that can be used for research is a good thing. Methods and means should be consistent with current state regulations. Those in support were OK with a 12 month tag because it would add value.

<u>Sale of Big Game, Big Game Trophies</u>

Proposal 48 **Action: Opposed unanimous**
Description: Prohibit the sale of bear parts harvested on National Park Service lands.
Discussion: The proposal goes against the grain of belief. It does nothing for conservation and doesn't stop anything that isn't already illegal.

Proposal 49 **Action: No action**
Description: Require logbooks for taxidermists and provide authority to the Alaska Wildlife Troopers to inspect taxidermy paperwork.
Discussion: Local taxidermists don't believe enforcement should have the carte blanche ability to inspect a business. Some people run these businesses out of their home and that would be a direct violation of a person's 4th amendment rights.

<u>Discretionary Permit Conditions</u>

Proposal 50 **Action: Support as amended**
Description: Review and potentially repeal discretionary hunt conditions and procedures applied to permit hunts across the state
Amendment: Remove (22) a permittee may transfer the permittee's Unit 13 subsistence permit to a resident member of the permittee's family, within the second degree of kinship; a person may not receive remuneration for the transfer of a permit under this paragraph;
Discussion: That section was designed for a Tier II hunt that no longer exists.

Proposal 51 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Allow ADF&G to require the latitude and longitude of kill locations on a harvest report for drawing and registration hunts.
Discussion: You can use a map to get the lat/long after the kill. One member has no intention of purchasing a GPS. Public knows that many people may not know how to read lat/long even on a map. People don't want to give out there special hunting spots.

Permits, Permit Allocations

Proposal 63 **Action: Support**
Description: Increase the number of drawing permits for each species that a person may apply for.
Discussion: If a person is willing to pay the money, they should be able to put in for as many drawings as they want. There was some concern of equity by those who can't afford to put in for multiple hunts. Six permits is not excessive.

Proposal 64 **Action: No action**
Description: Limit drawing permits to only two permits per year
Discussion: The idea behind this is that it would give more people an opportunity. Trying to sort through the preferences with drawings occurring at different times would be a logistical nightmare. A person should be able to put in as many as they want and they should be able to decide which ones they want to hunt.

Proposal 65 **Action: No action**
Description: Limit drawing permit winners to only two permits per year.
Discussion: Same comments as Prop 64

Proposal 66 **Action: Oppose unanimous**
Description: Allow a maximum of 10 percent for the Alaska drawing permits to be awarded to nonresident hunters.
Discussion: The nonresidents bring a lot of money to the state and there are many guides that make a living from taking nonresidents hunting. Statewide regulations have so much of the general population residing in Southcentral Alaska and this could really hurt some of the rural areas. There are a great variety of hunts around the state with different caps on non-resident hunters. Where a guide is required, it wouldn't do any good for a person to apply if they have no chance of getting a permit. Concern of this drastically changing hunting patterns was expressed. To change hunting regulations across the board for many species doesn't make sense.

Proposal 67 - 68 **Action: No action**

Description: Limit drawing permits to 10 percent for nonresidents, no nonresident permits if less than 10 permits available.
Discussion: Same comments as Proposal 66.

Proposal 69 **Action: No action**
Description: Establish bonus point/preference system for draw hunts.
Discussion: The board already passed a proposal but the department has not implemented it.

Proposal 70 **Action: Support**
Description: Allow nonresident deployed military personnel to defer drawing permits.
Discussion: This applies to residents currently and this would allow nonresident deployed military personnel the same ability. We should support our military.

Statewide Big Game Seasons

Proposal 71 - 74 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Open resident seasons one week before nonresident seasons in all intensive management areas.
Discussion: Residents have the advantage of living here and these type of proposals are divisive. In Unit 13 there are already four different seasons. Terrain, species, all need to be taken into consideration when these type of regulations are made. Arbitrarily changing regulations can be substantial in some areas.

Proposal 75 - 76 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Open early youth hunt for all big game, ten days before other seasons; require hunter education.
Discussion: Concern of this being abused as proxy hunting was – this is just the other end of the age spectrum. People can take their children during the regular season. Generally, it is good for people to take their children out hunting and teach them, but don't like the way this is written. Organizations also take people out (like Migratory Bird) with cooperation of agencies, using experienced hunters and native hunters to encourage the youth to hunt.

Proposal 77 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Require hunters to use only one type of method; either firearm or bow; require a tag.
Discussion: This is too restrictive.

Statewide Sheep Seasons and Permit Allocations

Proposal 78 - 85 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Open resident sheep seasons seven days earlier than nonresident seasons.
Discussion: Same comments as Prop 71 – 74. Competition for the resource will be there regardless of the seasons. This would also complicate regulations.

Proposal 86 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Begin the youth hunting season for Dall Sheep five days earlier than residents.
Discussion: Same comment as Prop 75-76.

Proposal 87 - 90 **Action: Oppose**

Description: Convert all nonresident sheep seasons to drawing permit hunts and limit to 5 percent of total permits.
Discussion: This would be very difficult to implement. These don't take into consideration the different hunts, terrain, and conservation. There are a lot of non-residents who hunt during the general season.

Proposal 91 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Nonresident next of kin sheep tags come out of the resident pool in Units where there are a limited number of nonresident sheep tags.
Discussion: Residents don't want to give up their opportunity and don't think they should. A non-resident is still a non-resident. Understand where the proposer is coming from; however the current regulations seem to be working.

Statewide Other Game Seasons

Proposal 92 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Allow only the use of traps and snares for taking wolf and wolverine. Prohibit the use of firearms except for dispatching trapped animals.
Discussion: It is a legal harvest method.

Proposal 93-94, 97, 108, 121, 124 - 126 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Allow only the use of traps and snares for taking wolf and wolverine on National Park Service lands and prohibit the use of firearms except for dispatching trapped animals.
Amendment:
Discussion: These all are attempting to restrict harvest on National Park lands.

Methods and Means

Proposal 98 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Prohibit the use of hand held electronics in taking game.
Discussion: We believe you should be able to use hand held electronic devises and this proposal is too vague.

Proposal 99 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Hunters using a licensed transporter cannot harvest an animal on the same day being transported.
Discussion: This is too broad for statewide.

Proposal 100 **Action: Support**
Description: Allow the use of laser sight, electronically-enhanced night vision scope, or artificial light for taking coyotes.
Discussion: Some of this is already legal if you have a trapping license. This would also increase the season. If someone wants to use that, they should be able to.

Proposal 101 **Action: No action**
Description: Allow same day airborne taking of coyotes statewide.
Discussion: You can already do this as long as you are 300 feet from the airplane. Would support if the feds didn't have a problem with it.

Proposal 102 **Action: Support as amended**
Description: Prohibit the use of pack animals other than horses while hunting goat or sheep.
Amendment: Prohibit the use of domestic sheep or goat only.
Discussion: Some species have become extinct and it can be traced back to this practice. Other animals should be able to be used as pack animals.

Proposal 103 **Action: Support 11-1**
Description: Prohibit the use of felt soled wading boots while hunting game.
Discussion: This aligns regulations and is a good conservation effort. One member is against for safety concerns, just like in the fishing issue. There are other materials of a boot that could also carry disease.

Proposal 104 **Action: Support**
Description: Prohibit the use of deer or elk urine for use in taking game.
Discussion: Concern of protecting our resources was expressed. Question of how this would be enforced was raised. They doubt many people use it, but outlawing it might be good.

Sealing and Bag Limits

Proposal 105 **Action: No action**
Description: Clarify the definition of wounded as it applies to the restrictions to bag limits.
Discussion: This is a judgement call made by the hunter in the field. This seems like it would be unenforceable.

Proposal 106 **Action: No action**
Description: Count wounded muskox, bison, sheep and goat that are not recovered as bag limit.
Discussion: Same comments as Prop 105.

Proposal 107 **Action: No action**
Description: Eliminate the statewide bag limit for black bear.
Discussion: This would be reported to law enforcement. Very few people take their limit and they are sealed by ADF&G.

Proposal 109 **Action: Oppose**
Description: Clarify and remove complicated and restrictive regulations and ADF&G discretionary provisions pertaining to black bear hunting.
Discussion: This is too broad. Regulations have been developed by region over time. Keeping up on the intensive management programs, and allowing this type of removal in areas where predator management is ongoing, could impact those programs.

Evidence of Sex, Transfer & Possession

Proposal 110 **Action: No action**
Description: Require the hunter to keep sex attached to the meat if it (the skull) needs to be sealed.
Discussion: For black bears, it's irrelevant what sex it is.

Proposal 111 **Action: No action**
Description: Clarify the sex organs, or portions of, that must remain attached for proof of sex.
Discussion: Don't understand this one.

Proposal 112 **Action: Oppose 3 - 9**
Description: Eliminate the evidence of sex regulation.
Discussion: Agree with the proposal – it is a pain. A year old skull cap should be able to be identified as such. For some people it's not that big of a deal. This may allow for more abuse. What about the DNA? 99% of the hunters will have their horns, so it's going to be the exception more than the rule. A photograph of the moose with their antler configuration could be produced.

Mel Matthews left the meeting.

Proposal 113 **Action: No action**
Description: Remove the reference to federal agent under the transfer and possession regulation.
Discussion: The feds already have an MOU regarding regulations. The proposal is poorly written.

Trapping

Proposal 127 **Action: No action**
Description: Prohibit the taking of a black bear by trap or snare.
Discussion: The concern of setting a precedent with this type of proposal. Already no existing trapping season for bear.

Proposal 128 **Action: Support as amended**
Description: Establish a tag and fee to allow trappers to retain incidental catch.
Amendment: Any animal except otter would be an incentive to trap out of season, so the amendment is to apply this to retention of incidental catch of otter only. 9 – 2 Support
Discussion: Incidental harvest does occasionally happen for trappers. This may adversely affect the harvest. Wolverine are more susceptible to over-harvest. Lynx and fox are easy to release. Wolverine are the one animal that one member hasn't figured out how to release. Times this would be good is when you are beaver trapping and you catch an otter. This is just part of trapping and incidental harvest has been a long time problem. Otters are caught in beaver traps and they are dead. The seasons are put in place, knowing there will be some incidental harvest.

Miscellaneous

Proposal 132 **Action: Support as amended**
Description: Modify the Agenda Change Request Policy.
Amendment: Allow Agenda Change Requests for the first meeting of the year only.
Discussion: Taking things up out of cycle with little notice is very difficult for everyone. There should be a higher standard for taking issues out of cycle.

INTERIOR REGION BOG PROPOSAL COMMENTS
Tok Area – Units 12 & 20E

Proposal 186 **Action: Support as amended**
Description: Modify moose season in portion of Unit 12 and 11.
Amendment: Remove Unit 11 (not Interior Region), modify Unit 12 Nabesna Road portion to align with current Unit 11 season and bag limit. 11-0 Support

Discussion: The season in Unit 12 is very complicated. The SRC is meeting in February and the Federal season dates will be determined at that time. Making it more easily defined to include the entire Nabesna Road will help hunters and enforcement.

Proposal 187 **Action: No action**
Description: Convert the any bull moose hunt to a spike-fork 50-inch or 3 or more brow tines in portion of Unit 12.
Discussion: The spike fork 50-inch is not necessary. See comment on Prop 186.

Proposal 245 **Action: Support 9-2**
Description: Reauthorize antlerless moose hunt in Unit 13
Discussion: This is an annual reauthorization. The moose counts have increased and it is good to keep this on the books to use by management, if needed.

Proposal 255 **Action: Support**
Description: Reauthorize brown bear tag fees exemption in Region IV
Discussion: This is another annual renewal.

Chuck McMahan was nominated to represent the Copper Basin AC at the Board of Game statewide meeting in Anchorage.

Next meeting to be determined if Board of Game proposals are needed by May 1 deadline.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 pm.

Delta Advisory Committee vote on Statewide Game Proposals 2011

Proposal 44, 8-1 in Favor Governors tags

Proposal 46, 4 in favor, 1 apposed, 4 abstained, Sale of big game trophies, no consensus from DAC

Proposal 49, 0 in favor, 8 opposed, 1 abstained Not in favor of law enforcement having free entrance to private property.

Proposal 51, 9 in favor, DAC in favor with the stipulation that the coordinates stay out of public record and are included in intensive management in 20A and 20B

Proposal 52, 9 in favor, Unanimous in Favor

Proposal 53, 9 in favor Unanimous in favor of crossbow definition

Proposal 57, 7 opposed 2 abstained, Allow use of mechanical broadheads.

Proposal 63, 7 opposed 2 abstained, Increase drawing applications to 6 per species

Proposal 63, 9 opposed, DAC has already voted to oppose this proposal several times

Proposal 70, 9 in favor, Unanimous in favor

Proposal 78, 6 opposed 3 abstained, No need for early resident season

Proposal 91, 9 opposed, Do not support this proposal

Proposal 95, 9 in favor, In favor of Falconry season

Proposal 96, 5 in favor 4 abstained, No consensus that archery be allowed anywhere shotguns only are allowed for small game

Proposal 99, 9 opposed, No need to limit harvest the same as same day airborne. No advantage over other hunters or game.

Proposal 100, 9 in favor, DAC Support this proposal

Proposal 101, 9 in favor, DAC Support this proposal

Proposal 102, 9 in favor, In favor with the stipulation that dogs and all equine not be excluded from being used for packing

Proposal 103, 9 in favor, Should be the same as fishing

Proposal 104, 9 in favor, DAC agrees, risk of disease

Proposal 105, 9 opposed, Already in regulation

Proposal 112, 7 opposed 2 abstained, Not a problem to required evidence now. DNA is slow and expensive

Proposal 114, 8 in favor 1 abstain, DAC in Favor

Proposal 115 & 116, 9 opposed, Not In favor of guides being able to bait and hunt "unlimited" baits

Proposal 117, 7 in favor 2 abstained,

Excerpt from the Eagle Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Eagle AC
Eagle Community School
12.19.2011 6PM

Meeting called to order 6:15 pm
Andy Bassich; Mike McDougal; Bo Fay; Chalia Selman, William Mosher; Don Woodruff; Charlie House; Issac Juneby; Jackie Helmer

Guests: Jeff Gross and Nissa Pilcher (both ADFG)

AC member Andy Bassich and guest Nissa Pilcher listened in on teleconference

Agenda approved with the agenda item added to include commenting on Interior BOG Proposals after the Statewide.

December 2010 Minutes approved

EIRAC Summery
Chairman Bassich gave a brief summary of the EIRAC meeting in Fairbanks in fall of 2011. BOG proposals and Customary Trade Subcommittee's results to limit customary trade in years of low abundance (if subsistence fishing is restricted) would be restricted to the areas of the Yukon basin only- so you wouldn't be able to trade in urban areas. It was noted that there was a lot of public testimony from people from Tanana against this decision. This SC is to meet later this winter to discuss this idea some more.

Discussion of the 40mile Caribou Herd Harvest Plan
Jeff Gross gave a brief rundown of the changes to the harvest plan that the 40mile coalition came up with. Noted that Andy or Mike is the rep from Eagle AC, and Don Woodruff (who is on the committee) represents the EIRAC, so Eagle is pretty well represented.

Concerns raised by the AC were:
Predator control, as well as carrying capacity for the herd.

It was noted that the current plan is a dynamic plan, and can be changed if early indications of a stressed herd is noted. If any major adjustments need to get made, then the Coalition can get together and address those concerns at that time.
Andy- Motioned
Charlie- Seconded
The Eagle AC endorses the current Draft Fortymile Caribou Herd Harvest Management Plan

DNR Land sales discussed near Chicken and how it will relate to wildlife. It was noted that these sales would be good for the communities of Chicken and Boundry, for their expansion and people moving in to those areas, although it was noted that there is no power, no infrastructure where these sales are being offered- so Princess Lodges, McDonalds, and WalMart are not around the corner in these areas. Motion that the Eagle AC does not support DNR's efforts to have land sales on the Taylor highway due to the negative impacts the further efforts to increase the 40mile herd.
By Andy
2- Chaliea
Passed Unanimously

Statewide Proposals

Proposal 71 **Action: Not supported**
Open resident seasons one week before nonresident seasons in all intensive management areas
We are happy with the way things are. There would be a lot involved if this proposal was to pass since it is a statewide proposal.
Motion
2nded
Unanimously unsupported

Proposal 92 **Action: Not supported**
Allow only the use of traps and snares for taking wolves and wolverines. Prohibit the use of firearms except for dispatching trapped animals.
Unnecessary regulation, excess burden to the hunter/trapper, removes the ability of a trapper from taking incidental wolves and wolverines. This is not consistence with C&T of hunters and trappers.
Motion
2nd
Unanimously unsupported

Proposal 93 **Action: Not Supported**
Description: Allow only the use of traps and snares for taking wolf and wolverine on National Park Service lands and prohibit the use of firearms except for dispatching trapped animals.
This would limit opportunity, and it is not consistent with customary and traditional practices of trappers and hunters.
Motion
2nd
Unanimously unsupported

Proposal 94 **Action: Not Supported**
Description: Prohibit the taking of wolf, fox, wolverine, or coyote during May, June and July on National Park Service lands.
This would restrict the end of wolf season in our area. See reasoning for Proposal 92 and 93.
Motion
2nd

Unanimously unsupported

Proposal 97 **Action: Not Supported**

Description: Prohibit the use of artificial light for taking game on all lands managed by the National Park Service.

It is our understanding that some user groups have stated that it is C&T for them to use artificial light to hunt bears in their dens. We want to support this practice if it is in fact C&T for these people.

Motion

2nd

Unanimously unsupported

Proposal 108 **Action: No Action**

Description: Prohibit the harvest of cubs and sows accompanied by cubs on National Park Service (NPS) lands

Ethical issues with supporting this unless there is an IM plan in place.

Motion 2nd

No Action

Proposal 109 **Action: Not Supported**

Description: Clarify and remove complicated and restrictive regulations and ADF&G discretionary provisions pertaining to black bear hunting.

These regulations should be done on a much smaller scale then statewide- individual GMU black bear seasons should be done on a case by case basis.

Motion

2nd

Unanimously not supported

Proposal 113 **Action: No Action**

Description: Remove the reference to federal agent under the transfer and possession regulation.

Remove the reference to federal agent under the transfer and possession regulation

Our understanding is that there is an MOU between the federal and state agencies.

Motion

2nd

No Action Unanimous

The AC chose to take up Proposals 114, 118, 119 and 120 at the same time

Proposal 114 **Action on Proposal 114; 118; 119; 120 Not Supported**

Description: Allow black bear to be taken same day airborne within 1/4 mile of bait station.

Inappropriate to do this- it is unethical to spot animals from the air, regardless of the species. For all of these proposals, this would not send a good message, especially if you were allowed to set up muitiple bait stations. This practice would be unfair, and would take the sport out of the hunt.

Proposal 118

Description: Clarify and modify the permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait and scent lures

Proposal 119

Establish a codified location for permitted black bear bait stations and establish seasons for all of Alaska

Proposal 120
Description: Eliminate black bear baiting as a method requiring a predator control permit in predator control areas

Motion
2nd
Not Support 8; abstain 1

Proposal 121 **Action: Not Supported**
Description: Prohibit black bear baiting on all National Park Service lands.
Baiting is a good way to hunt bears and wouldn't want to see it stopped. It is a traditional way of taking that animal species. Do not understand the rational for not wanting to have this on the Park Service Land. Goes against traditional practices of rural Alaskan's and should not be supported.
Motion
2nd
Unanimously not supported

Proposal 122
Proposal 123 **Action: Not Supported**
Allow the use of scent lures for black bear baiting while floating
Potential for making an unsafe situation for floaters that come along that are not baiting. No traditional hunting means.
Motion
2nd
Unanimously not supported

The Eagle AC chose to take action on proposal 124, 125, & 126 at the same time since they were relatively similar

Proposal 124 **Action *for all 3 proposals*: Not Supported**
Description: Require trap identification for all Units on lands managed by the National Park Service.
Proposal 125
Description: Require a 72 hour trap check for all traps and snares set on National Park Service lands.
Proposal 126
Description: Prohibit the trapping of black bears in all National Park Service managed lands.
Lumped together because they all put undue hardship on trappers operating on NPS land.
Interrupts' C&T behavior of trappers on NPS lands
Motion
2nd
Unanimously not supported

Proposal 127 **Action: Not Supported**
Prohibit the taking of a black bear by trap or snare.

Very viable means in remote areas to take care of bears. If you need meat, this is a good way of obtaining it, since it is operating 24 hours.
Motion
2nd
Unanimously not supported

Proposal 128 **Action: Not supported**
Description: Establish a tag and fee to allow trappers to retain incidental catch.
Creates incentive for trappers to operate outside of the season for their target species, which is not good.
Motion
2nd
Unanimously not supported

Excerpt from Minto Nenana AC's minutes

Minto-Nenana AC
Minto Lodge, Minto Village
12.28.11
11:07 am

Victor Lord, Doug Bowers, Tim McManus, Rondell Jimmie (Nenana); Philip Titus, Wayne Charlie, Nolan Titus, Luke Titus, Fred Titus (Minto)

Guests:
Frank Silas, Richard Peter, Tony Hollis (ADFG), Caroline Brown (ADFG) Nissa Pilcher (ADFG), Trooper Bump (DPS)

Minutes approved
Minto Elections held at Minto General Elections, so they will not be held at this meeting
New Business:
Nenana Elections held, and they were pretty wild, but AC elections were not held
Victor thanked Ray and Al for heading out, and mentioned regional meetings- how the AC use to carry more clout with the Boards because of regional meeting, we could throw a big stick at the Board with all our weight. Their being here is a good argument for Boards to get more funding so in the future these guys could have their trip paid for.

Statewide

Proposal 41 **Action: No Action**
Description: Review the regulation for permits to take game for cultural purposes.
AC is very supportive of the cultural and educational components of this permits, but are very uncomfortable about using this permit for stockholder/shareholder meetings, and highly uncomfortable about big game species hunted under this permit being taken out of state for any reason.

Motion to adopt the Fairbanks AC's comments, and add the caveat of not allowing any cooperation's to harvest a moose under this permit- cooperation's are not our culture.
Educational and traditional go hand and hand, but the cooperation is not part of that at all.
Unanimous support

Fairbanks AC's Comments read into record:
Proposal 41

Issue: Intended scope of the permit to take game for cultural purposes.
Recommendation: Amend/Adopt
Comments: The purpose of this permit is for educational purposes. The FAC recommends amending the language to limit these educational purposes to instate use only. The animals harvested under this permit are not the only source of game. Many individuals contribute game and food items made from game for cultural purposes. If there is an educational/cultural event outside Alaska, the game resource should be donated by individuals. For outside Alaska events, a permit could be given for game already taken. (DLP, Auto strikes, etc.)

Proposal 111 **Action: Support**
Clarify the sex organs, or portions of, that must remain attached for proof of sex.
In our cultural beliefs, we use to always remove this portion.
Unanimous support

Proposal 114-123 **Action: No Action**
Concerning Black Bear Baiting
Minto Nenana AC has traditionally been against black bear baiting, and we would like to reiterate this again. The AC would like to note that they understand that black bears are predators of moose calves, but this is a long standing action of the AC to be against black bear baiting.

Individual Comments
Proposal 116-
How many sites do you need? You get 4 assistant guides, that is 20 sites. The additional baits under personal use would open the door for abuse of this hunting practice.
Proposal 117
Native allotment down by old Minto, there is a bear baiting station on my father's allotment that I didn't okay. That is trespassing.

Proposal 124-126 **Action: No Action**
These proposals were all discussed.
In reference to proposals 126 and 127
The Minto Nenana AC has traditionally been against black bear trapping. It is very difficult and dangerous if not done correctly for both the trapper and the bear, and unless the black bear is needed for meat this isn't a practice that this AC believes should be done on a regular basis. Concern raised proximity to communities and the dangers those present to the residents especially children walking to school in the mornings.

Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee

Comments on Regulation Proposals (From 2011/2012 Proposals)

Comments are on both individual proposals and groups of proposals on the same issue. The FAC has commented on proposals which directly affect our constituents and on proposals we feel may set precedence for our constituents. Action taken by the FAC is shown for each proposal on the "recommendations" provided.

These comments were drafted by the Game Sub-Committee of the FAC in a public meeting on December 8th, and additional comments were added then discussed and voted on by the entire AC on December 23. The AC "Action" register shown for each proposal or issue is how the FAC voted to recommend action to the board.

Falconry, Other Permits

Proposals 38, 39 & 40

Issue: Changes to the Falconry Manual and Regulations to meet changes at the Federal level. And, in 40, authorize the harvest of Alaskan birds by non-residents.
Recommendation: None
Comments: The FAC is confident that the negotiations between the Alaska Falconers and the Department have resulted in positive changes for the regulations. Non-residents should have a requirement to "register" (apply) with the Dept. and pay a fee (which would need to be set by the Legislature).

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 41

Issue: Intended scope of the permit to take game for cultural purposes.
Recommendation: Amend/Adopt
Comments: The purpose of this permit is for educational purposes. The FAC recommends amending the language to limit these educational purposes to instate use only. The animals harvested under this permit are not the only source of game. Many individuals contribute game and food items made from game for cultural purposes. If there is an educational/cultural event outside Alaska, the game resource should be donated by individuals. For outside Alaska events, a permit could be given for game already taken. (DLP, Auto strikes, etc.)

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 42

Issue: Permits for public safety permits.
Recommendation: Adopt (With some editing within the "new" language.)
Comments: Looks like the new section (e) could be included with the wording in (c).

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 43

Issue: Review and modify nuisance beaver permits.
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt
Comments: This proposal to "consider research" and "allow beaver flow devices" does not respond to any conservation concern. We would expect the Department to review and use new research in the future. Of concern is the cost of "beaver flow devices" to Alaskans who are having trouble as individuals. That is, those with blocked culverts on their property, etc. The present policy can consider the need for fish passage.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 44

Issue: Add discretionary language to the Governor's permit tags to allow the dept. to define specific seasons and methods and means of hunting.
Recommendation: Amend /Adopt
Comments: There needs to be some guidelines for the deviations. Such discretionary language could greatly increase the value of the tags. The guidelines need to restrict the setting of seasons and methods and means to avoid interference with regular general seasons. (I.e. be set before or after far enough to be separate from regular seasons.) Also, the methods and means should not be less restrictive than those in force. For example, in the Fairbanks Management Area we have weapons restrictions to archery and in some cases muzzleloaders. In this example, the guideline should not allow the department to permit less restrictive weapons (rifles, shotguns, etc.)

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Sale of Big Game, Big Game Trophies

Proposal 45

Issue: Align regulation on Subsistence Bartering with statutory authority
Recommendation: Adopt
Comment: The FAC has always supported such alignment for many issues. We

encourage the Board and the Department to work on many of these issues to do the same.

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent,

Proposal 46

Issue: Purchase and sale of game (trophies).
Recommendation: Adopt
Comment: Somewhere in the history of big game hunting in Alaska, possibly from the actions of professional meat hunters prior to statehood, we developed the collective mindset that the state should be responsible for big game trophies as long as they remained in Alaska. Rather than think of them as a harvested and therefore now privately owned resource we developed a whole set of regulations perhaps thinking that at the time it was good for conservation. When an Alaskan harvests a tree to make a house log, the state quickly loses interest when it is removed from the forest. Even if the log is used in more than one building, it's private property and the state doesn't care if it's final resting place is a remote cabin or a urban log home, or a board for that matter. Nobody purports that the harvesting of the tree, rock, etc. will result in uncontrolled additional harvest of that resource. Big game trophies, harvested by a hunter with mount or taxidermy paid for by the hunter are not considered private property. In 2011-2012 with modern communications, oversight and reporting requirements in place to monitor the conservation issues with big game, it is no longer necessary for a trophy to be anything but private property. We recommend the Board come into the 21st century and back the state out of the issue of purchase and sale of trophies. If they have value, let them be like the gold nugget from the creek or the pile of logs from the forest.

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 47

Issue: Same as 46 limited to "acquired through legal actions such as divorces".
Recommendation: Adopt or include with 46
Comment: Same as for proposal 46.

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 48

Issue: Prohibit sale of bear parts harvested on National Park Service Lands
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt

Comment: In managing the bear population in consideration of other populations, there is no need to consider land management status as a requirement for prohibition of any use allowed by Alaska regulation. ANILCA is supposed to protect these historical uses and the NPS should recognize that requirement. There is no conservation issue.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 49

Issue: Provide authority to the AWT to inspect taxidermy business.
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt
Comment: The Department and the Board need to take a small step back and ask the AWT the burning question, "how big is the problem"? The FAC does not appreciate (again) last minute substitutions that we have not seen for public comment come in to the Board from AWT. The "What will happen if nothing is done?" says, ". . . . AWT will continue to have difficulty inspecting fish and game and compliance with regulations at licensed taxidermy businesses." How many tickets have been issued at taxidermists? This is still a fishing expedition for authority without an explanation of how this helps game conservation. The 100 plus taxidermists, most of whom work out of their homes, would be required to keep paperwork the business doesn't need for anything for five years. For example, to keep down the sale of personal use and subsistence permitees are required to clip the tails. Since the make-work for the AWT regulation went on the books there have been virtually no citations for sales but literally hundreds of citations for "not clipping the tail". What would the offense be for "not keeping the paperwork"? Is the "issue" needing more paperwork or stopping illegal shipment or shipment of illegal trophies? Tell them to get a warrant, search whatever they need to search and catch the bag guys. Like the "tail clipping", tickets for "not keeping the paperwork up to date" don't do anything for real issue. Every taxidermist in the Interior that testified to our AC opposes this action. Who pays for this inspection? What frequency can the AWT head into a home business to inspect? Most importantly, why is inspecting taxidermists important to AWT when they constantly complain about not having the resources to do the things they now have authority? This "request" has the potential to become an entire booklet of regulations on the details of how to use this new authority. Ask them to define the problem in detail, compare the explanation to the other things they could be doing and refuse to adopt this proposal.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Discretionary Permit Conditions

Proposal 50

Issue: Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures (review)
Recommendation: Amend/Adopt
Comment: The list of conditions and procedures is a hodge-podge of things thrown together to "fit" various special cases over a long time period. The FAC started a detailed review and concluded that many of these things can be better explained, included within other "numbered items", are redundant or are just not needed in 2012. The Board should task somebody, either a committee or the department to work on the this regulation and proposed changes for discussion at a future meeting. Table this proposal for now. The department continues to "ask" to use conditions each hunt even if the board has already approved them for the list of conditions. Why?

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 51

Issue: Require the latitude and longitude of kill locations on a harvest report for drawing and registration hunts.
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt
Comment: Amend to require the Lat. and Long. only for antlerless moose hunts in IM areas. The FAC realizes that the location of kills sites in the analysis of the harvest is an important piece of information. As written, either a GPS unit or a good map could be used to give a very close Lat. and Long. Permits for these hunts already contain a lot of "extra" information and it would not be a hardship to require a more detailed location than by drainage, gmu or permit-sub-unit. The FAC is opposed to requiring hunters to purchase and carry GPS units. After considerable discussion, the FAC recommends against this requirement.

The information provided by requiring the long. and lat. of the harvest site of an antlerless moose could be useful but only if the hunters provide valid, accurate data. Members expressed a concern for the accuracy of information collected in this manner. Hunters are likely to misrepresent harvest locations to protect favorite hunting areas, greatly skewing collected data results. The proposed regulation, even with our amendment, places an additional burden on the hunters. This requirement could increase administrative costs. Another recommendation would be to place a rough draft map on the rear of back of the harvest report and simply request the hunter to place an x over the harvest location.

Action: 5 In Favor, 7 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 52

Issue: Authority to require antler locking tags for certain permit hunts.
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt
Comment: The FAC recommends that, if required, this tag remain on the antler ONLY the until the animal is "out of the field". The purpose is to differentiate between bull moose with different antler requirements that are taken in the same general area. In our area this would be helpful in GMU 20A where there are specific general antler restrictions for general hunts and no antler requirements for hunters with a "any bull" permit. A visible antler tag would allow anyone in the field to recognize an "any bull" and know that the normal area antler requirements do not apply. There has been confusion in 20A when hunters did not know if a bull was taken under the "any bull" permit when it is seen as obviously not legal by the general antler restrictions. By requiring the tag to remain attached until the moose is "out of the field" limits the state's responsibility to follow that tag through, for example, butchering, packaging and storage. The Board may want to table this proposal for consideration and application at the Region III meeting because both of the areas this is either used or contemplated for use are in R3.

Antler locking tags are an additional burden for the hunters. The purpose of the tag requirement could be more "feel good" than actually add information for enforcement or the department. We don't want the board to open the door for a requirement for all moose hunters to have to attach a tag to all bull moose. In the Koyukuk there are reports of using this tag on trophy antlers and using the "destroy antlers" permits on smaller moose. Use of immediate fixing a tag may have solved a problem there. We question whether such a valid problem exists in 20A. A tag would add to the list of permit conditions and the list is already burdensome. This regulation, if considered at all, should be for Region III not statewide.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Archery, Crossbow Regulations

Proposals 53, 54, 55

Issues: Various definition changes, "archery attachment optical gear.
Recommendation: No Recommendation
Comment: After discussing these three proposals, the FAC has no recommendation for the Board.

Action: 0 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 0 Absent

Proposal 56

Issue: Use of archery certification for use of crossbow for disabled hunters.
Recommendation: Adopt Comment: Disabled hunters who can demonstrate archery proficiency using a longbow show be allowed to hunt in archery only hunts or areas. Disability may prohibit the ability to draw a bow. A few additional hunters could participate.

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 57 and 58

Issue: Use of mechanical/retractable blades in archery hunts.
Recommendation: Adopt
Comment: It is our understanding that new technology has improved the dependability of these blades. If they are improved to the standard for the previously accepted other blades, they should be added to legal methods.

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 59

Issue: Lighted nock for moose and bear hunters.
Recommendation: None
Comment: The FAC is concerned about hunter safety but question whether the issue is important enough to require hunters to use lighted nocks. Pope & Young (the archery trophy recognition organization) doesn't allow these. If they did, Alaska could support their use from a safety perspective. Discussion at the board level may bring Pope & Young into the discussion. A FAC member wrote to P&Y to ask their reason for not allowing trophies killed with a lighted nock and did not even receive a reply. The FAC would like to request the Board of Game draft a letter to Pope and Young to address the issue prior to taking action on this proposal.

Action: 0 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 0 Absent

Proposal 60

Issue: Definition of compound bow.
Recommendation: Adopt
Comment: Our definition should reflect that actual standards for the equipment.

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 61

Issue: Modify the legal requirement for "legal bows".
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt.
Comment: The FAC does not agree that this change is needed.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Permits, Permit Allocations

Proposals 62, 63, 64, 65

Issue: Number of permits per species that can be applied for.
Recommendation: Adopt Proposal 63.
Comment: With the IM use of small permit areas, many more "hunts" are listed for consideration. There is no need to limit the applicants to only three areas.

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 66, 67, 68

Issue: Allow 10% for non-residents in drawing hunt permits.
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt
Comment: These proposals do not detail the problem with the number of non-residents in existing policy for non-resident hunts. (For example, TMA sheep permits now use the 10% these proposals ask for.) The proposals generally seek to increase the number of permits for resident hunters.

Action: 3 In Favor, 6 Opposed, 3 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 69

Issue: Establish a preference points system.
Recommendation: Adopt
Comment: The Legislature did not fund the previous system adopted by the Board. There is nothing to show they have had a change of heart but if it's the department's

computer system or need for funding the board could ask the Legislature for an explanation.

Action: 9 In Favor, 3 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3Absent

Proposal 70

Issue: Allow non-resident deployed military personnel to defer drawing permit.
Recommendation: Adopt
Comment: The FAC would not like to see our military personnel lose opportunity because of deployment.

Action: 6 In Favor, 3 Opposed, 3 Abstained, 3 Absent

Statewide Big Game Seasons

Proposal 71, 72, 73, 74

Issue: Open season earlier for residents (Intensive management areas to all hunts).
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt
Comment: These proposals generally refer to competition between resident hunters and non-resident hunters without referring to species. They speak to the sponsor's preference and do not specify any particular area.

Action: 4 In Favor, 8 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 75, 76

Issue: Open youth hunt(ing) for all big game ten (10) days before other seasons.
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt
Comment: This is a "feel good" concept that would be very difficult for the Board to put into regulation and for the Department to manage. The Board has often discussed the participation of young hunters in our various hunts and has concluded that "youth only" hunts are not necessary in most cases. They have expressed interest in specific hunt opportunities, such as the Delta youth moose hunt, but have never supported a general "early" concept. The FAC feels the board is unlikely to adopt the idea now with no real record of problems of youth participation. If considered, the requirement for being accompanied in the field and using an adult hunter's tag should be retained.

Action: 3 In Favor, 8 Opposed, 1 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 77

Issue: Require hunters to use only one type of method; either firearm or bow; require a tag.
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt

Comment: It is not within the authority of the Board to require a hunter to "dedicate" to a particular method.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Statewide Sheep Seasons and Permit Allocations

Proposals 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86

Issue: Opening sheep seasons earlier for resident hunters than for non-resident hunters.
Recommendation: None
Comment: A substitute proposal is needed if the Board seeks to take action on this issue. The FAC discussed, as a substitute, opening the resident sheep season seven (7) days earlier than opening for non-resident hunters. Under the present season, resident season would open on August 3 and the non-resident season would open on August 10

That change would give some advantage, especially for the more easily accessible sheep resources, to resident hunters. Both residents and non-residents report the duration of sheep hunts averages five days (5) days in the field. Because of the heavy preference of resident hunters for hunting the opening, the sponsors seek to reduce conflicts with guide and non-resident hunters.

Recent analysis of the ram harvest for the last 20 years suggests that there is no real difference in the horn size between R and NR. The same analysis suggests there has been no substantial change in the percentage of harvest by R or NR hunters. The analysis seen by the FAC from Mr. Joe Want and Mr. Wayne Heimer suggest that in the highest harvest areas nearly half of the "legal" rams remain at the end of the season.

A change to earlier openings for residents would not be necessary for conservation or biological reasons. Additionally, no resource issue exists that would prohibit opening the season earlier for resident. Such a change would be for social and reducing conflicts reasons.

The staggered season openings could reduce the hunter competition for transportation services between R and NR. The difference we discussed would not require the guide industry to change their present planning and advertising cycles.

The FAC had public testimony that guides will be "in camp" whenever the first season opens to occupy their guide area camps as resident hunters. Some suggested that

guides and their employees who are residents may hunt for themselves during an non-resident restricted season. Discussion was also heard that this type of behavior would be cost prohibitive, and that it would be unlikely that guides would harvest animals in an area where they intend to bring paying clients later. The benefit of revenue earned from non-resident hunters to the support management programs was discussed, and there is no doubt to the benefit the state receives from those license and tag fees. Both AC members and the public addressed "conflicts" between guide operations and resident non-guided hunters.

Action: 5 In Favor, 5 Opposed, 2 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposals 87, 88, 89

Issue: Convert sheep hunts to drawing permit hunts and limit non-resident hunters to __% of the permits.
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt
Comment: These three proposals are not supported by the long range harvest data (20 years) and the analysis of that data. Statewide the % of harvest between R and NR hasn't changed significantly. Competition is some high participation areas is part of the long term sheep policy of making sure there are some areas where R hunters can go "every year". Competition for issue like transportation services can be minimized by staggering the opening dates between the R season and the NR season. Our trophy areas (where long term policy has been to manage for the opportunity for big rams) are already controlled by drawing permits with NR restricted to (usually) 10% of the permits.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposals 90, 91

Issue: Restricting NR hunters in small sized drawing hunts and taking Next of Kin tags out of the R pool rather than the NR pool.
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt
Comment: These issues were discussed in the newer drawing hunts. The present small percentage for NR was part of the Boards decision to provide some opportunity for NR hunters in high participation areas. Both R and NR hunters realize that these areas will

not provide for long term, low competition hunting. There is no reason presented to change at this time. We expect the guide industry to ask for NR participation in drawing hunts and next of kin hunters are in that pool. The industry has worked with the present system for some years and issue of NR vs next of kin hunters has not been a big issue. There is no data to support a change at this time. The harvest report data give a good data base to re-examine this ratio in the future.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Statewide Game Seasons

Proposal 92

Issue: Only traps and snares for taking wolves and wolverines (prohibit firearms).
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt
Comment: The FAC is unaware of any area in the state where there is an "excess of harvest of wolves or wolverines" because of the use of firearms while trapping. We disagree that a problem exists that needs to be addressed.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 93

Issue: Same as 92 for National Park Service Lands.
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt
Comment: The FAC strongly disagrees with the premise that existing trapping regulations are excessively liberal. The harvest of keystone, wild roaming predators is well within population objectives.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 94

Issue: No taking of wolf, fox, wolverine, or coyote during May, June or July on National Park Service managed lands.
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt
Comment: The FAC is unaware of any present problem with the existing regulations that would justify the proposal. None of the named species is cause for concern with respect to their population(s).

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 95

Issue: Management areas for hunting small game using falconry.

Recommendation: None
Comment: None

Action: 0 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 0 Absent

Proposal 96

Issue: Open areas to archery hunting if shotguns are allowed.
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt for Statewide, Consider for Regional, or site specific.
Comment: The FAC would like the Board to approach this issue for specific hunts or areas, not statewide.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Methods and Means

Proposal 97

Issue: Use of artificial light to assist in the taking of game, big game, fur, or a furbearer is illegal.
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt
Comment: This poorly though out proposal, even on park managed lands, has unintended consequences. For example, could a trapper follow a drag trail in the dark with his headlamp? Same with following the blood trail of a late in the day killed moose or caribou. It is unfortunate that an organization like the National Parks Conservation Association is so negatively focused on this touchy, feely stuff that does not now, nor ever has been a problem. That they are unwilling to accept the Alaska constitution and ANILCA, the law of the land, regarding use of wildlife resources, is not a credit to their organization.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 98

Issue: Prohibit the use of hand held electronics in taking game.
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt
Comment: This proposal is way too general. If the proposer has a specific electronic device in mind, he should say so. As written this would ban the GPS units that the AWT so prefers for locating bear baiting stations, most wrist watches are “electronic”. The specific equipment that has come before the board for previous review set the example for how to deal with this issue.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 99

Issue: Hunters using a licensed transporter cannot harvest on the same day transported.

Recommendation: Do Not Adopt (especially Statewide)

Comment: Limiting the use of transportation (or transportation services) is only one of the factors that influence the rate(s) of harvest. There is no statewide problem with "dramatic increase in harvest levels of black bears and deer". If this is a specific local problem, it should be tabled until the appropriate Regional BOG meeting.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 100

Issue: Allow the use of laser sight, electronically-enhanced night vision scope, or artificial light for taking coyotes.

Recommendation: Amend/Adopt

Comment: Amend to include wolves where appropriate. Coyotes have greatly increased their range in Alaska and are now a significant predator on young ungulates. Where wolves are part of predator management projects, the harvest could be increased.

Action: 11 In Favor, 1 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 101

Issue: Same Day Airborne taking of coyotes

Recommendation: Adopt

Comment: The significant increase in the population and range of coyotes is having a negative effect on other wildlife. Coyotes are a very difficult predator to reduce.

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 102, 103, 104

Issue: Restrict use of "other than horses" for pack animals; Felt soled wading boots; deer or elk urine

Recommendation: None

Comment: 102 Dogs and mules should be added if others restricted. 103 The felt soled wading boots issue is not significant compared to fishing activity. 104 the amendment should just restrict to "Non-Alaskan" deer or elk urine rather than banning the use of all.

Action: 0 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 0 Absent

Sealing and Bag Limits

Proposal 105, 106

Issue: Counting wounded game against the hunter's bag limit. Add "mortally" before wounded.

Recommendation: Do Not Adopt for statewide./In specific areas where populations make this a desirable thing, add the "mortally".

Comment: These are judgment calls for most hunters regardless of methods used. Arrows are often not recovered. Restrict the judgment calls as much as possible because of the problems with legal recognition of the event. Adding "mortally" where such a restriction is necessary makes good sense.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 107

Issue: Remove statewide black bear limit.

Recommendation: Adopt

Comment: In some GMUs or sub-units there is no reason to restrict hunters to a set "statewide" limit. The limit for black bear harvest should be set by Region, Unit or Subunit.

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 108

Issue: Taking of cub bears and female bears with cubs prohibited on lands managed by the National Park Service.

Recommendation: Do Not Adopt

Comment: Contrary to the sponsor's statement on the reasons for bear management, areas where it has been part of the Intensive management program often have not enough calf survival to maintain ungulate populations let along provide for human harvest. Lands managed by the NPS are not immune to this problem.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 109

Issue: Standardize bear seasons and bag limits as much as possible.

Recommendation: Adopt

Comment: The FAC supports the goal of standardizing the regulations.

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Evidence of Sex, Transfer and Possession

Proposal 110

Issue: Changes to bear sex identity, sealing, etc.
Recommendation: No Recommendation
Comment: None

Action: In Favor, Opposed, Abstained, Absent

Proposal 111

Issue: Change the language of identity of sex by allowing a testicle or the penis or the vulva or scrotum must remain naturally attached.
Recommendation: Adopt
Comment: Allowing options that reduce the possibility to have unusable meat is a good change. The ability to identify the sex of the animal taken is not impaired.

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 112

Issue: Eliminate the "evidence of sex" regulation. (Use DNA to make the determination.)
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt
Comment: The DNA samples used for identification, as in the bear studies in GMU 20, are sent out of state for processing. Unless the laboratory work is done locally using only DNA is going to be a problem for law enforcement. In the future this will be a viable option.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 113

Issue: Remove the reference to federal fish and wildlife agent under the transfer and possession regulation.
Recommendation: Adopt
Comment: The purpose of this proposal is NOT to pick on federal participation in enforcement activities. We prefer that cooperation be in the form or specific requests or specific agreements between agencies rather than in the Alaska codified regulations. There have been numerous problems lately caused by federal enforcement agents "having" to enforce state regulations. This proposal would remove one of the non-specific reasons for the federal agencies to assume they have authority not specifically given by the State of Alaska.

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Black Bear Baiting

Proposal 114

Issue: Allow Same Day Airborne outside ¼ mile from a black bear bait station.
Recommendation: Adopt
Comment: This is the common practice in IM GMUs. There is no evidence of a problem and this practice could be extended to statewide black bear baiting and restricted in areas where there is a problem.

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 115

Issue: Eliminate the personally accompany requirement for guides using bait stations or scent lures for black bear.
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt
Comment:

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposals 116, 117

Issue: Add language to black bear bait stations used by guides to restrict guides or assistant guides to require a guide client agreement.
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt
Comment: The FAC is not clear on what is the problem this proposal is intended to fix.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 118

Issue: Language changes to 92.044 for black bear baiting permits.
Recommendation: Do Not Adopt
Comment: The "group" may have approved all this language, but the FAC does not and we have not delegated our review and recommendation to the Greater Alaska anything. These are feel good suggestions that will do little for the actual management of black bear baiting. Several suggestions are addressing non problems and some extend the department's authority under this discretionary permit. We don't want the department AWT to adjudicate or "restrict the location of individual bait sites to eliminate conflicts with prior established stations". The present practice of notifying new participants of the location of existing sites is adequate.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 119

Issue: Establish a codified location for permitted black bear bait stations and establish seasons for all of Alaska.

Recommendation: Adopt

Comment: The FAC supports putting these issues in the codified rather than continue them at the discretion of the department.

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 120

Issue: Eliminate black bear baiting as a method requiring a predator control permit in predator control areas.

Recommendation: Amend/Adopt

Comment: The concept of separating normal black bear baiting and predator control is noble but the language in this proposal could handcuff the department in IM units where additional bear harvest could prevent a complicated predator control project. There are several units in the Interior where this is the case, the Yukon Flats as a specific example. The language should not be totally limiting. For example, there are areas where non-traditional take could be tried as an alternate to a full predator control plan. The board has been asked dozens of times in recent years to relax the prohibition on taking brown bears over black bear baits. The FAC has a proposal in to try this with hunter restrictions in Region 3. A statewide elimination of the potential to test this is not a good idea at this time. There are restrictions such as tag requirements, registration requirements and frequency of harvest that should be discussed before a blanket restriction is enacted.

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 121

Issue: Restrict bait stations and scent lures for black bear on lands managed by the National Park Service.

Recommendation: Do Not Adopt

Comment: The sponsor does not understand the present restrictions on baiting in areas close to high density human occupancy. If the NPS wants to make their own rule, let them do it.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 122, 123

Issue: Use of scent lures for black bear hunting while floating.

Recommendation: Adopt

Comment: River floaters could use a scent, kept with the boat or raft, for black bear hunting. The lure would not be fixed to the shore or any shore feature so that scent would be "left" behind after, for example, an overnight or weekend campsite. This technique could be used on many river float trips. The "problem" has been the lack of a specific site to "register" and we recommend the watercraft be the registered site. Adding "while floating" would have the same requirements for set backs and distance development.

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Trapping

Proposal 124

Issue: Require trap identification on all Units of land managed by the National Park Service.

Recommendation: Do Not Adopt

Comment: The judgment that on NPS lands the existing situation is for "excessively liberal trapping regulations" and that "problem" would be fixed by requiring trap identification is wrong. The state trapping rules would not be "ensured" by adopting this proposal. If the NPS wants to make such a rule, let them be responsible for it.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 125

Issue: Require a 72 hour trap check for all traps and snares set on National Park Service (managed) lands.

Recommendation: Do Not Adopt

Comment: Trappers determine the "acceptable" time period for checking their traps. Traps and snares that kill the furbearers still require that fur to be removed frequently to protect the value of the fur. Animals caught in live trap situations also need to be dispatched to protect their value. Terrain, weather, type of set and other environmental conditions factor into the frequency of checking traplines. This issue does not need a regulation on frequency, especially statewide.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 126

Issue: Taking black bear under a trapping license on lands managed by the National Park Service.

Recommendation: Do Not Adopt

Comment: The issues of trap (snare) strength, public safety risk and selection of the

animal (sows, cubs, etc.) are all covered in the regulations for trapping bears. The discussion on those issues was extensive and the questions were all answered. Experience from those states and provinces where bear trapping is allowed do not provide evidence of unacceptable risk to trappers or the public.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 127

Issue: Taking black bears by trap or snare.

Recommendation: Do Not Adopt

Comment: The sponsors are opposed to bears being snared or trapped. The present bear management policy was discussed in view of that opposition and adopted. Nothing in this proposal offers any new information that would cause a new discussion or a change in policy. Trying to mix methods and means used "since statehood" with the recent use of trapping in Intensive management areas is misleading. The population dynamics for many big game species have changed dramatically over time. The board and the department have responded to the need to change management strategy and that is a good thing.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 128

Issue: Establish a tag and fee to allow trappers to retain incidental catch.

Recommendation: Do Not Adopt

Comment: Although the request is outside the authority of the board to establish fees, incidental catch should be "turned in" not bought for a special tag fee.

Action: 0 In Favor, 12 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Intensive Management

Proposal 129

Issue: Clarifies responsibilities of the Department of Fish and Game Commissioner.

Recommendation: Adopt

Comment: This proposal clarifies language in the present regulation. The specific language removes uncertainty for action by the department.

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 130

Issue: Unit 26B Intensive Management Plan (Musk Ox)

Recommendation: Adopt

Comment: The issue of establishing a management project for the musk ox in Unit 26B is overdue. This is one of those situations wherein the department needs the tools to reduce the problem bears. The plan is a strategic strike not an areawide reduction in brown bears.

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 131

Issue: Add bear population reduction to the Unit 19A predation control program.
Recommendation: Adopt
Comment: The new methods for trapping bear have proven effective. This Unit has long recognized bears as a major part of the problem in moose calf survival. The addition of "bears" will make the overall recovery project shorter.

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Miscellaneous

Proposal 132

Issue: Policy for changing board agenda.
Recommendation: Amend/Adopt
Comment: The FAC supports the board's request to add to this policy. However, as presented in this proposal, more questions are unanswered than are answered. We would like the board to address issues like: the time between the ACR and the next regular meeting that the issue would be eligible for the agenda; how to handle requests from advisory committees who only meet once a year; keeping the 45 days (the board can discuss ACRs by email or phone); if you're not going to give special accommodation to your statutory advisory committees, don't give any special accommodation to other agencies, programs or laws (keep the same request, time frame, structure, definitions); keep in mind that a 60 day period will interrupt your ability to get regulations through review process in time for publication in the regulations publications. The board should define "new information".

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

Proposal 257

Issue: Unlawful methods of taking furbearers, exceptions. In Unit 1C, add language to cable snares breakaway distances and size of wire
Recommendation: Adopt
Comment: We support the best technology for the Gustavus trappers.

Action: 12 In Favor, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstained, 3 Absent

NUSHAGAK ADVISORY COMMITTEE
9 a.m. October 25, 2011
Dillingham City Council Chambers
DILLINGHAM, ALASKA

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

1. Call to Order
Chairman Hans Nicholson called the meeting to order at 9:10am.

2. ROLL CALL/ESTABLISH QUORUM
Members present at roll call were: Curt Armstrong, Frank Woods, Hans Nicholson, Joseph Wassily-Clarks Point, Carl Evon-Manokotak, Jonathan Forsling-Togiak, George Taylor-Ekwok. AC Coordinator Alissa Joseph participated by teleconference. Hans excused Robin Samuelson and Dan Dunaway because of prior commitments. Quorum not established. Bad weather prevented committee members from attending.

3. Approve Agenda
Chairman Nicholson explains that for this year, he has been authorized to hold two meetings. One now and one in the spring for Fisheries call for proposals. It is really unfortunate that the weather did not co-operate, as committee members who were planning on attending, were not able. Without a quorum this meeting would be for informational purposes only. For purposes of commenting on game proposals, the committee will not be able to go on record to comment on proposals. Chairman Nicholson thought that the committee would go ahead and comment on proposals that would affect GMU 17 even though we didn't have a quorum. At least the BOG would get some input on proposals the committee addressed. Chairman Nicholson presents the agenda with additions.

4. Approve January, 26, 2011 Meeting Minutes
Since there is no quorum, the committee agrees by consensus to approve at the next scheduled meeting.

5. Introduce Staff and Guests
The ADF&G staff present for all or part of the meeting included: Alissa Joseph, Boards Support; Tim Sands and Matt Jones, Area Biologists Commercial Fish; Jim Woolington, Area Biologist Wildlife Conservation; Fred Burk, ADF&G Enforcement; Andy Aderman, TNWR; Ted Krieg, ADF&G Division of Subsistence; Craig Schwanke, ADF&G Sport Fish; Mike Mason, KDLG; Joseph Chythlook, BBNC; Members of the public, Kenny Wilson.

6. New Business

a. Staff Reports

Tim Sands, ADF&G Comm. Fish introduces the 2011 Herring season summary. This year is similar to last year with only 22 seine and 25 gillnet vessels participating. 2011 was a lengthy season with 24556 tons harvested, or a 17% exploitation rate of the preseason biomass estimate of 140860 tons. Herring were harvested between May 10 and 28. 16753 tons of herring, or 96% of the purse seine quota was taken while 5946 tons taken amounted to 80% of the gillnet quota.

Tim Sands gave the 2011 post-season salmon report for the Nushagak District. In 2011 there was not a directed Chinook commercial fishery. Chinook escapement amounted to 59728 kings exceeding the minimum escapement goal of 40,000. The in-river escapement goal is set at 75,000. Incidental harvest during the course of the directed commercial sockeye fishery amounted to 29811 kings.

All Nushagak District Rivers exceeded their escapement goals. The 2011 sockeye run was earlier and weaker than forecast but close to the long term average. The Nushagak District harvest was just under five million (4,953,271). The age composition one/two's returned significantly under-forecast resulting in a less than anticipated sockeye run. Tim explains that he usually starts fishing when the Wood-River exceeds 100,000 sockeye escapement. The Wood River Tower was up and running on June 18. The Nushagak sonar was running June 5th or 6th. The Nushagak commercial fishery started on June 25. Even with the early run, Tim didn't think they missed counting much of the run based on tower and sonar counts. Nushagak allocation amounted to 17% set net, 7% Iguashik set net, and 76% driftnet. Tim started drift fishing on June 25 with a Igushik opener and the 25th in the Nushagak district with steady fishing and only closing for one tide the rest of the season. He delayed sockeye openers for conservation of Chinook.

Tim mentions that some regulatory considerations for the next BOF cycle might be: To allow dual set nets in the Wood River Special Harvest Area, 5AAC 06.358(d)(3). Offshore set nets by same owner 5AAC 06.331(u). Set net registration more than one section 5AAC 06.370(a)(3). These considerations are not currently allowed.

Discussion about the season, first opening date and fishermen's concerns about missing the front of the run resulting in lost economic opportunity were aired. Some felt that with the early run, the Wood River Tower was not able to record early sockeye escapement. Tim felt that early tower counts did not substantiate those claims.

The loss of the Nushagak Test Boat, lack of funding for the Wood River Tower and Nushagak Sonar were concerns that the committee voiced their concerns over. Without these 'tools", committee members felt that in 2011 fishermen incurred lost fishing opportunity. Opinions were based because of significant run strength on the first opening and diminishing daily after that. They felt that we were fishing the back-side of the run.

Tim encourages all to talk to legislatures for future increases in funding. Current funding for the tower has been the same since 1985 even with increased operating costs. He

would like to see additional funding for the Sonar through August 20 for pink and coho in 2012.

Break at 10:30
Back to order at 10:42

Matt Jones, ADF&G Comm. Fish reported that the 2011 Togiak District forecast was for 860,000 sockeye. Harvest came in at 748,000 and puts it 39% above the 20 year average. Escapement was 191,000. The escapement goal is set at a range between 120,000-270,000. The 2011 run came in 9% above forecast and was the 9th largest run ever. Chinook harvest was 6837 and coho harvest was 7709.

Committee members thought that this year, outside boats were able to start fishing right about the peak of the Togiak run. With the early run occurring in the east-side districts, many drift fishermen transitioned to Togiak to fish once the exclusive clause termination allowed them to. Some felt that with increased competition occurring at the peak of their fishery, took away economic benefit from local fishermen.

Fred Berg, AWT: Fred reported that 2011 herring saw limited enforcement. Spring bear saw effort shift to the west. Sport fishing violations were up: not recording kings, boat registration, life jackets were primary violations. Commercial fishing violations were down with 24 cases.

This fall, there were no misdemeanor cases. His department is concerned that in 17 A,B there were a half dozen bears shot and left, not salvaged. On the Lake Road there were a few complaints of Road Hunting, mostly bird-shot near residences. His points of concerns included subsistence nets not properly marked, not being picked, in the Naknek district there is an upswing in numbers of nets when cannery workers show up. For 2012 his department will issue tickets for life jacket violations resulting in a $100 fine. They will also encourage boat registration compliance.

Theodore Krieg, ADF&G Subsistence. Ted is completing a baseline household study in Manakotak, Clarks Point and Aleknagik. The report is in draft form and is being reviewed. He is currently working on a Bering Sea Ecosystem Subsistence Project. The project is nearing completion in Togiak but is still gathering information in Dillingham. He is also working in Akiak in the Kuskokwim doing baseline surveys in 13-14 communities. Ted also encourages everyone to turn in their subsistence salmon permit reports.

Break at 11:58
Back to order at 1:05

Craig Schwanke, ADF&G Sport Fish: During the Chinook sport fishery, Craig reported that the department imposed limits on June 23 because by then escapement indicated that it would come in under 55,000. In the Nushagak, they are coordinating Chinook studies with the commercial fisheries department to do an acoustic tag study 7

miles below the sonar. They tagged 300 kings and were able to see how many swam past the sonar. They wanted to see how many stayed in the lower part of the river. The genetic study is still on-going in the Nushagak River and their goal was to take 200 samples out of each tributary. They are counting Rainbow's in the Lower Talarik. Numbers are down since the 1970s. During their conversations with Togiak Sport Fish guides, kings were down district-wide. Two operators work the Kulukak River and report that effort is low. The department doesn't actively manage the drainage and doesn't do aerial surveys for escapement indicators.

Committee members were concerned that the sport fishery is unregulated and that the commercial fishery that used to occur, sacrificed opportunity to build up stocks.

Andy Aderman, TNWR: Andy reported that during the Nushagak Peninsula Caribou Hunt Feb 1-March 31 season 50 permits were issued with 45 Caribou taken. He thought the hunt was successful. They are currently monitoring radio collared female caribou. During early July, they completed a photo-census on the peninsula caribou with a minimum count of 859 while 709 were counted last year. As per the working group recommendation, this fall 5 permits were issued to Manakotak with 2 caribou taken. The rest will be issued during the winter hunt. The current calf/cow ratio is at 39/100 and the bull/cow ratio is 29/100 and is the lowest since monitoring began. During the last two years 75% of harvest taken were bulls.

Jim Woolington, ADF&G Wildlife: Jim reported that the moose population in 17b,c has been stable the past few years. He is still compiling the Fall 2011 hunt information and waiting on 182 hunt permit reports. Even with an increase in hunter numbers, moose harvest has relatively been the same.

Mulchatna Caribou harvest occurred predominately in Unit 18. He suspects a lot of unreported harvest. Reported harvest is up from last year. He is working with Andy on a satellite-tagging project, mostly Andy's. There hasn't been a photo-census the last 2 years because of bad weather. He needs dry, calm weather for the caribou to aggregate. He is encouraged by higher bull/cow and cow/calf ratios. He sees better productivity from the younger age class.

Brown Bear harvest is about the same, slowly increasing. Last years proposals allowed liberalized seasons. Bag limit was changed to allow 2 bear, August 20-May 31. Tag fee for residents was eliminated. Jim reports that for the first time they have a sealer in the field. A Sealer/Tagger who resides in New Stuyahok, Mike Gumlickpuk.

Wolf: Snow conditions this year was good with most harvest taken by trappers. Koliganek residents took over 30 wolves. Jim feels that taking those wolves in proximity to the caribou calving area benefited caribou populations.

Jim is concerned that he wasn't able to do a moose census count again this year because of poor snow conditions. He had pilots on call for a long time, but the weather never did cooperate. Bears are the hardest species to count. Last year bear survey on the peninsula

cost in excess of $200,000 over two years. Jim is encouraged by increasing bull/cow ratios but is concerned about the decline in cow/calf ratios. Predation could be the primary cause. There are two primary calving areas. One near Lime Village and the other near Koliganek..

During the caribou calf mortality study they radio-collared 81 calves in the southern calving area and 7 near Lime Village. Mortality can be determined whether by bears or wolves by the remains. 44% calf mortality occurred in the southern calving area while all 7 of the collared calves died near Lime Village. It was determined that bears accounted for 39% mortality, wolves 39%, unknown predator 11%, starvation 4%, and drowning 3%. They plan on doing it again this spring. One crew will camp out in the Sparravon Hills for the Northern Calving Area and the other crew will work out of Dillingham for the Southern Calving Area. The predator control program in caribou calving areas in Unit 17 is only for caribou. The State issues aerial control permits. The wolf survey is already funded.

Break at 2:45
Curt asks to be excused for school bus run.
Back to order at 3:07 pm

Skin Wysocki was able to call-in to the teleconference from Koliganek.

6(b) Game Proposals

i. Discuss

ii. Comment

Chairman Nicholson thought that even though we didn't have a quorum, we should go on record to show actions on specific proposals. Hans feels that it is unfortunate that we didn't have a quorum to take on more proposals he thought were important. We are also running into time constraints. (Jim is getting on the plane and needs to leave at 4:30. We had trouble coordinating with staff on meeting dates.) We will be addressing Statewide proposals to be taken up at the BOG meeting in Anchorage during Jan 13-18. He feels that at the very least, we should take up and go on record on proposals 157 and 255. Committee concurs.

Proposal 255
Jim introduces and committee discusses the merits of the brown bear $25 tag fee exemption. Committee agrees that brown bears are a problem statewide and are detrimental to the survival of moose and caribou populations.

- **Action:**

Joseph	**In favor**
Jonathan	**In favor**
George	**In favor**
Carl	**In favor**
Frank	**In favor**
Hans	**In favor**
Skin	**In favor**

Proposal 157
Jim introduces and committee discusses the intent of the proposal that would amend the Mulchatna Caribou Predation Management Plan Area. It would include Unit 19 (a),(b) "Northern Calving Area". It would increase the range of the "Management Plan" area. The current area includes 5000 sq. miles and would increase it to 10,000 sq. miles and include Unit 19.

- **Action:**

Joseph	**In favor**
Jonathan	**In favor**
George	**In favor**
Carl	**In favor**
Frank	**In favor**
Hans	**In favor**
Skin	**In favor**

Chairman Nicholson instructs Alissa to poll the rest of the committee members on support/no support on proposals 157, 255.

7. Old Business

a. Election of Officers

i. At large seat, alternate seat

ii. 2 Seats expiring

Chairman Nicholson tells the committee that since we did not advertise 14 days in advance, we cannot hold elections. Elections will be held for expiring seats and officers at the next scheduled meeting. Hans instructs Alissa to determine village and committee seats that are expiring so that they can be advertised for the next meeting.

8. Set next meeting date and place

Call of the chair. Possibly Feb-March for BOF call for proposal deadline of April 10.

9. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 3:50 pm.

Kodiak Fish & Game Advisory Committee
December 8th 2011-KNWRVC
Oliver Holm Chairman

Attn: Scott
AC Comments
BOG Sw 2012

Cliff Judkins
Chairman
Alaska Board of Game

December 2011

Subject:

Proposal 50; Review of discretionary hunt conditions and procedures.

Our committee unanimously opposes proposal 50.

We strongly support the Departments ability to use discretionary conditions applied to hunt conditions at the local level.

The Kodiak Advisory Committee has a long history of working closely with the Department, the USFWS, the Kodiak Aleutians Advisory(Federal Subsistence) Council, native villages and other affected user groups. We gather public input from our Islands communities to develop trust, consensus and compromise necessary for the best management of public resources. The discretionary ability of our local biologists to be able to "fine tune" allocative compromises frees us from the vociferous and occasionally mean spirited debate that occurs in other areas of the state. A good case in point is our mountain goat management plan which was applauded by both the Alaska Board of Game and the federal Subsistence Board as an exemplary strategy. It has been cited in game management classes at leading universities.

Local management accomplishments can be attested to by the relatively healthy populations of wild life in the Kodiak Management Areas and greater hunter success rates. Were strongly opposed to the board circumventing the public process by dissecting discretionary details from previously adopted regulations and management plans. Each regulation and plan needs to be reviewed in total context before deleting or amending discretionary permit conditions and procedures. Often a small detail for a permit hunt such as registration in a village or sealing skulls and hides before leaving the management area are the keystone of local compromise and allowed management plans to function successfully.

Sincerely ;
Oliver Holm
Chairman Kodiak Fish and Game Advisory Committee

Kodiak Fish & Game Advisory Committee
December 8th 2011-KNWRVC
Oliver Holm Chairman

(Minutes represent a paraphrased summary of the KAC, department staff and public comments and are not a verbatim transcript of the meeting. Tapes of the meeting are available for review by contacting the committee secretary)

Call to order: 7:10pm at Kenai National Wildlife Refuge Visitor Center

Roll Call: Quorum achieved with 10 members . Oliver Holm, Don Fox, Paul Chervenak, Harvey Goodell, Pete Hannah, Rick Berns, Rolan Ruos, Robin Overall (for Curt Waters), Herman Squartsoff and Andy Finke.
Department staff: John Crye and Larry Van Daele.
Public Safety: Trooper Alan Jones.
Audience members: 15.
Correspondence: Two letters from the Kodiak/Aleutians RAC concerning the population increase in mountain goats at the south end of Kodiak Island. The subsistence council was proposing a possible spring subsistence hunt for Kodiak residents for goat. Chairman Holm said the committee should re-form the goat committee to address the issue.

Chair Announcements: None.

Old Business: None.

New Business:

1) KARAC member Pat Holms gave the committee an update on federal subsistence issues and stated the need for the Kodiak Fish & Game Advisory Committee to reactivate the goat committee to address a subsistence goat harvest.
2) **Statewide game proposals:** Larry Van Daele informed the committee members of the change of cycle for BOG proposals. Call for proposals due in April 2012 for the March BOG meeting that addressed Kodiak issues. Discussion and action on statewide game proposals.
3) **KAC member to BOG:** Paul Chervenak was selected to represent the KAC at the January BOG meeting with Don Fox as the alternate.
4) **Date of next KAC meeting:** February 28, 2012 at 7pm at the KNWRVC to discuss and act on Statewide Dungeness crab and Miscellaneous shellfish issues. Our annual elections will also be held.
5) **Goat committee:** Paul Chervenak selected to chair goat committee the 1st meeting will be held sometime in March 2012.

ADJOURN: 11:07pm

Kodiak Fish & Game Advisory Committee
December 8th 2011-KNWRVC
Oliver Holm Chairman

Statewide Game Proposals

Proposal #39 **Action: Proposal Support 9-1(abstained)**

Description: Modify the state falconry regulations and the Alaska Falconry Manual to comply with new federal standards.
Amendments: Two.
1) Delete the provision in Alaska Falconry Manual #9 in Table 1 requiring the sterilization of non-indigenous sub-species of goshawks.
2) Amend Alaska Falconry Manual #9 to allow for a lottery for a non-resident take of raptors for falconry. Non-residents would be allowed to take 3 gyrfalcons, 3 peregrine falcons(any sub-species), 3 merlins, 3 sharp shinned hawks, 3 redtailed/Harlan hawks and 10 Northern Goshawks.

Staff comments: The rewrite of the Alaska Falconry Manual #9 which is a part of proposal #39 was submitted at a late date. Past the comment deadline. Its large 42 pages and contains a lot of information.
Committee comments: Agree with staff comments on the lateness of the report. Both Proposal #38 the AFA version of Manual # 9 and the departments version in proposal #39 are similar but there are significant differences in a few areas.
Comment on amendments:
Staff comments: See no reason to surgically sterilize non-indigenous sub-species of goshawks. Very few are in Alaska and slim chance they will interbreed with an Alaskan Northern Goshawk.
Committee comments: KAC member Mr. Fox agreed with staff comments and noted that the only know European Goshawk was held by Don Hunley in Anchorage. Mr. Fox also commented that of the 15 states that had resident goshawk populations none that he knew of required the procedure. If the BOG adopts a non-resident take of raptors they may wish to exclude some areas to avoid conflicts with resident falconers.
Minority opinion: KAC member Mr. Hannah abstained feeling the proposal was too complex to vote on and that he didn't have a full understanding of the issues.

Proposal #40 **Action:** None taken.
The KAC amended proposal #39 to allow for a non-resident take of raptors.

Proposal #44 **Action: Support 10-0.**

Description: Modify the ADF&G discretionary authority for Governor's tags.
Staff comments: Department proposal. Extra permits are available for charitable organizations to auction off. Hunts take place out of regular season.
Committee comments: Guides donate their services since the hunts take place out of normal guiding activities. Would generate money for bear management on Kodiak through the Brown Bear trust.

Kodiak Fish & Game Advisory Committee
December 8th 2011-KNWRVC
Oliver Holm Chairman

Proposal #46 **Action: Oppose 0-10**

Description: Allow the sale of big game trophies.
Staff comments: Larry Van Daele stated that there were no biological concerns. This proposal comes close to creating a commercialization of hunts especially for sheep and bear. This is one small step away from doing that. There is definitely a market for bear trophies and that he gets calls from people wanting to buy a bear hide without hunting them.
Committee comments: Agree with and support staff comments KAC would like to reference them. KAC member Mr. Chervenak who is a registered guide said he could probably make more money by going out and shooting a bear if he drew a tag and selling the hide then he would through the difficult work of guiding.

Proposal #47 **Action:** No action
Description: Would allow the sale of trophies acquired through legal action such as divorce.
Committee comments: No action in lieu of action taken on proposal #46.

Proposal #49 **Action:** No action.

Description: Require logbook for taxidermists and provide authority to Alaska Wildlife Troopers to inspect taxidermy paperwork.
Committee comments: KAC members agreed with Mr. Chervenak that the taxidermists already have the paperwork they need.

Proposal #50 **Action: Oppose 0-10**

Staff comments: BOG proposal. Staff OPPOSED. Department at the local level supports strongly keeping our discretionary regulations. This proposal is the same as proposal #191 that applied to the SC Region that the KAC rejected last year.
Committee comments: The committee agrees with the staff comments and strongly supports the departments ability to use discretionary conditions that apply to hunt conditions at the local level. We submitted a letter to the BOG last year and will resubmit it again further explaining our reasons for our opposition to this BOG generated proposal.

Proposal # 51 **Action: Support as amended 10-0**

Description: Allow the ADF&G to require the latitude and longitude of kill locations on a harvest report for drawing and registration hunts.

Kodiak Fish & Game Advisory Committee
December 8th 2011-KNWRVC
Oliver Holm Chairman

Amendment: Latitude and longitude is not public information and is for state and federal wildlife and enforcement use only.
Staff comments: Probably won't use in Kodiak but it's a tool that could be used if needed. Recommend adoption.
Committee comments: Would want the ability to extrapolate later on a map and not at time of kill. Would support as long is it isn't public information. Mr. Chervenak felt that his guided clients would not want to carry a GPS in the field and that this proposal should be a regional and not a statewide one.

Proposal # 54 **Action: Oppose 0-10**

Description: Expand the definition of archery hunts to include crossbows.
Committee comments: KAC members are against including crossbows in archery only hunts. Crossbows are more efficient and would tempt hunters to take longer shots thereby risk wounding more animals. They should be in there own category and not compete with bows.

Proposal #57 **Action: Oppose 0-10**

Description: Allow archers to use mechanical/retractable broad heads for all big game.
Staff comments: Not allowed for brown bear, mountain goats or elk.
Committee comments: KAC members agreed with audience comments that they have too many moving parts and if you hit at a bad angle or wrong spot they may break. They're good for lighter game such as deer but not larger animals.

Proposal # 62 **Action: Oppose 0-10**

Description: Restrict the number of permits a resident may apply for.
Staff comments: Allocative.
Committee comments: Committee opposed because the proposal unfairly limits the number of permit choices the hunter may apply for.

Proposal # 63 **Action: Oppose 0-10**

Description: Increase the number of drawing permits for each species that a person may apply for.
Staff comments: Department proposal. Would double the number of drawing permits you may apply for each species. Have undersubscribed hunts in state. Would increase the number of people applying for these under utilized hunts.
Committee comments: Opposed. This should be a regional and not a statewide proposal.

Kodiak Fish & Game Advisory Committee
December 8th 2011-KNWRVC
Oliver Holm Chairman

Proposal #66-67-68 **Action: Oppose 1 - 9**

Description: All three proposals would limit non-residents to a maximum of 10 percent of permits.
Staff comments: In Kodiak we have a breakdown of 60-67 % of permits for brown bear for residents and the rest for non-residents(around 33%). The guided non-resident bear hunt is important to the economy of Kodiak very few residents hire guides.
Committee comments: There are currently lightly used non-drawing areas for brown bear in the state. The guided hunt industry in Alaska is a major economic benefit to the statewide and local economies. Sheep hunting is a $20 million dollar industry in Alaska. In Kodiak where we have a large number of non-resident bear permits issued adoption of this proposal could be the death knell for our local guides especially in the villages. Very few residents use guides for bear hunts. Our allocation of non-resident permits works well for Kodiak no change is needed. This should not be a statewide proposal.
Minority opinion: KAC member Mrs. Overall felt that issuing so many non-resident permits makes it more difficult for local residents to obtain one.

Proposal #69 **Action: Oppose 0-10**

Description: Establish a bonus point/preference system for hunts.
Staff comments: A very expensive system to run they're usually contracted out. Research shows that the persons chances don't increase that much . You can get more bonus points as you get older in some hunts.
Committee comments: Agree with staff comments. KAC member also felt that adoption would take away from youth opportunity to hunt.

Proposal # 70 **Action: Support 10-0**

Description: Allow non-resident deployed military personnel to defer drawing permits.
Staff comments: No biological concerns its not a large number of permits. We need to support our military they put their life on the line for all of us. We should allow them to utilize their permit at a future date.
Committee comments: The KAC agrees with and would like to reference staff comments.

Proposal # 71-72-73-74 **Action: Opposed 0 - 10**

Description: All four proposals would open hunts one week(7 days) for residents before non-residents are allowed to hunt.
Staff comments: Allocative.

Kodiak Fish & Game Advisory Committee
December 8th 2011-KNWRVC
Oliver Holm Chairman

Committee comments: Should not be a statewide issue. Regulations should be addressed regionally. There is enough opportunity as is for hunters. Most hunters prefer hunting later in the season. Works fine as it is now for hunter opportunity.

Proposal #75 **Action: Oppose 0 - 10**

Description: Open early youth hunt for all big game, ten days before other seasons; require hunter education.
Staff comments: Allocative.
Committee comments: Shouldn't be a blanket statewide proposal for all animals. On Kodiak we have a 5 month deer season as well a special end of the season road system hunt with primitive weapons for youth.

Proposal #76 **Action: Oppose 0 - 10**

Description: Open early youth hunt (10-17 years) for all big game statewide and require accompanying adult to forfeit bag limit.
Staff Comments: Allocative.
Committee comments: Would reference comments on proposal #75. We could be teaching a youth disrespect for the law(who shoots the animal). We need to teach our youth the traditional ways to hunt.

Proposal #77 **Action: Oppose 0 - 10**

Description: Require hunters to use only one type of method; either firearm or bow; require a tag.
Staff comments: No recommendation from department.
Committee Comments: A hunter should be able to use what ever method they want and not commit in advance. This proposal limits the hunters options if they elect to hunt with a bow then decide later to use a firearm. Would prohibit a hunter who wounded an animal with a bow from finishing the kill with a firearm.

Proposal #95 **Action: Support 10-0**

Description: Open several management area to the taking of small game by the use of falconry.
Staff comments: There were public safety concerns with these road accessible areas so they were limited to archers. There wouldn't be any conflict between falconer and archers.
Committee comments: Agree with and support staff comments.

Kodiak Fish & Game Advisory Committee
December 8th 2011-KNWRVC
Oliver Holm Chairman

Proposal #98 **Action: Oppose 0 - 10**

Description: Prohibit the use of hand held electronics in taking game.
Staff comments: Don't adopt. Would include safety devices, rangefinders and GPS.
Committee comments: Agree with staff comments. Adoption would be a safety concern.

Proposal # 99 **Action: Oppose 0 - 10**

Description: Hunters using a licensed transporter cannot harvest an animal on the same day being transported.
Committee comments: KAC members are opposed. Would affect the way most hunters hunt deer on Kodiak Island. It would mean a boat that anchored for the night couldn't drop hunters off unless they spent the night on shore and then hunt the next day. There are abuses but this proposal is too broad brushed.

Proposal #102 **Action: Support 10-0**

Description: Prohibit the use of pack animals other than horses while hunting goats or sheep.
Staff comments: Adopt. Pack animals especially llamas can carry diseases that could be spread into areas where sheep and goats are. This proposal would protect game stocks from infestation.
Committee comments: Agree with and support staff comments.

Proposal # 103 **Action: Support 10-0**

Description: Prohibit use of felt soled wading boots while hunting game.
Staff comments: Adopt. BOF has already passed would mirror that regulation.
Committee comments: Good preventive measure for spread of invasive species.

Proposal # 104 **Action: Support 10-0**

Description: Prohibit the use of deer or elk urine for use in taking game.
Staff comments: Department proposal to prevent chronic wasting disease.
Committee comments: Not used often in Kodiak but adoption of this proposal would protect our islands big game stocks.

Proposal # 105 **Action: Oppose 0 - 10**

Kodiak Fish & Game Advisory Committee
December 8th 2011-KNWRVC
Oliver Holm Chairman

Description: Clarify the definition of wounding as it applies to the restrictions to bag limits(mortally wounded).
Staff comments: No recommendation the proposal would insert the word **mortally wounded** and not recovered and would count against bag limit.
Committee comments: Would be hard to tell if a animal is mortally wounded or not. KAC opposed.

Proposal # 106 **Action: Support 10-0**

Description: Count wounded muskox, bison, sheep and goats that are not recovered as part of bag limit.
Staff comments: This is same as Kodiak currently has for bear and elk.
Committee comments: Proposal encourages ethical hunting practices. Because you must make every effort to recover a wounded animal. Discourages long range shooting and herd shooting thus eliminating poor hunting practices.

Proposal # 111 **Action: Oppose 0 - 10**

Description: Clarify the sex organs, or portions of, that must remain attached for proof of sex.
Staff comments: Don't adopt defer to public safety.
Public safety comments: Trooper Jones stated that what we have now in regulation works.
Committee comments: Agree with and support public safety comments.

Proposal # 112 **Action: Oppose 0 - 10**

Description: Eliminate evidence of sex regulation. Proposal would have DNA results instead of sex organs.
Staff comments: Don't adopt. Too costly to use and the time frame for getting back results is too long.
Committee comments: Agree with and support staff comments.

Proposal #128 **Action: Oppose 0 - 10**

Description: Establish a tag and fee to allow trappers to retain incidental catch.
Staff comments: No recommendation because the BOG doesn't have the authority to set fees.
Committee comments: Could be open to abuse by trappers targeting animals that are more valuable during a closed season for the species.

ACTIONS OF THE WRANGELL FISH & GAME ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AT IT'S MEETING OF DECEMBER 22, 2011

Members Present:	Tom Sims	Brennon Eagle	David Rak
(12)	Marlin Benedict	Tony Guggenbickler	Brian Merritt
	Robert Rooney	Alan Reeves	Otto Florschutz
	Janice Churchill	Chris Guggenbickler	John Yeager

Following are the results of the Wrangell Advisory Committee's actions on the proposals presented in the Alaska Board of Fisheries, 2011/2012 Proposal Book. Listed here are the Southeast and Yakutat King and Tanner Crab, Dungeness Crab, Shrimp and Miscellaneous Shellfish proposals the Wrangell Committee chose to act upon during it's meeting. Actions on other proposals in that Book will be considered at meetings planned for December 29, 2011 and January 5, 2012.

Proposal #139 FAILED
Motion to adopt by: Tony Second by: Brennon
Number in favor: 0
Number opposed: 12
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: The proposal attempts to clarify where personal use shellfish regulations apply in SEAK. Joe Stratman explained that shellfish in an area with a customary and traditional determination (C&T) are managed under subsistence regulations. Wrangell has a C&T determination. The bag limits for personal use and subsistence are the same. Non-residents harvest shellfish under sport fish regulations, not personal use or subsistence. The was much discussion toward understanding a resident fishing with a subsistence pot, verses a guest or non-resident family member fishing with a pot under sport regulations.

Proposal #140 FAILED
Motion to adopt by: Chris Second by: Brennon
Number in favor: 0
Number opposed: 12
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: There may be a need for accountability of shellfish harvest in AK. ADF&G did not develop this proposal and feels the proposed reporting system would have a great cost in dollars, the Department may not have. The reporting system would be just another regulation for the average Alaskan to comply with. There are already enough unnecessary hunting and fishing regulations.

Proposals #141 to 144 FAILED
Motion to adopt by: Brennon Second by: Brian
Number in favor: 0
Number opposed: 12
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: The Department already has the authority through EO to close waters as needed, and once the closure is made by regulation of the BOF it is more difficult to open/close as needed. Troy explained the Department has no reason to close these waters at this time.

Proposal #145 PASSED
Motion to adopt by: Brennon Second by: Brian
Number in favor: 12
Number opposed: 0
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: This proposal was submitted by the Wrangell AC who feel the number of sport shrimp pots should be lowered to correspond with the lower sport bag limit.

Discussion from February 2011: The number of sport shrimp pots that nonresidents can fish is too big. The current regulation allows 10 pots per person and 20 per vessel. The bag limit that was allowed with this pot number was 10 pounds or 10 quarts daily. If it takes 20 pots to get 10 pounds or 10 quarts of shrimp; there is not enough shrimp in that area for a fishery. Since the bag limit has been lowered to 3 pounds or 3 quarts daily, the number of pots that nonresidents are allowed to fish should be lowered as well. Way too many shrimp are being caught and some unneeded mortality is occurring from inexperienced shrimp handlers. Hauling shrimp to the surface where they are exposed to sun and heat results in mortality. Having many shrimp on deck also provide temptation to go over the bag limit.
Out of State persons harvest shrimp under sport regulations. This reduction in shrimp pots would not affect residents who harvest shrimp under personal use.

Proposal #146 PASSED
Motion to adopt by: Brian Second by: Brennon
Number in favor: 12
Number opposed: 0
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: This proposal was submitted by Wrangell AC member Brennon Eagle. All waters closed to commercial Dungeness crab fishing should also be closed to sport Dungeness crab fishing. Wrangell residents harvest crabs under subsistence not sport regulations. It was explained that within the proposal it is "areas" not "seasons" that are closed. All areas closed to commercial Dungeness crab fishing should also be closed to sport Dungeness crab fishing, regardless of the commercial season being open or closed. These areas are set-aside for residents needs and they are subject to misuse and over fishing by out of state sports fishers prompting requests for larger closed areas for local use. (Reference proposals #161 and #162.) Locals should not have to compete with out of State fishers and lodges.

Proposal #147 Considered but NO ACTION taken.

Proposal #148 FAILED
Motion to adopt by: Rob Second by: Chris
Number in favor: 0
Number opposed: 12
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: When king crab stocks in the Juneau area are low all non-subsistence harvesters should experience a reduction in their bag limit. Ninety percent (or all) of the limited crab stocks should not be reallocated to personal use.

Proposal #149 Considered but NO ACTION taken.

Proposal #150 Considered but NO ACTION taken.

Proposal #151 FAILED
Motion to adopt by: Otto Second by: Allan
Number in favor: 0
Number opposed: 12
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: Joe Stratman explained this is a house keeping proposal by ADF&G because a regulation is needed for live holding facilities for personal use and subsistence king and Tanner crab fisheries. The proposal uses regulations already used in the subsistence Dungeness crab fishery. The AC finds unacceptable that no matter how many people are using a live holding facility; it can only contain one persons bag/possession limit in the facility at one time. The AC could support the proposal if it included a distinction between a holding pot in the water and holding facility on a boat. Example: If two persons go out to get crab together, they should be able to bring back two persons bag limits in a live tank on the boat.

Proposals #152 to 160 Considered but NO ACTION taken.

Proposals #161 and 162 FAILED
Motion to adopt by: Otto Second by: Brennon
Number in favor: 0
Number opposed: 12
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: Waters adjacent to road systems are generally close to town and fished by younger fishers using smaller boats. Need to provide opportunities and jobs for younger fisheries close to town. Currently waters close to the Juneau road system are closed to commercial dungeness crabbing. This proposal would expand closed waters in the Juneau area. Crabbers displaced from those waters will move into others areas that would ripple into the Wrangell area. There are people in Juneau who choose not to personal use fish for crab and would like to purchase a commercially caught crab. The expanding sea otter population is seriously impacting the numbers of Dungeness crab in the Juneau area. The proposal could represent greedy people who want their own area to catch crab.

Proposals #163 FAILED
Motion to adopt by: Otto Second by: Brennon
Number in favor: 0
Number opposed: 12
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: The further restriction of commercial crabbing in Excursion Inlet is excessive. The area is currently open only four months to commercial crabbing, and year round to other harvest groups. The expanding sea otter population is seriously impacting the Dungeness crab population in Excursion Inlet.

Proposals #164 FAILED
Motion to adopt by: Brennon Second by: Otto
Number in favor: 0
Number opposed: 12
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: This proposal is opposed by the AC for reasons similar to it opposition to proposal #163.

Proposal #165 PASSED
Motion to adopt by: Brennon Second by: Otto
Number in favor: 12
Number opposed: 0
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: The AC agrees with replacing “identical” with “similar” in the regulation. Due to fading paint, etc, it is very seldom that any two buoys are identical.

Proposal #166 PASSED
Motion to adopt by: Brennon Second by: Brian
Number in favor: 12
Number opposed: 0
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: The AC favors bringing the seasons for Districts 1 and 2 in line with the rest of Southeast Alaska. The AC feels that if crabs are available for harvest they should be taken.

Proposals #167 FAILED
Motion to adopt by: Otto Second by: Chris
Number in favor: 0
Number opposed: 12
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: Joe Stratman explained that the Yakutat Area commercial crab season was last open in 1999. In 200 it was classified collapsed and recovery. A survey is needed to show if health of stocks has improved before the Department will reopen the fishery. A survey is planned for May/June 2012. AC members report that the sea otter are thick in the Yakutat area and seriously impacting the Dungeness crab population. Historically crabbers in the Yakutat Area came from beyond Yakutat. IF the crab ever come back commercial crabbers will need 400 pots to fish the large area. Limiting crabbers to 60 pots would in effect limit the harvest to crabbers from Yakutat.

Proposal #168 PASSED
Motion to adopt by: Chris Second by: Brennon
Number in favor: 12
Number opposed: 0
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: This proposal was submitted by Wrangell AC member Brennon Eagle. Working within the GHL has concentrated the shrimp fleet into areas of known shrimp abundance. Need a tool and the ability to find shrimp in other (non-core) areas. This proposal would allow the fishery to shift out of the core areas into smaller areas where shrimp may be found, and work in an area that may not have had gear during the season. Three to seven days of fishing is not enough time to damage/harm a shrimp population, if protect the little shrimp. Protecting the small shrimp while being able to prospect small areas cannot harm the shrimp population.

Proposal #169 PASSED
Motion to adopt by: Chris Second by: Brennon
Number in favor: 12
Number opposed: 0
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: This proposal is a needed tool providing access to areas that may have shrimp. Brennon and the AC support the proposal in concept, but add the proposal needs some “fine tuning”.

Proposal #170 PASSED
Motion to adopt by: Otto Second by: Chris
Number in favor: 12
Number opposed: 0
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: This proposal was submitted by Wrangell AC member Otto Florschutz. The AC favors more proactive management using harvest data provided by the fisheries, and using the most recent data to manage the fishery. Managing the fishery using past data is rear view mirror management. Managers should use the data they have now. This proposal would support that effort. The Department is setting quotas within the GHL, ands leaving those in place for three years. This leads to leaving shrimp un-harvested in years of high abundance, and the season too long in years of low abundance.

Proposal #171 PASSED
Motion to adopt by: Brennon Second by: Brian
Number in favor: 12
Number opposed: 0
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: The spawner index system used in Canada is a great concept to work toward, but it would need adjustments in Alaska due to different pot size and mesh spacing. The AC supports the proposal in concept, but is not sure if managers could get there by next year. It would be a good thing to work toward in three to

five years. Troy Thynes explained the Department would need a great deal of funding to implement a spawner index system.

Proposals #172 FAILED
Motion to adopt by: Brennon Second by: Chris
Number in favor: 0
Number opposed: 13
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: The AC feels the Department already has all the tools it needs to close an area without an additional regulation by the BOF. And if the area is closed, it should be closed to all users.

Proposals #173 FAILED
Motion to adopt by: Brennon Second by: Brian
Number in favor: 0
Number opposed: 12
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: The AC opposes this proposal because all of the baseline data centers on an October opening. Changing the opening would effect the baseline. A later start date will not improve the quality of the shrimp harvested.

Proposal #174 PASSED
Motion to adopt by: Brennon Second by: Brian
Number in favor: 12
Number opposed: 0
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: This proposal was submitted by the Wrangell AC who feels shrimp pots should only be hauled once per pay. Double picking of pots is harmful to the shrimp, especially the small ones (which are the future crop). AC realizes that it is almost impossible to enforce the prohibition on double picking, but feels a need to protect the small shrimp. The Ac also realizes that limiting pot haul to once per day will force shrimp fishers with 100 pots to get to 140 pots. The percentage survival of small shrimp thrown back is unknown, but thought to be low. To conserve small shrimp it is best to use a large mesh size, leave the pot on the bottom as long as possible, and allow the small shrimp to escape while the pot is on the bottom. An option of changing the 6 AM to 6 PM described in the proposal, to sunrise to sunset (as determined by a published table similar to waterfowl regulations) was discussed; and possibly could be acceptable.
Discussion from January 2011: There is a need to prohibit double picking of shrimp pots and slow down the shrimp fishery. The proposal allows shrimp pots to be pulled once per day; not based on the current 8 AM to 4 PM fishing time. This change would allow shrimpers to adjust fishing time for weather in the case when a storm blows thru for four to six hours of a day. With more shrimpers fishing the maximum of 140 pots, mostly there is not time for a shrimper to double pick their pots. Current Alaska laws allow for double picking shrimp pots within the 8 AM to 4 PM fishing time. Canadian laws allow for one picking of each shrimp pot per day.

Proposal #175 Considered but NO ACTION taken.

Proposals #176 FAILED
Motion to adopt by: Rob Second by: Brennon
Number in favor: 0
Number opposed: 12
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: The only trawler on the AC at the meeting testified that not enough dungeness are caught in a slow moving trawl to make a difference. If you go slow the crabs get out on their own and are often found on the outside of the trawl because they are trying to get a small fish that is inside the trawl. The regulation is unnecessary. Trawlers just turn the crab out of the trawl if they are caught. There are very few people that have a trawl and dungeness permits, and it is not worth the time to have a separate regulation those few people.

Proposal #177 Considered but NO ACTION taken.
Motion to adopt by: Rob Second by: Brennon
Motion and second were withdrawn after brief discussion.
Comments: The only trawler on the AC at the meeting testified there are not enough beam trawlers left around to form a task force. Usually a task force would be a good way to work with industry. It was noted that ADF&G did not submit this proposal.

Proposals #178 to 194 Considered but NO ACTION taken.
Comments: The AC chose to take no action because no dive fishers were present.

Proposals #195 FAILED
Motion to adopt by: Otto Second by: Chris
Number in favor: 0
Number opposed: 12
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: There has been no recent Department assessment of abalone population in SEAK. The AC feels that human over fishing of abalone is not the problem. People are not hurting the abalone population; it is the expanding number of sea otters. The proposal may be an effort by the Department to preserve the small pockets of abalone that still exist. But the remaining abalone would only be protected for the sea otters. The abalone should not be saved for the sea otters, but should be available for people to take while they still can. Need to limit the harvest of abalone by sea otters, not by people.

Proposals #196 FAILED
Motion to adopt by: Otto Second by: Alan
Number in favor: 0
Number opposed: 12
Number abstaining: 0
Comments: Same as comments for proposal #195.

Proposals #197 to 198 Considered but NO ACTION taken.

The schedule of future AC meetings was discussed. Troy Thynes is available for the next 2 weeks. A meeting is planned for December 29 2011 and January 5 2012. Southeast Finfish proposals will be discussed at both meetings. Elections for 2012 will be held at the January meeting.

Tom discussed a concern brought to the AC by Susan Wise-Eagle over a proposal considered by the Board of Game that would allow for searching licensed taxidermy businesses in Alaska. The proposal was amended to replace searching the business to requiring the taxidermy business to keep a logbook that could be inspected. Susan, who has a home business, objected to the search of her business and home as originally proposed; but can accept maintaining a log book that could be inspected.

Tom discussed that SSRAA is looking for a location for a new fish hatchery or other fish enhancement facility. Provide location ideas to Tom.

The meeting was recessed until 7 PM on December 29, 2012.

/s/David Rak

DAVID RAK
Secretary