

Regional and Multiple Units

PROPOSAL 125 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Open a seven day moose season for bowhunting following the general season hunts in Units 11, 13, 14A, 14B, 16, and 17 as follows:

In each of the units listed for moose hunts where only a harvest ticket is required there would be a separate season "by bow and arrow only" starting the day following the general season and extending for an additional seven days. These hunts would have the same antler restrictions as currently listed for each unit. They would be limited to IBEP certified bowhunters only. Note that starting in July 2016 anyone hunting big game anywhere in Alaska will be required to be IBEP certified.

(This proposal was also submitted for the Southcentral Region meeting scheduled for March 2015.)

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? We request additional hunting opportunity for moose for IBEP certified bowhunters. We would like to see seven days added to the end of the general moose season with a season for bowhunting only. This would be for moose hunts in these units currently available by harvest ticket and would not include areas open only by drawing permit.

The primary reason for this request is to increase hunter opportunity at a time when the bulls are moving more because of the rut and meat care is easier because of cooler weather. The early archery season in Unit 15 has had very low participation and success because of dense foliage, limited moose movement and warm temperatures which make meat salvage difficult. We believe that this would result in a slightly higher harvest rate but would still be easily within the biologic surplus of animals available to be harvested without affecting the overall moose population.

PROPOSED BY: Alaskan Bowhunters Association (EG-C14-242)

PROPOSAL 126 - 5 AAC 92.015 Brown bear tag fee exemption. Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemptions for the Central/Southwest Region as follows:

- a) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in the following units:
- (1) Unit 11;
 - (2) Units 13 and 16(A);
 - (3) Unit 16(B) and 17;
 - ...
 - (11) Unit 9, within the following areas, unless a smaller area is defined by the department in an applicable permit:
 - (A) Unit 9(B), within five miles of the communities of Port Alsworth, Nondalton, Iliamna, Newhalen, Pile Bay, Pedro Bay, Pope Vanoy Landing, Kakhonak, Igiugig, and Levelock;

(B) Unit 9(C), within five miles of the communities of King Salmon, Naknek, and South Naknek;

(C) Unit 9(D), within five miles of the communities of Cold Bay, King Cove, Sand Point, and Nelson Lagoon;

(D) Unit 9(E), within five miles of the communities of Egegik, Pilot Point, Ugashik, Port Heiden, Port Moller, Chignik Lake, Chignik Lagoon, Chignik Bay, Perryville, and Ivanof Bay;

(12) Unit 10, within three miles of the community of False Pass, unless a smaller area is defined by the department in an applicable permit.

(b) In addition to the units as specified in (a) of this section, if a hunter obtains a subsistence registration permit before hunting, that hunter is not required to obtain a resident tag to take a brown bear in the following units:

(1) Unit 9(B);

(2) Unit 9(E), that portion including all drainages that drain into the Pacific Ocean between Cape Kumliun and the border of Unit 9(D) and Unit 9(E);

(3) Unit 17;

...

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Brown bear tag fee exemptions must be reauthorized annually or the fee will be automatically reinstated.

General Season Hunts: The board liberalized brown bear hunting regulations including the tag fee exemption to increase the harvest of brown bears in Units 11, 13, and 16 during the March 2003 board meeting and in Unit 17 during the March 2011 board meeting. The tag fee exemption in these units provides greater opportunity to harvest brown bears by allowing opportunistic taking.

The board also exempted brown bear tag fees for bear hunts near communities in Unit 9 to address public safety concerns in communities during the board meeting in March 2011. Brown bears are abundant in Unit 9 and are managed as a trophy species. Brown bears are frequently observed in communities where they destroy property in search of food or garbage and occasionally kill pets. The liberalized bear seasons and bag limits adopted along with the elimination of the tag fee were intended to allow people to take bears before they destroy property, to promote a greater acceptance of the unit's bear population, and to resolve some of the compliance issues associated with the take of defense of life and property (DLP) bears.

Subsistence Brown Bear Hunts: The Board waived the brown bear tag fee requirement for subsistence brown bear hunts in Unit 17 and portions of Unit 9. Subsistence brown bear harvest rates are low and well within sustainable limits. Exempting the resident tag fee has not caused an increase in subsistence harvest in these units. Continuation of the exemption accommodates cultural and traditional uses of brown bears in these units and provides an alternative for hunters who take brown bears primarily for their meat.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(EG-C14-349)

PROPOSAL 127 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. Remove the meat salvage requirements for brown bear taken over bait in the Central/Southwest Region as follows:

Remove all meat salvage requirements for brown bear taken over bait for the Central/Southwest Region.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Brown bear salvage requirements that force hunters to salvage meat that may be inedible. Why force hunters to salvage meat that may not be fit to eat?

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee (EG-C14-318)

PROPOSAL 128 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. Remove meat salvage requirements for brown bear taken over bait in the Central/Southwest Region Units as follows:

Align salvage requirements for brown bear with black bear, for bears taken over a bait station for the Central/Southwest Region.

(Note: This proposal was also submitted for the Southcentral meeting scheduled for March 2015.)

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Salvage of brown bear meat taken over bait. Remove salvage requirement.

PROPOSED BY: Joel Doner (EG-C14-314)

PROPOSAL 129 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Remove the requirement to clean up contaminated soil from bear bait stations in the Central/Southwest Region Units as follows:

Eliminate the requirement to "remove all contaminated soil" from a bear bait site at the conclusion of the baiting season.

(Note: This proposal was also submitted for the Southeast meeting scheduled for January 2015 and the Southcentral meeting scheduled for March 2015.)

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? At bear bait stations the requirement to remove all soil contaminated by the baiting at the end of the season is an excessive nuisance and is perceived by hunters to be a form of harassment by regulators who may be personally opposed to baiting bear in spite of the fact that bear baiting is a legal and accepted means of hunting bear and is often the only practical means of hunting bear in certain areas. This combined with the requirement to provide accurate GPS locations before a permit is obtained sends a message to hunters that they are potentially subject to prosecution if an

enforcement officer comes into the bait site with a trowel and samples some dirt which may have an increased sugar or fat content by lab analysis. From a practical perspective it is virtually impossible to remove all contaminated soil. Anything that is used for bait is biodegradable and will rapidly be removed by organisms from bacteria to bears. Anything not removed will go to fertilize the soil. There is no guidance with what should be done with the "contaminated soil". Alternatives would be to spread it out, carry it any given distance and throw it out, transport it back to town, and take it to a public dump.

Nothing in this discussion should be interpreted as wanting to change the regulation requiring removal of all trash, litter, bait barrels and other artificial structures at the end of the baiting season.

PROPOSED BY: John Frost (EG-C14-299)

Note: AS 16.05.783 only allows same day airborne for taking of wolves as part of a predator control program authorized by the board. The same restriction does not apply to coyotes.

PROPOSAL 130 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions. Allow same-day airborne hunting of wolves and coyotes as follows:

Wolves and coyotes may be taken the same day you are airborne in all of the Central/Southwest Region during any open season. A person must be at least 300 feet from the aircraft before shooting and cannot use the aircraft to herd, position or harass the animals in any way before landing.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? We would like to see same day airborne hunting of wolves and coyotes for residents and nonresidents in all of the Central/Southwest Region. There is or has been active predator control in most of this region and this would be a good tool to take some additional wolves and coyotes. Chances to take wolves and coyotes are rare and having to pass up a chance at one because you have flown that day seems like a waste.

PROPOSED BY: Mat-Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee (EG-C14-214)

PROPOSAL 131 - 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Lower the bag limit for goldeneye for the Central/Southwest Region as follows:

Lower goldeneye to allow no more than three goldeneye in the general bag.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? A low abundance of this limited range bird; Barrow's goldeneye are a sea duck with sensitive lifestage histories, behavior and reproductive strategies below long-term averages. They are mistakenly placed in with the dabbling general bag limit, with those birds counting in the millions above long term averages

PROPOSED BY: Sea Ducks Unlimited

(EG-C14-311)

PROPOSAL 132 – 5 AAC 92.010. Harvest tickets and reports. Require harvest reporting of migratory birds by species in Central/Southwest Region Units as follows:

For more accurate data, create a harvest ticket with opportunity of reporting harvest by species for migratory birds to gain information presently limited to ADF&G.

Use the system already in place for other species like deer, moose etc.

If reported electronically:

- Once filed online a certified receipt for your report will be returned by email. This receipt is proof that report has been filed.
- Harvest tickets and registration permits are good for a regulatory year, not a calendar year. For example, a harvest ticket for 2013 would be valid from July 1, 2013 - June 30, 2014.
- If ADF&G does not receive a hunt report, hunters will not be eligible for future hunts. Online reporting allows hunters to determine which reports have filed and which you have not.

If reported by mail:

Hunt reports will come with harvest tickets attached to them. The report portion need not be carried in the field but must be completed and returned within 15 days of the close of the season even if you did not hunt or did not take an animal. Reports of personal harvest location are confidential.

(Note: This proposal was also submitted for the Central/Southwest meeting scheduled for February 2015 and the Southcentral meeting scheduled for March 2015.)

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Electronic online or mail in harvest tickets and reporting required for migratory birds by species.

PROPOSED BY: Sea Ducks Unlimited

(EG-C14-235)

PROPOSAL 133 - 5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful taking of game; exceptions. Remove the restriction against using felt sole waders while hunting in Central/Southwest Region Units as follows:

People hunting in Alaska can legally wear whatever they want while pursuing game, including their choice of foot wear and/or any other personal protective equipment that they deem will make their hunt more safe.

(Note: This proposal was also submitted for the Southeast meeting scheduled for January 2015 and the Southcentral meeting scheduled for March 2015.)

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The Board of Game's (board) ban on wearing felt soles while hunting, making wading and rafting while hunting unsafe and dangerous for people. Anyone who has spent much time in the field—or worse, had unexpected “swims”—knows how dangerous our cold waters are and how quickly one could lose their life. Even a quick dunk can be unforgiving and have dire consequences. The difference between wearing felt and wearing rubber or caulked boots is like night and day. Unfortunately, there are no alternatives, regardless of what you are told. If you personally are unaware of this fact, then you have little experience wading rivers or streams and need to better educate yourself on the issue. Safety wise, it is the same as driving without a seat belt, or running a chainsaw without a pair of chaps. Sure you may get by without them, but do you want to get into an accident without your seat belt on? In essence, that’s what the board’s (and the Board of Fisheries) ban does. The ban states loud and clear that our safety, our lives and that of our children and loved ones, is unimportant.

If you do not lift this ban, people will die, drown and perish while hunting, due to our cold water temperatures. It’s as simple as that. While the attempt to thwart the spread of invasive plants and animals is noteworthy, the board’s lack of adequate analysis of the scientific data on this subject is both troubling and reckless. Can felt soles transport invasive plants and animals? Unfortunately, yes they can. But please look at the research—which is extremely limited at best. This small amount of research, much which has not been peer reviewed, has indicated that felt soles can spread such invasive species as Didymo (rock snot), possibly whirling disease, and one New Zealand mudsnail was proven to be transported by a felt boot. One! Research has also proven that these invasive species can be carried and transported to other waters on shoe laces, socks, inside the wading boots themselves, on the wading material itself and even on rubber wading boots. Furthermore, research has also proven invasive species can be transported from one water body to another by boat trailers and through bilge water of boats and float planes traveling to and from different water bodies. Even Darwin wrote many years ago, about migrating waterfowl transporting plants and animals from one water body to another, both internally and externally. Why not ban all of these vectors then?

PROPOSED BY: Jake Sprankle (EG-C14-298)

PROPOSAL 134 - 5 AAC 92.003. Hunter education and orientation requirements. Require certification for big game hunters using crossbows in the Central/Southwest Region as follows:

All hunters pursuing big game with a crossbow in the Central/Southwest Region must have passed a certification course presented by ADF&G and carry their certification card in the field. This regulation to be effective starting July 2016.

(Note: This proposal was also submitted for the Southeast meeting scheduled for January 2015 and the Southcentral meeting scheduled for March 2015.)

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The Board of Game passed a regulation stating that all hunters hunting with bow and arrow for big game must pass the IBEP certification and carry their certification card while hunting starting in July 2016. The board did

NOT include hunters who hunt with a crossbow in this regulation. There are safety issues involved with use of a crossbow which are unique to crossbows and do not apply to regular archery equipment or firearms. A crossbow is a different implement than bow and arrow but kills in the same fashion with sharp cutting of vital structures rather than shock as with a firearm. Firearms hunters who pick up a crossbow need to learn the limitations of the weapon, acceptable shot angles and target anatomy. In addition they need to learn appropriate follow-up and recovery techniques which may differ significantly from their experience with firearms. Crossbow hunters who wound animals may leave a visible projectile in the animal which can reflect poorly on not only crossbow hunters but also on bowhunters and intact on all hunters. I believe that all hunters who use a crossbow for hunting big game in Alaska should be required to pass a crossbow certification course developed and presented by ADF&G and should be required to carry their certification card while hunting big game with crossbow. The course should include a field day in which the student demonstrates knowledge of safe use of the crossbow and a minimum level of shooting proficiency.

Nothing in this should be interpreted to imply that crossbows are the same as archery equipment. the course must be separate from the IBEP certification and taught by instructors knowledgeable in use of crossbows and certified to teach the course. Also, nothing in this proposal should imply that crossbows are acceptable for use in special archery only areas or hunts.

This proposal is to cover all regions open for proposals for consideration by the Board of Game during their 2015 meetings. It is my intention to make the same proposal next year to apply to the Interior and Arctic/Western Region. This proposal is to be effective starting in July 2016 which would align it statewide with the recently passed regulation for bowhunters and would also give ADF&G time to implement the education programs.

PROPOSED BY: John Frost (EG-C14-293)

PROPOSAL 135 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits. Add five days to all resident hunting seasons and allocate 75% of the drawing permits to residents for the Central/Southwest Region as follows:

For the benefit of all Alaska residents change current regulations in all Central/Southwest units so the residents of the State of Alaska receive preference in regard to all hunting opportunities.

For all harvest ticket hunts: Allow state residents to start the hunting seasons five days early or allow state residents to hunt for five additional days after the season has closed for nonresident hunters.

For drawing hunts: change allocation systems to ensure Alaskan residents have been allocated to receive 75% of any drawing hunt opportunity. If state residents do not use that percentage of the pool, then the unallocated portion may be used by nonresident hunters.

(Note: This proposal was also submitted for the Southeast meeting scheduled for January 2015 and the Southcentral meeting scheduled for March 2015.)

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? For the benefit of all Alaskan residents change current regulations in all Units so the residents of the State of Alaska receive preference in regards to all hunting opportunities.

I am hopeful that the board will address the inequalities in resident hunter preference. For many years a significant portion of the large game species has been taken by nonresidents. This is due to several factors, as managers of a state resource, the board should be morally and ethically obligated to ensure that resident hunting opportunities and resident hunting preference are a priority.

PROPOSED BY: Kevin Secor

(EG-C14-227)

PROPOSAL 136 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits. Allocate 90% of big game drawing permits to residents for Central/Southwest Region Units as follows:

I'd like to see the Board of Game adopt a new allocation schedule for all big game draw permits in the Central/Southwest Region: 90% to residents and the remainder plus any undersubscribed to nonresidents.

(Note: This proposal was also submitted for the Southeast meeting scheduled for January 2015 and the Southcentral meeting scheduled for March 2015.)

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? At issue is allocation of big game draw permits. Currently a nonresident hunter has equal chance in the lottery as resident meat hunters. Nonresidents, albeit supporting the guide industry, have historically much better success rates no doubt due to the work of their guides. The end result is that more of the real harvest goes to nonresidents, many of whom don't even want the meat; rather than Alaskans who will respect the harvested animal all year long every tasty bite of the way. This is in direct contradiction to our mandate by Alaska's Constitution Article 8 section 3 stating that meat belongs to the residents. Most other states currently allocate only 10% of their draw permits to nonresidents, and guiding is still big business there. A real tragedy to the continuation of hunting tradition will befall us as our kids potentially will lose future opportunities to hunt this great land.

Considered was action to establish a point/preference system like most states to more directly and effectively tackle the issue, but this appears to be a legislative issue and would also take many years to implement. Also considered was a shorter season for nonresidents, but to be fair especially to mountain hunters, an equal number of weather windows should be provided for both. This would also promote mad-dash boating and bush flying, a dangerous and disrespectful practice. If nothing is done about this issue, meat will continue to be mis-allocated, Alaskan youth may see future opportunities lost, and game resources will decline.

Thank you for considering this 90/10 draw permit allocation, Alaskans appreciate it.

PROPOSED BY: Douglas Malone

(EG-C14-240)

Note: The board does not have authority to place restrictions on the transportation of hunters.

PROPOSAL 137 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits. Allocate 10% sheep harvest for nonresidents in Central/Southwest Region Units as follows:

Allow nonresidents only 10% maximum of harvest. This should include second degree of kindred. Also restrict the number of drop off hunts that air charters can perform. Stacking hunters is not good for anybody.

(Note: This proposal was also submitted for the Southcentral meeting scheduled for March 2015.)

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? This proposal is in regards to overcrowding. Residents only harvest about 23% of the total harvest per year, while nonresidents harvest 40% of the sheep taken in Alaska. This is total that is totally out of control. The board needs to follow the Alaska constitution. It is clearly stated that the Alaskan residents come first.

PROPOSED BY: Chris Gossen

(EG-C14-270)
