

## **Proposed Changes Outside the Board of Game's Authority**

The following proposals request changes that the Board of Game does not have authority to adopt. They are included in the book for review, comment, and discussion at the applicable meetings if the board desires.

---

*The Board does not have authority to determine the process for judging the legality of an animal taken during an antler restricted hunt.*

### **PROPOSAL 262**

**What solution do you recommend? In other words, if the board adopted your solution, what would the new regulation say?**

5 AAC XXX. Moose harvested under the horn restriction in 5 AAC 85.045 Units 1(B), and 3 will be judged for legality by a committee of biologists and law enforcement for consistency over time and without conspiring form a judgement beyond a reasonable doubt.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?**

Inconsistencies in judging legality of moose under the horn restriction hunt in GMU 1(B), 1(C), (3). Local hunters are frustrated with the current horn restriction and process for confiscation. Many locals refuse to hunt moose in the region under the current horn restriction. Recently a moose was taken from a hunter, deemed illegal by a trooper in the field, ground into hamburger, then the state dropped its case. Another hunter had his moose deemed legal by a biologist even though pictures clearly showed both spikes were broken and was illegal by the letter of the law.

We ask the Board of Game to establish in regulation, a committee process for judging the legality of moose harvested for Unit 1B, 1C and 3. If it's not under the board's regulatory authority, we ask the board to work with ADF&G and the Alaska Wildlife Troopers to establish it as a policy.

**Did you develop your proposal in coordination with others, or with your local fish and game advisory committee?**

Yes, this proposal was developed in two well attended local AC meetings.

**PROPOSED BY:** Wrangell Fish and Game Advisory Committee (HQ-F25-014)

\*\*\*\*\*

*The Board lacks the authority to amend a statute. Adding elk to Alaska Statute 16.05.407 would require an act by the Alaska Legislature.*

### **PROPOSAL 263**

**What solution do you recommend? In other words, if the board adopted your solution, what would the new regulation say?**

Include elk in the list of species requiring a nonresident to be accompanied by a person who is qualified to guide under Alaska Statute 16.05.407 in Unit 3.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?**

Due to the growth of social media, elk hunting in unit 3 has recently gained attention from non-resident hunters who are largely ill equipped for the task. Hunting elk in Unit 3 is extremely challenging logistically and in many cases at least as dangerous as mt. goat or sheep hunting. Hunters who are not fully prepared to navigate the hurdles run a significant risk of personal injury and of finding themselves in a position where they are unable to adhere to Alaska's strict meat salvage requirements.

**Did you develop your proposal in coordination with others, or with your local fish and game advisory committee?**

Yes, this proposal was discussed and agreed upon by the Ketchikan AC.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ketchikan Fish and Game Advisory Committee (OI-F25-174)

\*\*\*\*\*

*Black bear population goals and objectives are under the Department of Fish and Game's management authority.*

**PROPOSAL 264**

**What solution do you recommend? In other words, if the board adopted your solution, what would the new regulation say?**

Unit 3 Trophy Recognition: A 19-inch skull size aligns with the minimum threshold for trophy record book recognition, ensuring Unit 3 remains a destination for hunters seeking high-quality black bears.

Age and Quality Management: Targeting a 19-inch average skull size promotes the harvest of older, mature bears, maintaining a healthy population structure and supporting long-term trophy quality.

Declining Trophy Harvests: The rapid decline in 20-inch bear harvests over the last 20 + years suggests that current management may not be sustaining trophy-class bears, which could impact hunter interest and economic benefits from hunting tourism.

Conservation and Appeal: Adjusting the management goal to 19 inches balances conservation with the demand for trophy hunting, preserving Unit 3's reputation as a premier hunting area while ensuring sustainable bear populations.

ADF&G can request USFS help in reducing outfitter hunt allocation to help reach and maintain management goals, while also adjusting the non-resident non-guided hunt allocation. Resident hunter take to be reduced to one bear (instead of two bears) in Unit 3 to support the trophy area resource goals.

This change would align management practices with hunter expectations and maintain the ecological and economic value of Unit 3's black bear "trophy" population.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?**

Issue to Address: The current management of Unit 3 Black Bear by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) targets an average skull size of 18.5 inches, which does not prioritize

"trophy" quality. Over the past 20 years, the harvest of bears with skull sizes of 20 inches or larger has significantly declined, indicating a reduction in trophy-class bears.

Proposed Action: Modify the Unit 3 management goals to include a "trophy" quality objective by adjusting the average skull size harvest target to 19 inches.

**Did you develop your proposal in coordination with others, or with your local fish and game advisory committee?**

This idea was brought forward as a solution to help arrest the declining trophy quality and general population of black bears in a joint meeting with the ADF&G biologist, USFS staff, and guide/outfitter operators with permits allocated in the area.

**PROPOSED BY:** Zach Decker (OI-F25-034)  
\*\*\*\*\*

*Brown bear population goals and objectives are under the Department of Fish and Game's management authority.*

**PROPOSAL 265**

**What solution do you recommend? In other words, if the board adopted your solution, what would the new regulation say?**

Institute a minimum skull size for a sow harvest. The exact parameters to be set by the area biologists.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?**

The Kodiak office of the Alaska Department of Fish & Game has instituted a sow harvest restriction for brown bear hunts in several areas of southwest Kodiak in response to a decline in bear population in the Sturgeon area. Although there has not been a decline in Karluk Lake or North Karluk (the areas in which I live) these areas were included in this policy. These areas have actually seen an increase in population.

There are female bears that are past breeding age and should not be included in this policy. One way to exclude them is to institute a minimum skull size. There was a sow harvest restriction in RY 1994-RY 2006 that only applied to "female bear with a skull length (posterior sagittal crest to center of upper incisors) of less than 15 inches or with a skull width (zygomatic breadth) of less than nine inches."

**Did you develop your proposal in coordination with others, or with your local fish and game advisory committee?**

No.

**PROPOSED BY:** Mike Carlson (OI-F25-218)  
\*\*\*\*\*

*The Board does not have the administrative authority to require the Department of Fish and Game to use specific types of sealing tags.*

**PROPOSAL 266**

**What solution do you recommend? In other words, if the board adopted your solution, what would the new regulation say?**

New regulation would require ADF&G to use a plastic non metallic sealing tag on hides and furs that require sealing. A Plastic seal is fur friendly in the tanning and taxidermy process as opposed to the current steel locking tag.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?**

My Issue is with ADFG's use of steel locking tags on furbearers and trophies. The steel locking tags or seals are not fur friendly..the steel corrodes during the tanning process. When a hide is tanned one of the first things that happens to the hide after rehydrating is the hide is thinned on a sharp fleshing wheel. The steel locking tag can damage the fleshing wheel and the hide as the paint color bleeds off the tag. As the hide progresses along the tanning process the fur is drummed in a large round drum..the tag can and does catch on the other furs in the drum and causes unnecessary damage to the hides and other furs especially thin skinned animals such as beaver and marten. I have talked to taxidermists and tanneries in and out of Alaska that agree with this proposal. Simply put, steel locking tags damage animal skins and are not taxidermist or tannery friendly.

**Did you develop your proposal in coordination with others, or with your local fish and game advisory committee?**

I talked with two Taxidermists in State about this and two tanneries out of the state that work with Alaska tagged furs

**PROPOSED BY:** Jesse Ross (OI-F25-179)  
\*\*\*\*\*

*Fees related to hunting are established in state statute by the Alaska Legislature. The Board does not have the authority to establish or change fees related to hunting.*

**PROPOSAL 267**

**What solution do you recommend? In other words, if the board adopted your solution, what would the new regulation say?**

Sitka Blacktail Harvest tickets can be obtained from ADF&G or a local vendor for a charge of \$5.00 per tag. In the case of a lost tags, duplicates can be given to the hunter only once.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?**

In this proposal, taking away the current issuing of harvest tickets to residents, which currently, a resident hunter can get their harvest tickets issued online, and are still able to get more harvest tickets later, and/or photo copy them so the harvest ticket holder has a fresh set of tags every hunt. Changing this to where a hunter must go to ADF&G or a vendor to receive their tags, eliminating the opportunity for a hunter to defraud the system or over harvest deer. Also implementing a charge of 5 dollars per tag which proceeds could be used for the harvest ticket system, continued research

and management of the species, and help with the added administrative cost to the proxy amendment proposal. This proposal would be state wide where Sitka Blacktail Deer can be harvested.

**Did you develop your proposal in coordination with others, or with your local fish and game advisory committee?**

This proposal was not developed in coordination with the local advisory committee. There has been discussion within the City of Port Lions.

**PROPOSED BY:** Brandon Bartleson (OI-F25-201)  
\*\*\*\*\*

*Tag fees are established in state statute by the Alaska Legislature. The Board does not have the authority to establish or change fees related to hunting.*

**PROPOSAL 268**

**What solution do you recommend? In other words, if the board adopted your solution, what would the new regulation say?**

Nonresident deer tag for Unit \$400/tag  
Resident deer tag for Unit 8 \$50/tag

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?**

I am proposing increasing the cost of nonresident and resident Unit 8 Sitka Blacktail tags to more closely mirror what other states are charging for a deer tag. I feel that we give our resources away in our state and that needs to change. A premium should be put on everything in our state. Currently states such as Idaho, Wyoming, the Dakotas, Colorado, Montana, Oregon, Washington and Nevada, our closest neighboring states all sell nonresident deer tags in the \$400 dollar range for a single tag. Alaska could generate a lot more income for wildlife management off this revenue. It would most likely not deter hunters. I also believe Alaska resident hunters should pay for this right as well. Currently we pay NOTHING, ZERO for our deer tags. Nothing but good would come of this.

**Did you develop your proposal in coordination with others, or with your local fish and game advisory committee?**

nope. All me

**PROPOSED BY:** Stig Yngve (OI-F25-177)  
\*\*\*\*\*

*Tag fees are established in state statute by the Alaska Legislature. The Board does not have the authority to establish or change fees related to hunting.*

**PROPOSAL 269**

**What solution do you recommend? In other words, if the board adopted your solution, what would the new regulation say?**

ALASKA RESIDENT TAG cost in Unit 8 for Reindeer \$75, mountain goat \$75/tag, Roosevelt elk \$100, Kodiak brown bear \$150.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** Alaska residents pay virtually nothing for our tags for big game animals. In Unit 8, DEER, MOUNTAIN GOAT, REINDEER AND ELK TAGS ARE FREE. Bear tags are \$50. I propose that Alaskan residents pay a negligible fee for these tags to aid in Wildlife research and management.

**Did you develop your proposal in coordination with others, or with your local fish and game advisory committee?**

No

**PROPOSED BY:** Stig Yngve (OI-F25-192)  
\*\*\*\*\*

*The Board of Game does not have authority to regulate transporters. Transporters are regulated by the Big Game Commercial Services Board.*

**PROPOSAL 270**

**What solution do you recommend? In other words, if the board adopted your solution, what would the new regulation say?**

Mandatory ADF&G state issued logbooks for all big game transporters in Unit 8.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?**

Transporters in Unit 8 have zero accountability for hunting resources, especially boat based ones. There needs to be mandatory logbook for all transporters of big game hunters in Unit 8 to quantify and measure the impact they have on our resources here. This would be very similar to saltwater logbooks for sportfishing charters. It needs to be done.

**Did you develop your proposal in coordination with others, or with your local fish and game advisory committee?**

nope

**PROPOSED BY:** Stig Yngve (OI-F25-196)  
\*\*\*\*\*

*Proxy verification is within the Department of Fish and Game's administrative authority.*

**PROPOSAL 271**

**What solution do you recommend? In other words, if the board adopted your solution, what would the new regulation say?**

Proxy Tags will need to be notarized by both parties before the proxy tag is issued.

Proof of destruction of trophy, photo's of the carcass, and photo's of all salvageable meat must be submitted to ADF&G within 10 days of the end of the season.

If a hunter wishes to proxy for another hunter, all required proof must be submitted within 10 days of the end of the prior hunt in order to conduct a 2nd proxy.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?**

Proposal: Proxy Regulation Amendment - Unit 8

With is proposal, it would not be a regulation change but a regulation amendment. The proxy tags should be notarized by both parties before the hunt occurs. The notarized document will then be taken to the Department of Fish and Game to receive the proxy tag. Implementing proof of trophy destruction, photo's of the carcass, and photo's of of all salvageable meat will have to be submitted to ADF&G within 10 days of the season or hunt. The amendment should also include limiting the number of recipients a hunter can proxy for. That number would be 1 until the other proxy is officially submitted and sealed by ADF&G. The proxy system is being taken advantage of in Unit 8 and is being abused. There has been craigslist ads, Facebook posts, and other means of hunters advertising the option to proxy other peoples tags since they are planning trips to Kodiak to hunt deer. This proposal would be all of Unit 8.

**Did you develop your proposal in coordination with others, or with your local fish and game advisory committee?**

This proposal was not developed in coordination with the local advisory committee. There has been discussion with in the City of Port Lions.

**PROPOSED BY:** Brandon Bartleson

(OI-F25-197)

\*\*\*\*\*