

# **Kodiak Area – Unit 8**

---

## **PROPOSAL 198**

### **5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.**

Shorten the nonresident hunting season for deer in Unit 8 Remainder as follows:

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

Sitka blacktail hunting season in UNIT 8 Remainder

August 1-November 25 for Nonresidents and Aliens

August 1st-December 31st for Residents

Kodiak Road zone stays the same as its been.

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

My proposal addresses the clashing of nonresident deer hunters on Kodiak Island with resident hunters during our hunting season. There are flat out too many people hunting especially during November and December every year. Resident hunters utilize deer as a major source of subsistence in Unit 8, nonresident hunters utilize deer as a source of hunting and adventure and to a vastly lesser degree, eating. They are not dependent on it as a means of survival and subsistence like residents hunters. Nonresident harvest has steadily increased since 2016 while resident deer harvest has stayed steady or dropped. The increase in nonresident hunting for deer is perpetuated by the internet and DIY videographers and opportunistic transporters. Quality of hunting has gone way down for all user groups. It is getting so bad I now wear a bright orange gumby suit when out hunting so I don't get smoked with a stray bullet. There needs to be a reasonable season in place for different user groups.

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

I have formulated this proposal with the input of many Kodiak Island, Unit 8 residents and village residents as well as input from other continental Alaskans residents

**PROPOSED BY:** Stig Yngve (OI-F25-176)  
\*\*\*\*\*

## **PROPOSAL 199**

### **5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.**

Increase the nonresident bag limit for deer in Unit 8 Remainder as follows:

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

Increase the limit for Sitka blacktail deer on Kodiak Island for nonresidents from 1 buck to 2 deer or 3 deer (bucks only before October 1).

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

The limit for nonresidents was changed from three Sitka blacktail deer to one buck starting in the 2023 season. From what I can tell, this was due to “user-conflict issues” with villages on the ferry system rather than deer population concerns. The Department of Fish & Game opposed the reduction finding no biological reason for it. The population remains high and healthy.

Very few nonresidents ever harvested more than one deer. However, they did book 4-7 day trips wherein they harvested the first decent buck they saw and spent the remaining time in the field trying to beat the size.

The unintended consequence of this reduction is additional pressure put on waterfowl hunting and fishing. When hunters harvest deer at the beginning of their trip, instead of staying in the field looking for a bigger buck, they are now waterfowl hunting and fishing to fill the rest of the days of their trip. I have lived in Larsen Bay my whole life and have never seen so much winter charter fishing and waterfowl hunting.

There are also far fewer nonresidents booking hunts. This is for at least two reasons. First, the reduction in limit gave the impression that the population of deer on Kodiak was low. That is not the case. Second, hunters did not want to devote the time and expense to a hunt that could be over in one day. This harms lodges, transporters, air taxies, outfitters, and other Alaskan businesses.

If this were a population issue or an issue that effected the health of the deer on Kodiak Island, I would be fully supportive. My father was a guide here, my son is guiding too, and we want this area healthy and productive for generations to come. However, the deer population in my area, Larsen Bay/Uyak Bay, is high and healthy. There were 42 deer in my yard last week. Winter conditions effect deer population far more than hunters. We have had mild enough winters, without sheets of ice that block deer food sources, and the population is thriving.

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

No.

**PROPOSED BY:** Mike Carlson (OI-F25-182)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 200**

**5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.**

Increase the nonresident bag limit for deer in Unit 8 Remainder from one to two bucks for as follows:

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

Change the nonresident Unit 8 deer limit to two bucks to allow hunters that are successful early in their hunt to continue their time in the field.

“Nonresidents Unit 8 Remainder two bucks HT Aug 1 - Dec 31

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

The one deer limit in Unit 8 for nonresidents is a deterrent to nonresident hunters, and a detriment to Kodiak Island businesses and State of Alaska revenue for a negligible reduction in harvest.

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

In consultation with Kodiak Island businesses catering to hunters.

**PROPOSED BY:** Roark Brown (HQ-F25-003)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 201**

**5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.**

Increase the nonresident bag limit for deer in Unit 8, Remainder to two bucks as follows:

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

Increase the nonresident bag limit for deer in Unit 8, Remainder as follows:

- Unit 8: Remainder
- Nonresidents
- Bag Limit: Two Bucks
- Season dates: Aug. 1 — Dec. 31

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

In 2023, the Alaska Board of Game adopted a proposal (Proposal 73) which decreased the nonresident bag limit in Game Management Unit 8, Remainder from three deer to only one buck. This decrease was drastic and was not supported by data or opinions offered by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. I believe that if a bag limit change were needed, the board should have taken a more gradual approach (two deer or two bucks). As an Alaska resident, I personally have several nonresident friends and family members who would buy two deer tags when coming to Kodiak. In the off chance that they filled one early, they would have the rest of the hunt to pursue a bigger buck. Most of these hunts would still only result in one deer killed but the department still made money on that second tag. Most of my friends and family now cannot justify coming to hunt Kodiak when limited to only one tag. I also know of Alaskan transporter businesses that lost money to the bag limit decrease.

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

Myself and various friends and family.

**PROPOSED BY:** Mike Harris (OI-F25-183)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 202**

**5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.**

Change the bag limit for deer in Unit 8 for Guide Use Areas 08-01, 02, 26, 27 and 28, to two bucks only through December 1, and antlerless deer after December 1 as follows:

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

Bucks only until December 1st, One antlerless deer after December 1st in Guide Use Area's 08-01, 08-02, 08-26, 08-27 and 08-28.

Bucks can only be harvested until December 1<sup>st</sup>; after December 1st, does and antlerless deer may be harvested.

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

Proposal: Bucks only until December 1<sup>st</sup>; one antlerless deer after December 1st - Unit 8.

The harvest limit would not be affected in this proposal. This proposal would take affect in Guide Use Area's 08-01, 08-02, 08-26, 08-27, and 08-28. With ease of transportation and todays technology, it is more accessible to these area's causing higher harvest of does and does with fawns. With the harvest of does with fawns, the fawns are left alone to survive without the added protection from their mother. With the health of the population in mind, and the mating season being in the prime of the hunting of the species, this would protect does with fawns as well as the does that become pregnant and give them a chance to reproduce the population. Enriching the biological diversity of these areas, to grow the population of mature animals and increase the sustainability of the population is the goal behind this proposal.

**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 conversation within the City of Port Lions.

**PROPOSED BY:** Brandon Bartleson (OI-F25-198)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 203**

**5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.**

Increase the nonresident bag limit for deer in Unit 8 Remainder from one to three as follows:

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

The limit for Sitka blacktail deer in Unit 8 should be raised back to three for nonresident hunters.

Nonresident hunters in Unit 8 Remainder deer bag limit **3 deer total** [ONE BUCK]

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

I would like to address the recent change for nonresident hunters in Unit 8 from three Sitka blacktail deer of any sex to one buck only. This change has negatively affected me and my family and according to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game had no biological reason to be implemented.

Thank you.

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

**PROPOSED BY:** Zachary Porter (OI-F25-005)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 204**

**5 AAC 85.030(a)(6). Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.**

Increase the nonresident bag limit for deer in Unit 8 Remainder to two bucks as follows:

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

**Remainder of Unit 8**

**RESIDENT HUNTERS:**

Three deer; however, only bucks may be taken before Oct. 1  
Aug. 1 - Dec. 31

**NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:**

**Two bucks** [One buck]  
Aug. 1 - Dec. 31

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

The current regulation restricts nonresident hunters to harvesting only one buck deer annually on Kodiak Island, while Alaska residents may harvest up to three deer of either sex. This regulation lacks biological justification, as the Sitka blacktail deer population on Kodiak is stable, productive, and resilient. There is no data indicating that nonresident harvest poses a conservation concern. The regulation should be updated to reflect actual population dynamics and to align with the sustainable yield principles guiding Alaska’s game management.

Nonresidents are an important stakeholder group in Alaska’s wildlife management system. They contribute significant revenue through license/tag sales, transport, lodging, and guiding services. Limiting them to one buck per year—despite healthy deer numbers—artificially restricts opportunity and economic benefit to the region.

Recent harvest data and field reports show that the deer population on Kodiak Island has rebounded strongly from previous harsh winters and continues to produce strong fawn recruitment and mature buck age classes. There is no indication that increasing the nonresident limit from one to two bucks would pose a conservation threat, especially as the regulation would still prohibit doe harvest by nonresidents.

The proposed two-buck limit maintains a conservative and biologically sound approach:

- It allows increased opportunity while continuing to protect breeding-age does.
- It better reflects the productivity of the unit and brings nonresident opportunity closer to that of residents (who are allowed three deer, including does).

If the regulation remains unchanged, nonresident opportunity remains artificially limited, economic contributions to local businesses will remain suppressed, and the management framework will continue to be misaligned with the actual status of the deer herd on Kodiak Island.

This proposal is a modest, biologically justified increase in harvest opportunity. It helps align regulation with current herd conditions, better serves the hunting public, and increases the economic benefit to Kodiak communities—all while remaining within a sustainable framework.

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

**PROPOSED BY:** Austin Atkinson (OI-F25-048)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 205**

**5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.**

Change the season dates and bag limits for deer hunting in Unit 8, Ugak Bay, Saltery Cove and Rough Creek as follows:

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

Proposed Regulation – Kodiak Off-Road Accessible Areas (Ugak Bay, Saltery Cove, Rough Creek)

Season Dates and Bag Limits:

August 1 – October 31

Bag Limit: Three (3) bucks

Antler Restrictions: Any size

Legal Weapons: All legal hunting methods permitted

November 1 – November 30

Bag Limit: Three (3) adult deer

Antler Restrictions for Bucks: Minimum spike length of 3 inches

Harvest Restrictions: Harvest of nursing does and fawns prohibited

Legal Weapons: All legal hunting methods permitted

December 1 – December 31

Bag Limit: Three (3) adult deer

Antler Restrictions for Bucks: Minimum spike length of 3 inches

Legal Weapons: Muzzleloader or primitive weapons only

Youth and Hunters with Disabilities:

Bag Limit: Three (3) deer, any sex or age

Season Dates: August 1 – December 31

Legal Weapons: All legal hunting methods permitted

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

I'm writing to raise concern about the declining deer population in Kodiak's Ugak Bay, Saltery Cove, and Rough Creek—areas accessible by ATVs and UTVs. Since 2015, the rise of side-by-sides has allowed more hunters to access these regions, stay longer in colder months, and transport more gear and game. These small areas remain open to extended seasons and motorized access, resulting in increased harvest pressure. As mature deer become scarce, younger deer are being taken, reducing reproductive success and long-term sustainability. I urge the Board of Game to review regulations in these off-road accessible zones to help protect and restore the deer population yet maintain the season bag limits and duration so that residents and no and preserve the quality of hunt for the residents and nonresidents.

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

I've spoken with many hunters who use this area in the fall after the road system closes. While opinions vary on the best approach, there is broad agreement that action is needed to preserve the deer population and maintain quality hunting opportunities.

**PROPOSED BY:** Lucas Smith (OI-F25-199)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 206**

**5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.**

Change the road system boundary for deer hunting in Unit 8, from the mouth of the Saltry River to the mouth of Wild Creek as follows:

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

For deer hunting in Unit 8, move the on road system line from the mouth of the Saltry River to the mouth of Wildcreek. Leaving the other end of the line in Sharatin Bay the same.

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

Overhunting of deer of the Saltry River Drainage due to increased access of the off-road system area directly adjacent to the on-road system area by large side-by-sides

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

Yes, after talking to a lot of the other local hunters about what to do about the overhunting of this area this was the solution.

**PROPOSED BY:** John Neff (OI-F25-064)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 207**

**5 AAC 85.030(a)(6). Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.**

Change the bag limit for deer in Unit 8 for Guide Use Areas 08-01, 02, 026, 027, and 028, to require a fork on at least one side as follows:

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

Proposal: Spike/Fork Restriction - Unit 8

This restriction would take place in Guide Use Areas 08-01, 08-02, 08-26, 08-27 and 08-28. Bucks must have a fork on at least one side of their antlers in order to be harvested.

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

This restriction would allow bucks to age past their first year and help the biological diversity of these areas. The mortality rate, when we have hard winters, the first age group of deer to die off are the younger age groups, thus this proposal would give the younger animals a chance of maturing if they make it through the harder winters. The younger age group of bucks and does has been substantially decreasing in these area's due to the increased pressure and ease of access.

**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. Their has been conversations within the City of Port Lions.

**PROPOSED BY:** Brandon Bartleson (OI-F25-193)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 208**

**5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.**

Prohibit the take of fawns or does with fawns in Unit 8 as follows:

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

Taking of fawns or does with fawns is prohibited.

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

Decline in deer population in easy to access hunting areas and unethical harvest of young deer.

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

**PROPOSED BY:** Jessie Juhlin (OI-F25-238)  
\*\*\*\*\*



**PROPOSAL 209**

**5 AAC 85.035. Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk.**

Require nonresidents to hunt elk with a guide in Unit 8 as follows:

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

All aliens and nonresidents regardless of degree of kindred relatives as Alaska resident must have a guide for Kodiak brown bear, Roosevelt elk and mountain goat in Unit 8.

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

There is a gross abuse of hunting resources in our state by degree of kindred nonresident hunters hunting like Alaskan residents. Many Alaskans as the degree of kindred link are not experienced or qualified enough to hunt big game animals in Unit 8 like Mountain goat or brown bear, but they act like it, and thus a father or mother or brother or sister nonresident can legally hunt with them unguided. This is a major source of exploitation by Coast guard people in Unit 8, especially with bears. WE ARE SUPPOSED TO BE GOOD STEWARDS OF THE RESOURCE and we are not in this case. Many of these hunters shoot barely legal sows or not legal cub bears because they are not experienced enough to know better. If you are any kind of nonresident, Alaska degree of kindred relative or not, a guide should be mandatory for Kodiak brown bear or mountain goat hunting.

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

Nope.

**PROPOSED BY:** Stig Yngve (OI-F25-194)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 210**

**5 AAC 85.035. Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk.**

**5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.**

Reallocate elk permits in hunt areas DE715, DE717, DE721, DE723 and RE706 and limit RE706 tags issued in Port Lions and Ouzinkie to one per household as follows:

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

Return the 16 tags to the DE715, DE717, DE721, and DE723 pool of permits and assign four registration tags from RE706 for in-person release in Ouzinkie and four registration tags from RE706 for in-person release in Port Lions.

Designate these tags for in-person release in Ouzinkie and Port Lions as one per household.

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

The allocation of 16 registration elk permits (RE752 and RE756) that can only be picked up in the extremely difficult and costly to access communities of Port Lions and Ouzinkie is excessive and negatively impacts highly competitive draw hunts for the rest of Alaska residents. The creation of

RE753 and RE756 registration permits removed 16 tags from the DE715, DE717, DE721, and DE723 draw hunts, reducing the overall number of draw tags by 9.4% for those areas.

Removing 9.4% of the total tags from the DE715, DE717, DE721, and DE723 pool of tags, which have a 2-3% draw success rate, is punitive to Alaskans who do not live in these communities.

This inequity to fellow Alaskans is heightened by the fact that a registration hunt for Alaska residents exists on Raspberry Island (RE706) which provides an abundant resource for subsistence elk hunting. Raspberry Island is closer by distance to both Ouzinkie and Port Lions in comparison to the current East Afognak and Remainder hunt areas.

In addition, RE752 and RE756 are not limited to one permit per household. This resulted in three households receiving two permits during the 2024 permit issuance.

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

No

**PROPOSED BY:** Brooks Horan (OI-F25-180)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 211**

**5 AAC 85.035. Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk.**

Extend the elk registration hunt in Unit 8, to December 31 as follows:

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

Elk Registration on Kodiak Island until December 31<sup>st</sup>.

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

Allow for elk registration be extended beyond the closure for Raspberry Island and Afognak Island for the remainder of Kodiak Island.

Elk move from Raspberry or Afognak Island on occasion to the main Island of Kodiak. During registration season you may harvest an elk on Kodiak if you see one. The refuge does not elk to establish a population on Kodiak.

I would like to see Eek registration to be allowed on Kodiak Island until December 31/

If poaching is a concern require verifiable proof of kill and gut pile with GPS coordinates included in a photo to be submitted with your registration to ADF&G upon return to town.

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

Several people have expressed interest in hunting elk late in the fall on Kodiak Island.

Not run through Kodiak Advisory Committee.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alexis Kwachka (OI-F25-229)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 212**

**5 AAC 85.035. Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk.**

Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 elk drawing hunt DE702, to “up to” 10% of the available permits as follows:

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

Limit nonresident permit allocation for drawing hunt DE702 to UP TO 10% of the available permits. If at least 10 permits are not issued a nonresident permit will not be available.

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

Limit the number of tags that may be drawn by nonresidents for drawing hunt DE702.

There is currently no cap on how many tags may be drawn by nonresidents.

If nothing is changed residents will continue to lose opportunities to hunt in easier accessible areas that are limited to drawing hunts because of said access issues. The nature of many hunts in Alaska requires that hunters use expensive modes of transportation to access an area to hunt. Many of the drawing hunts are only restricted to drawing because they are in easier accessible areas. Even where access is not the primary limiting factor Alaskan residents are being out competed by guided nonresidents in the draw by outfitters and license application services. Additionally caribou, moose, bison, muskox, black Bear and elk do not require a guide and non-guided nonresident interest in these species is increasing.

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

No

**PROPOSED BY:** Craig Van Arsdale (OI-F25-075)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 213**

**5 AAC 85.035. Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk.**

Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 elk drawing hunt DE704, to “up to” 10% of the available permits as follows:

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

Limit nonresident permit allocation for drawing hunt DE704 to UP TO 10% of the available permits. If at least 10 permits are not issued a nonresident permit will not be available.

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

Limit the number of tags that may be drawn by nonresidents for drawing hunt DE704. There is currently no cap on how many tags may be drawn by nonresidents.

If nothing is changed residents will continue to lose opportunities to hunt in easier accessible areas that are limited to drawing hunts because of said access issues. The nature of many hunts in Alaska

requires that hunters use expensive modes of transportation to access an area to hunt. Many of the drawing hunts are only restricted to drawing because they are in easier accessible areas. Even where access is not the primary limiting factor Alaskan residents are being out competed by guided nonresidents in the draw by outfitters and license application services. Additionally caribou, moose, bison, muskox, black bear and elk do not require a guide and non-guided nonresident interest in these species is increasing.

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

No

**PROPOSED BY:** Craig Van Arsdale (OI-F25-076)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 214**

**5 AAC 85.035. Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk.**

Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 elk drawing hunt DE711, to “up to” 10% of the available permits as follows:

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

Limit nonresident permit allocation for drawing hunt DE711 to UP TO 10% of the available permits. If at least 10 permits are not issued a nonresident permit will not be available.

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

Limit the number of tags that may be drawn by nonresidents for drawing hunt DE711.

There is currently no cap on how many tags may be drawn by nonresidents.

If nothing is changed residents will continue to lose opportunities to hunt in easier accessible areas that are limited to drawing hunts because of said access issues. The nature of many hunts in Alaska requires that hunters use expensive modes of transportation to access an area to hunt. Many of the drawing hunts are only restricted to drawing because they are in easier accessible areas. Even where access is not the primary limiting factor Alaskan residents are being out competed by guided nonresidents in the draw by outfitters and license application services. Additionally caribou, moose, bison, muskox, black bear and elk do not require a guide and non-guided nonresident interest in these species is increasing.

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

No

**PROPOSED BY:** Craig Van Arsdale (OI-F25-079)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 215**

**5 AAC 85.035. Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk.**

Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 elk drawing hunt DE713, to “up to” 10% of the available permits as follows:

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

Limit nonresident permit allocation for drawing hunt DE713 to UP TO 10% of the available permits. If at least 10 permits are not issued a nonresident permit will not be available.

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

Limit the number of tags that may be drawn by nonresidents for drawing hunt DE713.

There is currently no cap on how many tags may be drawn by nonresidents.

If nothing is changed residents will continue to lose opportunities to hunt in easier accessible areas that are limited to drawing hunts because of said access issues. The nature of many hunts in Alaska requires that hunters use expensive modes of transportation to access an area to hunt. Many of the drawing hunts are only restricted to drawing because they are in easier accessible areas. Even where access is not the primary limiting factor Alaskan residents are being out competed by guided nonresidents in the draw by outfitters and license application services. Additionally caribou, moose, bison, muskox, black bear and elk do not require a guide and non-guided nonresident interest in these species is increasing.

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

No

**PROPOSED BY:** Craig Van Arsdale (OI-F25-080)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 216**

**5 AAC 85.035. Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk.**

Limit the nonresident permit allocation for Unit 8 elk drawing hunt DE721, to “up to” 10% of the available permits as follows:

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

Limit nonresident permit allocation for drawing hunt DE721 to UP TO 10% of the available permits. If at least 10 permits are not issued a nonresident permit will not be available.

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

Limit the number of tags that may be drawn by nonresidents for drawing hunt DE721.

There is currently no cap on how many tags may be drawn by nonresidents.

If nothing is changed residents will continue to lose opportunities to hunt in easier accessible areas that are limited to drawing hunts because of said access issues. The nature of many hunts in Alaska requires that hunters use expensive modes of transportation to access an area to hunt. Many of the drawing hunts are only restricted to drawing because they are in easier accessible areas. Even where access is not the primary limiting factor Alaskan residents are being out competed by guided nonresidents in the draw by outfitters and license application services. Additionally caribou, moose, bison, muskox, black bear and elk do not require a guide and non-guided nonresident interest in these species is increasing.

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

No

**PROPOSED BY:** Craig Van Arsdale (OI-F25-081)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 217**

**5 AAC 85.035. Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk.**

Limit the nonresident permit allocation for Unit 8 elk drawing hunt DE723, to “up to” 10% of the available permits as follows:

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

Limit nonresident permit allocation for drawing hunt DE723 to UP TO 10% of the available permits. If at least 10 permits are not issued a nonresident permit will not be available.

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

Limit the number of tags that may be drawn by nonresidents for drawing hunt DE723.

There is currently no cap on how many tags may be drawn by nonresidents.

If nothing is changed residents will continue to lose opportunities to hunt in easier accessible areas that are limited to drawing hunts because of said access issues. The nature of many hunts in Alaska requires that hunters use expensive modes of transportation to access an area to hunt. Many of the drawing hunts are only restricted to drawing because they are in easier accessible areas. Even where access is not the primary limiting factor Alaskan residents are being out competed by guided nonresidents in the draw by outfitters and license application services. Additionally caribou, moose, bison, muskox, black bear and elk do not require a guide and non-guided nonresident interest in these species is increasing.

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

No

**PROPOSED BY:** Craig Van Arsdale (OI-F25-082)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 218**

**5 AAC 85.035. Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk.**

Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 elk drawing hunt DE715, to “up to” 10% of the available permits as follows:

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

Limit nonresident permit allocation for drawing hunt DE715 to UP TO 10% of the available permits. If at least 10 permits are not issued a nonresident permit will not be available.

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

Limit the number of tags that may be drawn by nonresidents for drawing hunt DE715.

There is currently no cap on how many tags may be drawn by nonresidents.

If nothing is changed residents will continue to lose opportunities to hunt in easier accessible areas that are limited to drawing hunts because of said access issues. The nature of many hunts in Alaska requires that hunters use expensive modes of transportation to access an area to hunt. Many of the drawing hunts are only restricted to drawing because they are in easier accessible areas. Even where access is not the primary limiting factor Alaskan residents are being out competed by guided nonresidents in the draw by outfitters and license application services. Additionally caribou, moose, bison, muskox, black bear and elk do not require a guide and non-guided nonresident interest in these species is increasing.

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

No

**PROPOSED BY:** Craig Van Arsdale (OI-F25-083)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 219**

**5 AAC 85.035. Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk.**

Limit the nonresident permit allocation for Unit 8 elk drawing hunt DE717, to “up to” 10% of the available permits as follows:

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

Limit nonresident permit allocation for drawing hunt DE717 to UP TO 10% of the available permits. If at least 10 permits are not issued a nonresident permit will not be available.

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

Limit the number of tags that may be drawn by nonresidents for drawing hunt DE717.

There is currently no cap on how many tags may be drawn by nonresidents.

If nothing is changed residents will continue to lose opportunities to hunt in easier accessible areas that are limited to drawing hunts because of said access issues. The nature of many hunts in Alaska requires that hunters use expensive modes of transportation to access an area to hunt. Many of the drawing hunts are only restricted to drawing because they are in easier accessible areas. Even where access is not the primary limiting factor Alaskan residents are being out competed by guided nonresidents in the draw by outfitters and license application services. Additionally caribou, moose, bison, muskox, black bear and elk do not require a guide and non-guided nonresident interest in these species is increasing.

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

No

**PROPOSED BY:** Craig Van Arsdale (OI-F25-084)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 220**

**5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat.**

Extend the subsistence goat hunting season in Unit 8 to March 31 as follows:

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

One goat available by permit RG471-474, 476 season November 1-March 31st.

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

I want to address subsistence mountain goat hunting in draw hunt areas on Kodiak Island. Currently there is a subsistence hunt available in 471, 472, 473 and 474 and 476 Unit 8 goat hunts. This subsistence tag becomes available to hunt November 1st. I would like to see the season extended to March 31st for subsistence hunts to mirror the same season as RG480. It would give people more time to utilize the resource and harvest goats at lower elevation in winter months. ADF&G still would have emergency order power to close a hunt if the harvest quota was met.

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

No

**PROPOSED BY:** Stig Yngve (OI-F25-191)  
\*\*\*\*\*



**PROPOSAL 221**

**5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat.**

Lengthen the season for the RG480 goat hunt in Unit 8, to start August 1 as follows:

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

Open season for RG480 runs from August 1-March 31.

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

I propose that the start date of RG480 be modified from August 20 to August 1. To begin, according to a AF&G biologist I spoke with, there is no biological evidence for the start date to be later than August 1.

In addition, an August 1st start date would provide an amazing opportunity for young hunters and parents to hunt goat prior to the start of a new school year. I imagine many Alaskans would appreciate the expansion of a quality hunt option prior to the start of the school year so that young hunters can enjoy the experience of a mountain goat hunt without missing school and sporting events.

Lastly, this change would align with the start of deer season in Kodiak, which would give hunters more options for harvesting goat or deer on an early season hunt.

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

I developed the proposal in coordination with the many parents of young hunters who are always looking for high quality hunting opportunities prior to the start of the school year. An early season mountain goat hunt in Kodiak that would not require stude

**PROPOSED BY:** Daniel Olson (OI-F25-018)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 222**

**5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat.**

**5 AAC 92.171. Sealing of horns and antlers.**

Change the bag limit for hunting goat in Unit 8 to one billy only, and require horns be sealed as follows:

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

I recommend changing the hunts in Unit 8 to billy only and reducing RG480 back to one male goat with requirements to seal so we can have better harvest information on this population.

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

The current mountain goat strategy on Kodiak Island is shifting the nanny/billy ratio across the Island. We currently have a long season on the South end to reduce population by 20% and due to federal managers not wanting the animals there, over harvest of billys and lack of sealing

requirements, it has been left open despite low abundance of mature males. This has left a disproportionate amount of young goats and nannys to mature males. Even though these were an introduced population, these animals provide value to the economy, one of the only reliable over the counter opportunities and subsistence to locals.

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

**PROPOSED BY:** Caleb Martin (OI-F25-022)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 223**

**5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat.**

Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 goat drawing hunt DG471, to “up to” 20% of the available permits as follows:

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

Limit nonresident permit allocation for drawing hunt DG471 to UP TO 20% of the available permits. If at least five permits are not issued a nonresident permit will not be available.

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

Limit the number of tags that may be drawn by nonresidents for drawing hunt DG471.

There is currently no cap on how many tags may be drawn by nonresidents.

If nothing is changed residents will continue to lose opportunities to hunt in easier accessible areas that are limited to drawing hunts because of said access issues. The nature of many hunts in Alaska requires that hunters use expensive modes of transportation to access an area to hunt. Many of the drawing hunts are only restricted to drawing because they are in easier accessible areas. Even where access is not the primary limiting factor Alaskan residents are being out competed by guided nonresidents in the draw by outfitters and license application services. Additionally caribou, moose, bison, muskox, black bear and elk do not require a guide and non-guided nonresident interest in these species is increasing.

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

No

**PROPOSED BY:** Craig Van Arsdale (OI-F25-100)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 224**

**5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat.**

Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 goat drawing hunt DG472, to “up to” 20% of the available permits as follows:

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

Limit nonresident permit allocation for drawing hunt DG472 to UP TO 20% of the available permits. If at least five permits are not issued a nonresident permit will not be available.

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

Limit the number of tags that may be drawn by nonresidents for drawing hunt DG472.

There is currently no cap on how many tags may be drawn by nonresidents.

If nothing is changed residents will continue to lose opportunities to hunt in easier accessible areas that are limited to drawing hunts because of said access issues. The nature of many hunts in Alaska requires that hunters use expensive modes of transportation to access an area to hunt. Many of the drawing hunts are only restricted to drawing because they are in easier accessible areas. Even where access is not the primary limiting factor Alaskan residents are being out competed by guided nonresidents in the draw by outfitters and license application services. Additionally caribou, moose, bison, muskox, black bear and elk do not require a guide and non-guided nonresident interest in these species is increasing.

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

No

**PROPOSED BY:** Craig Van Arsdale (OI-F25-101)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 225**

**5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat.**

Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 goat drawing hunt DG473, to “up to” 20% of the available permits as follows:

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

Limit nonresident permit allocation for drawing hunt DG473 to UP TO 20% of the available permits. If at least five permits are not issued a nonresident permit will not be available.

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

Limit the number of tags that may be drawn by nonresidents for drawing hunt DG473.

There is currently no cap on how many tags may be drawn by nonresidents.

If nothing is changed residents will continue to lose opportunities to hunt in easier accessible areas that are limited to drawing hunts because of said access issues. The nature of many hunts in Alaska requires that hunters use expensive modes of transportation to access an area to hunt. Many of the drawing hunts are only restricted to drawing because they are in easier accessible areas. Even where access is not the primary limiting factor Alaskan residents are being out competed by guided nonresidents in the draw by outfitters and license application services. Additionally caribou, moose, bison, muskox, black bear and elk do not require a guide and non-guided nonresident interest in these species is increasing.

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

No

**PROPOSED BY:** Craig Van Arsdale (OI-F25-102)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 226**

**5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat.**

Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 goat drawing hunt DG474, to “up to” 20% of the available permits as follows:

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

Limit nonresident permit allocation for drawing hunt DG474 to UP TO 20% of the available permits. If at least five permits are not issued a nonresident permit will not be available.

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

Limit the number of tags that may be drawn by nonresidents for drawing hunt DG474.

There is currently no cap on how many tags may be drawn by nonresidents.

If nothing is changed residents will continue to lose opportunities to hunt in easier accessible areas that are limited to drawing hunts because of said access issues. The nature of many hunts in Alaska requires that hunters use expensive modes of transportation to access an area to hunt. Many of the drawing hunts are only restricted to drawing because they are in easier accessible areas. Even where access is not the primary limiting factor Alaskan residents are being out competed by guided nonresidents in the draw by outfitters and license application services. Additionally caribou, moose, bison, muskox, black bear and elk do not require a guide and non-guided nonresident interest in these species is increasing.

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

No

**PROPOSED BY:** Craig Van Arsdale (OI-F25-103)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 227**

**5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat.**

Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 goat drawing hunt DG476, to “up to” 20% of the available permits as follows:

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

Limit nonresident permit allocation for drawing hunt DG476 to UP TO 20% of the available permits. If at least five permits are not issued a nonresident permit will not be available.

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

Limit the number of tags that may be drawn by nonresidents for drawing hunt DG476.

There is currently no cap on how many tags may be drawn by nonresidents.

If nothing is changed residents will continue to lose opportunities to hunt in easier accessible areas that are limited to drawing hunts because of said access issues. The nature of many hunts in Alaska requires that hunters use expensive modes of transportation to access an area to hunt. Many of the drawing hunts are only restricted to drawing because they are in easier accessible areas. Even where access is not the primary limiting factor Alaskan residents are being out competed by guided nonresidents in the draw by outfitters and license application services. Additionally caribou, moose, bison, muskox, black bear and elk do not require a guide and non-guided nonresident interest in these species is increasing.

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

No

**PROPOSED BY:** Craig Van Arsdale (OI-F25-104)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 228**

**5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat.**

Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 goat drawing hunt DG478, to “up to” 20% of the available permits as follows:

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

Limit nonresident permit allocation for drawing hunt DG478 to UP TO 20% of the available permits. If at least five permits are not issued a nonresident permit will not be available.

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

Limit the number of tags that may be drawn by nonresidents for drawing hunt DG478.

There is currently no cap on how many tags may be drawn by nonresidents.

If nothing is changed residents will continue to lose opportunities to hunt in easier accessible areas that are limited to drawing hunts because of said access issues. The nature of many hunts in Alaska requires that hunters use expensive modes of transportation to access an area to hunt. Many of the drawing hunts are only restricted to drawing because they are in easier accessible areas. Even where access is not the primary limiting factor Alaskan residents are being out competed by guided nonresidents in the draw by outfitters and license application services. Additionally caribou, moose, bison, muskox, black bear and elk do not require a guide and non-guided nonresident interest in these species is increasing.

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

No

**PROPOSED BY:** Craig Van Arsdale (OI-F25-105)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 229**

**5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat.**

Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 goat drawing hunt DG479, to “up to” 20% of the available permits as follows:

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

Limit nonresident permit allocation for drawing hunt DG479 to UP TO 20% of the available permits. If at least five permits are not issued a nonresident permit will not be available.

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

Limit the number of tags that may be drawn by nonresidents for drawing hunt DG479.

There is currently no cap on how many tags may be drawn by nonresidents.

If nothing is changed residents will continue to lose opportunities to hunt in easier accessible areas that are limited to drawing hunts because of said access issues. The nature of many hunts in Alaska requires that hunters use expensive modes of transportation to access an area to hunt. Many of the drawing hunts are only restricted to drawing because they are in easier accessible areas. Even where access is not the primary limiting factor Alaskan residents are being out competed by guided nonresidents in the draw by outfitters and license application services. Additionally caribou, moose, bison, muskox, black bear and elk do not require a guide and non-guided nonresident interest in these species is increasing.

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

No

**PROPOSED BY:** Craig Van Arsdale (OI-F25-106)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 230**

**5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat.**

Extend the season for the RG480 goat hunt in Unit 8, to start August 1st as follows:

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

Extend the dates for RG480 from August 20-March 31 to August 1st to March 31st.

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

Extend the dates for RG480 from August 20-March 31 to August 1st to March 31st.

Add additional opportunity to hunt goats while hunting deer from August 1st to August 19th.

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

No

**PROPOSED BY:** Craig Van Arsdale (OI-F25-123)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 231**

**5 AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep and mountain goat drawing permit hunts.**

Limit nonresident permit allocation to 10%, for the Unit 8 goat drawing permit hunts DG471, DG472, DG473, DG474, DG476, DG478, and DG479 as follows:

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

Nonresident allocation for goat draw permits DG471, DG472, DG473, DG474, DG476, DG478, and DG479 should be capped at 10% of the total number of permits issued.

This would not only limit the competition in the field for resident hunters, but it will also increase the odds of drawing a permit by taking excess applications out of the drawing pool if/when the 10% cap is reached for nonresident permits.

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

The Issue:

Nonresidents are drawing upwards of 20% of the goat drawing permits for hunts DG471, DG472, DG473, DG474, DG476, DG478, and DG479.

Why it matters:

These hunts offer residents of Alaska a great opportunity to hunt goats with a healthy population and high odds of success at a decreased overall cost due to these units being a shorter flight from the city of Kodiak or accessible from the road system.

Bush plane flights have risen astronomically over the last several years and a flight to the south end of Kodiak to hunt RG480 is running over \$4,000 round trip. The draw units are half the cost

for a flight and two of them can be hunted off the Kodiak road system. Goats are big animals and yield a decent amount of meat. Deer can also be harvested concurrently on these hunts, giving residents more opportunity to fill their freezers.

Goat hunts statewide are strictly monitored and are managed exclusively via registration and drawing permits. Registration permits on the mainland are prone to small quotas and early closures. Draw permits on the mainland typically see less than a dozen permits issued making them extremely hard to draw.

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

No

**PROPOSED BY:** Jesse Dunshie (OI-F25-156)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 232**

**5 AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep and mountain goat drawing permit hunts.**

Establish an allocation for resident and nonresident goat drawing permits for North Kodiak Island in Unit 8 as follows:

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

If this moves forward:

Board of Game established appropriate ratio of opportunity for residents and nonresidents to access North Kodiak Islands goat populations.

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

Kodiak has a very unique situation. We live on a road system adjacent to two goat areas. residents can fly into town and stay in a hotel and take a cab to access hunting area's. This option is available for residents and nonresidents. It's becoming extremely important to guides as well. I feel it's time to explore either a set aside for guides or a ratio of permits available to residents / nonresidents. Draw areas 471, 472, 478 and 479 should be considered for this actions.

These four area's can be accessed by vehicle or 4-wheeler and should have a priority for resident hunters who can access goat country at a reasonable cost. I feel like establishing a criteria of allocation will eliminate potential conflict between guides and resident hunters in the future.

If this proposal moves forward the data will be helpful in narrowing in the proper proportions.

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

Several people have spoken to me about this and what is felt like declining opportunity because of guides loading up the drawing with potential hunters. I feel like it's good policy to try and be ahead of a cure versus behind and trying to catch up. Kodiak is one of a handful of places where you can access goats at a reasonable cost. We should be aware of this and regulate accordingly. I believe most of these are's fall outside of guide area's and are appealing to access for nonresident hunters



through the use of a guide. If this is the case we should definitely recognize this and regulate it. Known numbers for each user will establish stability and provide the most opportunity to access goats.

I did not run this through the local advisory Board, but i'm sure a robust conversation from the submittal of this proposal will ensue.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alexis Kwachka (OI-F25-226)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 233**

**5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.**

Change the boundary for the Unit 8 brown bear drawing hunts DB 106/206/136/236 as follows:

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

Change the boundary of Kodiak bear drawing DB 106/206/136/236. Change the northeast boundary of this bear area to follow the ridgeline to Cape Kasiak (The point that separates Three Saints Bay from Kaiugnak Bay; rather than come down Avnulu Creek.

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

The boundary for DB 106/206/136/236 is in a bad place. For some reason, unknown to anyone at ADF&G the boundary goes down Avnulu Vreek. This is contrary to almost every other Kodiak bear hunt boundary which follow the ridgelines or high ground. It makes this area very difficult to hunt because the only practical access is from Kaiugnak Bay but only half of the valley is in that unit, making it very frustrating to hunt. The side that is in the opposite area is good to hunt also but virtually inaccessible for anyone with that tag because float planes can't pull up to the rocky/wavy beach. It is more than 10 miles of very rough ocean from any place in that unit where a floatplane could land. It is only practical via inflatable from Kaiugnak. I asked the staff in Unit 8, they were not opposed, but they wanted the Board of Game to weigh in. As far as we can tell staff has the authority to move the line. I also talked to the bear guide in the adjacent unit and he is not opposed.

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

Developed with the adjacent area guide (his area will be slightly smaller. Also Unit 8 ADF&G staff and USF&WS staff for Kodiak Refuge.

**PROPOSED BY:** Aaron Bloomquist (OI-F25-035)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 234**

**5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.**

Shorten the spring brown bear season on Kodiak Island in Unit 8, to start April 20 as follows:

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

Kodiak Brown Bear

Spring season April 20 - May 20th

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

The issue I want to address is spring bear season on Kodiak Island. It begins April 1st. There is VERY LITTLE actual bear harvest or bear activity in early April, so most people never start until around April 20th, every year, guided and Alaskan. We have had a lot of late springs where nothing is happening at all for successful hunting until the very end of April til the end on May 15th. I believe shortening the season and changing dates would still allow for everyone, resident and nonresident and alien to have a high quality experience and harvest more boars, thus growing a healthier and more uniform bear population. All vendors and airplane and boat transport services would not lose business, if anything it would increase for everyone being able to operate during warmer better weather.

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

I collaborated with Alaskan and Kodiak Island residents as well as some guides and nonresidents on this matter.

**PROPOSED BY:** Stig Yngve (OI-F25-178)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 235**

**5 AAC 92.132. Restrictions to bag limit.**

Count a wounded bear against a hunter's bag limit in Unit 8 as follows:

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

Bag limit for Kodiak brown bear in Unit 8 in any draw or registration hunt is 1 KODIAK BROWN BEAR wounded or harvested every 4 REGULATORY YEARS.

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

The issue my proposal addresses is wounded bears and a lack of ethics hunting with Kodiak brown bear. Current regulations allow for a bear hunter to LEGALLY WOUND A BEAR in Unit 8, on any SPRING kodiak brown bear hunt (APRIL 1<sup>st</sup> - MAY 15th) and hunt again that same calendar year fall hunt (October 25<sup>th</sup> - November 30th). The reason for this is a new ADF&G management year begins in July every year, thus allowing a hunter to hunt again because it is a "new" year by the fish and game management calendar. This to me promotes gross and negligent mismanagement of a very finite and unique resource, Kodiak brown bear. A wounded bear is a

wounded bear, and it should be treated the same as a harvested bear for the magnitude of putting a bullet (or arrow) in that animal. IT IS WRONG MORALLY AND ETHICALLY speaking, that a person can potentially wound/kill two bears in one calendar year. This needs to change. It has been happening for far too long and is an overlooked example of bad management.

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

NOPE. ALL MYSELF

**PROPOSED BY:** Stig Yngve (OI-F25-175)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 236**

**5 AAC 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures.**

**5 AAC 92.061. Special provisions for brown bear drawing permit hunts.**

Remove the sow restriction and penalties for resident hunters in Kodiak brown bear hunt areas 8 thru 16, and institute a sow skull size restriction for resident hunters as follows.

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

**Remove the sow restrictions and penalties for resident hunters in hunt areas 8-16.**

**Institute a skull size component to where the elimination of any permits only happens if a sow is harvested with a skull size less than 15 inches in length or 9 inches in width.**

From the 2024/2025 draw hunt supplement: “The bag limit is one bear every four years, and a legal bear is any bear except cubs or females with cubs. A wounded bear counts against your bag limit for the regulatory year.”

Including resident brown bear hunters in the sow harvest restrictions in these hunt areas will lead to many more permits being taken away from resident hunters than nonresident guided hunters.

A resident bear hunter who draws a once-in-a-lifetime Kodiak brown bear permit wants to take a trophy (male) bear but also doesn’t want to come away without harvesting a bear in what will likely be the only chance he or she gets the opportunity for this coveted hunt. Taking a sow in these areas does not affect that hunter, so there is no real incentive to not take a sow. The loss-of-permit penalty falls on future resident hunters.

A guided nonresident hunter is after a trophy brown bear, and most guides will not let a client take a sow. Guides have far more knowledge than most resident bear hunters on judging sows vs boars. Guides in the areas where these sow restrictions are in place have a monetary incentive to avoid taking sows because the penalty (loss of a permit) applies to that guide with that concession area. So, guided nonresident hunters are much more likely to avoid taking a sow.

The previous RY94-RY06 sow harvest restrictions in these hunt areas only applied to nonresident drawing permits and according to the Department, “it was widely believed this prior regulation (RY94-RY06) had a positive effect on the population.”

Going back a few years, the ADF&G chart below shows that in hunt areas 8-16, from RY 21 – 24, nonresidents harvested 10 sows, and residents took 26 sows. Resident hunters took about 73 percent of the sows, with nonresidents taking 27 percent.

1	Area	Sex	Residency	SKTOTAL	Regulatory Year	cert
2	111	F	Nonresident	24.5625	2021	1807985
3	112	F	Nonresident	24.3125	2021	1808011
4	113	F	Nonresident	21.8750	2021	1807995
5	143	F	Nonresident	23.0000	2021	1805763
6	113	F	Nonresident	22.5625	2022	1806351
7	116	F	Nonresident	20.1250	2022	1806333
8	146	F	Nonresident	19.8125	2022	1806233
9	238	F	Nonresident	23.9375	2022	1806286
10	240	F	Nonresident	23.1250	2022	1806212
11	113	F	Nonresident	20.8125	2023	1807341
12	208	F	Resident	20.1875	2021	1808002
13	211	F	Resident	20.9375	2021	1808012
14	211	F	Resident	22.1875	2021	1808028
15	212	F	Resident	21.3750	2021	1807982
16	214	F	Resident	23.1875	2021	1808078
17	215	F	Resident	22.6875	2021	1808021
18	240	F	Resident	22.3750	2021	1805784
19	244	F	Resident	22.8125	2021	1805752
20	210	F	Resident	23.6250	2022	1806336
21	211	F	Resident	23.0625	2022	1806386
22	212	F	Resident	21.1250	2022	1806352
23	213	F	Resident	23.7500	2022	1806368
24	213	F	Resident	25.0000	2022	1806330
25	215	F	Resident	21.6250	2022	1806360
26	238	F	Resident	22.5000	2022	1806298
27	241	F	Resident	22.5625	2022	1806277
28	243	F	Resident	22.3750	2022	1806223
29	212	F	Resident	21.1875	2023	1807316
30	214	F	Resident	20.5000	2023	101188
31	214	F	Resident	22.6250	2023	1807333
32	241	F	Resident	22.6875	2023	1807291
33	243	F	Resident	21.9375	2023	1807210
34	208	F	Resident	19.5625	2024	1813379
35	211	F	Resident	20.6875	2024	1813363
36	213	F	Resident	22.4375	2024	1813389
37	214	F	Resident	21.6875	2024	1813378

If only including nonresidents (who take a quarter of the sow harvests) in the previous sow restrictions had a positive effect on the population to the point those restrictions were rescinded, why are we including residents in these sow restrictions now? Again, without a penalty to the individual resident hunter who takes a sow, there is no real incentive not to take a sow when that hunter won't be affected by future loss of permits. This will continue to result in a significant loss of permits to residents.

We'd like the Department of Fish and Game to only include nonresident drawing permits for these sow harvest restrictions in these hunt areas. Start out just like we did the last time when we had bear conservation concerns in these areas, put the emphasis on guided hunters whereby the guide has a clear incentive not to harvest sows.

Including a skull size component places no burden on Department staff because skulls are already required to be sealed and skulls are measured when sealed. There should be no penalty for any hunter for taking older class sows with a skull size larger than 15 inches in length or 9 inches in width.

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

**Kodiak brown bear restrictions on the taking of sows in hunt areas 8-16 and elimination of permits for residents if sows are taken**

Department concerns with lower brown bear populations in the southwestern portion of Kodiak Island resulted in the Department instituting regulations in RY23 that result in a loss of permits to both residents and nonresidents if any sows are taken in hunt areas 8–16 (Deadman Bay, Dog Salmon River, South Olga Lakes, Red Lake, Frazer Lake, Karluk Lake, Halibut Bay, Sturgeon River, & North Karluk River).

These new sow harvest restrictions are similar to what was in place in RY94–RY06 in the same hunt areas, although the previous sow harvest restrictions had a skull size component and did not include resident bear hunters.

Since the implementation of these sow harvest restrictions in RY 23 in these hunt areas, residents have harvested nine sows, and nonresidents 1 sow. This results in a significant loss of permits for resident hunters. While we understand the necessity to take fewer sows in these areas, we don't believe resident bear hunters should be included in the sow restrictions and penalties.

Also, we want to note that after the Department implemented these sow restrictions, there was nothing in the Draw Permit Supplement to inform hunters who apply for permits in these areas that these sow harvest restrictions were in place. However, hunters are informed of the sow harvest restrictions after they win a permit for these areas.

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

RHAK always contacts Department biologists when working on proposals. Thanks to Department staff for answering questions and providing harvest information!

**PROPOSED BY:** Resident Hunters of Alaska (OI-F25-187)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 237**

**5 AAC 92.061. Special provisions for brown bear drawing permit hunts.**

Require all nonresident hunters to apply for Unit 8 brown bear drawing permits and reallocate unused nonresident permits to residents as follows:

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

- 1) Require all nonresident guided hunters to apply for Unit 8 Kodiak brown bear drawing permits, pay the application fee, and for the Department to submit that application.**
- 2) If guided nonresident Kodiak brown bear permits are not being utilized, reallocate those permits to residents.**

There is absolutely no reason why the board should continue to allow nonresident guided hunters to skip the Kodiak brown bear draw permit process. This state-managed draw permit hunt clearly gives a preference to nonresidents over residents and should not be allowed to happen.

If guided nonresident Kodiak brown bear “draw” permits awarded to exclusive or semi-exclusive guide concession areas are not being utilized, those permits for those areas should be re-allocated to the resident draw permits.

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

**Guides and their nonresident clients being allowed to intentionally “skip” the Kodiak brown bear “draw” permit process.**

5 AAC 92.061 Special provisions for Unit 8 brown bear permit hunts (our emphasis):

“In the Unit 8 general brown bear drawing permit hunt, the department shall issue permits, and a hunter may apply for a permit, as follows:

(1) the department shall issue a maximum of 40 percent of the drawing permits to nonresidents and a minimum of 60 percent to residents; each guide may submit the same number of nonresident applications for a hunt as the number of permits available for that hunt;

(2) the department **shall** enter, in a resident drawing, each application from a resident and each application from a nonresident accompanied by a resident relative who is within the second degree of kindred; for each season, the department shall issue a maximum of four permits to nonresident hunters accompanied by a resident relative who is within the second degree of kindred; however, the department may not issue, within one calendar year, more than one of these permits per individual hunt, as described in the permit hunt guide published each year by the department;

(3) the department **shall** enter, in a guided nonresident drawing, each complete application from a nonresident who will be accompanied by a guide; the department may enter an application and issue a drawing permit for the general hunt only to a successful nonresident applicant who presents proof at the time of application that the applicant will be accompanied by a guide, as required under AS 16.05.407 or 16.05.408;

(4) the following provisions apply to a guided nonresident drawing under this section:

(A) an applicant for a guided nonresident drawing permit may apply for only one such permit per application period;

(B) **after the successful applicants have been selected by drawing**, the department shall create an alternate list by drawing the remaining names of applicants for a specific hunt and placing the names on the alternate list in the order in which the names were drawn;

(C) if a successful applicant cancels the guided hunt, the person whose name appears first on the alternate list for that hunt shall be offered the permit; if an alternate applicant cancels the guided hunt, the permit must be offered in turn to succeeding alternate applicants until the alternate list is exhausted;

(D) if a guided nonresident drawing permit is available, but the alternate list is exhausted, the permit becomes available, by registration at the Kodiak ADF&G office, to the first applicant furnishing proof that the applicant will be accompanied by a guide;”

Resident Hunters of Alaska submitted a similar proposal (Proposal 78) for the 2023 Southcentral meeting, trying to get the board to recognize that these hunts aren’t really a “draw” hunt for nonresidents at all when they can skip the permit process completely. During deliberations on

Proposal 78, the chairman of the board made these statements below, transcribed from the audio recording (our emphasis):

Chairman Burnett: *“So, why do we pretend that these are draw hunts? I mean, other than the fact we’ve identified them as draw hunts by putting them in the draw supplement. No one can draw except very few people, there are no odds, it’s 100% or zero. Why can’t we identify those separately? And rather than pretending that it’s a regular random draw like everything else, maybe have people pay a fee as if it were a draw. What prevents us from doing that?”*

Department of Law: *“The Department is kinda limited on what they can do here because of these exclusive guide use areas. It’s really controlled by the federal process. “*

Chairman Burnett: *“Perhaps those should be registration hunts? Identify those hunts and we can make them registration hunts for nonresidents because they can only have one permit. Or something like that rather than pretending they are a draw permit. Because it is...the people support this proposal – and we’ve seen this proposal in the past -- because it’s confusing and it seems unfair. It’s nothing the state’s doing that’s unfair, it’s a fact that there is a federal exclusive guide use area, doesn’t have anything to do with what the state’s actions are here. But, somehow to identify it so it doesn’t provide the confusion that these people are doing something wrong.”*

The board’s own former chairman has said on the record that these hunts listed as “draw” hunts for nonresidents are not really draw hunts at all, that we are “pretending” these are random draw hunts for nonresidents. Clearly, as he also alludes, this is “unfair.”

We are not going to advocate to make these nonresident Kodiak brown bear hunts registration hunts, as the former Board of Game chairman suggested, because clearly it would be unconstitutional for residents to be required to participate in a random draw hunt for any opportunity to hunt a Kodiak brown bear while nonresidents could hunt whenever they want via a registration hunt.

But for decades now, what the board is allowing is unconstitutional because it is a random lottery draw hunt for residents, but nonresidents have 100% opportunity to hunt.

The regulation is very clear in 5AAC 92.061 where it states that the Department *“shall enter, in a guided nonresident drawing, each complete application from a nonresident who will be accompanied by a guide.”*

Yet the Department is not doing that, and the board is not requiring the Department to do that. The alternate list in 5AAC 92.061 is only to be used *“after the successful applicants have been selected by drawing”*

But the Department is issuing over-the-counter tags to nonresidents who didn’t apply for a draw permit and were not selected as part of the alternate list.

The fact that this happens on federal lands within exclusive guide concession areas doesn’t mean that the Department and the board are “limited” in what they can do, as the Department of Law suggested. **This is a state-managed hunt, under state regulations, and the current regulation isn’t being followed!** Even the Department’s own area biologist agrees that it isn’t being followed.

**Details Submitted Previously**

RHAK has provided ample evidence in previous proposals how some guides and their clients are taking advantage of the unfair system of how nonresident Kodiak brown bear “draw” permits are issued.

These permits actually go to the guide with the exclusive concession area to allocate as they wish. Some guides don’t use the permits awarded to their area. Some guides donate permits to be auctioned off to the highest bidder before the draw results even come out for that application period. Some nonresident hunters are able to hunt every four years after harvesting a bear, as we have shown, until they get their trophy 10-foot bear.

**Draw Permit Supplement shows this is still Happening**

Looking through the 2025/2026 Draw Permit Hunt Supplement results from the previous year, you can see that most guides and their clients go through the required draw application process, pay the fee, and the Department submits those applications.

But you can also see that many guides and their clients do not submit a draw application or pay a fee, yet those “draw” permits were hunted. Here are a few examples:

**Results of the 2024 Permit Hunt Drawing**

Hunt Number	Apps Received	Permits Available	% Drawn
<b>Brown Bear</b>			
DB108*	1	2	100
DB116**	1	2	100
DB122*	1	2	100
DB138*	1	4	100
DB139*	1	3	100
DB145**	1	3	100
DB155*	2	4	100

There are also many examples that appear to show that some guides aren’t even utilizing the permits awarded to their concession area.

Hunt Number	Apps Received	Permits Available	% Drawn
<b>Brown Bear</b>			
DB117**	0	2	0
DB123*	0	1	0
DB125*	0	2	0
DB143**	0	3	0
DB153*	0	2	0



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

RHAK always contacts Department biologists when working on proposal submissions. Thanks to Department staff for answering questions and providing harvest information!

**PROPOSED BY:** Resident Hunters of Alaska (OI-F25-208)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 238**

**5 AAC 92.003. Hunter education and orientation requirements.**

Require residents hunting brown bear in Unit 8, to complete an online education course specific to Kodiak Island brown bear as follows:

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

Create an online course that covers properly identifying Kodiak Island brown bear sows and boars as well as biological features that are unique to different age classes of bears and sex. The information provided must be from Kodiak Island and not other regions in the state of Alaska or elsewhere.

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

Currently residents are harvesting more than double the amount of sows as guided nonresidents, with residents harvesting 33% sows and nonresidents harvesting 15% sows. While the Kodiak Island bear biologist can manage with an up to 40% sow harvest, a lower sow harvest percentage would allow for more future resident opportunity and a greater Kodiak brown bear management plan.

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

Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee and Kodiak game biologist.

**PROPOSED BY:** Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee (OI-F25-051)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 239**

**5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game.**

Reduce the bag limit for sea ducks in Unit 8, and require harvest reporting as follows:

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

Reduced bag limits on sea ducks.

Logbooks to capture amount of harvest and loss.

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

Limit sea duck harvest on multi-day transporter hunts or require very accurate harvest numbers while harvesting (logbook of kills and losses). We need accurate trends in harvest to be accountable of impacts transporters are having of migratory birds.

Sea ducks are important food source to our local communities understanding impacts on a local level will enhance the Board of Game to manage impacts in the future.

Transporters are having impacts and to this point there is no recourse to mitigate them. hunting grounds are being preempted and game is being depleted of run off.

Sea ducks, deer, fox and and fish all need to be considered. Fish not your issue.

Place halved or reduced numbers that can be taken on transported trips. Auality of experience over quantity. If nothing is done we will continue to push towards the boiling point.

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

Local people frustrated and concerned on various levels. Lots of discussion about being in over utilized hunting area's. Concern about access to game and ducks.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alexis Kwachka (OI-F25-230)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 240**

**5 AAC 8.060. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals.**

**5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions.**

Reduce the bag limit for taking fox in Unit 8 and prohibit the use of night vision for hunting as follows:

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

Either limit two fox to nonresidents while hunting in Unit 8 or two fox to all hunters who utilize transporters to the field or while in the field.

Prohibit all infrared hunting in Unit 8. Infrared hunting maybe useful on mainland where population are not on a vertical hillside adjacent to the ocean, but here on Kodiak this will be deadly for all game. NOT FAIR CHASE.

The State Constitution will limit how this is done but if the Board of Game allows infrared use Statewide, this issue you will come before you in more than one area. We have strict limits on guides and the guide industry, Transporters are the wild Wild West and we are seeing area's of localized depletion of our deer populations on island. Please do not let fox be next. I realize this will insult many but I and many on island do not feel infrared hunting has anything to do with fair chase. Please be proactive versus reactive to protecting our fox.

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

I would like the Board of Game to put a limit of two fox on all hunters who use a transporter for access to the field.

Through recent Board of Game actions of the use of infrared or night vision technology the residents have grave concern about elimination of fox along our bays. We have a huge uptick of transporters on the Island deer hunting. Our fox population is highly susceptible to adverse impacts of this technology on our fox populations.

Transporters have had a huge impact of local hunters to access deer, with this new regulation fox will be extremely vulnerable. There is a saying on Kodiak; "when the tide is low the table is set"

For good reason the there have been regulations prohibiting the use of lights while hunting. Infrared technology will have a huge impact on our fox population.

There is a big difference between local hunters and fur trappers than non Unit 8 residents. I/we are asking that you take this difference into consideration while considering this proposal.

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

Many local residents have concern of the fox population and the use of infrared in the field.

The Kodiak Advisory Committee was not consulted but at the last meeting expressed concern of the use of infrared use. If my memory serves me right.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alexis Kwachka (OI-F25-228)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 241**

**5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping.**

Open a year-round season for trapping mink in Unit 8 as follows:

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

5AAC 84.270 (7) Mink and Weasel

....

Units 7, 8, and 14-16 Nov.10 - Jan.31 No Limit

Except in Unit 8, mink may be taken year-round.

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

Remove the season dates for mink in Unit 8 to allow trapping for mink year round in Unit 8. Allowing both increased flexibility for fur trapping and for trapping of nuisance mink.

The mink population has grown alot on the northern part of Kodiak Island and several other islands since their arrival about 10 years ago. The mink trapping season, however, coincides with the worst weather and shortest days of the year. Since most travel to remote areas of the island is via boat, access is much more difficult during November to January than the better weather and longer days from February through April such as already an option during the beaver season. Additionally, a year round season would allow trapping of nuisance mink to protect livestock and hatchery operations without a depredation permit from ADF&G.

Kodiak has a fairly constant year round climate and fur quality in the spring is not an issue with other species such as beaver and not likely to be for mink either.

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

I worked with the Kodiak Area wildlife biologist and assistant area biologist to get recommendations for proposal language and with other Kodiak trappers to gauge interest. There is a general desire to allow more species to be trapped in the spring on Kodiak given the difficulties of trapping during the fall and winter with weather and daylight. And given fur quality for species that are trapped in the spring is typically not an issue on Kodiak.

**PROPOSED BY:** Tyler Polum (OI-F25-011)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 242**

**5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping**

Extend the trapping season for river otter in Unit 8 to end April 15 as follows:

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

Extend the river otter season in Unit 8 by two and a half months, to end on April 15.

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

Reduce the potential for an incidental catch of river otter when trapping for beaver since they can be trapped in the same locations. Other Units within the state have a river otter season that extends past January 31. Example: Unit 12.

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

**PROPOSED BY:** Jessie Juhlin (OI-F25-239)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 243**

**5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.**

Require all snares set n the Kodiak Road system within Unit 8, to include breakaway mechanisms as follows:

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

On the Kodiak road system, all snares must include breakaway mechanisms as follows:

All snares must be equipped with a breakaway mechanism (of a designated minimum poundage) on the loop-end of the snare and the snare cable and anchor must be stronger than the breakaway mechanism.

This change was proposed during each of the last two cycles, first by the Kodiak Fish and Game Advisory Committee in 2019 (Southcentral Region meeting: March 14-19, 2019; Proposal 109) and then again by the Humane Society of Kodiak in 2023 (Southcentral Region Meeting; March 17-22, 2023; Proposal 81). Despite broad community support for both proposals they were ultimately not adopted by the Board. At those meetings, comment from the Board of Game (BOG) and the Alaska Trappers Association (ATA) indicated that community outreach, led by ATA, was the preferred approach instead of a regulatory change. In the intervening six years, ATA has made no effort to conduct community outreach in Kodiak; meanwhile, the number of incidents and volume of community discussion related to this issue has only increased.

The inclusion of appropriately sized breakaway mechanisms would allow trappers to continue targeting furbearers with snares along the Kodiak road system. While at the same time, this would reduce catch of non-target animals, promote responsible trapping practices, and reduce user group conflict. Inclusion of breakaway mechanisms is not expected to significantly increase direct costs for an individual to participate in trapping activities.

**Note:** The Humane Society of Kodiak is not a member of, nor formally affiliated with, the Humane Society of the United States

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

There has been an increase in catch of non-target animals in snares set along the Kodiak road system, including bears, deer, and domestic animals. The main concern is with locking style snares that do not incorporate breakaway mechanisms. Snares without breakaway mechanisms cause severe injury or death to non-target animals, resulting in increased mortality of valuable game resources (i.e., bears and deer) and conflicts between trappers and other user groups, particularly when domestic animals (i.e., dogs and livestock) are involved.

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

While Alaska Department of Fish and Game Advisory Committee has submitted this same proposal previously with broad support, the current proposal is submitted without coordination with the local advisory committee.

**PROPOSED BY:** The Humane Society of Kodiak (OI-F25-165)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 244**

**5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.**

Require identification tags on traps and snares set along the Kodiak road system within Unit 8 as follows:

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

Identification tags are required for each trap and snare set along the Kodiak road system. A person may not set a trap or snare along the Kodiak road system unless there is attached to the trap or snare an identification tag. Identification tags must provide some form of owner identification, such as a personal identification number (PIN) registered with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The Department will make identities of trappers who register their traps and snares with the Department available to law enforcement but otherwise, will keep identities confidential. If there is an injury or death (of a dog or human) resulting from being caught in a trap, it will be the injured party’s responsibility to report to law enforcement, who can then investigate the incident and respond appropriately.

The expense related to the cost of tags would be minimal to trappers.

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

There is not a mechanism in place to identify the owners of traps or snares set along the Kodiak road system. The concern is that there is no official way to identify the owner of a trap that is placed illegally or is in a location where there are frequent user groups, such as hikers, that could pose a public safety concern. Over the years, there have been dogs caught in traps that were close to trails, causing injury and emotional distress. Without the ability to identify the trapper, there is not the opportunity for law enforcement to intercede and educate on proper placement of traps.

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

A similar proposal was submitted previously by Kneeland Taylor as a state-wide proposal and was considered at the March 21-28, 2025, meeting of the Board of Game (Proposal 131). That proposal was unanimously supported by the Kodiak Fish and Game Advisory Committee at their meeting in February 2025. The Humane Society of Kodiak is proposing this regulation, specific to the Kodiak road system within Unit 8, without coordination of other parties, but with strong community support.

**Note:** The Humane Society of Kodiak is not a member of, nor formally affiliated with, the Humane Society of the United States

**PROPOSED BY:** The Humane Society of Kodiak (OI-F25-170)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 245**

**5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.**

Prohibit the use of all artificial light and infrared devices for hunting in Unit 8 as follows:

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

ALL ARTIFICIAL LIGHT AND INFRARED/ HEAT SIGNATURE OPTICS ARE ILLEGAL TO HUNT big game or hunt or trap small game in Unit 8.

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

I would like to address infrared and artificial light for hunting predators (foxes ) in Unit 8. Infrared heat vision optics is now legal statewide. The main motivation for this is wolf and coyote predator control state wide. FOXES ARE NOT DANGEROUS PREDATORS IN KODIAK. This should not be legal here because it will set a precedent for allowing infrared vision, possibly for other big game like BEARS and deer on Kodiak down the road. IT IS not fairchase, ethical or promoting safe hunting on Kodiak Island. In the fall many deer and bear hunters camp right on the beach with base camp in close proximity to other hunters.

Allowing infrared fox hunting at night is dangerous for other user groups and someone or their tent or boat is liable to get inadvertently shot. People don't hunt at night anyway on our island, they get drunk. So allowing this type of hunting on Kodiak Island is a recipe for disaster when foxes are not a true predator of things but rather just a furbearer.

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

I collaborated with Kodiak Advisory Committee.

**PROPOSED BY:** Stig Yngve (OI-F25-181)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 246**

**5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions.**

Prohibit the use infrared devices for hunting in Unit 8 as follows:

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

Ban all infrared hunting Unit 8.

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

Ban all infrared hunting in Unit 8.

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

This action maybe appropriate for other area's but not in Unit 8.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alexis Kwachka (OI-F25-231)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 247**

**5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.**

Allow the use of artificial light for taking fox under a trapping license as follows:

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

5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions,

The following methods of taking game are prohibited:

(7) with the aid of a pit, fire, artificial light, laser sight, electronically enhanced night vision scope, radio communication, cellular or satellite telephone, artificial salt lick, explosive, expanding gas arrow, bomb, smoke, chemical (excluding scent lures), or a conventional steel trap with an inside jaw spread over nine inches, except that

(C) for the purpose of taking furbearers under a trapping license during an open season November 1 - March 31 in Units 7 and 9 - 26, **and during an open season January 1 - March 31 in Unit 8 for land-based trapping only**, artificial light may be used;

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

Under current regulation, use of artificial light is prohibited for trapping in Unit 8.

Fox are one of the main furbearers in Unit 8. With no natural predators such as coyote or wolf and the ready availability of marine food sources year-round, their population is relatively unchecked. Winter trapping months in Unit 8 have limited daylight and notoriously poor weather, limiting trapping opportunity. By allowing the use of artificial light the state could provide for additional opportunity of an underutilized resource. Traditionally, fox farming and trapping was a thriving industry in Unit 8.

Because of the potential for obfuscation of illegal use of artificial light from boats during open deer hunting season, this provision could be limited to land-based use by those with a trapping license, and only after the deer hunting season has been closed.

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

**PROPOSED BY:** Taj Shoemaker (OI-F25-027)

\*\*\*\*\*



**PROPOSAL 248**

**5 AAC 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking game; exceptions.**

Prohibit the use of electronically enhanced night vision for taking furbearers in Unit 8 as follows:

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

5 AAC 92.080. The following methods of taking game are prohibited:

(7) with the aid of.....

(E) electronically enhanced night vision; except that electronically enhanced night vision can be used for taking furbearers **in Units 1-7 and 9-26**;

(F) any forward looking infrared device; except that forward looking infrared devices can be used for taking furbearers **in Units 1-7 and 9-26**;

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

The issue I’m seeking to address is that the statewide change to allow electronically enhanced night vision and forward looking infrared devices does not fit well with Kodiak’s circumstances and is unnecessary. Kodiak does not coyote or wolf, and our daylight restrictions are less than northern parts of the state. Additionally, in Unit 8 allowing these devices creates an enforcement challenge because there is considerable overlap between the trapping season and the open season for big game animals, including brown bear and deer. This is very different from the interior region, where this regulation was originally adopted, where there is considerably less overlap between trapping seasons and open seasons for big game.

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

The Kodiak Advisory Committee discussed the statewide proposal to allow these devices in early 2025 and did not support its application to Kodiak/Unit 8. I did not have a chance to discuss this specific proposal with the AC because there wasn’t another AC meeting between the Board of Game and the proposal submission deadline.

**PROPOSED BY:** Rebecca Skinner (OI-F25-163)

\*\*\*\*\*