

MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH

350 E Dahlia Ave., Palmer, Alaska 99645

CHAIRPERSON

Mike Wood

VICE CHAIR

Howard Delo

MSB STAFF

Ted Eischeid



BOARD MEMBERS

Andy Couch

Larry Engel

Tim Hale

Tam Boeve

VACANT

VACANT

Ex officio: VACANT

FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMISSION

AGENDA

MSB DSJ Bldg, Lower Level Conference Room, Palmer AK

January 21, 2021 – 4:00 PM

Remote Participation Options: Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Or call in (audio only)

[+1 907-290-7880,,362738290#](#) United States, Anchorage

Phone Conference ID: 362 738 290#

[Find a local number](#) | [Reset PIN](#)

[Learn More](#) | [Meeting options](#)

Meeting Documents available on the FWC Web Page: <https://www.matsugov.us/boards/fishcommission>

MSB Directive #10 for COVID-19: Cloth facial coverings or a face shield are required (with limited exceptions) while in a Mat-Su Borough facility; face masks are available upon request.

REGULAR MEETING

4 P.M.

January 21, 2021

- I. CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; ESTABLISH QUORUM
- II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 - a. December 17, 2020
- IV. AUDIENCE INTRODUCTIONS & PARTICIPATION (3 min./person, chair's discretion)
- V. STAFF/AGENCY REPORTS & PRESENTATIONS
 - a. Staff report/correspondence ~ 5 Minutes
- VI. ITEMS OF BUSINESS
 - 1. Alaska Board Of Game Proposals-Comments and Action ~ 30 minutes
 - 2. ANC Watershed and Natural Resources Advisory Committee-collaboration.
 - 3. West Susitna Access Road Project Update ~ 15 minutes
 - 4. Governor's Conservationist of the Year Award nominations ~ 15 minutes
 - 5. FWC Vacancies.
- VII. MEMBER COMMENTS ~ 10 minutes
- VIII. NEXT REGULAR MEETING – February 18, 2021, 4 PM – AGENDA AND PRESENTATION IDEAS?
- IX. ADJOURNMENT

MSB FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMISSION Regular Meeting: December 17, 2020 – MinutesMSB Assembly Chambers – Back Half //Teams Remote Participation OptionMinutes prepared by Ted Eischeid, Planner II**I. CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; ESTABLISH QUORUM**

- a. Call to Order at: 4:11 PM by Chair Mike Wood.
- b. Present: Mike Wood (MW); Howard Delo (HD); Larry Engel (LE); Tim Hale (TH); Tam Boeve (TB).
- c. Absent: Andy Couch; Amber Allen; Robert Chlupach; Bruce Knowles.
- d. Quorum (5 minimum): Quorum established.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

- a. Moved by: *LE moved to approve the agenda as presented;*
- b. Seconded by: *HD*
- c. Motion result: ***Motion passed unanimously.***

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. November 19, 2020
 - i. *Moved by: HD moved to accept the minutes as presented;*
 - ii. *Seconded by: LE*
 - iii. Corrections? None [S. Braund later contacted staff about a misspelling of his name in the minutes; corrected]
 - iv. Motion result: ***Motion passed unanimously.***

IV. AUDIENCE INTRODUCTIONS & PARTICIPATION (3 min./person, chair's discretion)

- a. Jim Sykes: discussed wetland mitigation ordinance and North Pacific Fisheries Management Council.
- b. Steve Braund, Northern District Set Netters Association of Cook Inlet.
- c. Kendra Zamzow, Environmental Program Manager, Chickaloon Native Village.
- d. Neil Dewitt
- e. Becky Long, Talkeetna.
- f. Bill Stoltze.

V. STAFF/AGENCY REPORTS & PRESENTATIONS

- a. Staff report/correspondence
 - i. Ted Eischeid gave a staff report.

VI. ITEMS OF BUSINESS

i. NPFMC Action on Cook Inlet Salmon FMP

1. Discussion:

- a. LE: Alternative 4 came from ADFG; how the state manages areas will impact the benefits/costs of the NPFMC decision; the basic concept in alternative 4 has been one we have basically supported in our past decisions;
- b. HD: We need to pay close attention to BOF and ADFG activities going forward in light of the NPFMC decision;
- c. MW: Need to watch what the BOF could do out-of-cycle and what ADFG might do as well;
- d. LE: This issue came about because state wants this kind of management; doesn't expect big changes from BOF;
- e. MW: Feels confidence, but need to watch lower Cook Inlet comm. fish managers; Will this be appealed?
- f. HD: Yes, expect litigation.

2. No action taken.

ii. Alaska Board Of Game Proposals-Comments and Action

- 1. Motion: *LE moved to postpone action on BOG proposals until the FWC BOG committee finds out more information about the various proposals and comments on them; HD seconded.*
- 2. Action: ***Motion passed unanimously.***

iii. West Susitna Access Road Project Update

- 1. Discussion: HD – Becky Long's comment was awesome; MW – discussed impact on RS 20-123 on future WSAR projects regarding wetlands; Stefan – new borough manager is very interested in fisheries, recommends FWC formally dialogue with Assembly and Manager about FWC accomplishments/committed to work with Ted on facilitating a dialogue.

2. Motion: *LE moved that the FWC create a committee authorized to draft and forward a letter to Mayor Halter regarding FWC opposition to RS 20-123 that would stop all work on any draft supplemental wetland mitigation ordinance given possible future impacts from the WSAR project; committee to consist of MW, TB, and HD; HD seconded.*
3. Action: ***Motion passed unanimously.***

iv. Vacant FWC positions for 2021

1. Motion: *HD moved to create a FWC committee consisting of HD, LE, and MW to further explore recommending qualified candidates to the open FWC positions; LE seconded.*
2. Action: **Motion passed unanimously.**

v. Governor's Conservationist of the Year Award nominations

1. Discussion: HD shared recent information he received about this from ADF&G; will forward to Ted for sharing with FWC.

VII. MEMBER COMMENTS

- a. HD: I wish everyone a happy holiday season.
- b. LE: I echo HD's wishes for a happy holiday season; would like to see us sit down with the new borough manager and assembly members to open up some lines of dialogue.
- c. HE: Merry Christmas.
- d. TB: Apologizes for being a little late to today's meeting.
- e. MW: Excited about our FWC work together; happy holidays.

VIII. NEXT REGULAR MEETING – January 21, 2021, 4 PM – AGENDA AND PRESENTATION IDEAS?

- a. WNRAC Collaboration

IX. ADJOURNMENT

- a. Moved by: *HD*
- b. Seconded by: *TB*
- c. Motion result: ***Motion passed unanimously.***

Meeting stands adjourned at: 6:00 PM.

Mike Wood, Chair

Dated

ATTEST:

Ted Eischeid, Planner II Staff

Dated



MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH

Planning and Land Use Department

Planning Division

350 East Dahlia Avenue • Palmer, AK 99645

Phone (907) 861-7833

<http://www.matsugov.us> • planning@matsugov.us

Date: 21 January 2021

Re: FWC Staff Report

--

1. Supplemental Wetlands Mitigation Ordinance update

- a. Summary of Mayor/Assembly action on RS 20-123.
- b. Current work.

2. Best practices for communicating with MSB Management/Elected Officials

- a. Via FWC Resolution/how to?
- b. If via committee motion, best to bring back committee resolution/letter for better public process and full FWC approval.

3. Consider additional communications within the MSB:

- a. Consider having a meeting with Mgr. Brown to orient him to the FWC's work.
 - i. Involve Planning Director Alex Strawn and Manager Kim Sollien.
- b. Consider briefing new Assembly on FWC issues intermittently during 2021/work with Manager and Stefan.

4. National Fish Habitat Partnership Board Seat for Local Government representative-update.

5. Agenda items-staff review:

- a. Alaska BOG Proposals
- b. Anchorage WNRAC-MDB FWC collaboration options.

Providing Outstanding Borough Services to the Matanuska-Susitna Community

Ted Eischeid, Planner II

Supporting Environmental Planning and the MSB Fish & Wildlife Commission.

Ted.eischeid@matsugov.us Ph. 907.861-8606, Cell 795-6281

- c. West Susitna Access Road Project Update.
- d. Governor's Conservationist of the Year Award.
- e. FWC Vacancies/Recognition of recent members.
 - Bruce Knowles – ex officio nonvoting member (for previous FWC member).
 - Bob Chlupach – Member 4 At Large seat.
 - Amber Allen – Member 5 At Large seat.

From: [Nicholas Spiropoulos](#)
To: [Theodore Eischeid](#)
Cc: [John Aschenbrenner](#)
Subject: RE: Legal opinion requested by the MSB Fish and Wildlife Commission
Date: Monday, December 14, 2020 11:59:21 AM
Importance: High

I don't have a whole lot to offer about whether it's a good idea or not.

That's really a policy call.

When you read the justifications, the proposed change from the 2 different groups are attempting to change the requirements to obtain a resident sport fishing license to be the same as the requirements to obtain a PFD in Alaska. If the proposal gains traction, the State of Alaska Department of Law will be involved in reviewing the process for proposed changes to any regulations. There may be some legal issues in the way the language is written, but I would say at this point, the commission can pass a resolution as to whether the MSB should support the change in concept or not.

My observation is that under the current regulations, the list of things from (A) to (I) are the things people can use to show evidence of domicile to qualify for the resident licenses. The concept of proposal says that if a person meets the residency qualifications for a PFD, then they get the resident license, and if not, they should not qualify for the resident license. That would seem to render the list of things from (A) to (I) as unnecessary because the PFD has its own residency eligibility set out in AS 43.23.005.

Without digging through all the regulations I can't say whether there is a better way to define the resident vs. non-resident license and associated fees to capture the concept. I'm not sure the only change would be to change the definition of "domicile" in the regulations. There could be other changes warranted as a result, but they aren't addressed in the proposals here.

My opinion to the commission is that this is probably not the best way to address the issue. The proposal should be more clear that satisfying residency requirements to be eligible for the PFD is the only way to qualify for the resident licenses. Leaving the list of things in (A) through (I) could cause confusion because I'm sure the PFD has its own regulations on how to comply with the requirements of AS 43.23.005.

Again, our MSB commission can simply take up the concept of the proposal and take a position on whether the MSB should support such a proposal before the state board.

FYI, this is NOT an area the MSB commission can send direct to the State. Administration of fees and licenses is not covered under MSB 4.75.010(A), but rather is an issue under MSB 4.75.010(B), so the advice is to the Manager and Assembly about whether the MSB should take a position.

The only matters the MSB commission can give direct advice to entities outside the Manager and Assembly relate to the "conservation and allocation of fish, wildlife, and habitat" and license structure and fee structure do not fall into that.

Nicholas Spiropoulos | Matanuska-Susitna Borough Attorney |

nspiropoulos@matsugov.us | (907) 861-8677

From: Theodore Eischeid <Ted.Eischeid@matsugov.us>
Sent: Thursday, December 3, 2020 2:25 PM
To: Nicholas Spiropoulos <Nicholas.Spiropoulos@matsugov.us>
Cc: John Aschenbrenner <John.Aschenbrenner@matsugov.us>
Subject: Legal opinion requested by the MSB Fish and Wildlife Commission

The MSB Fish and Wildlife Commission chair recently made a request of me to forward a question to MSB Legal regarding some work on two Alaska Board of Fisheries proposals.

These Board of Fisheries proposals, 235 and 236, would make changes in the definition of *domicile* in sport fishing regulation, as it relates to requirements for qualifying as a resident versus a nonresident sport fish license. In short, the proposals would require a person buying a resident license use the same definition/evidence of “domicile” as used by the Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend in order to determine Alaska residency.

From the Borough Attorney’s perspective, would this be an acceptable way to administer hunting/fishing licenses? Has a similar definition of domicile been used in other places? The FWC would desire any legal opinion on this issue.

The details on these two proposals, 235 and 236, can be found here, pages 224-231:
http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/static/regulations/regprocess/fisheriesboard/pdfs/2020-2021/proposals/proposal_book.pdf

Any opinion on the strengths and weaknesses of the two proposals would be appreciated. The FWC would like to discuss these proposals at their December 17 meeting.

Thank you

--

Ted Eischeid, Planner II

Matanuska-Susitna Borough
350 E. Dahlia Ave
Palmer AK 99645

Ph. 907.861-8606

--

Providing Environmental Planning and Mat-Su Fish & Wildlife Commission services <•)(((((<

--

--

<https://www.matsugov.us/planning>

29 October 2020 FWC – BOG Notes

Notes: FWC BOG Committee

29 October 2020

3:30 PM –5:50 PM

Present: Howard Delo HD, Andy Couch AC, Mike Wood MW.

HD facilitator.

Regional and Multiple Unit Proposals

Proposal 1 - Shift to later moose hunting seasons in Units 13 and 14:

- HD: lots of archery proposals; ADFG may have concerns about extending seasons into October (extend from Sept. 21 to Oct. 9) since it may lead to an overharvest; MW: thinks time shift will have a huge impact and is unreasonable; rut issues might make meat less attractive; smaller expansion would be better;
- Do we want to comment on this?
 - MW: Not for this proposal with such a long extension. Unit 14 offers a little extra time; open to the idea, but not to Oct. 9th.
 - AC: from a spike/50 perspective there shouldn't be an issue; this could happen, but the reason we have hunts happen earlier is for school kids to participate; HD – no earlier start, but extending the end by about 19 days; in the past we've had seasons go to Sept. 30th; I have no problem going to Sept. 30th like in the past; Dept. would have biggest issue with 13, since 14 already goes Sept. 25.
 - HD: doesn't mind a minor extension to Oct. 1, but thinks Oct. 9 is too long; concurs with MW. No one seems to object to extending the season, just not to so late.
 - **WE SUPPORT THE CONCEPT OF EXTENDING THE SEASON, BUT HOW MUCH SHOULD BE FURTHER DISCUSSED. WE RECOMMEND SEASON BEING EXTENDED TO EITHER SEPT. 25TH OR SEPT. 30.**

Proposal 2 – Establish archery seasons for Dall sheep...

- HD: no position; some concern about all these special hunts being proposed; if all these are approved, the black powder enthusiasts will ask for same; based on this tends to lean against; brought up prop. 3; said indicators show sheep population was reduced; sheep hunters are a distinct minority; .

- MW: did not read this one; needs more time to study this; around the state sheep populations reduced due to high snow loads last winter; brought up Emperor Goose draw hunt proposal that is a better proposal to the sheep proposals
- AC: Prop 2, 4, 5 are all registration dall sheep hunts, which is generally free to the public and just takes time away from Dept; provides a significant larger opportunity for hunters; provides opportunity and economic impact for local communities;

Proposals 2, 3, 4, 5 – **NO CONSENSUS**; one for, one against, one neutral.

Proposal 6 – Brown Bear Exemption Fee

- HD: supports.
- AC: no problem supporting from a couple standpoints; from MSB perspective, maybe prefer us not taking a position on this; supports proposal.
- MW: don't totally understand this prop/ HD explained – this prop makes it easier to take a bear; MW supports.

○ **SUPPORT**

Prop. 7 – Black Bear bag limit increase

- AC: since predation plan went away in 16, I've noticed more bear tracks; HD – that predator control program expired; favors a larger bag limit, but knows there are people in the MSB who would rather see one rather than shoot one; representing the MSB, we don't need this higher five bear limit. No position.
- MW: This only has advantages if you are bear baiting or guiding over bait; not sure anyone needs five bears a year versus the present three black bear limit; inclined to leaving bag limit at three.
- HD: would be useful to have the Dept.'s comments on these;
 - **NO ACTION RECOMMENDED.**

Prop. 8 – Shorten Coyote Trapping Season

- AC: does not have a desire to harvest a coyote.
- HD: would like to know what is happening with population levels.
- MW: suggests no comment.
 - **NO ACTION RECOMMENDED.**

Prop 9 – Extend Wolf Trapping Season

- **NO ACTION RECOMMENDED**

Prop 10 – Allowing harvest of beaver via bow/arrow with a trapping license.

- **NO ACTION RECOMMENDED**

Prop 11 – Add bow/arrow to legal methods for taking beaver.

- **NO ACTION RECOMMENDED**

GLENNALLEN REGION, P. 62

Prop 51 – Bison Hunting

- MW: doesn't know much about it, whether this is good or bad; does this even fall within the MSB? No .
- HD: same; herd has moved east and south unexpectedly; animals have become a nuisance to vehicles traveling the McCarthy Road; .
- AC: would the native association be opposed?;
 - **NO ACTION RECOMMENDED**

Prop. 52 – Repeal pre-2018 caribou hunting regs

- MW: conflicted about these community hunt definitions; not a huge fan of these; see prop. 74 as an alternative to support instead;
- HD: we can take no position without objection.
 - **NO ACTION RECOMMENDED**

Prop. 53 – Caribou subsistence hunt increase allocation.

- MW: not keen on this?
- AC: no support for this; when you allocate to this you are taking away from other hunts.
 - **OPPOSED.**

Prop 54 – Increase youth caribou hunt in 13 (p. 64 of booklet):

- Proposal is for "increase" in youth caribou hunt.
 - **OPPOSED.**

Prop 55 – Goat hunt

- HD: Okay, but ultimately depends on dept. analysis.
- MW: No position
- AC: No position
 - **NO ACTION RECOMMENDED**

Prop 56 – Moose season expansion via bow/arrow in 11

- HD: Oppose.
- AC: No position.
- MW: No position.
 - **NO ACTION RECOMMENDED**

Prop 57

- **NO ACTION RECOMMENDED**

Prop 58 – Reauthorize antlerless moose season in 13.

- HD: Supports; gives ADFG a mgmt. tool.
- AC: Supports; doesn't make a whole lot difference what we do, but generally support giving ADFG tools as populations go up and down; may issue "up to 200 permits".
- MW: only okay if it is limited in scope; ADFG has better ways to achieve this proposal, similar to prop 62; not the best way to manage in this area; would like to hear from ADFG; John Schandelmeier didn't support this.
 - **NO CONCENSUS.**

PROP 59

- AC: has strong opinion; not a lot of moose out there to take; no position.
 - **NO CONCENSUS.**

PROP 60

- HD/MW: oppose
- AC: concurs.
 - **OPPOSED.**

Prop 61

- HD: Oppose
 - MW: Oppose
 - AC: No position
- **NO CONCENSUS**

Prop 62

- HD: Supports.
 - MW: Opposed.
 - AC: Supports.
- **NO CONCENSUS**

Prop 63

- HD: Opposed.
 - MW/AC: Opposed
- **OPPOSED**

Prop 64

- HD: Can live with opposition.
 - AC: Opposed.
 - MW: Opposed.
- **OPPOSED**

Prop 65

- **OPPOSED**

Prop 66

- MW: Have always been a little confused by this approach; wording needs clarification; can see where it might clarify things;
 - HD: Adding the word “state” clarifies the regulations.
 - AC: I can go either way.
- **NO POSITION**

PROP 67

- **NO POSITION**

PROP 68

PROP 69

- MW: see very few brownies in 13
- HD:
- AC: recommend no position.

- **NO POSITION**

Prop 70

- MW: Opposed to this, especially going moose hunting and running into someone's bear bait station.
- AC: support MW's position that this could create a dangerous situation for some, so opposes this prop.

- **OPPOSED.**

Prop 71

- **NO POSITION**

Prop 72

- **NO POSITION**

Prop 73

- **NO POSITION**

Prop 74

- MW: talked to John S. about this; gives an option for some nonmotorized users to harvest before community hunt as an additional opportunity; knows more people who are using nonmotorized options to hunt; likes how its written; okay with no position.

- AC: likes nonmotorized options to some extent; believes there might be legislation that guarantees motorized use; would oppose this, or would accept no consensus.
- HD: can't see any reason against it.
 - **NO CONCENSUS.**

Prop 75

- MW: gave some background, attempt by proposer to keep this area from being overrun by motorized users; a local "pissing match"; not sure this is the appropriate venue for this issue;
- HD: No comment, but needs more discussion at FWC.
- AC: Don't know the situation there, but some places are overrun with people driving, and sometimes has used these routes for access;
 - **NO POSITION;**
 - **NEEDS FURTHER FWC CONSIDERATION.**

PROP 76

- MW: I'm Oppose.
- AC; prefer status quo, and oppose this.
 - **OPPOSED**

Prop 77

- HD: stay status quo?
- MW: no position.
- AC: opposes this.
 - **NO POSITION**

NEXT MEETING ON MONDAY, NOV. 2, AT 4 PM.

Proposals 78-100, Palmer Area Proposals – Units 14A, 14B, and 16; all here at 4:01 PM:

PRESENT: HD, MW, AD, TE as notetaker.

MW: Might want to change our positions as we discuss these props with our communities/AC during the next week or so; encourages us to reach out to our respective ACs, contacts, etc.

HD: When ADFG gets their comments out about Thanksgiving we might want to consider those in making changes to our positions; comments to BOG due early January; gives time for changes at Dec. 17 meeting.

AC: Committee recommends to FWC, but FWC can change position recommendations as new information comes to light;

HD: We aren't an AC, so we won't get as much time to testify, but we could emulate the AC approach in time-abbreviated fashion that benefits the BOG.

Prop 78 – Extend caribou season in 16B:

- HD: language is a bit confusing; deals with old bulls; belongs to a group that is overshooting the 40 mile herd, doesn't see the access rationale stated.
- AC: talked to someone with a permit there previously, and understands that the herd is really low there; extending the season will increase odds for harvest; extension to Sept. 30th; sees no reason to extend/opposes.
- MW: would oppose as well; needs more info on hunting in 16B; AC: Rainy Pass; ADFG has tools to manage already;

○ **OPPOSED**

Prop 79 – reauthorize antlerless moose permits in 14A and B.

- HD: supports; gives ADFG another tool in management, see language on p. 83 “up to” ceiling language, so it gives management flexibility.
- MW: if ADFG thinks they need this tool we should give it to them, especially for moose near roadways.
- AC: agrees with MW; had problems with the targeted hunt; only going to have this is animals are near the road; 14B moose population is down, doesn't anticipate many permits given out; 14A data shows good opportunity to take moose there; biologist didn't think they had ever given out the full 2000 permits; this gives the ADFG some flexibility in managing the moose population; supports this.

○ **SUPPORT**

Prop 80 – create a resident youth hunting season for any bull moose in unit 14A:

- MW: if there is a large moose population, this is a great way to manage that;
- HD: one issue might be that the ADFG want to keep a minimum of 20 bulls: 100 cows; heard they are hovering around that; ADFG might think this might result in an excessive bull harvest below that ratio – stated noncommittal fashion.
- AC: talked to Chris B who sees this as an allocative decision, good or bad; the way it is written this should overharvest the bulls; see Ted Spraker's prop 155; low draw probability for the individual; I can see supporting this; .
 - **SUPPORT the concept;** some concern about how late the season runs.

Proposal 81 – allow muzzle loading/black powder cartridge long guns for moose in 14A and B

- HD: my proposal; was written to allow black powder muzzle loading and black powder cartridge take to targeted hunts; shared parts of his write up/rationale; uses the existing bison black powder minimums for these moose hunts; a targeted hunt definition centers about a draw hunt that you can only apply for online during the month of October; hunt usually runs January to mid-March, depending upon snow load and when it might concentrate animals along roadways; No difference in black powder ballistics between similar black powder cartridges and muzzle loading calibers; Chris's concern is with the single shot and the ability to put a moose down;
- AC: I understand everything you said; can you already use black powder tools in the restricted hunts? Would support this.
- MW: would support this.
 - **SUPPORT**

Prop 82 – Extend by two days current bow only general moose season in 14A, B and 16A.

- HD: one reason ADFG closes for a separation-allows moose to settle down, perhaps to prevent illegal take scheme.
- AC: not many bow hunters out on Susitna Flats; allows for more opportunity, and support it on those grounds.
- MW: supports.
 - **SUPPORT**

Prop 83 –

- AC: Determining a legal bull is already difficult, and this adds to that; I would oppose this strongly; many others that a lot of people have had problems with this.
- MW: agrees with AC. You really need to know what you're looking at.
- HD: most problems with the accidental illegal bull moose take is that the moose is just short of 50, although it is easier to count brow tines = thinks that's the rationale behind this.
 - **OPPOSE**

Prop 84 – Establish an antlerless moose season in Unit 16B

- HD: supports.
- AC: talked to Chris about numbers; some concern that moose population in 16 is significantly down; these numbers are well over the top of the 7500; that's where you should allow some harvest here; but if numbers are low the ADFG won't allow harvest; this would allow more opportunity; HD agrees.
- MW: many of these regs depend upon hunter access; this is a really hard area for hunters to access, so is open to this proposal/would support.

○ **SUPPORT**

Prop 85 – Establish a registration hunt for bull moose limited to...

- MW: a lot of bow proposals... I would like the idea of a winter hunt since a snow machine would make for more accessibility;
- HD: proposal shows low archery impact; ADFG can always not issue the registration hunt; hard area to get into; could provide more opportunity; I agree with AC; we are seeing a steady increase in bow hunter education; biologically shouldn't be a problem; bow hunters are asking for a lot in this cycle; black powder folks are asking how about us?; no objection at this point.
- AC: DM540 any moose drawing permit; don't think a substantial number of bulls would be harvested; doesn't think it would be negative biologically; more benefit than loss; I'll support.

○ **SUPPORT**

Prop 86 – bag limits for Dall sheep in 14A

- HD: would support; would like ADFG info.;
- AC: this covers the drawing permit areas, and only a few are given out; biggest problem are hunting guides selling a trip for a big ram; ADFG info three quarters of rams die naturally before they get to full curl; issue of determining of whether it is a legal animal or not; does not support this.
- MW: likes the idea of it being a full curl; thinks Talkeetna's get hit hard by the guide companies; supports this proposal, but understands AC concern.

○ **NO CONSENSUS**

Prop 87 – Change the bag limit for Dall sheep permit hunts in 14A

- HD: taking an already complex drawing hunt regulations and making it more complex;
- AC: this will allocate permits to archery; would make remaining permits somewhat restricted; this allocating at least half of sheep hunt opportunity to the archery community; can not support.
- MW: I agree with AC.

○ **OPPOSE**

Prop 88 – Establish an archery only season for Dall sheep in Unit 14

- HD: last I heard Dall sheep population under some stress; would this only stress sheep population more?
- AC: the archers aren't going to kill many sheep; everybody who wants to participate who wants to; archers might push sheep higher, making it harder for later rifle hunters; but not unlike what hikers do; this shouldn't adversely affect the sheep much; we should support this.
- MW: kind of agrees with AC, but would like to talk to others; seem like a lot of people, not many sheep.

○ **NO CONSENSUS**

Prop 89 – Establish a registration hunt for Dall sheep open to...

- HD: sees a rift in the archery community between traditional and compound archers; would oppose.
- MW: this is getting a little ridiculous;
- AC: would oppose; too specific to a narrow user group;

○ **OPPOSE**

Prop 90 – Extend the brown bear hunting season in 14A and B

- AC: opposes; understands their rationale, but 14A is pretty populated area; goes into bear baiting season, and baited areas in populated areas would be dangerous.
- MW: would oppose this; not into extending the season.
- HD: By June 30 high probability of a bad fur; not edible either.

○ **OPPOSE**

Prop 91 – Establish a general season by bow and arrow only for brown bear in 14A and B.

○ **OPPOSE**

Prop 92 – Open a year round season for brown bear in 16

- AC: would support;
- MW: would like to know more about brown bear harvest over bait?; seems like the only reason to kill the bear is to kill the bear; could support, but wishy washy; I oppose this after all.

○ **NO CONSENSUS**

Prop 93

- **NO CONSENSUS**

Prop 94 – Establish a general season by bow and arrow only for brown bear within 16A and B

- HD: would oppose.
- AC: would oppose; most archers would bear bait.
- MW: oppose.

○ **OPPOSE**

Prop 95 – Lengthen brown bear season in 16B

- HD: oppose because harvesting something not useable, but wants more info.

○ **NO CONSENSUS**

Prop 96 – Allow the take of black bear in 16B the same day the hunter has flown

- AC: doesn't think we need any more opportunity to use airplanes for harvesting.
- MW: agrees with AC.

○ **OPPOSE**

Prop 97 – Allow beaver to be taken with firearm or archery in 16

- AC: supports.
- MW: supports
- HD: supports

○ **SUPPORT**

Prop 98 – Extend beaver trapping season in 16

- AC: Opposes;
- HD: agrees with AC.
- MW: Opposes.

○ **OPPOSE**

Prop 99 – close areas within 14a, B, and 16A to trapping

- AC: Opposes; has seen the issues that MW raises; most seems reasonable; Hay Flats have many responsible trappers out there;
- MW: Supports; there should be limits here; a huge issue in the MSB; had a problem in Talkeetna; there's a place and time for everything, but we all need to all get along.

- HD: A lot of the MSB problems on the conflicts involve younger trappers; MSB has regulations on keeping pets under control which is an issue; can see both sides.

○ **NO CONSENSUS**

Prop 100 – Remove requirement that traps and snares for beaver be submerged in 16.

- AC: supports the concept.
- MW: does not support.
- HD: sounds like a no consensus.

○ **NO CONSENSUS**

STATEWIDE Proposals

Prop 155 – Establish protocol for ... any bull moose hunt.

- AC: writer thinks it's a money generator; many applicants; in 14A you could add a few any bull drawings; would encourage ADFG to offer any bull permits for any of the antlerless hunts we have in 14A.
- MW: supports; this kind of hunt supports wildlife management; would add the same for 16, especially for winter; would rather hunt moose in winter than fall.
- HD: no problem with this; would like ADFG data; would support;

○ **SUPPORT**

Fishing statewide proposals 235 and 236 – also talk about hunting; residency requirements for purchasing licenses (see p. 224 of fishery packet – 2021 BOF Cycle)

- AC: Modify the definition of domicile; location of the person's primary residence that allows person to meet the definition of primary residence according to the PFD requirements; some people come to AK and buy resident hunting and/or fishing licenses, but claim to be residents in two places; would like to consider support; maybe the MSB attorney should look at this?; this should be brought to the BOG attention;
- MW: property owners are not the same as resident; mentioned the Chase (MSB) example; where you vote is your area of residence;
- HD: where is the list of requirements from?/AC: it's the PFD requirements for residency to receive the PFD; agree with MW that where you vote is where you are resident; agrees with AC about asking the MSB attorney; Would this be an acceptable way to administer hunt/fish licenses? Is this done other places?

○ **CONSENSUS TO CONSIDER SUPPORTING** PENDING LEGAL OPINION AND FURTHER DELIBERATION

FINAL THOUGHTS

- How will we manage this discussion at the FWC meeting to keep it from getting too long; will need good time management from chair;
- Ted: consider – giving your recommendations to FWC on Nov. 19; suggest any new information changes; assign them to read/consider/research for the Dec. 17 meeting; consider final FWC action at the Dec. 17 meeting.

From: [HOWARD DELO](#)
To: [Theodore Eischeid](#)
Subject: Fwd: Gov's Conservationist of the Year Award
Date: Thursday, December 17, 2020 10:37:09 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL - CAUTION: Do not open unexpected attachments or links.]

Here's the email I received.

Howard

From: "Grasser, Eddie K (DFG)" <eddie.grasser@alaska.gov>
To: "Rutz, David S (DFG)" <david.rutz@alaska.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 10:19:49 AM
Subject: RE: Gov's Conservationist of the Year Award

Just a friendly reminder

Eddie Grasser
Director of Wildlife Conservation
(907) 444-1973

We are once again seeking nominations for the Governor's Conservationist of the Year Award. Nominations are due by January 29, 2021. Nominations should come from an organization and meet the following criteria.

1. Individual should have a **longstanding** involvement with fisheries and/or wildlife conservation in Alaska
2. He or she should have a **demonstrated** history of supporting the State's authority to manage.
3. Nominees should show they have contributed to the conservation of fish, wildlife and habitat resources, and public access to those resources.
4. Nominees should be able to show they have been active in the promotion of hunting, fishing and trapping, as well as programs to increase outdoor skills; recruitment and retention of anglers and hunters; and supporting conservation education efforts across the state.

Some past winners include: Tina Cuning, Nick & Karen Steen, Randy Zarnke, John Sturgeon, Ron Somerville, Larry Engel and Frank & Sue Entsminger.

Please send your nominations into Kari Winkel at dfg.commissioner@alaska.gov and please include a comprehensive bio and supporting documentation.

Eddie Grasser
Director of Wildlife Conservation
(907) 444-1973

Dave Rutz
Director of Sport Fish
(907) 863-8603