

ALASKA LEGISLATURE COMMITTEE FILES 2007-2008
SRES 12683

ballot is not to assure water quality for its own sake, but to shut down the Pebble Mine. On its face, this might not look much like allocation (just like you might think that "how or when a wolf dies" isn't allocation) but in the end it is. If humans vote a referendum on use of aircraft for controlling predators, the food (game) over which we presently compete will be reallocated, de facto, to the competition. Similarly, if we pass such stringent water quality regulations that no mine can comply, we stealthily allocate the mineral resources to "non-use." I would prefer to see legislation that takes these sorts of ultimate allocation decisions out of the emotional caludron of initiative marketing and puts them in the reasoned frame of the legislature where the Constitution defines them as proper.

Respectfully,

Wayne E. Heimer
Fairbanks

----- Original Message -----

From: Rep. Harry Crawford
To: Wayne Heimer
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2008 3:24 PM
Subject: RE: testimony on HB 348

Mr. Heimer,

After listening to your testimony of March 14th, I was unable to let it go by without comment. Your blanket statements about the motives and tactics of initiative sponsors really irritated me.

There have been a number of initiatives that I did not like and did not vote for, and there will be initiatives in the future that I will not vote for. I will not vote for the anti-pebble mine initiatives because I believe they will have long range detrimental effects on the the whole mining industry of the state. I won't vote for the gambling initiative to expand gambling in Alaska, but I will fight for their right to put it on the ballot and I will trust what the people decide.

In Alaska, the people have the right to be heard through the initiative process and I don't take lightly the responsibility I bear in protecting that right. I will continue to wade in whenever I see that right being threatened.

Also, in each of the initiatives that I have done, I have gathered thousands of signatures personally, and paid out of my own pocket a substantial portion of the cost, as has Eric Croft and David Guttenberg. I don't know where you get it from, that there is big money in initiatives. It has always cost me both money and time.

Sincerely,
Harry T Crawford Jr.

Representative Harry Crawford
East Anchorage District 21
www.akdemocrats.org/crawford
1-888-478-3438 (toll free)
907-465-4565 (fax)

From: Wayne Heimer [mailto:weheimer@alaska.net]
Sent: Monday, March 17, 2008 1:12 PM
To: Rep. Harry Crawford
Cc: Rep_John_Coghill@legis.state.ak.us; Rep. David Guttenberg; Rep. Scott Kawasaki; Rep. Wes Keller; Rep. Mike Kelly; Rep._Jay_Ramras@legis.state.ak.us; Rep. Mike Chenault; Rep. Kevin Meyer; Rep. Bill Stoltze; Rep._Righard_Foster@legis.state.ak.us; Rep. Mike Hawker; Rep._Bill_Thomas@legis.state.ak.us; Rep. Les Gara; Rep. Reggie Joule; Rep. Mary Nelson; Sen. Gene Therriault; Sen. Joe Thomas; Sen. Gary Wilken; Sen. Lyda Green
Subject: testimony on HB 348

Dear Representative Crawford:

I testified (telephonically, from Fairbanks) before the House Finance Committee on HB 348 last Friday afternoon. Several observers have subsequently reported to me that my testimony was troubling for you, and have asked me what I said. I can't recall saying anything that I am unwilling to "stand behind" or defend. I read my testimony from the attached file (subsequent clarifications in brackets,). Perhaps, it will be helpful to you.

In reviewing my testimony, I do note that I failed to specify "wildlife management" initiatives, and may have been understood as speaking of "all initiatives." I did use the term "all initiatives," intending to be understood as "all wildlife initiatives," the narrow focus of HB 348. My use of, "all initiatives" was an overgeneralization inartfully driven by my effort to condense testimony in the interest of time.

I am aware of your involvement with other initiatives, and your predisposition favoring the initiative process. I respect and acknowledge the process. However, not every "Alaskan grievance" is amenable to solution by the initiative process. Art. 11, Sec. 7 makes it clear that "who gets what and how much of Alaska's resources" is one such "Alaskan grievance." I gathered the consensus is that "game" is a state asset. If this is so, I reason that day-to-day wildlife allocations issues are not not now (and should never have been considered) fruitful or practical applications of the initiative process.

I argue we trivialize the initiative process in toto by such minor exercises. The issue of whether or not Alaska might choose to manage (or not) may rise to worthiness for consideration as an initiative (except for the fact the Constitution says we shall manage). I view attempts to prohibit management by banning methods of means of predator control as attempts to stop constitutionally mandated management based on the individual morality of the sponsors. The wildlife initiative record is fairly rich in this regard. How a few wolves might die (and wolves never die prettily) doesn't meet my test of importance in the larger picture.

I found Mr. Jans' testimony much more interesting than mine. Notably, he said he and his friends favor (even pre-emptive, aerially supported) wolf control to prevent "biological emergencies," but his fight "here" is to preserve the constitutional initiative process (which I don't see as under attack). Defense of the initiative process was not his apparent motive when he sponsored the initiative many months before HB 348 was even conceived, and it doesn't match his stance in the "myspace or "you-tube" (sorry if I've spelled it incoorrectly) movie produced by his friends.

Respectfully,

Wayne E. Heimer
1098 Chena Pump Road
Fairbanks, Alaska 99709

Sharon Long

From: Sen. Charlie Huggins
Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2008 11:19 AM
To: Sharon Long
Subject: FW: HB 348

Karen Sawyer, Staff

From: Bruce [mailto:chaakhit@acsalaska.net]
Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2008 10:28 AM
To: Sen. Charlie Huggins
Subject: HB 348

Please support SS for House Bill 348 Board Of Game Regulations

Thank you

Bruce Royce

Sharon Long

From: Sen. Charlie Huggins
Sent: Monday, March 17, 2008 7:33 AM
To: Sharon Long
Subject: FW: Report on Public Testimony Friday 14-HB348

fyi:

Karen Sawyer, Staff

From: rodarno@gmail.com [mailto:rodarno@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** Rod Arno
Sent: Sunday, March 16, 2008 9:34 PM
To: Tom Scarborough
CC: Wayne Heimer; Tinker; Virgil Umphenour; Ron Bless; Steve Vincent; Debby Waugaman-Curnow; Larry Dalrymple; Jason Hite; Al Barrette; Emma Lee Grennan; Bill Larry; Dan Gilson; Rob Hams; Scott Bidwell; Hal Hume; Karen Gordon; Ralph Seekins; Peter Buist; Lynn Levensgood; Jennifer Yuhas; Bud & Sally Burris; gutpile@alaska.com
Subject: Re: Report on Public Testimony Friday 14-HB348

Hi Tom,

I testified in support of HB348 on AOCs behalf the day it was introduced before the H(RES) committee. Although I told the AOC Board the timing of the bill was ill conceived and poorly drafted the AOC board chose to support HB348. Board members could easily see the advantages to AOC members of having the same status that Alaska state courts have given fish apply to game when it came to voter initiatives that could affect renewable resource management.

So far all I've seen HB348 accomplish is that it has given the Anti's and their media disciples another pulpit to spew their lies from. Hopefully the Anti's will end up "cooking their own goose" and the public will reject their lies and vote to defeat the ballot initiative this summer during the primary election. Whether or not the votes are there in the legislature to pass HB348 into law, with legislators up for re-election this fall, remains to be seen. We'll just have to see how that all turns out.

In the future I do think it would be advantageous to all Alaskan hunters if the newly created Alaska chapter of SFW and AOC could work together on game management issues. Feel free to contact AOC whenever you feel their is legislation being introduced that you would like AOC support on. You can rest assured that AOC staff and Board members will be working to pass, defeat, or amend any proposed legislation that would effect game management and allocation in Alaska. So don't be offended when Wayne Heimer or Nick Jans give credit to AOC for influencing the fate of introduced game management legislation. It is a fact, AOC does affect the out come of wildlife legislation in Alaska.

Contact me anytime,
 Rod Arno

On Sun, Mar 16, 2008 at 6:18 PM, Tom Scarborough <scarbrgh@ptialaska.net> wrote:

Wayne missed explaining that Scott Ogan, President of SFW (Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife), testified in favor of HB 348. SFW is really the force behind this bill and AOC has very little to do with it. No one representing AOC testified at this hearing. Scott did a very good job of explaining why we need to help the Courts with a State Stature clearly stating that wildlife is an ASSET.

3/17/2008

From: :om
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2008 10:34 AM
To: Rep. Wes Keller
Subject: *****SPAM***** HB 348

Representative Wes Keller, Myself and my family are behind you in your efforts. We are all outdoorsmen and Women and have started seeing the results of the Predator control program in unit 13. We have seen more Caribou and Moose calfs and although we have not been succesfull in our big game hunts the last two years in unit 13 we are seeing more animals, and know it is just a matter of time untill we see more Leagle animals. Now if we could use our aircraft for caribou hunting in unit 13 we would have a fair chance to harvest an animal just as the atv's and boaters do. I am not shure how it came to pass that how I chose to spend my hard earned money on an aircraft instead of a boat or fleet of atv's, that it would elimanate us from participating in this hunt. My family has hunted this area with aircraft since 1965.

Thank you for your time.

Good luck!
Randy Apling
Sharon Apling
Tyler Apling
Trisha Apling
Floyd Apling
Ardith Apling

Anchorage, AK 99501
91

More new features than ever. Check out the new AOL Mail!

2/13/2008

From: patti barber [mailto:patti.barber@alaska.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2008 9:53 AM
To: Rep. Wes Keller
Subject: HJR 31 and HB348

I support these bills as written. This will enhance the value of the wild food source.

Kenny Barber

Palmer, AK 99645

2/13/2008

From: O'Connor

Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2008 9:56 AM

To: Rep. Wes Keller

Dear Representative Keller,
I support HB 348.

Patrick O'Connor

14. 1-1
Palmer, AK 99645

2/13/2008

From: Dane Crowley
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2008 9:42 AM
To: Rep. Wes Keller
Subject: HB 348 and HJR 31

Dear Representative Wes Keller,

Thank you first for your service to the State of Alaska and for bringing the HB 348 and HJR 31 to the attention of our government body. Both of these speak to issues plaguing Alaska and must be addressed.

I whole-heartedly support HB 348 and would like to offer the following comments;

- 1) It puts Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game back into the correct role of managing Alaska's fish and game resources for ABUNDANCE and not managing people through archaic seasons, bag limits and poorly designed experiments like the proposed "any ram" hunt in 14A and 13D.
- 2) It gives Alaskans preferential use of game resources. I would like to again bring up the proposal #158 to take 13D and 14 A and eliminate an open sheep hunt for Alaskans, turn it into a draw and reduce opportunity for Alaskans by 2/3 AND allocate 10% permits for non-residents. If there are not enough sheep to have an open hunt there can be no opportunity for non-residents. I say ADF&G must manage for more sheep not limit opportunity, this bill sets it straight.
- 3) Puts into code (Pullen v Ulmer) that game is an asset much like it defined fish.
- 4) This is backed by independent tourist industry business people, backed by hunter groups, subsistence hunters, guides and native organizations because it manages for abundance and reduces in-fighting amongst Alaskans.
- 5) Allows Alaska to manage game without meddling from outside special interest with single-minded objectives not compatible with the Alaskan way of life or constitution.
- 6) Last but not least this does not change any law, law on initiatives, it simply clears the air and helps everyone see the job at hand and give them a base to work off of to do that job.

HJR 31 put another tool in our wildlife manager's tool box and we must be willing to try. If we can take nothing else from the aerial wolf control of Alaska's pre-statehood days, it's that 30 years of intense wolf eradication efforts failed to kill all of or even place Alaska's wolves into a threatened or endangered category. We simply need to put things back into balance. Like it or not People are part of the ecosystem and we are obligated to manage, let manage for healthy moose, caribou, sheep AND bear and wolves.

Thank you for your efforts and I would be more than willing to speak or lend my voice anytime. Keep up the good fight.

Dane Crowley
Life Member FNAWS and current board member
Life member SFW/SFH and current board member SFH.
Palmer Alaska

From: jason kottsick [mailto:jason.kottsick@alaska.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2008 8:51 AM
To: Rep. Wes Keller
Subject: I support you!!!!

Mr. Keller,

I just received an email from Scott [redacted] of the SFW. As a member of SFW, and new Alaska resident, I support what you are standing for. We NEED to have more scientific data to prove that killing predators will in-turn produce more big game and possibly more predators in the future. We must keep aerial predator hunting as a tool to control predators. This is the most humane and effective method that we have. Most importantly though, we need to educate all the people opposed to managing OUR wildlife. They need to understand that what they hear or see on some stupid commercial or from some radical is not always true. People need to learn to rely on sound data that has been produced by our biologists, not rely on what some novel gives them.

I understand that what we are fighting for is very difficult when the folks we are dealing with have a lot of support and money to fight against us. Most of those that oppose this aren't even from Alaska and don't understand subsistence and wildlife management. I respect what you are doing.

Thank you,
Jason Kottsick

Climb to the top of the charts! Play the word scramble challenge with star power. [Play now!](#)

From: Steve Colligan
Sent: Tuesday, February 12, 2008 10:29 PM
To: Rep. Wes Keller
Subject: HB 348 Board of Game Regulations and HJR 31 Oppose Federal Law Re; Aerial Hunting

Dear Representative Keller:

I just wanted to take this opportunity to express my support for HB348 and HJR 31. I fully believe that Alaskans should manage their own resources and follow the process and procedures that are on the books already, that support abundance management. HB348 clarifies the existing relationship between the Department, Board of Game and the Legislature. This will save untold amount of department resources from frivolous challenges from outside interest. I believe that the people nearest the resources have the clearest insight and historical knowledge of game resources in their own back yard. There is an existing process that allows open access between all parties involved, unfortunately outsiders have manipulated this process at the expense of the same people they are claiming to help.

Thank you for this bill to clarify what to many already exists.

HJR 31:

I am in full support of a statement of opposition to Miller of California who is touring his hand brushed show wolf. He is purposely misleading the general public with his Hollywood pet .vs the what really exist in the wild. I am offended that we as Alaskans are his fundraising poster child.

Thank you for bringing these forward for sportsman and subsistence alike.

-Steve Colligan, Wasilla, AK

2/13/2008

From: Rep. Wes Keller
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2008 8:37 AM
To: Jim Pound
Subject: FW: HB 348-HJR 31

From: Dickey, Martin L [mailto:Martin.Dickey@alaska.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2008 8:33 AM
To: Rep. Wes Keller
Subject: HB 348-HJR 31

Good morning Wes Martin Dickey here I am a life long Alaskan of 51+ yrs and have enjoyed many years as an active fisherman and hunter the Bill HB 348 is a good start as to getting this state my home back on track and managing our own resources all resources.

Which brings us to the next topic Bill HJR 31. This bill is also very important in the management of our resources as wolves/predators are very necessary in nature aerial wolf hunting or fly and shoot same day for predator control based on all the available data is a very valuable tool at our disposal and should not be given away this State my State where I choose to live year round and have raised four children who all live and work here also 4 grandchildren who love the outdoors camping, hunting and fishing so lets choose to manage our resources to the best of our ability so there is always enough for all to enjoy.

Sincerely:
Martin Dickey
Wasilla AK. 99654

2/13/2008

From: Corey Rossi
Sent: Tuesday, February 12, 2008 10:13 PM
To: Rep. Wes Keller
Subject: HB 348 and HJR 31

Dear Representative Keller

I am firmly in favor of HB 348 Board of Game Regulations and HJR 31 Oppose Federal Law Re;
Aerial Hunting.

Please keep these important bills moving forward for the good of our beloved game
resources.

Thank you!

Corey Rossi

From: Andrew Zajac .
Sent: Tuesday, February 12, 2008 9:50 PM
To: Rep. Wes Keller
Subject: HB 348 & HJR 31

Dear Representative Keller,

It has just come to my attention that there will be hearings on HB 348 Board of Game and HJR 31 Oppose Federal Law tomorrow. Please be assured that you have my support. I urge you to protect our fish and game from the encroachment of outside interests who wish to dictate how we Alaskans regulate our wildlife. I have hunted in Alaska since 1970 and have seen the decline in our game populations. Bears and wolves are nice to have around, but as predators, they need to be drastically reduced. The needs of humans come first!!

Thank you for you efforts.

Sincerely,
Andy Zajac

2/13/2008

From: Linda Frey
Sent: Tuesday, February 12, 2008 7:28 PM
To: Rep. Wes Keller
Subject: HB 348 and HJR 31

Dear Rep. Keller,

I am writing to encourage you in your efforts to pass HB 348 and HJR 31. We are 24 year Alaskans who now have 2 younger generations of hunters in the family. We would like to be able to take our 1 year old twins grandsons hunting and fishing as they get older. We are proud to be Alaskans and recognize that Alaskans do know what is best for our state, not outside anti-hunter groups who wouldn't know what to do with a fresh side of moose if it was handed to them.

Thanks for your work on these bills.

Linda and Dana Frey

From: Dane Crowley |
Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2008 11:21 AM
To: Rep. Wes Keller
Subject: HB 348

To Esteemed Alaska Legislator and Public Servant:

Please continue to support Alaska and Alaskans, our right to manage, our right to vote and our constitutional right to the fish and game assets of Alaska.

Please continue to support Alaskans by supporting HB348. This bill strengthens our rights and our right to vote not some outside interest as some would lead you to believe. The bill makes no mention of any change to the initiative process and has no effect on how the initiative process is conducted. This bill also serves as the stop to the unethical and morally incomprehensible divide created by outsiders to pit Alaskans against Alaskans, rural vs. urban, sport vs. subsistence and worse yet, non-native vs. native.

Clarification will end this manufactured debate and allow Alaskans to manage our game. I urge you to take a stand as an elected official to support the Constitution of Alaska and do right by Alaskans. Thanks again for taking the lead on this issue; you are an asset to Alaska.

Sincerely,

Dane Crowley
Palmer Alaska
PO Box 99645

3/11/2008

Jim Pound

From: Wayne Heimer
Sent: Monday, February 18, 2008 11:50 AM
To: Rep. Wes Keller; Representative_Jay_Ramrus@legis.state.ak.us;
Representative_Dave_Guttenberg@legis.state.ak.us; Rep. Scott Kawasaki
Cc: sheephorn@gci.net; kgordon@mosquitonet.com; cmmgen@mtaonline.net; grizzlybear@mosquitonet.com;
dcrowley@npialaska.com; rlee@fnaws.org
Subject: HB 348

Dear Representative Keller, et al.,

I and (the 200 members of) the Alaska Chapter of the Foundation for North American Wild Sheep strongly support HB 348. It is an approach to protecting Alaskans from exploitation via the ballot initiative process which has been needed for a long time. We are thrilled to see it moving legislatively.

Personally, I first saw the need for this legislation when I served as plaintiff in Heimer v. Leman, an attempt to keep the "bear baiting" initiative off the ballot. We were unsuccessful in that attempt, but Alaskans raised enough money to defeat the measure at the ballot box...about \$650K. Now, we're trying to raise **three quarters of a million dollars** to defeat the latest wolf protection initiative driven by established, traditional anti-management interests. These continuing election campaigns are wasteful and divisive on issues that should never have been allowed as subjects of the initiative process. The legislature will serve Alaska well to clarify the status of wild resources as assets of the state and "methods and means" as allocative in nature. This is just constitutional common sense.

As a member of the National Board of Directors for the Foundation for North American Wild Sheep, I can assure you that this organization (representing 6,000 sheep-interested conservationists) also strongly supports this bill, even though support has been by positional consensus and not through formal action.

I understand that commercial fishing interests are opposed to this bill. Please understand that this special interest group fails to understand that it needs this protection because of its traditional political influence and the narrow ruling in Pullen v. Ulmer. These folks think they are immune from assault via ballot initiative: they aren't. About all it will take is a citizen's initiative mandating larger net mesh size to allow more fish to escape upstream (as a matter of "methods and means)", and there will be a horrible fisheries mess. I know of dissatisfied subsistence and personal use fishers who are currently agitating for such an initiative. It's time to act in the best interests of Alaskan fish and wildlife conservation, even if the "fishermen's union" doesn't think it is necessary.

Similarly, the present anti-mining initiatives represent attempts to codify *highly technical regulatory functions* (analogous to fish and wildlife "methods and means" regarding levels of discharge from mining operations) *as law* via the initiative process. This masquerades as "citizen democracy," but is really the tool of a moneyed special interest group bent on frightening the public into codifying its special interest position. We consider this very serious, and reason that HB 348 is the best approach to protecting Alaskans from special interests bent on stifeling use of Alaska's resources by cleverly allocating them to themselves for their special "non-uses." Now may not be the time to deal with the mining issue, but it is certainly the time to address the problem with fish and wildlife.

Thank you for carrying this issue forward.

Sincerely,

Wayne E. Heimer
President, Alaska FNAWS

HB 348 defines Alaska's game resources as an asset of the State and expressly empowers the Board of Game to allocate these assets. This change will bring Alaska's Board of Game statutes in compliance with recent Alaska Supreme Court case law which recently ruled that fish are an asset of the State.

2/22/2008

Jim Pound

From: Rick and Paris Kinmon
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2008 10:59 AM
To: Rep. Wes Keller
Subject: Support of HB348 and HJR31

Dear Representative Keller:

I just wanted to take this opportunity to express my support for HB348 and HJR 31. I fully believe that Alaskans should manage their own resources and follow the process and procedures that are on the books already, that support abundance management. HB348 clarifies the existing relationship between the Department, Board of Game and the Legislature. This will save untold amount of department resources from frivolous challenges from outside interest. I believe that the people nearest the resources have the clearest insight and historical knowledge of game resources in their own back yard. There is an existing process that allows open access between all parties involved, unfortunately outsiders have manipulated this process at the expense of the same people they are claiming to help.

Thank you for this bill to clarify what to many already exists.

HJR 31:

I am in full support of a statement of opposition to Miller of California who is touring his hand brushed show wolf. He is purposely misleading the general public with his Hollywood pet vs the what really exist in the wild. I am offended that we as Alaskans are his fundraising poster child.

Thank you for bringing these forward for sportsman and subsistence alike.
Respectfully,
Rick Kinmon
Wasilla, AK

2/22/2008

Jim Pound

From: Matt & Jacelyn Mahoney ,
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2008 8:04 AM
To: Rep. Wes Keller
Subject: Complete support of HB 348; thank you for supporting us.
Attachments: Matt's Moose 2008.JPG

Dear sir,

As part of a larger group of scientifically educated, politically active, sportsman I would like to thank you for sponsoring this bills. Currently there are some glaring problems with the way we (Alaskans) are "allowed" to manage our fish and wildlife resources. Politics and emotion have replaced science as the primary management tool regarding our predator / prey relationship, and managers have become so hamstringed all they can do is provide a "opportunity" to harvest an animal. I don't want an "opportunity" that includes restricted bag limits and shorten seasons. I want more animals. Thank you for sponsoring this bill and know there is a growing group of us sportsman who stay polittically active and will throw our votes behind those who support us.

Matt Mahoney

2/22/2008

Jim Pound

From: Kathryn Folsom [
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2008 6:48 AM
To: Rep. Wes Keller
Subject: HB 348 & HJR31

LONG OVER DUE FOR THIS LEGISLATION - BILL FOLSOM PALMER

2/22/2008

Jim Pound

From: Terry/Lucy Thisius ,
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2008 2:18 PM
To: Rep. Wes Keller
Subject: HB348

Re: HB348

Wes:

I am a 27 year resident of the state and an avid outdoors man. I am writing to urge your support along with your colleagues to pass this bill. I have been getting more and more aggravated by the special interest groups and their deep pockets meddling in our board of game decisions. The game and fish in this state is defined by our constitution as ours (residents of the state), and if this bill is the answer to keep the decisions at the discretion of the boards of fish and game I couldn't be more supportive and urge our legislatures to vote the same.

Thank you,
Terry Thisius
Palmer, AK

Jim Pound

From: K.M. Gordon
Sent: Monday, February 18, 2008 10:51 PM
To: Rep. Wes Keller; Rep. Jay Ramras; Representative_Dave_Guttenberg@legis.state.ak.us;
Rep. Scott Kawasaki
Cc: Wayne Heimer; sheephorn@gci.net; cmmgen@mtaonline.net; grizzlybear@mosquionet.com;
dcrowley@npialaska.com; rlee@fnaws.org; Sue Stancliff
Subject: Please support HB 348

Dear Representatives Keller, Ramras, Guttenberg, and Kawaski:

I live in Fairbanks and encourage you to strongly support HB 348. Alaska's initiative process has become the emotional battleground for extremist environmentalists who continue to attempt to change our game laws according to their philosophical whims. Rather than using the process set forth through the Advisory Committees and the Board of Game, these folks misuse the initiative process and use it to circumvent the legitimate process already in place to effect changes in fish and game laws. This chronic use of the ballot box to make resource allocations has to stop NOW.

The Constitution states that the initiative process cannot be used to allocate the State's resources, and yet these folks, heavily funded by environmental groups from outside of Alaska, use the initiative process as their convenient tool to circumvent the current regulation system.

HB 348 would keep the allocation of natural resources safely protected under the Constitutional mandate as originally intended by its framers rather than at the whim of anti-hunting groups backed by large sums of money who would control our Alaskan lifestyle using our ballot box to accomplish their agenda.

Please support HB 348 and do the right thing to put an end to this backdoor method of allocating our natural resources. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Karen Gordon
PO Box 61414
Fairbanks, AK
457-7189

Support of HB 348

The Governor, in her inauguration speech, told Alaskans that the Department of Fish and Game had a new directive – to manage wildlife for abundance. Many of my friends and I were elated at the prospect of a new day when science rather than politics would rule, and our game populations would return to their previous high numbers. This will not happen without active predator management in some areas. While I hope and pray the Governor's commitment to abundance management does not waver, we have enemies at the door who would undermine the Governor's own priorities.

Under the guise of saving wolves, radical environmentalists have become predators themselves, warring against the people of Alaska to, in essence, take the food right off our plates by not allowing the Department of Fish and Game to manage for abundance as the Governor has said it will. If HB 348 doesn't pass, extremists will continue to abuse the initiative process to steal away the rights of Alaskans to manage our own wildlife and thus feed our people.

The war of extremists is based on emotion, not science. They reject data from the professionals at Fish and Game as inconclusive and inadequate, and cry for more studies simply to delay the demise of predators. And while we are left to haggle over who gets the last moose, the extremists will long ago have had their victory party.

Let's put an end to the abuse of the initiative process that has become the tool of too many outside special interests. Enough pandering to their emotional marketing campaigns and threats of tourist boycotts. Their continuing to make the ballot box their weapon against Alaskans is especially irksome to me when they ignore the process that already exist to deal with such matters. Moreover, it is foolishness to keep going through this debacle every time these environmentalists want to save a wolf but ignore the fact that that wolf will kill hundreds of caribou or moose.

HB 348 would enforce the Constitutional mandate that State resources cannot be allocated through the ballot box. I'm sick of it. I hope you are too.

Karen Gordon
PO Box 61414
Fairbanks, AK 99706

...

From: Andy Ziegler []
Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2008 8:28 PM
To: Rep. Mike Chenault; Rep. John Coghill; Rep. Carl Gatto; Sen. Lyda Green; Rep. John Harris; Rep. Mike Hawker; Sen. Charlie Huggins; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Wes Keller; Rep. Kevin Meyer; Rep. Ralph Samuels; Rep. Bill Stoltze; Rep. Bill Thomas; Sen. Gene Theriault; Sen. Tom Wagoner
Subject: HB 348

I live in Alaska for many reasons, one of which is my hunting rights. I fully support HB348 and I hope each of you do also. Game management by the emotional vote is not very scientific and has no part in our government.

Thanks,
Andrew Ziegler

3/13/2008

From: Richard and Joan Kerr |
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 12:54 AM
To: Rep. Wes Keller
Subject: Support HB348

Please support House Bill 348. It is essential for responsible management of Alaska's heritage of fish and game.

Thank you for supporting HB348.

Richard Kerr

3/20/2008

From: Dan Caldwell
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 11:44 AM
To: Rep. Wes Koller
Subject: HB 348

I strongly support HB 348 for the following reasons.

- Violate the Alaska Constitution by appropriating (or expropriating) the state's wildlife assets, independent of the legislative process (Article 11, Section 7).
- Violate the rights of consumptive users who have already been appropriated a portion of the state's wildlife assets by the legislature.
- Disproportionately harm rural subsistence users who rely on wildlife for food, yet do not have the votes to stop outside interests from harming their ability to hunt.
- Allow outside special interests (with millions of advertising dollars) to control Alaska's wildlife assets, and limit all Alaskan hunters' rights.
- Undermine professional scientific wildlife management

Your support will be greatly appreciated.

Thanks,

Dan Caldwell

3/20/2008

Please get the EMOTIONAL thought out of Alaska's wildlife management once
and for all.
Our decimated wildlife populations deserve a LOGICAL attempt to rebalance the
predator pray equation before it is too late.
Please support Wess Kellers very LOGICAL HB 348
And stop the EMOTIONAL "Balot box biology" forever.

Thankyou , Sincerly Doug Gross Wasilla

Jim Pound

From: on behalf of D. Williams !
Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2008 9:19 PM
To: Rep. Wes Keller
Subject: *****SPAM***** HB348

I urge you to support HB348 and protect my rights to hunt, fish and trap the wildlife in my state.

Wildlife initiatives:

- Violate the Alaska Constitution by appropriating (or expropriating) the state's wildlife assets, independent of the legislative process (Article 11, Section 7).
- Violate the rights of consumptive users who have already been appropriated a portion of the state's wildlife assets by the legislature.
- Disproportionately harm rural subsistence users who rely on wildlife for food, yet do not have the votes to stop outside interests from harming their ability to hunt.
- Allow outside special interests (with millions of advertising dollars) to control Alaska's wildlife assets, and limit all Alaskan hunters' rights.
- Undermine professional scientific wildlife management

David Williams

3/13/2008

From: Tony Russ [
Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2008 7:11 PM
To: Rep. Wes Keller; Rep. Bill Stoltze; Rep. Bill Thomas; Rep. Carl Gatto; Sen. Charlie Huggins; Rep. Mark Neuman; Sen. Lyda Green
Subject: H 348

Legislators,

I thank you all for continually working on our behalf in the realm of fish and game resources. HB 348 is another good step toward classifying our fish and game resources as assets that belong to all of us Alaskans equally, and should be used equally by all of us. Please support this bill, and the Senate Bills that coincide with it.

What also would be great is if we could stop ballot initiatives from being used to manage our fish and wildlife. They have no place in scientific management by professionals.

Tony Russ
www.ChinookShows.com
"Guiding You to Success in the Alaska Outdoors"

Tony@ChinookShows.com

3/13/2008

From: Nina Faust [mailto:fausbail@horizonsatellite.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 26, 2008 7:32 PM
To: Sen. Charlie Huggins
Subject: SB 176

P.O. Box 2994
Homer AK 99603

March 26, 2008

Dear Senate Judiciary Member:

We oppose HB 348 and SB 176 which make wildlife an "asset" or commodity much akin to oil and gas or other resources. It is disappointing that the House passed HB 348. Clearly the intent of these bills is to redefine wildlife as an "asset" so that the public will no longer be able to bring wildlife initiatives to the voters. At the same time this bill's language strengthens the Board of Game mandates for predator control under the intensive game management law. Basically, this bill would make it the Board of Game's job to turn management of our state's wildlife into a game ranch for moose and caribou. Before humans interfered there were more prey and predators which cycled naturally and achieved a dynamic equilibrium.

This was not the intent of our original constitution. Wildlife belongs to all Alaskans, not just hunters and trappers who constitute only 18% of Alaska's adult population. Wildlife also does not just mean moose and caribou. Wildlife should be managed by the Board of Game to protect all species so that healthy ecosystems are maintained throughout the state. Predators are usually the scapegoat for excessive numbers of game taken by hunters. Supporters of these bills don't believe it is for the government to decide management through legislative action or a vote of the people but both these bills specifically address management for hunting to benefit one small segment of Alaskan residents.

Some proponents also argue that it is bad public policy to use the ballot box to impose viewpoints on one group. Citizen initiatives and the right to vote on issues affecting our state, its citizens, and its resources is an important right. The initiatives passed by Alaskans have dealt with policy issues and have not interfered with the Board of Game's mandate to manage for abundance. Nor have the previous, or upcoming, citizen initiatives prioritized game for one group or another as HB 348 and SB 176 do. They've simply set policy standards by which to reach our goals of managing for abundance.

Some argue that hunting and trapping are an extremely important part of Alaska's economy, especially for rural subsistence users. While it is true that hunting and trapping are extremely important in rural subsistence communities, it is increasing less important in most of the urban areas. In fact, tourism based on wildlife viewing and photography are increasingly important aspects of the Alaskan economy. Tourism is the state's largest economic industry behind oil, providing more revenue to the state than any other industry other than oil. It also employs nearly 15% of Alaskans. It is a vital source of income for Alaska's family-owned and rural businesses. Even some rural subsistence communities are beginning to examine the possible role of eco-tourism and wildlife viewing in their own communities. The tourism industry has an

important role in developing wildlife management programs in Alaska and needs to be given a greater voice.

Extremely popular and economically valuable bear viewing should have a role in developing predator control programs that target bear populations. If these bills pass and curtail citizen involvement through the initiative process, a large part of the public and many tourism-related businesses will be disenfranchised.

HB 348 and SB 176 benefit a small group of Alaskans, namely hunters. Non-consumptive citizens of Alaska, visitors, and non-consumptive businesses that rely on our state's wildlife resources have no representation on the Board of Game even though the Board is mandated by law to provide representation to all Alaskans. Instead, every seat is filled by a hunter or trapper. This is not fair public policy to prioritize the state's wildlife resources with legislative actions and yet deny the majority of Alaska's citizens fair and equal representation on the Board of Game and at the same time propose to remove the only recourse available to those disenfranchised by this lack of representation on the Board of Game, which should be a Board of Wildlife.

Proponents argue that the Board of Game considers public input and that the Department of Fish and Game biologists do a good job with science-based wildlife management. Trouble is, there is a disconnect with the BOG. They do not always base their decisions on science. In 2004, ADF&G testified to the Board of Game that they did not have the scientific data to support aerial predator control programs that the Board of Game was interested in adopting. The ADF&G recommended to the Board of Game not to adopt them at that time due to the lack of scientific data to support these predator control proposals. The Board of Game, with strong lobbying by the Chair, chose to ignore ADF&G's recommendation. When the BOG ignores the science, the only checks and balances left is the initiative process. We feel strongly that this balance be maintained. Please oppose SB 176!

Sincerely,

Nina Faust and Edgar Bailey

From: Valerie Connor [mailto:redherring007@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 4:13 PM
To: Sen. Charlie Huggins
Subject: FW: HB 348

March 21, 2008

Dear Senator Huggins,

I have been tracking HB 348 and understand it is scheduled for a hearing on Monday, March 24 in the Senate Resources Committee. The reason I have been tracking this bill is because it concerns me greatly. HB 348 adds language to the statutes governing the Board of Game's use of intensive management programs by changing our wildlife from a public resource to a "public asset" with the following wording:

"the public asset of game is allocated or appropriated"

What does this language do? As an asset, our wildlife resources would be lumped together with oil or minerals, which are out of the reach of public initiatives. HB 348 would remove citizen's initiatives from wildlife resource issues for good, and would nullify the upcoming state wide initiative in August, which 56,000 Alaskan's signed to put on the ballot. It also directly rebukes the vote of the citizens of this state in 2000 when 72% of Alaskan's voted against a constitutional amendment that attempted to remove the initiative process in managing our wildlife resources.

The express intent of this bill is to remove the public from having the means to participate in the management of our wildlife resources. If you have any doubt as to the purpose of this bill, just contact Representative Keller's staff who will tell you in no uncertain terms (as they did my colleague), that this bill will achieve just that-it will take those pesky voters out of the equation since they don't understand the complexities of wildlife management.

The Alaskan constitution mandates that Alaska's resources will be managed for the benefit of all Alaskans. Many of us are increasingly frustrated with how our precious wildlife resources are being managed and how little influence we have. For example, non-consumptive users currently have zero representation on the Board of Game. This despite the fact that 85% of Alaskans do not even hunt! The initiative process is one of the only tools we have left to us to have our voices heard. Please don't vote to take that away.

I ask that you consider this bill carefully, and uphold the will of the people and our constitution by voting NO on HB 348.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.

Respectfully,
Valerie Connor

Anchorage, Alaska 99517

Raymond Watson, Chairperson
Myron P. Naneng Sr., President
Phone (907) 543-7300
Fax (907) 543-3369

AVCP
Association of Village Council Presidents
Administration
Pouch 219, Bethel, AK 99559



Aktachuk
Akiak
Akiakuk
Andreasky
Aniak
Armanatuk
Bethel
Bill Moore's St.
Chitofruk
Chitva
Chuvachuk
Chukochuk
Crooked Creek
Eek
Emmoak
Georgetown
Grudnew Bay
Hamilton
Harper Bay
Lower Kalskag
Upper Kalskag
Kasiguk
Kipruk
Kongiganak
Kurtuk
Kwestuk
Kwiglingok
Lime Village
Mamihall
Mekoryuk
Mtn. Village
Napaimut
Napukuk
Napukuk
Newok
Nigamute
Nunakayak
Nunam Iqua
Nunapitchuk
Ohegamut
Oscarville
Paimut
Pilot Station
Pitka's Point
Platinum
Quinhagak
Red Devil
Russian Mission
Scammon Bay
Sleetmute
St. Mary's
Stony River
Tuluksak
Tuntutuk
Tunuk
Umkumut

April 10, 2008

Honorable Mary Nelson
House of Representatives
Rm. 415, State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

Honorable Lyman Hoffman
Alaska State Senate
Rm. 518, State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

Re: HB348 Support

Dear Representative Nelson and Senator Hoffman,

After obtaining legal review from Sky Starkey and reported concurrence with his opinion from Carol Daniels of Alaska Federation of Natives, that the current language of HB348 (without amendment) does not present any apparent risks to subsistence uses, we withdraw our opposition and request your supporting vote for this legislation. We ask also that you would solicit the support of other bush caucus members to aid in achieving its passage.

Though it appears to simply restate existing authorities already vested in the Board of Game, and its value of impact in future court decisions remains undetermined, we have been informed that it contains significant changes that include increased ability of the state to fight off the ongoing legal challenges by political action groups and organizations avidly opposed to our predator management programs. And further, could also prove instrumental in eventually nullifying the current (and any similar in future) ballot initiative to stop these programs that is scheduled to occur during this summer's primary election in August.

Rural Alaska has been a major victim and suffered by far the greatest harmful consequences from both the 1996 & 2000 initiatives (as noted through annual resolutions on point, unanimously passed from regional non-profits and AFN for 9 consecutive years) through our loss of subsistence harvest opportunities in many areas. Most notably in the AVCP region with the Tier II hunt status imposed on the lower half of GMU 19A in 2006, and the total closure from hunting in our recognized customary and traditional hunting areas of the Stony, Holitna and Hoholitna river drainages.

Since associated risks appear minimal and the potential benefits greater, passage of this bill could well serve our interests better in the long term.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,
Association of Village Council Presidents

Myron P. Naneng, Sr.,
President

Bill History/Action for 25th Legislature

BILL: SB 306

SHORT TITLE: BOARD OF GAME REGULATIONS

BILL VERSION:

CURRENT STATUS: (H) RLS

STATUS DATE: 04/11/08

SPONSOR(s): RESOURCES

HEARD: [REDACTED]

TITLE: "An Act relating to the adoption of conservation, development, and utilization regulations by the Board of Game to address concerns relating to public assets "

Bill Number: [Display Bill](#) [Print Bill](#)

[Full Text](#) [Fiscal Notes](#)

[Display Committee Action with Bill History](#)

Jrn-Date	Jrn-Page	Action
03/21/08	2290	(S) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
03/21/08	2290	(S) RES
04/11/08	2814	(S) RES RPT 2DP 2NR
04/11/08	2814	(S) DP HUGGINS, GREEN
04/11/08	2814	(S) NR STEDMAN, STEVENS
04/11/08	2814	(S) FN1 ZERO(LAW)
04/11/08	2814	(S) FN2 ZERO(DFG)
04/11/08	2859	(S) RULES TO 1ST SUP CALENDAR 4/11/2008
04/11/08	2859	(S) READ THE SECOND TIME
04/11/08	2859	(S) ADVANCED TO THIRD READING UNAN CONSENT
04/11/08	2859	(S) READ THE THIRD TIME SB 306
04/11/08	2859	(S) PASSED Y15 N5
04/11/08	2860	(S) STEVENS NOTICE OF RECONSIDERATION
04/11/08	2860	(S) RECON TAKEN UP SAME DAY Y15 N5
04/11/08	2860	(S) PASSED ON RECONSIDERATION Y15 N5
04/11/08	2874	(S) TRANSMITTED TO (H)
04/11/08	2874	(S) VERSION SB 306
04/11/08		(H) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
04/11/08		(H) RLS
04/11/08		(H) REFERRED TO RULES
04/11/08		(H) RULES TO CALENDAR PENDING REPORT

Similar Subject Match or Exact Subject Match
 FISH & GAME (GAME)
 REGULATIONS
 REGULATORY ACTIONS

Bill Number: [Display Bill](#)

[Next Bill](#)

[Return to Basis Main Menu \(25th Legislature\)](#)

Alaska State House of Representatives
Twenty-Fifth Legislature
Second Session

RCS# 721
Item 6

4-13-08
11:36:02

SB 306
Third Reading
Final Passage

Yeas: 24 Chenault, Coghill, Dahlstrom, Edgmon,^(D)
Fairclough, Foster, Gatto, Harris, Hawker,
Johansen, Joule, Keller, Kelly, Lynn, Meyer,
(D) Nelson, Neuman, Olson, Ramras, Roses, Samuels,
Stoltze, Thomas, Wilson

Nays: 16 Buch, Cissna, Crawford, Doll, Doogan, Gara,
Gardner, Gruenberg, Guttenberg, Holmes,
(A) Johnson, Kawasaki, Kerttula, LeDoux, Salmon,
(A) Seaton

Excused: 0

Absent: 0

SB 306

WORK ORDER REQUEST FORM

W.O. 25-LS1589

KEYWORDS: FISH/GAME, GAME

ASSIGNED: Kane

REQUEST FOR: New Bill

TAKEN BY: Weed

SUBJECT: Fish & Game Appropriation of Resources

REQUESTED FOR: SC SRES

BY: Sharon

PHONE: 465-4907

DELIVER TO: Sen. Huggins; Attn: Sharon -- Cap. 119

INSTRUCTIONS:

Draft a Senate duplicate of CSHB 348(FIN), WO# 25-LS1328\X, relating to the Board of Game.

<p>OBTAIN</p>	<p>SPECIAL DRAFTING INSTRUCTIONS ATTACHED [] AUTHORIZED TO CONFER WITH</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>RETURN _____</p> <p>_____ TO REQUESTOR</p> <p>APPROVED <u> X </u> DIRECTOR, LEGAL SERVICES</p>
<p>REVIEWED _____</p> <p>IN <u>03/19/08</u> DUE <u>for Intro</u></p> <p>TYPED: DRAFT _____ DATE _____</p> <p>FINAL _____ DATE _____</p> <p>PROOFED _____ DELIVERED _____</p>	<p>SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS to TYPING/PROOFING</p> <p>Request for FINAL</p>

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE

Interim:

**600 East Railroad Avenue
Wasilla, Alaska 99654
Phone (907) 373-1842
Fax: (907) 373-4729***



Session:

**State Capitol Building
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182
Phone: (907) 465-2186
Fax: (907) 465-3818**

REPRESENTATIVE WES KELLER DISTRICT 14

MEMO

To: Senator Charlie Huggins

Fm: Representative Wes Keller

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Wes", written over the printed name "Representative Wes Keller".

Date: March 24, 2008

Re: Request for Hearing CS SS HB 348 (FIN)

Please accept this memo and the attached packet as a request for the Senate Resources Committee to schedule pending referral, CS SS for House Bill 348 (FIN) "An Act relating to the adoption of conservation, development, and utilization regulations by the Board of Game to address primary concerns relating to public assets."

CS SS HB 348 will place into game statutory language the words asset and allocation. This language will clearly state that we fully understand that our game are assets and that management decisions are based on that knowledge.

I urge your assistance by placing CS SS HB 348 (FIN) on the Senate Resources schedule at your earliest convenience.

Attachments: Sponsor Statement, CSSSHB 348 (FIN), CSSSHB 348 (RES), SSHB 348, HB 348 Fiscal Note (Law)¹, Fiscal Note (F&G), Fiscal Note (Law), AS 16.05.255, Points from Pullen v. Ulmer, F&G Relationship between wildlife, Wildlife Conservation performance, Sample Board of Game Report, Information on Moose and Caribou, Constituent Support

¹ Revised to Zero with Fin CS

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE

Interim:

**600 East Railroad Avenue
Wasilla, Alaska 99654
Phone (907) 373-1842
Fax: (907) 373-4729**



Session:

**State Capitol Building
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182
Phone: (907) 465-2186
Fax: (907) 465-3818**

REPRESENTATIVE WES KELLER DISTRICT 14 Sponsor Statement

CS FOR SS HB 348 (FIN)

"An Act relating to the adoption of conservation, development, and utilization regulations by the Board of Game to address primary concerns relating to public assets."

For years Alaska has devoted time and money to the management of one of its most valuable renewable resources. Wild Game represents many things to many Alaskans. Be it commercial guiding, hunting, or simply viewing wildlife, Alaska is unique and every Alaskan enjoys the gift of the resource.

Every year, Alaskans and tourists carrying in state or out of state licenses look for the moose, caribou or bear. Every summer thousands of tourist marvel at herds of caribou or a lone moose or sow with her cubs.

Alaska's wildlife is an asset. Without them not as many people would visit the state, which translates into a loss of revenue. Without them, guides would not earn a living and hunters would not put food on the table.

The problem we face is that we have not allowed our Boards of game to manage the resource and **allocate** it for what it actually is an **asset**. CS for SS for House Bill 348 (FIN) will accomplish that by inserting those important words into statute. The language makes it clear to others that it is our asset and we will manage for abundance as promised in the Alaska Constitution.

We urge your support for the language in CS for SS for HB 348 (FIN) to make it clear we understand what our wildlife truly is and what they mean. It is language that is easy to understand whether you live in Alaska or somewhere else.

**E-Mail: Representative_Wes_Keller@legis.state.ak.us
Call Juneau Toll free: (800) 468-2186
Website: www.akrepublicans.org/keller/**

CS FOR SPONSOR SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 348(FIN)

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

TWENTY-FIFTH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

BY THE HOUSE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Offered: 3/18/08

Referred: Rules

Sponsor(s): REPRESENTATIVES KELLER, Kelly

A BILL

FOR AN ACT ENTITLED

1 **"An Act relating to the adoption of conservation, development, and utilization**
2 **regulations by the Board of Game to address concerns relating to public assets."**

3 **BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:**

4 *** Section 1. AS 16.05.255 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:**

5 **(k) This section authorizes the board to regulate regarding the conservation,**
6 **development, or utilization of game in a manner that addresses whether, how, when,**
7 **and where the public asset of game is allocated or appropriated.**

CS FOR SPONSOR SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 348(RES)

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

TWENTY-FIFTH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

BY THE HOUSE RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Offered: 2/27/08

Referred: Finance

Sponsor(s): REPRESENTATIVES KELLER, Kelly

A BILL

FOR AN ACT ENTITLED

1 **"An Act relating to the adoption of regulations by the Board of Game."**

2 **BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:**

3 *** Section 1. AS 16.05.255(d) is amended to read:**

4 **(d) Regulations adopted**

5 **(1) under (a) of this section must provide that, consistent with the**
6 **provisions of AS 16.05.258, the taking of moose, deer, elk, and caribou by residents**
7 **for personal or family consumption has preference over taking by nonresidents;**

8 **(2) under (a)(3), (a)(7), or (a)(10) of this section that implement,**
9 **interpret, or make specific conservation and development of resources and**
10 **utilization of game must primarily concern whether, how, when, and where the**
11 **public asset of game will be allocated or appropriated.**

**SPONSOR SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 348
IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA
TWENTY-FIFTH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION**

BY REPRESENTATIVE KELLER

**Introduced: 2/6/08
Referred: Resources, Finance**

A BILL

FOR AN ACT ENTITLED

1 **"An Act relating to the adoption of regulations by the Board of Game."**

2 **BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:**

3 *** Section 1. AS 16.05.255(a) is amended to read:**

4 (a) The Board of Game may adopt regulations it considers advisable in
5 accordance with AS 44.62 (Administrative Procedure Act) for

6 (1) setting apart game reserve areas, refuges, and sanctuaries in the
7 water or on the land of the state over which it has jurisdiction, subject to the approval
8 of the legislature;

9 (2) establishing open and closed seasons and areas for the taking of
10 game as a means to allocate the asset of game;

11 (3) establishing the means and methods employed in the pursuit,
12 capture, taking, and transport of game as a means to allocate the asset of game.
13 including regulations, consistent with resource conservation and development goals,
14 establishing means and methods that may be employed by persons with physical
15 disabilities;

- 1 (4) setting quotas, bag limits, harvest levels, and sex, age, and size
2 limitations on the taking of game as a means to allocate the asset of game;
- 3 (5) classifying game as game birds, song birds, big game animals, fur
4 bearing animals, predators, or other categories;
- 5 (6) methods, means, and harvest levels necessary to control predation
6 and competition among game assets in the state;
- 7 (7) watershed and habitat improvement, and management,
8 conservation, protection, use, disposal, propagation, and stocking of game;
- 9 (8) prohibiting the live capture, possession, transport, or release of
10 native or exotic game or their eggs;
- 11 (9) establishing the times and dates during which the issuance of game
12 licenses, permits, and registrations and the transfer of permits and registrations
13 between registration areas and game management units or subunits is allowed;
- 14 (10) regulating sport hunting and subsistence hunting as needed for the
15 conservation, development, and preferential use [UTILIZATION] of game;
- 16 (11) taking game to ensure public safety;
- 17 (12) regulating the activities of persons licensed to control nuisance
18 wild birds and nuisance wild small mammals;
- 19 (13) promoting hunting and trapping and preserving the heritage of
20 hunting and trapping in the state.

HOUSE BILL NO. 348

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

TWENTY-FIFTH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

BY REPRESENTATIVE KELLER

Introduced: 1/31/08

Referred: House Special Committee on Fisheries, Resources

A BILL

FOR AN ACT ENTITLED

1 **"An Act relating to the adoption of regulations by the Board of Fisheries and the Board**
2 **of Game."**

3 **BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:**

4 *** Section 1. AS 16.05.251(a) is amended to read:**

5 (a) The Board of Fisheries may adopt regulations it considers advisable in
6 accordance with AS 44.62 (Administrative Procedure Act) for

7 (1) setting apart fish reserve areas, refuges, and sanctuaries in the
8 waters of the state over which it has jurisdiction, subject to the approval of the
9 legislature;

10 (2) establishing open and closed seasons and areas for the taking of
11 fish as a means to allocate the asset of fish; if consistent with resource conservation
12 and development goals, the board may adopt regulations establishing restricted
13 seasons and areas necessary for

14 (A) persons 60 years of age and older to participate in sport,

- 1 personal use, or subsistence fishing; or
- 2 (B) persons under 16 years of age to participate in sport
- 3 fishing;
- 4 (3) setting quotas, bag limits, harvest levels, and sex and size
- 5 limitations on the taking of fish as a means to allocate the asset of fish;
- 6 (4) establishing the means and methods employed in the pursuit,
- 7 capture, and transport of fish as a means to allocate the asset of fish;
- 8 (5) establishing marking and identification requirements for means
- 9 used in pursuit, capture, and transport of fish;
- 10 (6) classifying as commercial fish, sport fish, guided sport fish,
- 11 personal use fish, subsistence fish, or predators or other preferential categories
- 12 essential for regulatory purposes;
- 13 (7) watershed and habitat improvement, and management,
- 14 conservation, protection, use, disposal, propagation, and stocking of fish;
- 15 (8) investigating and determining the extent and effect of disease,
- 16 predation, and competition among fish in the state, exercising control measures
- 17 considered necessary to the resources of the state;
- 18 (9) prohibiting and regulating the live capture, possession, transport, or
- 19 release of native or exotic fish or their eggs;
- 20 (10) establishing seasons, areas, quotas, and methods of harvest for
- 21 aquatic plants;
- 22 (11) establishing the times and dates during which the issuance of
- 23 fishing licenses, permits, and registrations and the transfer of permits and registrations
- 24 between registration areas is allowed; however, this paragraph does not apply to
- 25 permits issued or transferred under AS 16.43;
- 26 (12) regulating commercial, sport, guided sport, subsistence, and
- 27 personal use fishing as needed for the conservation, development, and utilization of
- 28 fisheries;
- 29 (13) requiring, in a fishery, observers on board fishing vessels, as
- 30 defined in AS 16.05.475(d), that are registered under the laws of the state, as defined
- 31 in AS 16.05.475(c), after making a written determination that an on-board observer

1 program

2 (A) is the only practical data-gathering or enforcement
3 mechanism for that fishery;

4 (B) will not unduly disrupt the fishery;

5 (C) can be conducted at a reasonable cost; and

6 (D) can be coordinated with observer programs of other
7 agencies, including the National Marine Fisheries Service, North Pacific
8 Fishery Management Council, and the International Pacific Halibut
9 Commission;

10 (14) establishing nonexclusive, exclusive, and superexclusive
11 registration and use areas for regulating commercial fishing;

12 (15) regulating resident or nonresident sport fishermen as needed for
13 the conservation, development, and utilization of fishery resources;

14 (16) requiring unlicensed fishing vessels present in or transiting the
15 waters of the state to report to the department the quantity, species, and origin of fish
16 on board; in this paragraph, "unlicensed fishing vessel" means a fishing vessel that is
17 not licensed under AS 16.05.490 - 16.05.530;

18 (17) promoting fishing and preserving the heritage of fishing in the
19 state.

20 * Sec. 2. AS 16.05.255(a) is amended to read:

21 (a) The Board of Game may adopt regulations it considers advisable in
22 accordance with AS 44.62 (Administrative Procedure Act) for

23 (1) setting apart game reserve areas, refuges, and sanctuaries in the
24 water or on the land of the state over which it has jurisdiction, subject to the approval
25 of the legislature;

26 (2) establishing open and closed seasons and areas for the taking of
27 game as a means to allocate the asset of game;

28 (3) establishing the means and methods employed in the pursuit,
29 capture, taking, and transport of game as a means to allocate the asset of game,
30 including regulations, consistent with resource conservation and development goals,
31 establishing means and methods that may be employed by persons with physical

- 1 disabilities;
- 2 (4) setting quotas, bag limits, harvest levels, and sex, age, and size
- 3 limitations on the taking of game as a means to allocate the asset of game;
- 4 (5) classifying game as game birds, song birds, big game animals, fur
- 5 bearing animals, predators, or other categories;
- 6 (6) methods, means, and harvest levels necessary to control predation
- 7 and competition among game assets in the state;
- 8 (7) watershed and habitat improvement, and management,
- 9 conservation, protection, use, disposal, propagation, and stocking of game;
- 10 (8) prohibiting the live capture, possession, transport, or release of
- 11 native or exotic game or their eggs;
- 12 (9) establishing the times and dates during which the issuance of game
- 13 licenses, permits, and registrations and the transfer of permits and registrations
- 14 between registration areas and game management units or subunits is allowed;
- 15 (10) regulating sport hunting and subsistence hunting as needed for the
- 16 conservation, development, and preferential use [UTILIZATION] of game;
- 17 (11) taking game to ensure public safety;
- 18 (12) regulating the activities of persons licensed to control nuisance
- 19 wild birds and nuisance wild small mammals;
- 20 (13) promoting hunting and trapping and preserving the heritage of
- 21 hunting and trapping in the state.

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2008 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: HB340C888/FIN-LAW-CN-03-18-08
 Bill Version: CSSHB348(FIN)
 () Publish Date: _____

Identifier (file name): _____ Dept. Affected: LAW
 Title An Act relating to the adoption of regulations by the Board of Game. RDU CIVIL
 Component NATURAL RESOURCES
 Sponsor REPRESENTATIVE KELLER
 Requester HOUSE FINANCE Component Number 2212

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

	Appropriation Required	Information						
		FY 2009	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014
OPERATING EXPENDITURES								
Personal Services	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Travel								
Contractual								
Supplies								
Equipment								
Land & Structures								
Grants & Claims								
Miscellaneous								
TOTAL OPERATING	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES								
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
-------------------------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts								
1003 GF Match								
1004 GF	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1005 GF/Program Receipts								
1037 GF/Mental Health								
Other Interagency Receipts								
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2008) cost: 0.0

POSITIONS

Full-time							
Part-time							
Temporary							

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

This bill constitutes a legislative statement that when the Board of Game acts within its authority to develop regulations for the conservation, development and utilization of game, it is allocating or appropriating a public resource.

Prepared by: Betty Martin, Administrative Services Director
 Division: Administrative Services Division
 Approved by: Talis Colberg, Attorney General
Department of Law

Phone 907-465-5427
 Date/Time 3/18/08 10:00 AM
 Date 3/18/2008

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2008 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: _____
 Bill Version: CS88HB 348(FIN)
 () Publish Date: _____

Identifier (file name): HB348CS88(FIN)-DFG-BSS-03-14-08 Dept. Affected: Fish and Game
 Title: Board of Game Regulations RDU: Administration and Support
 Component: F&G Boards & Advisory Committees
 Sponsor: Representative Keller
 Requester: House Finance Committee Component Number: 2825

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

	Appropriation Required	Information						
		FY 2009	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014
OPERATING EXPENDITURES								
Personal Services								
Travel								
Contractual								
Supplies								
Equipment								
Land & Structures								
Grants & Claims								
Miscellaneous								
TOTAL OPERATING		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES								
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()								
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts								
1003 GF Match								
1004 GF								
1005 GF/Program Receipts								
1037 GF/Mental Health								
Other Interagency Receipts								
TOTAL		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2008) cost: _____

POSITIONS

Full-time								
Part-time								
Temporary								

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

Passage of this bill will have no fiscal impact on the Department of Fish and Game.

Prepared by: Kristy Tibbles, Executive Director, Board of Game
 Division: Boards Support Section
 Approved by: Tom Lawson, Director
 Division of Administrative Services, Department of Fish and Game

Phone 465-6098
 Date/Time 3/14/08 4:00 PM
 Date 3/14/2008

FISCAL NOTE

**STATE OF ALASKA
2008 LEGISLATIVE SESSION**

Fiscal Note Number: 1B34888-LAW-CV-02-12-01
 Bill Version: SSHB348
 () Publish Date: _____

Identifier (file name): _____ Dept. Affected: LAW
 Title An Act relating to the adoption of regulations by the Board RDU CIVIL
of Game. Component NATURAL RESOURCES
 Sponsor REPRESENTATIVE KELLER
 Requester HOUSE RESOURCES Component Number 2212

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

	Appropriation Required	Information						
		FY 2009	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014
OPERATING EXPENDITURES								
Personal Services	37.2	0.0	37.2	37.2	37.2	37.2	37.2	37.2
Travel	0.3		0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Contractual	4.3		4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Supplies	0.8		0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8
Equipment	0.5		0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Land & Structures								
Grants & Claims								
Miscellaneous								
TOTAL OPERATING	43.0	0.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES								
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
-------------------------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts								
1003 GF Match								
1004 GF	43.0	0.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0
1005 GF/Program Receipts								
1037 GF/Mental Health								
Other Interagency Receipts								
TOTAL	43.0	0.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2008) cost: 0.0

POSITIONS

Full-time	0.3		0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Part-time							
Temporary							

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)
 See attached analysis.

Prepared by: Robert Meiners, Administrative Services Manager
 Division: Administrative Services Division
 Approved by: Talia Colberg, Attorney General
Department of Law

Phone 907-465-5427
 Date/Time 2/12/08 3:40 PM
 Date 2/12/2008

FISCAL NOTE

**STATE OF ALASKA
2008 LEGISLATIVE SESSION**

BILL NO. SSHB348

ANALYSIS CONTINUATION

SSHB 348 was written for the purpose of emphasizing, in statute, the allocative nature of many game regulation decisions, so that such decisions would not be subjected to the whims of political change through the initiative process. Unfortunately, the way the bill is worded, it could easily be interpreted as serving to limit the Board of Game's ability to exercise many of its most important powers to only those situations in which the regulations are being done "as a means to allocate the asset of game." Because of this danger, the Board would be forced to build a record for every regulation which illustrates how the Board is allocating game through that regulation. This would likely add several days to each major board meeting, with resulting costs, and to more legal arguments and challenges regarding whether, and how, the Board is allocating, also with resulting costs. It is difficult to predict the increased costs for the Department of Law, but it might be reasonable to guess, for now, that up to two more lawsuits per year might be the result requiring additional resources equivalent to 1/4 FTE of attorney time

Sec. 16.05.255. Regulations of the Board of Game; management requirements.

(a) The Board of Game may adopt regulations it considers advisable in accordance with AS 44.62 (Administrative Procedure Act) for

(1) setting apart game reserve areas, refuges, and sanctuaries in the water or on the land of the state over which it has jurisdiction, subject to the approval of the legislature;

(2) establishing open and closed seasons and areas for the taking of game;

(3) establishing the means and methods employed in the pursuit, capture, taking, and transport of game, including regulations, consistent with resource conservation and development goals, establishing means and methods that may be employed by persons with physical disabilities;

(4) setting quotas, bag limits, harvest levels, and sex, age, and size limitations on the taking of game;

(5) classifying game as game birds, song birds, big game animals, fur bearing animals, predators, or other categories;

(6) methods, means, and harvest levels necessary to control predation and competition among game in the state;

(7) watershed and habitat improvement, and management, conservation, protection, use, disposal, propagation, and stocking of game;

(8) prohibiting the live capture, possession, transport, or release of native or exotic game or their eggs;

(9) establishing the times and dates during which the issuance of game licenses, permits, and registrations and the transfer of permits and registrations between registration areas and game management units or subunits is allowed;

(10) regulating sport hunting and subsistence hunting as needed for the conservation, development, and utilization of game;

(11) taking game to ensure public safety;

(12) regulating the activities of persons licensed to control nuisance wild birds and nuisance wild small mammals;

(13) promoting hunting and trapping and preserving the heritage of hunting and trapping in the state.

(b) *[Repealed, 12 ch 52 SLA 1986.]*

(c) If the Board of Game denies a petition or proposal to amend, adopt, or repeal a regulation, the board, upon receiving a written request from the sponsor of the petition or proposal, shall in addition to the requirements of AS 44.62.230 provide a written explanation for the denial to the sponsor not later than 30 days after the board has officially met and denied the sponsor's petition or proposal, or 30 days after receiving the request for an explanation, whichever is later.

(d) Regulations adopted under (a) of this section must provide that, consistent with the provisions of AS 16.05.258, the taking of moose, deer, elk, and caribou by residents for personal or family consumption has preference over taking by nonresidents.

(e) The Board of Game shall adopt regulations to provide for intensive management programs to restore the abundance or productivity of identified big game prey populations as necessary to achieve human consumptive use goals of the board in an area where the board has determined that

(1) consumptive use of the big game prey population is a preferred use;

(2) depletion of the big game prey population or reduction of the productivity of the big game prey population has occurred and may result in a significant reduction in the allowable human harvest of the population; and

(3) enhancement of abundance or productivity of the big game prey population is feasibly achievable utilizing recognized and prudent active management techniques.

(f) The Board of Game may not significantly reduce the taking of an identified big game prey population by adopting regulations relating to restrictions on harvest or access to the population, or to management of the population by customary adjustments in seasons, bag limits, open and closed areas, methods and means, or by other customary means authorized under (a) of this section, unless the board has adopted regulations, or has scheduled for adoption at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the board regulations, that provide for intensive management to increase the take of the population for human harvest consistent with (e) of this section. This subsection does not apply if the board

(1) determines that intensive management would be

(A) ineffective, based on scientific information;

(B) inappropriate due to land ownership patterns; or

(C) against the best interest of subsistence uses; or

(2) declares that a biological emergency exists and takes immediate action to protect or maintain the big game prey population in conjunction with the scheduling for adoption of those regulations that are necessary to implement (e) of this section.

(g) The Board of Game shall establish population and harvest goals and seasons for intensive management of identified big game prey populations to achieve a high level of human harvest.

(h) *[Repealed, 2000 Ballot Measure No. 6.]*

(i) For the purpose of encouraging adults to take children hunting, the board shall establish annual hunting seasons in appropriate areas of the state for big game, other than bison and musk ox, that are open before schools start in the fall and before regular hunting seasons begin. Only a resident child accompanied by a resident adult or a child accompanied by the child's resident parent, resident stepparent, or resident legal guardian may take big game in an area where a season established under this subsection is in effect. The adult, parent, stepparent, or legal guardian who accompanies the child may only assist the child in taking big game. A big game animal taken under this subsection must be counted against the bag limits of both the child and the adult, parent, stepparent, or legal guardian who accompanies the child. In this subsection,

(1) "adult" means an individual who is 21 years of age or older;

(2) "child" means an individual who is not more than 17 years of age and not younger than eight years of age.

(j) In this section,

(1) "harvestable surplus" means the number of animals that is estimated to equal the number of offspring born in a game population during a year less the number of animals required for recruitment for population maintenance and enhancement, when necessary, and the number of animals in the population that die from all causes, other than predation or human harvest, during that year;

(2) "high level of human harvest" means the allocation of a sufficient portion of the harvestable surplus of a game population to achieve a high probability of success for human harvest of the game population based on biological capabilities of the population and considering hunter demand;

(3) "identified big game prey population" means a population of ungulates that is identified by the Board of Game and that is important for providing high levels of harvest for human consumptive use;

(4) "intensive management" means management of an identified big game prey population consistent with sustained yield through active management measures to enhance, extend, and develop the population to maintain high levels or provide for higher levels of human harvest, including control of predation and prescribed or planned use of fire and other habitat improvement techniques.

(5) "sustained yield" means the achievement and maintenance in perpetuity of the ability to support a high level of human harvest of game, subject to preferences among beneficial uses, on an annual or periodic basis.

((3 ch 206 SLA 1975; am 5 ch 151 SLA 1978; am 10, 11 ch 132 SLA 1984; am 4, 5, 12 ch 52 SLA 1986; am 1 ch 6 SLA 1989; am 2 ch 13 SLA 1994; am 2 ch 54 SLA 1996; am 4 - 6 ch 76 SLA 1998; am 1 ch 20 SLA 2000; am 1 2000 Ballot Measure No. 6; am 1 ch 68 SLA 2001; am 1 ch 132 SLA 2003; am 4 ch 87 SLA 2005))

Pullen v. Ulmer 923 P.2d 54; 1996 August 26, 1996, Decided

Chief Justice, Rabinowitz,

On November 7, 1995, appellants Harvey Pullen and United Fishermen of Alaska (Pullen) filed suit for declaratory and injunctive relief challenging, on several grounds, the Lieutenant Governor's certification of the initiative. More particularly, Pullen asserted that (1) the proposed bill is not a proper subject of an initiative because it would make an appropriation of the State of Alaska's salmon resources, (2) the allocation of salmon resources of the state among common users is exclusively the responsibility of the legislature,

Pullen's appeal from the superior court's decision on summary judgment raises two issues. First, Pullen argues{1996 Alas. LEXIS 13} that management of Alaska's salmon resources falls exclusively within the power of the state legislature as trustee of Alaska's wildlife, and therefore is not a proper subject of an initiative. Second, Pullen contends that the proposed initiative makes an appropriation of state property, in violation of article XI, section 7 of the Alaska Constitution. We address this latter contention first.

if the state's salmon population{1996 Alas. LEXIS 17} precipitously declines, the fishing industry would be devastated, causing even more harm to Alaska's economy and revenue base. The state benefits from the harvest of salmon through the collection of taxes imposed on business enterprises engaged in the fishery and license fees imposed on sport, personal use, and commercial fisheries.

Pullen's contention that the public trust responsibilities imposed on the state by the provisions of article VIII of our constitution compel the conclusion that fish occurring{1996 Alas. LEXIS 21} in their natural state are property of the state for purposes of carrying out its trust responsibilities. {923 P.2d 61} In short, we are in agreement with Pullen's position that it is the authority to control naturally occurring fish which gives the state property-like interests in these resources. For that reason, naturally occurring salmon are, like other state natural resources, state assets belonging to the state which controls them for the benefit of all of its people.

We hold that the state's interest in salmon migrating in state and inland waters is sufficiently strong to warrant characterizing such salmon as assets of the state which may not be appropriated by initiative. Thus we conclude that the superior court correctly reasoned that salmon are public assets of the state which may not be appropriated by initiative.



Overview of Relationships Between Bears, Wolves, and Moose in Alaska

Relationships between large predators and their prey in Alaska are complex, and no one model fits all situations. It is possible to generalize about some situations, particularly in Interior Alaska. This information on the biology of moose, bears, and wolves, represents highlights from 25 years of research and management programs conducted by universities and state, provincial and federal governments in Alaska and Canada. In 1997, the National Academy of Sciences published a summary and review of predator/prey interactions in Alaska (National Research Council, 1997). More research has been conducted since that review. The published references listed below can be found in most university or large municipal libraries.

In the boreal forest of northern Canada and Interior Alaska, where bears (either black bears, grizzly bears, or both) and wolves are lightly harvested and are major predators on moose, moose densities typically remain well below levels that their habitat can support. Under these circumstances, moose density fluctuates between about 0.1 and 1.0 moose/mi² over large areas; most commonly densities are 0.4 to 0.6 moose/mi². Biologists refer to this situation as the Low Density Dynamic Equilibrium or LDDE because moose density fluctuates yet remains low. This occurs primarily because, together, bears and wolves are efficient predators on moose calves, and kill most of the calves born each year. The highest densities reached in these systems (about 1 moose/mi²) tend to occur in very large burns where habitat is excellent and moose apparently are more successful at avoiding predators.

Although the LDDE prevails in much of remote interior Alaska, differences occur between areas. In most areas, bears are the major predator on moose calves. An exception occurs in Game Management Unit 20A where wolf control has been shown to be effective at maintaining high numbers of moose and high long-term harvests of moose. In Unit 20A, initial reductions in wolves increased moose population density, wolves also quickly increased after wolf control because, ultimately, the number of wolves in an area depends mostly on the number of prey animals in the area. Number of moose harvested also remained high after wolves increased. An abundance of trappers in Unit 20A has kept wolves from increasing to the point where they could cause declines in the moose population. A similar situation likely occurs in portions of Units 20B and 20D South.

Grizzly bears have been shown to be particularly effective predators of moose calves from birth to about 2 months of age and often kill adult moose in the spring. In this regard, one grizzly bear is