

Ketchikan Advisory Committee Minutes

Date: 10/30/2025

Location: ADFG Conference

Room

Call to Order: 5:15pm

Roll Call: 16 members, 9 present, 7 absent

Beau Dale (Chair) (2027) - Present

Rudy Franulovich (Vice Chair) (2027) - Present

Matt Allen (Secretary) (2027) - Present

Sean Roberts (2026) - Present

Clay Bezenek (2027) - Present

Ben Atwood (2026) - Present

Marvin McCloud (2028) - Absent

Devin Dalin (2026) - Absent

John Scoblic (2028) - Absent

Andrew Pung (2027) - Present

Robert Jahnke (2027) - Present

Jeremiah Sullivan (2026) - Absent

Brian Ringeisen (2027) - Absent

Keenan Sanderson (2027) - Absent

Annie Pung (Alternate) (2026) - Absent

Soren Heinecke (Alternate) (2026) - Present

Introductions:

Ketchikan AC members, ADFG Department Staff, Public in attendance

Public Present:

Carrie Ann Mueller(BOG Board Member), James Miller,
Madison Lewis (high school), Jonas Simpson (high school), Jim
Baichtal (POW)

Department Present:

Ross Dorendorf (Wildlife, ADFG), Tessa Hasbrouck (Wildlife, ADFG),
Kristy Tibbles (Executive Director, BoG)

Meeting Agenda:

Move to adopt meeting agenda, Bezenek

2nd - Franulovich

Unanimous to accept meeting agenda

Old business items:

1.)ADFG Board of Game Proposals

2.) Elections

New business:

1.)ADFG Board of Game Proposals

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes:

Move to Amend 10/23 meeting minutes, Dale

2nd - Allen

Dale - Modify to reflect appreciation that the Subsistence Board didn't take up the emergency proposals submitted due to a lack of data. They will re-evaluate after data/information is provided.

Motion to approve amended meeting minutes - Pung

2nd - Franulovich

Unanimous to accept amended meeting minutes

Chairman's Report:

None

Committee/Member Reports/Comments:

None

Public Comment:

Carrie-Anne - newly appointed BOG member (3yr term). I want to learn more about the KTN AC. Lifelong Alaskan, lives in Palmer, AK. Hunting, fishing, trapping interests, is a pilot. Has travelled several times to SEAK for play, hunting, and fishing. Does internal marketing for grocery chains in AK to include Three Bears, Carrs Safeway, and A&P.

1.)BOG proposals 40 and up

Proposal 40, 41

Move to adopt - Atwood

2nd - Pung

Discussion:

Dale - I know where these guys are coming from. However, what's the impact this proposal will have if approved?

Dorendorf - From 1997-2024, non-resident hunters in GMU2 averaged 10% of all hunters. Of that, non-resident hunters accounted for 4.3%.

The number of deer they harvest on average and if this proposal is approved it would save 18 bucks on average. Most non-residents take 1-2 deer.

Atwood - I oppose this. There would be economic impacts. The deer population is rebuilding and 18 deer is a very minimal amount.

Heinecke - I agree

Roberts - I agree, where does this end?

Bezenek - I mirror everyone else's comments.

Call the question - Bezenek

2nd - Franulovich

Proposals 40 and 41 Opposed, 8 opposed, 0 support, 1 abstention

Jahnke - These numbers go back too far. I'd like to see the number of non-residents from 2020-2025.

Proposal 42

Move to Adopt - Atwood

2nd - Dale

Discussion:

Dale - I'm sorta torn on this proposal. I'd like to see this proposal succeed. The alpine is near and dear to me. I like to have it to myself. By pushing the start date back it helps to preserve the experience.

Roberts - I'm against this proposal.

Heinecke - How many people are you seeing?

Atwood - I oppose this for the same reasons as proposals 40, 41.

Allen - I would hope that those that support this proposal would make it clear we are doing it to save or maintain the aesthetics of the hunt and not for the reasons the proposers have outlined that this proposal is necessary to save the deer.

Atwood - I don't like any proposal that is going to put more pressure on my home unit. If people are going to come to Unit 1 because of changes in Unit 2, I'm not in support.

Heinecke - A lot of what I'm reading is that non-residents are being painted as the boogie man and the issues they believe they have and are trying to address won't be significantly impacted by the approval of these proposals or ones like it.

Dale - It gets confusing when you have different bag limit regulations for State and Federal land. It's not as confusing if dates are changed.

Jahnke - We should see what the residents of Craig and Klawock believe. I feed my family by harvesting deer. I don't like people from out of state having the same bag limit, it's just a trophy for them.

Atwood - The area won't have much impact on Unit 2 residents and their ability to feed their family.

Heinecke - We have to be careful about interpreting what the economic impact will be.

Allen - I agree with Soren. We don't know the economic impact. It might be that it would have a greater impact on smaller operators with one plane who don't have the opportunities/fleet that other larger carriers have.

Dale - It's important to carve out opportunities for residents.

Call the question - Bezenek

2nd - Allen

Proposal 42 Opposed, opposed 6, 3 support.

Proposal 43

Move to adopt - Atwood

2nd - Jahnke

Discussion:

Dorendorf - Population and effort has increased over this time period. The number of days hunted to harvest has decreased. There is opportunity to align season and bag limit with the remainder of Unit 1a. The number of hunters in these areas is comparatively low.

Jahnke - I can support the 4 buck limit but not the season extending into December. The bucks are rundown at that time. If you can't get your deer in four months there's something wrong with you.

Bezenek - I tend to support Bob's idea. I'll never agree with the December season. I'd like to make an amendment to end the season on November 30th.

Jahnke - 2nd.

Dale - The amendment to the proposal would read, season date of August 1st to November 30th, 4 bucks.

Discussion on Proposal 43 amendment:

Bezenek - I'd like to see how this amended proposal would prove out.

Dale - The reason I tend to support this proposal as written is because it would align the remainder of Unit 1a with Federal regulations. I feel like darn near anybody that is going to hunt the Cleveland Peninsula is going to be Federally qualified. Currently I can go over there and

hunt/harvest a buck(s) as a Federally qualified user not based on being a State resident. I don't see much impact changing the proposal to a season ending on November 30th.

Heinecke - I can support the increase in bag limit but can't support the season end date of November 30th. There are times when the only opportunity I have is in December and I too feed my family. It's not all trophy hunters in December, I appreciate having that time.

Allen - What is the Department currently doing to monitor populations on Cleveland and Unit 1a.

Dorendorf - We used to utilize pellet counts. We stopped that in 2020 and have tried new methods utilized in the lower 48 and in other questions. Cameras capture images based on animals passing by and at specific time intervals. There are currently cameras being utilized on Gravina and other areas in SEAK. We have 4yrs of data and currently evaluating 3yrs of data. We don't have any cameras on the Cleveland.

Allen - I'd like us to consider that we are not immune to the impacts of logging. Many of these proposals are now recognizing the impacts of legacy logging on POW. Logging is still active on Gravina, Shelter Cove road system and there are new timber harvest opportunities up for public comments. We enjoy access and a robust population currently but this will not always be the case. I would hope we will be nimble when the time comes to make new regulations in the future.

Atwood - I think this proposal is possibly one board cycle too early.

Dale - I've hunted the same place early season for the past 17yrs. I usually harvest 2 bucks and because of that I am tagged out on the Cleveland, Etolin, most of POW. For me, I would never have poked around Cleveland if I wasn't Federally qualified. I'm not going

anywhere and harvesting four deer. I like the opportunity to hunt and explore different areas and I can do that now being Federally qualified.

Franulovich - how much of Cleveland is Federal vs. State land?

Dorendorf - most of Cleveland is Federal land.

Franulovich - this proposal would have little impact on resident/federally qualified hunters.

Dorendorf - it would have more impact on non-residents.

Franulovich - are deer emaciated in December?

Dorendorf - I hear of more reports in the late winter/spring prior to the first green flush.

Allen - Ross can you speak to the December harvest in Unit 1a?

Dorendorf - it was around 20 bucks.

Allen - I don't see how this amendment would have much impact. I think a December season provides opportunities for those that don't have time prior or for those who come back home for the holidays.

Call the question on Amendment to Proposal 43- Allen

2nd - Roberts

Amendment to Proposal 43 Opposed - 8 opposed, 0 support

Call the Question on Proposal 43 - Allen

2nd - Atwood

Proposal 43 Supported as written - 7 support, 1 opposed

Proposal 44, 45, 46

Move to adopt - Atwood

2nd - Pung

Discussion:

Dale - how many non-residents are getting this tag?

Dorendorf - DG005 <1/yr,

Roberts - I'd like to amend these proposals to limit non-resident draw to 10%. That is how many states in the lower 48 manage.

Dale - so this would essentially prevent non-residents from drawing DG005 and DG008 and provide 2 opportunities for non-residents to draw in DG006.

Roberts - How many non-residents drew this year?

Dorendorf - it's relatively low, 3.

Atwood - I would like to amend the three proposals to read up to 10%. Some local guides have a significant number of non-residents putting in. I'd like my son to be able to pull this tag one day.

2nd - Roberts

Call the question on the Amendment to Proposals 44, 45, 46 -

Franulovich

2nd - Roberts

Proposals 44, 45, 46 Supported as Amended - 8 support, 0 oppose

Discussion on Amended Proposals 44, 45, 46:

Dale - My sister and I hunted one of these tags this year and it's going to be one of the highlights of our relationship. These tags are very

special to locals. DG008 is the premier goat hunt in the state. I wish we had Devin and Marvin here. My question to them would be how many clients don't draw and go over the counter vs. don't hunt at all.

Call the question Amended Proposals 44, 45, 46 - Allen

2nd - Atwood

Amended Proposals 44, 45, 46 Supported - 8 support, 0 oppose

Proposal 47

Move to adopt - Atwood

2nd - Pung

Discussion:

Dorendorf - Is typically a debate about whether you like bear meat or not. Current regs were adopted in 1996. Similar proposals in the past have failed. Most harvest in Unit 1a occurs in the spring, peaking in May. Concerns with flavor associated with feeding on fish. We have reached out to hunters randomly and some would increase efforts others wouldn't. The proposers are looking to increase harvest to curb fawn predation.

Atwood - Personal observation is that when non-resident went to draw, harvest went down. I'd like to see this go for residents and non-residents even though it's not on the table at this time. I'd like to see bears knocked down a bit.

I would like to amend to include non-residents

Eliminate the meat salvage requirement in May for black bear in Unit 2 for residents and non-residents.

2nd - Roberts

Discussion:

Roberts - if they want to harvest more bears let the non-residents help them

Call the question on Amendment to Proposal 47 - Roberts

2nd - Atwood

Amendment to Proposal 47 Supported - 7 support, 1 opposed

Discussion:

Roberts - is the current population booming?

Dorendorf - we are currently meeting the two management objectives which would indicate the population is doing well.

Baichtal - I'm really impressed with what ADFG has done. I believe the current management strategy is working. I have been seeing an age class of bear that had been missing from the landscape.

I have a personal philosophy about salvaging the meat of the animals I harvest. I can see where the proposers are coming from and what they are hoping to accomplish. I would still salvage the meat but that is me.

Dale - Understood. This wouldn't prevent people from salvaging the meat and we already don't require salvage in the fall.

Call the question on Amended Proposal 47 - Atwood

2nd - Heinecke

Amended Proposal 47 Supported, 7 support, 1 opposed

Proposal 48

Move to adopt - Atwood

2nd - Pung

Discussion:

Dorendorf - Majority of the historic management strategy has been based on a quota system. More recently it has been based on a season length with a population objective. ESA petitions in 1993, 2011 and 2020. The Department has been able to address conservation concerns through research. The Department is looking to preserve future management options through increasing the population objective to 200-300 wolves. This population has similar inbreeding to the Island Royal population that went functionally extinct due to inbreeding depression. However, we have yet to see inbreeding depression in the POW population. Immigration into Unit 2 is limited. Not only does an animal need to immigrate, it has to become part of the breeding population to contribute to the population's genetic diversity.

We are proceeding with another 31 day season. We base the season length based on population estimates from the previous year. Instances where population estimates are later adjusted is possibly due to bias in the model. We are looking into improving our methodology through additional research.

Franulovich - These wolves have been on POW for thousands of years. How is it that they have yet to go extinct or suffered inbreeding depression?

Dorendorf - We have detected two genetic bottle neck events, one in 1790's and a second in the 1970's. These events contributed to the inbreeding we are seeing today.

Atwood - I don't envy Ross, we know this is contentious. I don't have confidence in the methodology or population estimates. How do you extrapolate to come up with the population? What are your estimates of this population in the 90's-20's.

Dorendorf - We have hair boards over a significant portion of Unit 2. We are able to detect the movement of individual wolves for those that roll/rub on the hair boards and that allows us to determine the range they have. When we extrapolate that out we are covering 60%-80% or more of Unit 2. The areas in Unit 2 that aren't covered by hair boards could have different populations, that's why we are supporting a grad student to help address this by looking at the outer islands. Right now we are utilizing the density of wolves in our study area and extrapolating that out to the other areas. Our hair board study areas are supplemented by trapper harvest in other areas.

We have two population estimates, one based on radio collaring (350 with large confidence intervals). The current population estimates have smaller confidence intervals.

Miller - I'm from Idaho. One thing that is missing from this conversation is the average litter size for this area and wolf populations can rebound quickly. What are we seeing here? I support anything that will prevent wolves from being listed because once they are, it's difficult to get them delisted.

Dorendorf - The average litter is 4 pups. This can be impacted by food availability and other factors.

The Department believes we have good data and that we are managing sustainably.

Dale - I remember attending a meeting at the White Cliff building about ten years ago where the Department was presenting information and saying we don't have a wolf population problem, we have an ESA listing problem. They had to talk people down and try to convince them they were making management decisions so as not to have the wolves listed. That's the gist I took away from the meeting.

Dorendorf - this all comes back to deer. It is an incredibly important subsistence resource. We are coming off years of reduced harvest. This has changed recently through communications with Unit 2 residents and a decrease in the number of days to harvest a deer. This is not a trend but it is encouraging.

Call the question - Franulovich

2nd - Atwood

Proposal 48 Opposed, 1 support, 7 oppose

Franulovich - why did Matt vote yes?

Allen - This is a Department generated proposal. I tend to support Department proposals. They have already been managing this way. I want them to have the tools they need to manage successfully and I don't want to see them receive an ESA listing.

Next Meeting

12/04/2025 @ 5:15pm ADFG Conference

Move to Adjourn: Franulovich

Second: Pung

Adjourn: 7:30pm