



**Submitted by:** Daniel Epperson

**Community of Residence:** Ione, Ca

**Comment:**

Please support prop 16, 24,29,30

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 16:** Support

**Proposal 24:** Support

**Proposal 30:** Support

**Proposal 19:** Oppose

**Proposal 29:** Support



**Submitted by:** Luke Fanning

**Community of Residence:** Juneau, AK

**Comment:**

I am writing in opposition to proposal 36, which would reduce the bag limit for sooty grouse in drainages crossing the Juneau road system. I have been hunting grouse in the Juneau area for nearly 30 years. While I seldom feel the need to take the full limit of five birds, the proposed limit of three birds per day is unnecessarily restrictive and does not address or alleviate a conservation concern. It will also lead to confusion in many popular hunting areas, where hunters are either accessing hunting grounds from one drainage in order to hunt another, or where drainage status on a ridge line is not easily determined.

My understanding is that there is not a conservation issue that must be addressed, and that the Department of Fish and Game believes the birds stock is healthy. Additionally, grouse populations are impacted to a much greater degree by natural conditions, including weather.

This proposal will be cumbersome and confusing for both hunters and enforcement. The Juneau area has numerous prime hunting areas which can be accessed via drainages that cross the road system, but where some of the best hunting area faces drainages that do not cross the road system. For example, Douglas Island includes numerous access points on the East side of the island, which hunters often use to access ridge lines above the West side of the Island.

Imagine a grouse hunter who begins at Eaglecrest, and then hikes to a ridge line to find birds on a ridge above a West facing drainage, which either drains on the other side of the island, or where the drainage line is unclear. That hunter could be legally allowed five birds, but would then have to walk back to through a drainage where the bag limit is only three birds to access their vehicle. An enforcement officer would then have to determine where the birds were hunted, and where that location would have drained, in order to ultimately establish whether a bag limit was exceeded.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 10:** Oppose

**Proposal 21:** Oppose

**Proposal 37:** Oppose

**Proposal 11:** Oppose

**Proposal 36:** Oppose

**Proposal 41:** Support

**Submitted by:** Luke Fanning

**Community of Residence:** Juneau, AK

**Comment:**

I am writing in opposition to proposal 37, which would reduce the bag limit for ptarmigan in drainages crossing the Juneau road system. I have been hunting ptarmigan in the Juneau area for nearly 30 years. While I have never taken a full limit of 20 birds, the proposed limit of five birds per day is unnecessarily restrictive and does not address or alleviate a conservation concern. It will also lead to confusion in many popular hunting areas, where hunters are either accessing hunting grounds from one drainage in order to hunt another, or where drainage status on a ridge line may not be easily determined (particularly if there are clouds).

My understanding is that there is not a conservation issue that must be addressed, and that the Department of Fish and Game believes the birds stock is healthy. Additionally, ptarmigan populations are impacted to a much greater degree by natural conditions, including weather.

This proposal will be cumbersome and confusing for both hunters and enforcement. The Juneau area has numerous prime hunting areas which can be accessed via drainages that cross the road system, but where some of the best hunting area faces drainages that do not cross the road system. For example, some of the best hunting areas are on ridge lines that ultimately drain into Taku Inlet, but which are commonly accessed from drainages and routes that cross the Juneau road system.

Imagine a grouse hunter who begins at Sheep Creek, and then hikes to a ridge line to find birds on a ridge high above, which either drains on the other side, or where the drainage line status is unclear. That hunter could be legally allowed 20 birds, but would then have to walk back to through a drainage where the bag limit is only five birds to access their vehicle. An enforcement officer would then have to determine where the birds were hunted, if they were all hunted in the same regulatory area/drainage, and where those locations would have drained, in order to ultimately establish whether a bag limit was exceeded. This proposal should be reasonably expected to result in confusion, and it does not stem from a conservation concern, as the ptarmigan population is very healthy.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 10:** Oppose  
**Proposal 11:** Oppose

**Proposal 21:** Oppose  
**Proposal 37:** Oppose

**Proposal 38:** Oppose  
**Proposal 41:** Support



**PC53**

**Submitted by:** Stephanie Farac

**Community of Residence:** Novato, CA

**Comment:**

Hello Board members,

I support all proposals pertaining to the wolves on Prince of Whales Island and against any proposal increasing brown bear harvests. Tourism is very important to the community, and wolves and bears are vital for the ecosystem. These wolves and bears are on public Lands and belong to all Americans. An unsustainable number of wolves were harvested in past years and allowing this again will cause a collapse in the ecosystem and bring ESA protections. These animals are worth more alive than dead. I spend thousands to see them in the wild. You were brought into this position to protect our wildlife, wild lands and manage it responsibly. Majority of us are not hunters and want our wildlife protected, but I understand the need to manage for all sides.

What inclined me to comment was seeing on Facebook a trapper bragging about trapping over 10 wolves in one weekend in Ketchikan. The picture was horrifying. My first thought was this is illegal. After finding out it was not, I was compelled to speak up. I am not a resident of Alaska, but I spend my hard-earned money to visit this beautiful place every year. Wildlife, especially wolves bring me there. There needs to be a bag limit for wolves everywhere in the state. It is not sustainable for any individual to be able to kill as many as possible. I am sure many kills go unreported. Also, the disrespect for wildlife is worrisome. Every hunter and trapper should have to participate in a workshop about the animal that they plan to kill and learn about their value in the environment. I do not have a problem with ethical hunting for food, but trophy hunting is barbaric. Alaska's ongoing war on predators is really about our own struggles to smartly coexist respectfully with nature.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

- |   |  |                             |                             |
|---|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Proposal 1:</b> Support                | <b>Proposal 14:</b> Oppose                 | <b>Proposal 27:</b> Support | <b>Proposal 41:</b> Support |
| <b>Proposal 2:</b> Support                | <b>Proposal 15:</b> Support with Amendment | <b>Proposal 28:</b> Oppose  | <b>Proposal 42:</b> Oppose  |
| <b>Proposal 3:</b> Support with Amendment | <b>Proposal 16:</b> Oppose                 | <b>Proposal 29:</b> Oppose  | <b>Proposal 43:</b> Oppose  |
| <b>Proposal 4:</b> Support                | <b>Proposal 17:</b> Oppose                 | <b>Proposal 30:</b> Oppose  | <b>Proposal 44:</b> Oppose  |
| <b>Proposal 5:</b> Oppose                 | <b>Proposal 18:</b> Oppose                 | <b>Proposal 31:</b> Oppose  | <b>Proposal 45:</b> Oppose  |
| <b>Proposal 6:</b> Oppose                 | <b>Proposal 19:</b> Oppose                 | <b>Proposal 32:</b> Support | <b>Proposal 46:</b> Oppose  |
| <b>Proposal 7:</b> Oppose                 | <b>Proposal 20:</b> Oppose                 | <b>Proposal 33:</b> Oppose  | <b>Proposal 47:</b> Support |
| <b>Proposal 8:</b> Oppose                 | <b>Proposal 21:</b> Support                | <b>Proposal 34:</b> Oppose  | <b>Proposal 48:</b> Support |
| <b>Proposal 9:</b> Oppose                 | <b>Proposal 22:</b> Oppose                 | <b>Proposal 35:</b> Oppose  | <b>Proposal 49:</b> Support |
| <b>Proposal 10:</b> Support               | <b>Proposal 23:</b> Oppose                 | <b>Proposal 36:</b> Support | <b>Proposal 50:</b> Support |
| <b>Proposal 11:</b> Support               | <b>Proposal 24:</b> Oppose                 | <b>Proposal 37:</b> Support | <b>Proposal 51:</b> Support |
| <b>Proposal 12:</b> Oppose                | <b>Proposal 25:</b> Oppose                 | <b>Proposal 38:</b> Oppose  | <b>Proposal 52:</b> Support |
| <b>Proposal 13:</b> Oppose                | <b>Proposal 26:</b> Support                | <b>Proposal 39:</b> Oppose  | <b>Proposal 53:</b> Support |
|   |  | <b>Proposal 40:</b> Oppose  | <b>Proposal 54:</b> Support |



**PC54**

**Submitted by:** Randall Ferguson

**Community of Residence:** Sitka, Alaska

**Comment:**

Proposal #5 I have had outstanding duck hunting in the first 2 weeks of November. Please don't close it then. Thanks

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 5:** Support with Amendment



**PC55**

**Submitted by:** Friends of Admiralty

**Community of Residence:** Juneau, Alaska

**Comment:**

Friends of Admiralty opposition to Proposal #12

Friends of Admiralty is a Juneau-based organization that has advocated for land and wildlife habitat protection of Admiralty Island since 1990. A group priority is the utilization of a wide range of the Brown bear resource in the interest of all Alaskans. Our members include a broad range of recreational users, including hunters. We were one of the members of the Unit 4 Brown Bear Management Team in 1999.

We believe that certain relatively small, accessible areas lend themselves best to wildlife viewing, recognizing diverse public use of public resources. We oppose opening The Mitchell Bay Closed Area because:

- (1) it has been in place for decades, with wide acceptance from the public and governmental agencies;
- (2) it was originally designated by the BOG as part of an agreement to open the then existing Thayer Lake Closed Area on Admiralty Island;
- (3) Angoon, whose private lands exist within the Closed Area, has always supported the closure, and is currently exploring the economic potential of bear viewing there. If the area is opened, there will likely be user conflicts;
- (4) over 96 % of Unit 4, Admiralty Island, is open to bear hunting. Retaining the closure is not an unreasonable burden on bear hunters when there are many good alternate hunting opportunities nearby;
- (5) the Unit 4 Brown Bear Management Team agreed that Agencies should encourage high quality bear viewing opportunities on private lands (see P.6 of the 1999 Report).

John Neary

President, Friends of Admiralty Island



**PC56**

**Submitted by:** Thomas Gagnon

**Community of Residence:** Juneau, Alaska

**Comment:**

I'm opposed to decreasing the number of deer allowed to be harvested each year in the Juneau area!



**PC57**

**Submitted by:** Lucas Giese

**Community of Residence:** Juneau, AK

**Comment:**

My girlfriend and another friend hunted together. See attached Word document for our experience and proposed regulation changes.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 4:** Support

**Proposal 6:** Support

**Proposal 7:** Support

**Proposal 10:** Support

**Proposal 11:** Support

**Proposal 12:** Support

**Proposal 21:** Support

**Proposal 23:** Oppose

**Proposal 26:** Oppose

**Proposal 27:** Oppose

**Proposal 28:** Support

**Proposal 29:** Support

**Proposal 30:** Support

**Proposal 33:** Oppose

**Proposal 34:** Support

**Proposal 52:** Oppose

**Proposal 53:** Oppose

**Proposal 54:** Oppose

---

*See attachment on the following page.*



## Game & Fish Unit 3 Moose Regulations Proposal

This past fall, two friends and I hunted moose on Kupreanof Island. We spent 26 days on the island and had incredible hunting nearly the entire time. However, out of nearly 30 bulls we called in, only two were confirmed legal. We hunted with archery equipment, so the bulls we called in, we called in close. Getting good looks at their antlers was not an issue. All of the non-legal bulls were mature bulls (we didn't call in a single spike or fork) that had 1x1 or 1x2 brow tines. Most, if not all, of which will probably never grow more, keeping them illegal their whole life and passing on those genes to future calves. Of the two legal bulls we did find, our party shot one of them. The only reason his bull was legal though was because his left side was goofy. It was much smaller than the right, and had a single brow tine with a roughly 14-inch ladled palm with no points, thus making him a fork. His right side was a full paddle and single brow tine, much like the others we called in.

We met and talked with many other hunters while on the island, and some of them did not see one single legal bull during their entire hunt. We also talked to a couple Game & Fish biologists who said that bulls of all ages are being shot, so the antler restrictions meant to protect the prime breeding class, are not working. This year, too, less moose were harvested in Unit 3 than in previous years. One of our party members did this same hunt in 2019, and from what he could tell, the moose numbers had definitely not decreased. If anything, they had increased, which we think could be a sign of more illegal bulls.

We have brainstormed multiple potential solutions to this problem in Unit 3. Obviously, it cannot become an any-bull hunt, because that would draw too many hunters to the island. Doing an any-bull draw would also not be ideal, because it's a meat hunt for people on the island and close surrounding areas, and that would take away much of their opportunity. So, we propose that a draw for a set amount of Any-Bull permits is added. We think this could help in the long run, in that Any-Bull hunters might take some of the 1x1 and 1x2-browed bulls out of the gene pool. Another potential solution could be reducing the 50-inch and over width down to 40 inches and over. Not one bull we saw was over 50 inches, and we doubt very many bulls ever get that large. We did see three huge bulls that were close to 50 inches though, and would definitely have been over 40.

Please consider our proposals, or another one that may help the problem. We strongly believe that regulations need to change in Unit 3, both to reverse this trend of genetic selection for bad brow tines and so that hunters in the unit have a population of moose that are legal to harvest.



**Submitted by:** Dave Gordon

**Community of Residence:** Sitka, Alaska

**Comment:**

Dave Gordon Sitka Resident.

Proposal 5. Splitting the waterfowl season. I would support a split season only if the closure dates begin no earlier than November 15. A preferred date would be Dec 1 to allow for hunting opportunities over Thanksgiving weekend. If a split season is not to be provided I prefer the Season opens September 1.

In most years Waterfowl migrations through SE Alaska begins by September 1 and continues through mid-November. Opportunities to hunt waterfowl that are migrating through SE Alaska might be missed if there is a closure before November 15. After mid-November the population of waterfowl in SE Alaska is largely mallards and Canada geese that over-winter in SE Alaska

Thanks for the opportunity to comment

Dave Gordon



**Submitted by:** Grateful Dogs of Juneau

**Community of Residence:** Juneau

**Comment:**

Grateful Dogs of Juneau

PROPOSAL 40 – 5 AAC 92.520(a) Allow the take of deleterious exotic wildlife in the Mendenhall Wetlands State Game Refuge.

OPPOSED.

The Grateful Dogs of Juneau opposes PROPOSAL 40 due to the danger that the proposed action poses to the public who uses the Mendenhall Wetlands State Game Refuge. Between waterfowl hunting seasons, large numbers of the public utilize the refuge for wildlife viewing and outdoor recreation. Hunting for starlings and related wildlife would create conflicts with other users of the refuge. Grateful Dogs of Juneau concurs with the position of ADF&G on this proposal.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 40:** Oppose

---



**Submitted by:** Jared Gross

**Community of Residence:** Wrangell, AK

**Comment:**

Greetings to the board.

My name is Jared Gross, I am commenting on proposal 17 and I am in favor of this proposal. I reside in wrangell Alaska and I am an avid hunter who knows the difference between elk and deer sign.

I hunt zarembo island every year and have noticed a heavy increase of elk on the island. There are elk tracks, rubs, beaten down trails, and droppings everywhere you look. I have had multiple sightings of the animals every year over there. I strongly believe there is a sustainable population of elk for a hunt on the island. I would like to see the board approve this proposal. This is a thriving resource that could potentially provide meat in the freezer for whoever gets a tag.

I hope the board considers my comments in their decision on proposal 17.

Thank you,

Jared Gross

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 17:** Support

---



**Submitted by:** Charlie Hamley

**Community of Residence:** Wrangell, Alaska

**Comment:**

Support proposal 17

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 17:** Support

---



**Submitted by:** Alex Hedman

**Community of Residence:** Eagle River, AK

**Comment:**

Proposal 16 - Support. Extends bow season by two months, while retaining the existing bag limit; affords more hunting opportunity for bowhunters and community members.

Proposal 19 - Oppose. Essentially cuts archery season and lengthens “any weapon” (rifle) season, increasing harvest rates, and allowing rifle hunting during peak of the rut when elk can’t think straight and are most vulnerable.

Proposal 24 - Support. Creating a registration-only archery hunt that requires in-person registration in Petersburg supports the local community (either through community harvest, or hunter spending on the local community).

Proposal 29 - Support. Extends goat season to archers (historically low harvest percentage), with minimal estimated impact to local goat population.

Proposal 30 - Support. Similar reasoning to my support for proposal 29; increased hunt opportunity/days to hunt, while maintaining relatively low harvest rates.

*Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 16:** Support  
**Proposal 19:** Oppose

**Proposal 24:** Support  
**Proposal 29:** Support

**Proposal 30:** Support



**PC63**

**Submitted by:** Anthony Heil

**Community of Residence:** Wausau, WI

**Comment:**

I am supporting the use of archery in Alaska and the hunting opportunities for archers

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 16:** Support  
**Proposal 19:** Oppose

**Proposal 24:** Support  
**Proposal 29:** Support

**Proposal 30:** Support



**PC64**

**Submitted by:** Ben Higdon

**Community of Residence:** Juneau, AK

**Comment:**

Douglas island has seen a marked decrease in harvest numbers this year and while I completely agree with the one doe policy to help boost population numbers I believe if that's the goal then we also need to address the wolf situation. Yes the wolves travel between the mainland and Douglas and are an important part of the ecosystem that we all belong to and benefit from so I don't believe it should be attempted or proposed to try and eradicate them. However the balance seems to have tipped in favor of the wolves. I'm not a close to the road hunter and each season am on all peaks, ridges, valleys and drainages of the northern part of Douglas where most people wouldn't go because of access/time/amount of work to get a deer out of if you are successful in harvest and I believe that wolves are one of the more important factors in the decrease of deer sightings/harvests/even just sign that we have seen. Douglas is a great place to take new hunters where there are harvest opportunities in a relatively safe environment(as safe as AK can be) as well as a place where non boat owners like myself can go and spend a reasonable amount of time to find a deer to harvest. I expect to spend 3-5 days to find one with an ethical shot but that has turned into 8-10 the last few years while I'm seeing much more wolf sign. I do understand there are many factors (weather, hunter pressure, luck and predation from others like bears) so I appreciate your time listening. I do believe that to improve the deer numbers though we need to address the annual wolf limit at the same time as limiting/adjusting what the deer bag limits can be. We have a wonderful resource that could provide and sustain a healthy deer population and harvest if we look at it from as many vantages as possible. Thank you for your time. Ben



*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 10:** Oppose  
**Proposal 11:** Oppose

**Proposal 21:** Oppose  
**Proposal 41:** Support



**PC65**

**Submitted by:** Bruce Hoch

**Community of Residence:** PAGOSA SPRINGS CO.

**Comment:**

Keep up

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 16:** Support  
**Proposal 19:** Oppose

**Proposal 24:** Support  
**Proposal 29:** Support

**Proposal 30:** Support  
:



**PC66**

**Submitted by:** Mark Hofstad

**Community of Residence:** Petersburg Alaska

**Comment:**

Hello committee,

I would like to comment on proposal #22. I would like you to remove the special use condition regarding the prohibition on the use of land vehicles during the 1B moose hunt. There is absolutely no reason to have this rule in effect. I have a cabin in the area and I can drive my truck to a nearby bay and get into my skiff and hunt legally but if I spot a moose on my way to or on the way back to the cabin I am prohibited to pursue the moose. Unit 1B is not a special or conditional use area and this special rule needs to go away since it serves no management purpose. The only way I can hunt from my cabin is by either foot or bicycle, I believe this is the only area in SE Alaska or anywhere where such a rule exists. Since this rule serves no management purpose it's time to eliminate it. Thank you, mark hofstad

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 22:** Support



**PC67**

**Submitted by:** Jim Holder

**Community of Residence:** Petersburg Alaska

**Comment:**

I support this hunt 100% it is sustainable there are multiple herds on the island I have personally seen up to 30 cows in one group multiple bowls ranging from spikes to massive six points at the department is not going to issue tags for these invasive species that they have transplanted on this island they need to explain this to the local population and what their intentions are with these animals thank you



**Submitted by:** Deidra Holum

**Community of Residence:** Ketchikan, Alaska

**Comment:**

Dear Chairman and Board Members:

Drones, Animal Cams, Night Vision Goggles, ATV's, Snowmobiles, Helicopters and more. With all these advantages for hunters and trappers what chance do other predators have for survival? How can they live their lives helping maintain healthy ecosystems when their sole purpose is to be hunted and destroyed?

I was born in Ketchikan before statehood and SE Alaska remains my home. Over the years I have hiked the mountains, explored bays and inlets and and made trips up the gorgeous river systems in this area. To date the only wolf I have seen in the wild was Romeo of Mendenhall Glacier fame. This was a lone wolf in the Juneau area who was attracted to people bringing their dogs out to the glacier to play with him. Eventually Romeo was trapped in nearby mountains by someone who fantasized about fame and fortune by killing him. It was a sad day in Juneau when news of Romeo's death was announced.

Please stop the massacre of the unique but dwindling group of wolves that live on Prince of Wales Island. Give these animals protection and help their numbers return to sustainable levels based on the data provided to the board by the scientific community. Please help maintain the balance in nature brought about by top predators like wolves and bears. My hope is to see these animals in the wilds of SE Alaska and not as trophies on someone's wall.

I strongly support and urge your support of proposals: 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53 and 54.

I am strongly opposed to proposals: 24, 25, 46 and 202.

Thank you for including my input in your consideration.

Deidra Holum

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 24:** Oppose  
**Proposal 25:** Oppose  
**Proposal 45:** Support

**Proposal 46:** Oppose  
**Proposal 47:** Support  
**Proposal 48:** Support

**Proposal 49:** Support  
**Proposal 50:** Support  
**Proposal 51:** Support

**Proposal 52:** Support  
**Proposal 53:** Support  
**Proposal 54:** Support



**Submitted by:** John Howard

**Community of Residence:** Juneau ak

**Comment:**

Proposal 36&37 need to keep ptarmigan daily limits the same

Proposal 41 needs to happen so the deer population can rebound for deer hunting



**Submitted by:** Bryan Hum

**Community of Residence:** Poland, OH

**Comment:**

Archery only hunting opportunities are dying in some states. With the decrease in hunting license sales nationwide, many states are expanding gun hunting opportunities to combat this and try to increase license sales. Please keep providing archery opportunities in Alaska. I haven't hunted Alaska yet, but hope to very soon. Thanks.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 16:** Support  
**Proposal 19:** Oppose

**Proposal 24:** Support  
**Proposal 29:** Support

**Proposal 30:** Support



**Submitted by:** Sharon Hunter

**Community of Residence:** PETERSBURG

**Comment:**

I do not support proposals 24 and 25 to allow black bear hunting in the Petersburg Creek area. The viewing of bears so close to town is a great pleasure to local residents and an attraction to our visiting tourists. The bears in this area are able to behave in a natural manner allowing great viewing pleasure as they have not been hunted which would change their reaction to people in the area. This is a rare benefit for those of us who enjoy the experience of seeing the bears. Please vote no on this issue.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 24:** Oppose

**Proposal 25:** Oppose



**Submitted by:** Gerald Hunter

**Community of Residence:** Decorah

**Comment:**

I support the Pope and Youngs decisions

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 16:** Support  
**Proposal 19:** Support

**Proposal 24:** Support  
**Proposal 29:** Support

**Proposal 30:** Support



**Submitted by:** Deborah Hurley

**Community of Residence:** Kupreanof, Alaska

**Comment:**

Proposal 24 and 25

I am opposed to hunting of black bear in the Petersburg Crrek Wilderness area, by bow, gun, or any other method.

As a 40 year resident of Kupreanof I feel Petersburg creek is a special place and we fought to have it designated as a Congressional designated wilderness area. Let's keep it a safe haven for all creatures.

The reason there are bears in the wilderness area is because there is no hunting allowed. We have traveled Southeast waterways for 40vyears and have noticed a definite decline in bear numbers. In the past you would see enough bears to make it common, now it is a wow moment.

Wounded bears are aggressive and present a real danger to other users of the area. Shooting towards trails and waterways without clear sightings could injure or kill others.

Most bear hunters do not eat the meat. Especially in the fall when bears taste like the tide flat smells, i.e

Rotten fish. Every spring we are offered poorly dressed bear meat from out of town hunters that are required to salvage the meat.

Hunters want to open the Petersburg Creek wilderness area to bear hunting because they have killed all the other bears.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 23:** Oppose

**Proposal 25:** Oppose

**Proposal 24:** Oppose

**Proposal 33:** Oppose



**Submitted by:** Mark Idone

**Community of Residence:** Juneau, Alaska

**Comment:**

I don't not agree with these proposals

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 10:** Oppose

**Proposal 21:** Oppose

**Proposal 37:** Oppose

**Proposal 11:** Oppose

**Proposal 36:** Oppose

**Proposal 41:** Oppose



**Submitted by:** Eric Indreland

**Community of Residence:** Juneau AK

**Comment:**

See survey below

Oppose 1,10,11,36,37

Support 1-9 28-31 & 41

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 1:** Oppose  
**Proposal 2:** Support  
**Proposal 3:** Support  
**Proposal 4:** Support  
**Proposal 5:** Support

**Proposal 6:** Support  
**Proposal 7:** Support  
**Proposal 8:** Support  
**Proposal 9:** Support  
**Proposal 10:** Oppose

**Proposal 11:** Oppose  
**Proposal 21:** Oppose  
**Proposal 28:** Support  
**Proposal 29:** Support  
**Proposal 30:** Support

**Proposal 31:** Support  
**Proposal 36:** Oppose  
**Proposal 37:** Oppose  
**Proposal 41:** Support



**Submitted by:** Timothy Ison

**Community of Residence:** Columbus , Indiana

**Comment:**

I am an archery hunter that has hunted Alaska before.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 16:** Support  
**Proposal 19:** Oppose

**Proposal 24:** Support  
**Proposal 29:** Support

**Proposal 30:** Support



**Submitted by:** Robert Jahnke

**Community of Residence:** Ward Cove

**Comment:**

proposal #4 I Oppose, It creates a more complex season when taking two weeks out of the middle. Just back the ending date to 12/15 every year. The only hunters at that time are targeting local seabirds that are not migratory for trophy value and not to put on the table. proposal #6 I Oppose , Nov. 10th is too early in unit 1a for prime pelts. Proposal # 7 I oppose, Not prime that early, [Nov.10th.] Proposal # 8, Support , are still prime until end of Feb. Proposal # 9, I support, In 2009 the trapper lost 74 days of our season when two years prior the hunt gained 71 days in the fall season. I've trapped since 1972 and never caught a Wolverine pregnant or with milk, they den in high country like wolves do, unit 1a has few road systems on the mainland, most of us trap the beaches. Proposal # 27 Oppose, no reason for this. We learned that here in Ketchikan when the trail buffers were eliminated a few years ago with the help of Senator Dan's office. Proposal # 42 Oppose, It's a buck only season here in 1a currently for 4 months and they are run down by Dec.1st. along with the fact that the antlers begin to shed in the beginning of Dec. .Please protect the residents right to feed their family and not turn this into a trophy hunt. ADF&G should not support this. Proposal # 45, I oppose, Proposal # 47, I oppose, Proposal

# 48, I oppose, Proposal # 49, I oppose, Proposal# 50, I oppose, Proposal # 51, I oppose, Proposal # 52, I oppose, Proposal # 53, I oppose, and Proposal # 54 I really oppose because it shows the Alaska Wildlife Alliances true colors, that they are against wolf control. Thank you for this opportunity.



**PC78**

**Submitted by:** Cole Jensen

**Community of Residence:** Juneau, AK

**Comment:**

DO NOT CHANGE WATERFOWL SEASON!! It's necessary to prevent the over hunting of certain species and a split season would damage migrations and returns.

On top of this, I know tons of families with the tradition of hunting for duck to eat for Thanksgiving dinner. A split season would ruin century-old traditions.

A split season would be bad for duck and bad for the hunters.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 5:** Oppose



**PC79**

**Submitted by:** Chris Kalil

**Community of Residence:** Middletown

**Comment:**

I wish to approve and oppose the following

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 16:** Support

**Proposal 24:** Support

**Proposal 30:** Support

**Proposal 19:** Oppose

**Proposal 29:** Support



**PC80**

**Submitted by:** Justin Kamps

**Community of Residence:** Jenison, MI

**Comment:**

Looking to continue to expand opportunities for archery hunting

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 16:** Support

**Proposal 24:** Support

**Proposal 30:** Support

**Proposal 19:** Oppose

**Proposal 29:** Support



**Submitted by:** Joshua Keller

**Community of Residence:** Havre, Montana

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 19.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 16:** Support

**Proposal 24:** Support

**Proposal 30:** Support

**Proposal 19:** Oppose

**Proposal 29:** Support



**Submitted by:** Stacey Kleinsmith

**Community of Residence:** Chugiak, Alaska

**Comment:**

For Proposal 16, I ask for your SUPPORT. This proposal asks to lengthen an existing archery only hunt with the bag limit (2 bucks) to remain the same. This would allow more opportunity for pursuing early season deer in the alpine. This proposal would benefit all bowhunters who choose to utilize this hunt but would be of most benefit to local residents of the hunt area. This area is already limited to bow and arrow only with a bag limit of two buck deer and the only change this proposal would bring is added days of season to hunt.

For Proposal 19, please consider OPPOSITION. This proposal calls for cutting the Etolin Island archery elk season by half, and add a new any-weapon season with an additional 25 elk permits which would take place in what is currently the last 2 weeks of the archery season and the peak of the elk rut. In a nutshell, this proposal would cause the number of drawing permits for the month of September to go from 25 to 50 with half of that number being available to rifle hunters during the peak of the rut. There are already 2 existing any-weapon drawing permit elk hunts on Etolin during the month of October. Harvest Data shows that currently, the any-weapon hunts yield over 50% more harvest than the additional archery hunt. The elegance of the current regulation is that it allows a longer season with more hunting opportunity in September due to the low impact of archery equipment. This proposal would take away from that opportunity while also potentially having a negative effect on the elk herd on the Island.

For Proposal 24, I ask for your SUPPORT. This proposal advocates opening a registration archery only hunt for black bear in the Petersburg Creek drainages of Kupreanof Island.

There would be a maximum of 10 permits available for this hunt which would only be available in-person at the Petersburg ADF&G office. This permit would be available only to residents of Alaska and would have a bag limit of one bear per regulatory year. The season for this hunt would be from April 15th – June 30th. Proposal 24 affords residents of the Petersburg area a great opportunity to pursue black bear locally with archery equipment.

For Proposal 29, I ask for your SUPPORT. This proposal would expand the hunt area of the RG014 archery goat hunt in Unit 1C. This would avail more hunting opportunity to bowhunters and would not cause any population concerns according to ADFG.

For Proposal 30, I ask for your SUPPORT. This proposal would open a fall archery goat hunt in Unit 1C, the southern end of the Chilkat Peninsula from August 1st – September 1st. If adopted, this hunt would afford more hunting opportunity while also having a low impact due to the limitations of archery equipment.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 16:** Support

**Proposal 19:** Support with  
Amendment

**Proposal 24:** Support  
**Proposal 29:** Support

**Proposal 30:** Support



**PC83**

**Submitted by:** Rebecca Knight

**Community of Residence:** Petersburg, Alaska

**Comment:**

See attached

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 24:** Oppose

**Proposal 46:** Oppose

**Proposal 50:** Support

**Proposal 54:** Support

**Proposal 25:** Oppose

**Proposal 47:** Support

**Proposal 51:** Support

**Proposal 26:** Support

**Proposal 48:** Support

**Proposal 52:** Support

**Proposal 45:** Support

**Proposal 49:** Support

**Proposal 53:** Support

---

*See attachment on the following page.*





**Comments of Rebecca Knight  
Southeast Region Proposals  
Alaska Board of Game Meeting  
Ketchikan, Alaska  
January 20-24, 2023**

Hello Alaska Board of Game Members,

My comments regard **PROPOSAL 24**. I oppose this proposal.

The Proposal would abolish the Petersburg Creek Closed Area by opening black bear hunting in the Petersburg Creek drainage with an exclusive, certified bow hunter, 10 permit, resident only hunt. According to ADF&G, the area has been closed to black bear hunting since 1975, likely due to safety concerns and to provide for a prime and local black bear viewing area.

My family and I are long term users of the area including various forms of boating, hiking, fishing, and wildlife viewing. Black bear viewing is an integral part of our experience, especially during the Spring when bears are out on the grass flats feeding and into the summer/fall when they bulk up on salmon. It is a very popular and easily accessible destination for Petersburg residents.

- *As I understand*, if the Petersburg Creek drainage is opened to *any* black bear hunting, it would be the first time a such a closure was reversed by the BOG—a precedent setting consideration;
- Carving out this exclusive exception to the closure would be further precedent setting by allowing a foot-in-the-door to open black bear hunting in the drainage—one piece at a time;
- During the Dec. 3 Petersburg Advisory Board meeting, various board members expressed opposition to this proposal since small exceptions to the regulations could create confusion and new conflicts. They voted in opposition based on that consideration;
- There has been no hue and cry from area residents to open the area to black bear hunting in the 47 years since the closure was established; nothing is broken;
- The Petersburg Creek Drainage is near the communities of Kupreanof and Petersburg and is easily accessible to all for black bear viewing, and requires no limited viewing permit. This unique opportunity is unlike other areas in SE Alaska—like Anan and Pack Creek where viewing opportunities are heavily regulated. Let's keep it that way;
- Proposal 24 would conflict with long established and existing recreational uses like wildlife viewing and photography, hiking, boating, and including the very popular spring steelhead and fall coho sport fish seasons. It would create safety issues amongst user groups due to increased hunting activity;



- There are no shortage of Unit 3 acres available to hunt black bear. The Petersburg Creek Drainage, comprises only about 1.5% of the total Unit 3 area. *As I understand*, it is the only area closed to the taking of black bear in Unit 3 other than minimal closures around municipalities, roadways, etc.;
- Black bear in the area seem somewhat inured to human presence. I have kayaked (at a safe distance) right past them as they feed on the grass, and often they just keep feeding or slowly amble away. Granted, if downwind they may not smell me or see me, but nonetheless this experience is exceptionally enjoyable. Hunted populations would become wary;
- Black bears would be sitting ducks, especially for those out on the grass flats, for the first few hunters in nearly five decades to use the area for this purpose. While there “may” be a trophy bear in the mix due to the long time closure, it is unwise to open the season for that possible underlying motivation at the expense of the rest of the public;
- There is no commercial use up Petersburg Creek proper with the exception of a few guided hikers from the Kupreanof dock, across a muskeg, and to the lower creek shoreline and return. Opening the area to black bear hunting would invite bear guide activity and would dramatically change the character of the drainage from a local to a commercial flavor, and once again another special place in SE Alaska will be lost to consumptive, for-profit use.

For the above reasons, I urge the Board of Game reject Proposal # 24.

Thank you,

Rebecca Knight  
Petersburg, AK



**Comments of Rebecca Knight  
Southeast Region Proposals  
Alaska Board of Game Meeting  
Ketchikan, Alaska  
January 20-24, 2023**

Hello Alaska Board of Game Members,

My comments regard **PROPOSAL 25**. This proposal would open black bear hunting in the Petersburg Creek drainage to resident and nonresident hunters, and eliminate the Petersburg Creek Closed Area. I oppose this proposal.

Many of my following comments mirror those that I submitted for Proposal #24, which is specific to a proposed, exclusive black bear bow hunt.

According to ADF&G, the area has been closed to black bear hunting since 1975, likely due to safety concerns and to provide for a prime and local black bear viewing area.

My family and I are long term users of the area including various forms of boating, hiking, fishing, and wildlife viewing. Black bear viewing is an integral part of our experience, especially during the Spring when bears are out on the grass flats feeding and into the summer/fall when they bulk up on salmon. It is a very popular and easily accessible destination for Petersburg/Kupreanof area residents.

- *As I understand*, if the Petersburg Creek drainage is opened to black bear hunting, it would be the first time such a closure was reversed by the BOG—a precedent setting consideration;
- There has been no hue and cry from area residents to open the area to black bear hunting in the 47 years since the closure was established; nothing is broken;
- There are no shortage of Unit 3 acres available to hunt black bear. The Petersburg Creek Drainage, comprises only about 1.5% of the total Unit 3 area. *As I understand*, it is the only area closed to the taking of black bear in Unit 3 other than minimal closures around municipalities, roadways, etc.;
- In fact, according to ADF&G, “The allowable harvest of black bears on Kupreanof Island is 80. Over the last five seasons an average of 69 bears have been harvested on the island.” Clearly, there is no shortage of black bear for human use, that makes opening this closed area necessary.
- The Petersburg Creek Drainage is near the communities of Kupreanof and Petersburg and is easily accessible to all for black bear viewing, and requires no limited viewing permit. Let’s keep it that way. This unique opportunity is unlike other areas in SE Alaska—for instance, Anan and Pack Creek where viewing opportunities are heavily regulated;



- Proposal 25 would conflict with long established and existing recreational uses like wildlife viewing and photography, hiking, boating, and including the very popular spring steelhead and fall coho sport fish seasons. It would create safety issues amongst user groups due to increased hunting activity;
- Black bear in the area seem somewhat inured to human presence. I have kayaked (at a safe distance) right past them as they feed on the grass, and often they just keep feeding or slowly amble away. Granted, if downwind they may not smell me or see me, but nonetheless this experience is exceptionally enjoyable. Hunted populations would become wary;
- If approved, for the first few hunters in nearly five decades to use the area for this purpose, black bears would be sitting ducks, especially for those out on the grass flats. While there “may” be a trophy bear in the mix due to the longtime closure, it is unwise to open the season for that possible underlying motivation at the expense to the rest of the public;
- There is no commercial use up Petersburg Creek proper with the exception of a few guided hikers from the Kupreanof dock, across a muskeg, and to the lower creek shoreline and return. Opening the area to black bear hunting would invite bear guide activity and would dramatically change the character of the drainage from a local to a commercial flavor—and once again another favorite and special place in SE Alaska will be lost to consumptive, for-profit use.

For the above reasons, I urge the Board of Game reject Proposal # 25.

Thank you,

Rebecca Knight  
Petersburg, AK



**Submitted by:** Bob Koenitzer

**Community of Residence:** Juneau

**Comment:**

Regarding proposal #5, a change to a split waterfowl season. adopting a split seasons will overall reduce opportunities for waterfowl hunters. I have been hunting waterfowl all over Southeast for almost 40 years. The best season to allow for the most opportunity is 9/16-12/31. The number of birds available in the first two weeks of September are very limited. A mid-season closure would result in reduced opportunity at a time when more birds are available. The best waterfowl hunting in SE is roughly from late September through November with Oct the peak. ADF&G should ditch every other year early start, this is not a well-conceived plan and likely an administrative burden. Even though hunting is harder, there are way more opportunities to take waterfowl in the last 2 weeks of December than the first two weeks of September. Please do not split the season and return to 9/16-12/31. this will provide the most opportunities for waterfowl hunters.

*Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 5:** Oppose

**Proposal 28:** Support



**Submitted by:** Courtney Kreis

**Community of Residence:** Juneau, AK

**Comment:**

There are many talented and well-educated biologists working for FNG who know far more about wildlife, ecology, and population carrying capacity than I and the general public do. Matters of policy should not trumped by the armchair expert. Public involvement is a crucial step in our government, and I appreciate this opportunity. But I support FNGs opposition to proposal 10, 11, 36, and 37. Especially for 10 and 11, my anecdotal evidence is that the deer population is not declining in unit 4 to warrant a reduction in harvest tickets.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 10:** Oppose

**Proposal 21:** Oppose

**Proposal 37:** Oppose

**Proposal 11:** Oppose

**Proposal 36:** Oppose



**Submitted by:** Michael Kreis

**Community of Residence:** Juneau/Douglas, Alaska

**Comment:**

I do not support proposals 10/11, 36, and 37, lowering deer, grouse, and ptarmigan limits, if ADF&G doesn't support these changes. What is the scientific backed conservation reasoning for these proposed changes?

Thank you

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 10:** Oppose

**Proposal 21:** Oppose

**Proposal 37:** Oppose

**Proposal 11:** Oppose

**Proposal 36:** Oppose



**Submitted by:** Mary Larson

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage, AK

**Comment:**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposals that affect the archery community in SE Alaska

Sincerely,

MJ Larson

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 16:** Support

**Proposal 24:** Support

**Proposal 30:** Support

**Proposal 19:** Oppose

**Proposal 29:** Support



**Submitted by:** Jordan Lavigne

**Community of Residence:** Juneau, AK

**Comment:**

Proposal 28- Please do not support this proposal. Changing these boundary lines will do nothing except hurt our goat population by giving easy access to goats from a private road. Easy and fast access to this area will increase goat harvest while pushing goats out of a designated safe zone that is used for breeding and wintering grounds.

Proposal 30- Please support this proposal. This hunting area doesn't open until September 1st which is when storms and rain are very frequent. Opening this hunt in august will give better hunting opportunities during a month with statistically better weather and longer days. The logistics of getting to this location are enough of a deterrent that it's unlikely goat harvest in this area will dramatically increase.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 4:** Support

**Proposal 21:** Oppose

**Proposal 31:** Support

**Proposal 41:** Support

**Proposal 10:** Oppose

**Proposal 28:** Oppose

**Proposal 34:** Support

**Proposal 11:** Oppose

**Proposal 29:** Support

**Proposal 36:** Oppose

**Proposal 13:** Support

**Proposal 30:** Support

**Proposal 37:** Oppose



**Submitted by:** Cody Ledoux

**Community of Residence:** Point Agassiz, Alaska

**Comment:**

To whom it may concern:

Hello,

My name is Cody Ledoux. This is in regards to proposal 22. The motorized vehicle restriction during moose season out at Thomas Bay/Point Agassiz area.

My wife, Faith Nelson, and I live out at Point Agassiz. I am a Disabled Veteran/part time handyman and my wife raises golden retrievers. Needless to say we are a low income family who live a subsistence lifestyle.

My wife has lived out at Point Agassiz for over 15 years. I lived off grid for a dozen years in the Interior on a fly in lake so we both live "field to table"

In my opinion the current non-motorized vehicle restrictions on moose hunting out at Point Agassiz/Thomas Bay is a direct violation of our rights to live a subsistence lifestyle.

No where else in Alaska are you not allowed to use atv's or trucks to hunt. We arent talking about shooting a 150 pound deer, a moose requires a motorized vehicle to process, but you need it then, not in 4 hours after you bike home to get an atv (which I cant due because I am disabled)

Starting in late August most bulls move up the road system. Several groups of hunters have campers along the road systems so there isnt really room to hunt on the road system. This country is too dangerous to go off the roads without gear, and I personally can't pack survival gear on my back or moose meat. I need to use an atv and a chainsaw winch.

You are putting hundreds of pounds of meat at risk of wanton waste if you dont have a vehicle to haul it out, which for us that live out there and don't have the means to have a moose camp (A: because we are currently broke, and B: because it costs a lot of money to live off-grid, costs too much to haul a camper out, especially when you can sleep at home 10 miles away.)

Anyways, there is no scientific reason to not allow vehicles. It is in my opinion unlawful to infringe on our rights to live a subsistence lifestyle and I believe the restriction needs to be completely lifted.

Thank you for your time,

Cody Ledoux

Point Agassiz, AK

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 22:** Support



**Submitted by:** Ryan Littleton

**Community of Residence:** Petersburg, Alaska

**Comment:**

I am writing in opposition to proposal 22. My name is Ryan Littleton, I was born and raised in Petersburg. I have been hunting the Point Agassiz area since I was a young boy and have continued to do so every year since. I harvested my first moose there when I was 12 years old. I am also a landowner and own a cabin in the area. When I first started hunting there the area was vast with lots of moose and roads to put camps on. As the years have gone on the amount of hunting area has shrunk significantly, the once fresh clear cuts have re-grown and logging roads have succumb to mother nature. The main road from Point Agassiz to the end is now only just over 9 miles. The unfortunate part is the clear cuts that allowed the moose to flourish have grown up now there is less vegetation for the moose to browse. The population has declined and now the annual harvest the past few years has been near historic lows. There are a few remaining residential cows that live along the road system, every year during the rut a handful of bulls come down to find one of these cows. I have a concern that with increased motorized vehicle traffic the few remaining moose will leave the area.

I would also like to talk about the different types of hunts in the state of Alaska, one of the best things about growing up in Alaska is all the different types of hunts within the state. We have non-motorized vehicles, draw hunts, archery only draw hunts, youth hunts and areas only accessible by plane and boat. This allows hunters many types of opportunity and experiences.

I also would like to respectfully mention that people with disabilities can apply for a driving permit.

The last thing I would ask the board of game to consider is as the moose habitat has changed more of the moose population is located in the area with the property owners. This benefits those with cabins, as moose sightings on privately owned land have increased over the years. This year one landowner/resident of PT. Agassiz harvested a moose on her property.

I just don't see any upside to allowing hunting with motorized vehicles during the moose season. This will only increase pressure on the remaining moose and potentially chase them out of the area. With very limited amount of hunting area left in the Point Agassiz and few moose left to hunt there just isn't any upside to applying more pressure on them during the rut.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 22:** Oppose

---





**Submitted by:** Rodney Littleton

**Community of Residence:** Petersburg

**Comment:**

I have been a resident of Petersburg since 1967 and have been hunting in Thomas Bay for over 50 years . It has a very small road system. I am against proposals 22 and 23 because it would put more pressure on the already small moose herd . Not driving in Thomas Bay has worked for many many years . This not the time to change it.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 22:** Support

**Proposal 23:** Support

**Proposal 33:** Support



**Submitted by:** Rocky Littleton

**Community of Residence:** Petersburg Alaska

**Comment:**

Oppose # 22 and 23. Thomas bay has a small road system and allowing motorized vehicles for moose hunting will increase pressure on an already small moose herd. I am 72 to years old and have hunted there for more than 50 years. I can ride a bicycle anywhere on the road system in less than an hour. There are numerous other areas around Petersburg that allow the use of motorized vehicles for moose hunting.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 22:** Oppose

**Proposal 23:** Oppose

**Proposal 33:** Oppose



**Submitted by:** Donald Long

**Community of Residence:** Ottawa Lake, MI

**Comment:**

I would like to my opinion known on several of the proposals that will directly affect bowhunting opportunities in Alaska.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 16:** Support

**Proposal 24:** Support

**Proposal 30:** Support

**Proposal 19:** Oppose

**Proposal 29:** Support



**Submitted by:** John Longworth

**Community of Residence:** Petersburg AK

**Comment:**

Oppose #24 and #25. This is not the best use for our wildlife and there are safety concerns on lands that are frequented by the public enjoying the area. Bears are not always killed by now hunting.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 24:** Oppose

**Proposal 25:** Oppose



**Submitted by:** Joey Ludlam

**Community of Residence:** Juneau, alaska

**Comment:**

Why do people that don't live here get to even suggest taking things away from people who do live here? Disgusting, sneaky and underhanded. Support hunters and trappers.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

- Proposal 1:** Oppose
- Proposal 2:** Oppose
- Proposal 3:** Oppose
- Proposal 4:** Oppose
- Proposal 5:** Oppose
- Proposal 6:** Oppose
- Proposal 7:** Oppose
- Proposal 8:** Oppose
- Proposal 9:** Oppose
- Proposal 10:** Oppose
- Proposal 11:** Oppose
- Proposal 12:** Oppose
- Proposal 13:** Oppose
- Proposal 14:** Oppose

- Proposal 15:** Oppose
- Proposal 16:** Oppose
- Proposal 17:** Oppose
- Proposal 18:** Oppose
- Proposal 19:** Oppose
- Proposal 20:** Oppose
- Proposal 21:** Oppose
- Proposal 22:** Oppose
- Proposal 23:** Oppose
- Proposal 24:** Oppose
- Proposal 25:** Oppose
- Proposal 26:** Oppose
- Proposal 27:** Oppose
- Proposal 28:** Oppose

- Proposal 29:** Oppose
- Proposal 30:** Oppose
- Proposal 31:** Oppose
- Proposal 32:** Oppose
- Proposal 33:** Oppose
- Proposal 34:** Oppose
- Proposal 35:** Oppose
- Proposal 36:** Oppose
- Proposal 37:** Oppose
- Proposal 38:** Oppose
- Proposal 39:** Oppose
- Proposal 40:** Oppose
- Proposal 41:** Oppose
- Proposal 42:** Oppose

- Proposal 43:** Oppose
- Proposal 44:** Oppose
- Proposal 45:** Oppose
- Proposal 46:** Oppose
- Proposal 47:** Oppose
- Proposal 48:** Oppose
- Proposal 49:** Oppose
- Proposal 50:** Oppose
- Proposal 51:** Oppose
- Proposal 52:** Oppose
- Proposal 53:** Oppose
- Proposal 54:** Oppose



**Submitted by:** Eric Lund

**Community of Residence:** Wrangell, AK

**Comment:**

Proposal 17

I support a drawing hunt for elk on Zarembo Island. I believe there are more elk then the current estimate living there.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

**Proposal 17:** Support



**Submitted by:** Brian Lynch

**Community of Residence:** Petersburg, Alaska

**Comment:**

Proposal 16, 5 AAC 85.030(a)(5). Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer:

I am in support of Proposal 16.

As a certified bow hunter, founding member of Devilsthumb Archers archery club and one of the initial proposers to establish the Petersburg Management Area (PMA), I am in full agreement with the comments presented by to proposer as the justification for the extended deer bow season in the PMA .

If the Board does not support the two-month August-September season extension in the PMA, I would request an extension to at least include September.

Proposal 22, 5 AAC92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures.

And

Proposal 23, The use of “E-bikes” with 750 watts or less are permitted for hunting.

I am in support of Proposal 22. The conditions of the hunt and habitat at the time the current prohibition on the use of motorized vehicles while moose hunting in Unit 1B was established are no longer at issue. As some of the proposers have stated, the current prohibitions present undue and unnecessary hardship for local residents to hunt moose.

If the Board does not support the full elimination of the current motorized vehicle restriction in Unit 1B I would encourage the passage of Proposal 23, The use of “E-bikes” with 750 watts or less are permitted for hunting.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

<b>Proposal 16:</b> Support	<b>Proposal 22:</b> Support	<b>Proposal 23:</b> Support	<b>Proposal 33:</b> Support
-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------



**Submitted by:** Robert MacKinnon

**Community of Residence:** Juneau, AK

**Comment:**

I can only comment on the area's and species that I have hunted and observed over many years in the Juneau area, some of the proposals regarding other community's I have no first hand knowledge of, so my survey will have some holes in it. Thank you for the consideration.

*Note: respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment portal. This information helps Board Support staff develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:*

<b>Proposal 1:</b> Oppose	<b>Proposal 11:</b> Oppose	<b>Proposal 31:</b> Support	<b>Proposal 38:</b> Support
<b>Proposal 2:</b> Oppose	<b>Proposal 21:</b> Oppose	<b>Proposal 32:</b> Support	<b>Proposal 39:</b> Support
<b>Proposal 3:</b> Support	<b>Proposal 28:</b> Oppose	<b>Proposal 34:</b> Support	<b>Proposal 40:</b> Support
<b>Proposal 4:</b> Support	<b>Proposal 29:</b> Oppose	<b>Proposal 36:</b> Oppose	<b>Proposal 41:</b> Support
<b>Proposal 10:</b> Oppose	<b>Proposal 30:</b> Support	<b>Proposal 37:</b> Oppose	