



Name: Kuhn, Tyler

Community of Residence: Palmer, Alaska

Submission Time: 1/9/2024 12:23:05 AM

Comment:

I mostly want to address "Proposal 3" i think the proposal is about the most ridiculous and non-scientific backed proposal i have ever seen. There are less than 300 BULL caribou harvested per year in this herd via Non-resident hunting activities (both guided, and un-guided combined) while residents are allowed to be harvest "5 caribou per day!" i think the declining caribou population is a real easy problem to fix. Reduce the RESIDENT caribou harvest to one or two bulls ONLY and ban the harvest of cows and calves completely! Caribou have a low yield when it comes to calving, cows don't start breeding until almost 3 years old, and only birth a single calf that stays with its mother until the following calving season. If the above is implemented the only possible outcome will be an increase in the overall caribou population. In literally every other state when a species population is in danger the harvest of females is either banned or greatly limited. But the BOG has for some reason neglected our states caribou herds for far too long! The BOG does not allow Harvest ticket, open season hunts statewide for cow moose because again, female populations need to be strong to continue the population. And yet cow moose produce more offspring than caribou do. So why is it that this is easy to understand in terms of moose regulations, but not caribou? I hope the BOG does not continue to screw up caribou management and allow nonsensical proposals like this and hopefully will save Alaska's caribou the same fate Quebec's herds did and that is, total collapse...

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 2: Support Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 4: Support Proposal 5: Support with
Amendment Proposal 6: Support Proposal 12: Support Proposal 16: Support Proposal 17:
Support Proposal 22: Support Proposal 33 Support Proposal 36: Support Proposal 38:
Oppose Proposal 39: Support Proposal 40: Support Proposal 41: Support Proposal 42: Support



PC 302

Name: Kuykendall, Kole

Community of Residence: North Pole Alaska

Submission Time: 1/2/2024 11:41:21 PM

Comment:

3: I a pose

38: I a pose

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 303

Name: Lambert, Garrett

Community of Residence: Homer, Alaska

Submission Time: 1/12/2024 1:10:05 AM

Comment:

Thank you for your time and work into these proposals, It is a long and yet greatly appreciated amount of work.

I am speaking to the opposition of proposal 3 and proposal 38.

I am aligned with ADFG local area biologist that non resident harvest has no significant impact to long or short term population outlook/ stability. Creating restrictive measures to non resident hunters does barely impacts biological and inhibits socio economic opportunity's at the local level.

Thank you for your time.

Best regards,

Garrett Lambert

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 304

Name: Lamping, Dillon

Community of Residence: Scappoose Oregon

Submission Time: 1/8/2024 5:01:59 AM

Comment:

Proposal 3 and 38. I oppose the odea of closing out non resident hunters from ever hunting caribou in these proposals.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 305

Name: Lamson, Reid

Community of Residence: Corning, Ca

Submission Time: 1/8/2024 8:42:44 PM

Comment:

I oppose 3 and 38.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



Name: Landecker, Isaac

Community of Residence: Anchorage, AK

Submission Time: 12/4/2023 7:02:18 AM

Comment:

Proposal 1: Suggest a registration hunt for any weapon and not restrict it to archery. Sheep hunting is already difficult enough.

Proposal 9: Unit 18 already has liberal limits. No change is needed at this time.

Proposal 14: The permits should be available to all residents online. Offering up permits in isolated villages is not fair to other resident hunters. Especially when Proposal 15 is for a subsistence muskox hunt. RX110 is a good example of creating a permit that less than 1% of resident hunters actually have the opportunity to get. Why not make it available online? Proposal 15 will ensure the "closest" residents are able to harvest muskox.

Proposal 15: Approve subsistence permit, but make Proposal 14 available online for all alaskan residents.

Proposal 25: Rather than close for nonresidents, make nonresidents a draw or registration tag.

Proposal 31: Rather than liberalize the bag limit, suggest allowing aircraft for moose hunting in 26A

Proposal 34: open a registration sheep hunt with no weapons restriction.

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 1: Support Proposal 7: Oppose Proposal 8: Oppose Proposal 10: Oppose Proposal 11: Oppose Proposal 14: Support with Amendment Proposal 15: Support with Amendment
Proposal 16: Support Proposal 17: Support Proposal 19: Support Proposal 20: Support
Proposal 25: Support with Amendment Proposal 26: Oppose Proposal 27: Support Proposal 31: Support with Amendment
Proposal 33: Oppose Proposal 34: Support with Amendment Proposal 35: Support
Proposal 36: Support Proposal 37: Support Proposal 38: Oppose Proposal 39: Support
Proposal 40: Support Proposal 41: Support



PC 307

Name: Langton, Alec

Community of Residence: Everett, WA

Submission Time: 1/9/2024 3:38:07 AM

Comment:

I oppose proposals 3 and 38 for the following reasons.

Non-resident hunters have a minimal impact on the caribou population, primarily harvesting bulls, which are less critical to population growth compared to cows and calves.

Economically speaking closing non-resident hunting could adversely affect local businesses and services that cater to these hunters, such as charter services.

Regulated hunting, including by non-residents, can be a tool for effective wildlife management and conservation.

These proposals do not address the more significant impact of subsistence hunting, which accounts for a much larger annual harvest.

There is insufficient scientific evidence directly linking non-resident hunting to the decline in the caribou population. The closure could set a concerning precedent for wildlife management, potentially leading to more extensive restrictions without clear scientific backing.

The closure would deny non-residents the cultural and recreational experience of hunting in this unique region.

Instead of outright closure, improved management practices and regulations could be a more effective approach to ensuring the herd's sustainability. Addressing caribou population decline requires a comprehensive strategy that considers all factors, including climate change and habitat loss, not just hunting regulations.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 308

Name: Lanningham, Jamie

Community of Residence: Nampa Idaho

Submission Time: 1/7/2024 4:24:52 PM

Comment:

A friend and I hunted out of Kotzebue in august of 23. Booked with a flight service located there. Arrived to town and honestly realized I was in a different place for sure. Walking around the town I noticed that people have a tough life compared to most places. Honestly I was a bit apprehensive to talk to the locals because I've been told they don't want any non locals here. Was surprised with how we were treated, everyone we Interacted with was extremely friendly and helpful. Everyone of them seemed excited we were there and hunting caribou. I'm not exactly sure what we spent in total dollar amounts just in Kotzebue, but I would imagine it was around \$2500 between food and lodging and tips. Not to mention the tags and licenses for the hunt. I honestly haven't really read up on the new poor ideas of closing down units and hunts in Alaska. Pretty sure it's the same poor management plans from the good old boys club behind closed doors. Let Alaska manage their game heard. Use proven facts on the heards. Use proven science based statistics on the decisions. Use conservation based decisions. The revenue generated would impact the whole community during the whole season. But unfortunately until the actual state of Alaska stands up and takes the control back, these surveys and no backbone petitions will not help. Regardless I vote no on the BS.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 309****Name:** Lanningham, Jamie**Community of Residence:** Nampa Idaho**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 1:03:17 AM**Comment:**

Let's rock some actual facts on herd management! Stop the good old chiefs from saying what the herd out come is! They waste more caribou than anyone! Stand up to the fools and manager your state game population and herds Alaska! Put your foot down and say no to #3 & #38

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 310****Name:** LaPierre, Zachary**Community of Residence:** Cataldo,Idaho**Submission Time:** 1/10/2024 2:40:13 PM**Comment:**

I oppose both proposal 3 and proposal 38. Here is why:

The closure could set a concerning precedent for wildlife management, potentially leading to more extensive restrictions without clear scientific backing.

The closure could set a concerning precedent for wildlife management, potentially leading to more extensive restrictions without clear scientific backing.

Addressing caribou population decline requires a comprehensive strategy that considers all factors, including climate change and habitat loss, not just hunting regulations.

Thank you for your time.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 311

Name: Lappe, Jeff

Community of Residence: Milford, Iowa

Submission Time: 1/10/2024 9:48:18 AM

Comment:

I oppose proposal #3 and #38 on the grounds that caribou herds naturally have wide fluctuations in their population numbers and there is no scientific evidence linking the decline to non-resident hunting. Non-resident hunters have minimal impact on caribou populations and greatly contribute to local businesses and services that cater to them. A much greater impact on the caribou populations comes from the much larger annual harvest by subsistence hunting.

There needs to be clear scientific evidence using sound game management practices to make such a decision as to close non-resident hunting, or it could lead to other closures with no scientific evidence.

There needs to be a comprehensive approach and strategy. All factors need to be considered and instead of a closure, improved management and regulations could be used to ensure the herds sustainability.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 312

Name: Larsen, Jared

Community of Residence: Lolo, MT

Submission Time: 1/3/2024 3:29:20 AM

Comment:

Proposal 3 and 38 would be detrimental to the hunting community, I'm all for limited and restricting tag numbers but to take away that opportunity at large would be saddening.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 313

Name: Lauterbach, Mitchell

Community of Residence: Meridian, Idaho

Submission Time: 1/9/2024 4:06:06 AM

Comment:

Do not take away opportunities from out of state hunters. We support your community and this is a bad direction for the hunting community overall.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 314

Name: Lea, Ian

Community of Residence: Colorado

Submission Time: 1/12/2024 4:14:27 PM

Comment:

I am a believer in the North American model of wildlife conservation, and an advocate for scientific wildlife management. If the Caribou populations are in decline, I do agree that steps should be taken to reduce harvest and allow the populations to recover. However, I feel that ending all non-resident hunting in the area is a drastic overstep and that it sets a very dangerous precedence for the future. Decisions like this should be made by biologists based on scientific data, NOT by ballot initiatives or proposals.

I think that a much more logical solution would be to place a temporary cap on the number of licenses sold to non residents to be re-evaluated in 3-5 years. Additionally, if you want to make a meaningful impact on the overall harvest, the restrictions would need to be place on resident hunters that are currently allowed to harvest up to 5 Caribou per day. Restricting their total harvest, specifically cow harvest, is going to have a much more positive effect on the population over time.

I strongly oppose proposals 3 and 38

I support proposals 2, 36, and 37 WITH AMMENDMENT.

Thank you 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 submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:

Proposal 2: Support with Amendment Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 36:
Support with Amendment Proposal 37: Support with Amendment Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 315****Name:** Lepak, Jason**Community of Residence:** Tulsa, Oklahoma**Submission Time:** 1/5/2024 11:38:38 PM**Comment:**

I "oppose" Proposal #3 (closure of non-resident caribou opportunities in units 22, 23, 24C, 24D, 26A, and portions of 21D and 24B). Instead of complete closure, look at game management alternatives: truncated seasons, restricting the number that can be taken by both residents and non-residents, etc. This is a dream hunt for me and one I would like the opportunity to do in my lifetime. As a non-resident traveling in, I will positively stimulate the economy. You can apply reasonable restrictions on limits and simultaneous caribou conservation that will allow flourishing. Of course, if you have knowledge that they are in imminent threat of becoming endanger that would change my thoughts, but there are known to likely be more caribou than people living in Alaska and with the ratio of caribou hunters in the general population it appears to be sustainable. Thank you and I appreciate your thoughtful consideration.

I "oppose" Proposal #38 (closure of unit 23 for all non-resident caribou hunting seasons). Instead of complete closure, look at game management alternatives: truncated seasons, restricting the number that can be taken by both residents and non-residents, etc. This is a dream hunt for me and one I would like the opportunity to do in my lifetime. As a non-resident traveling in, I will positively stimulate the economy. You can apply reasonable restrictions on limits and simultaneous caribou conservation that will allow flourishing. Of course, if you have knowledge that they are in imminent threat of becoming endanger that would change my thoughts, but there are known to likely be more caribou than people living in Alaska and with the ratio of caribou hunters in the general population it appears to be sustainable. Thank you and I appreciate your thoughtful consideration.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 316

Name: Levering, Raymond

Community of Residence: Fountain, Colorado

Submission Time: 1/12/2024 2:01:39 AM

Comment:

Limited Impact of Non-Resident Hunting: Non-resident hunters have a minimal impact on the caribou population, primarily harvesting bulls, which are less critical to population growth compared to cows and calves.

Natural Population Fluctuations: The Western Arctic Herd has historically undergone significant population fluctuations, suggesting that the current decline might be part of a natural cycle.

Economic Considerations: Closing non-resident hunting could adversely affect local businesses and services that cater to these hunters, such as charter services.

Conservation through Hunting: Regulated hunting, including by non-residents, can be a tool for effective wildlife management and conservation.

Subsistence Hunting Impact: The proposals do not address the more significant impact of subsistence hunting, which accounts for a much larger annual harvest.

Precedent for Wildlife Management: The closure could set a concerning precedent for wildlife management, potentially leading to more extensive restrictions without clear scientific backing.

Lack of Scientific Evidence: There is insufficient scientific evidence directly linking non-resident hunting to the decline in the caribou population.

Cultural and Recreational Loss: The closure would deny non-residents the cultural and recreational experience of hunting in this unique region.

Potential for Better Management Practices: Instead of outright closure, improved management practices and regulations could be a more effective approach to ensuring the herd's sustainability.

Need for Comprehensive Approach: Addressing caribou population decline requires a comprehensive strategy that considers all factors, including climate change and habitat loss, not just hunting regulations.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 317

Name: Levering, Sarah

Community of Residence: Fountain, Colorado

Submission Time: 1/13/2024 1:01:25 AM

Comment:

Limited Impact of Non-Resident Hunting: Non-resident hunters have a minimal impact on the caribou population, primarily harvesting bulls, which are less critical to population growth compared to cows and calves.

Natural Population Fluctuations: The Western Arctic Herd has historically undergone significant population fluctuations, suggesting that the current decline might be part of a natural cycle.

Economic Considerations: Closing non-resident hunting could adversely affect local businesses and services that cater to these hunters, such as charter services.

Conservation through Hunting: Regulated hunting, including by non-residents, can be a tool for effective wildlife management and conservation.

Subsistence Hunting Impact: The proposals do not address the more significant impact of subsistence hunting, which accounts for a much larger annual harvest.

Precedent for Wildlife Management: The closure could set a concerning precedent for wildlife management, potentially leading to more extensive restrictions without clear scientific backing.

Lack of Scientific Evidence: There is insufficient scientific evidence directly linking non-resident hunting to the decline in the caribou population.

Cultural and Recreational Loss: The closure would deny non-residents the cultural and recreational experience of hunting in this unique region.

Potential for Better Management Practices: Instead of outright closure, improved management practices and regulations could be a more effective approach to ensuring the herd's sustainability.

Need for Comprehensive Approach: Addressing caribou population decline requires a comprehensive strategy that considers all factors, including climate change and habitat loss, not just hunting regulations.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 318

Name: Licht, Adam

Community of Residence: Cave Cree, AZ

Submission Time: 1/13/2024 12:50:27 AM

Comment:

I oppose proposals #3 and #38.

Non-resident hunters have a minimal impact on the caribou population, primarily harvesting bulls, which are less critical to population growth compared to cows and calves.

Closing non-resident hunting could adversely affect local businesses and services that cater to these hunters, such as charter services.

The closure could set a concerning precedent for wildlife management, potentially leading to more extensive restrictions without clear scientific backing.

There is insufficient scientific evidence directly linking non-resident hunting to the decline in the caribou population.

Thank you

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 3: Oppose

**PC 319****Name:** Limpert, Matthew**Community of Residence:** Salt Lake City, Utah**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 10:47:30 PM**Comment:**

Please don't further limit our non resident hunting opportunities. Once a privilege is taken it is very rarely given back to the people. Wildlife populations seem to vary throughout the course of history regardless of human involvement. Save our hunting opportunities please. Thanks

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 320****Name:** Linscott, Walt**Community of Residence:** Milton, Georgia**Submission Time:** 1/12/2024 4:58:48 PM**Comment:**

Proposal 3 Close nonresident caribou hunting in Units 21D Remainder, 22, 23, 24B Remainder, 24C, 24D, and 26A -

The overwhelming evidence adduced and placed in the record with respect to this proposal clearly demonstrates that the overall contribution of non-resident hunters to the taking of caribou is inconsequential. There is not a statistically significant correlation between non-resident hunter take and caribou population decline. If in fact the aim is to provide some manmade control over what is historically a natural ebb and low of the relevant game population then this particular measure is not a rational mechanism to achieve this. Nonresidents were barred from hunting on federal public land in much of the subject areas in 2022. This action reduced the nonresident take of caribou significantly but as a mitigation measure that is ostensibly designed to increase long-term herd size, produced an inconsequential result. Nonresidents in large measure take only bulls. In Unit 23 just 54 bulls were taken in 2023. Nonresidents took just 102 bulls in Unit 26A in 2023. A bull to cow ratios remain well above the 30 bull to 100 cow goal. There are clearly surplus bulls available for harvest, supporting a small nonresident bull-only harvest on a herd of 164,000 caribou. Additionally, nonresident hunters typically purchase and use predator

tags thereby reducing the take of predators preying on caribou. Removing the opportunity to also have an opportunity to take a bull caribou will significantly reduce the appeal of investing in an Alaskan hunt - an investment that many non-residents pay very large sums of money for thereby providing a significant economic engine for the state, the area and a means to provide a direct means of economic based subsistence for residents. Furthermore, regulations require the complete collection and proper transfer of all meat harvested by non-resident hunters with a large proportion of the meat being directly transferred to local populations for subsistence purposes. In this latter respect, removing this source of subsistence means it will simply be replaced by increased local subsistence hunting. This further reduces any possible effect removing non-resident hunters from the equation might have. Non-resident hunters are an important component of subsistence hunting that is traceable and verifiable due to existing tag and transfer of possession regulations. Coupled with the significant revenue and fee generation that supports the overall management of game well beyond that of resident based fees, non-resident hunters provide far more benefit to the game management equation than they possibly extract. Removing them from the equation by this proposal would indeed be extremely short-sighted to the long-term management goals. Furthermore, resident harvest opportunity is still very generous in bag limit and season length that does not necessarily correlate with actual need or mass balance as the amount of meat that can be taken far exceeds what is needed on a per person to biomass that is allowed for taking. As with any proposal, the Board of Game should firmly weigh the economic and biological consequences of further restricting harvest opportunity for nonresidents. As long as resident hunters are allowed to take up to 5 cows per day from the Western Arctic Caribou Herd during an 8-mo season, there is no rational basis for eliminating the ability for individual nonresidents to harvest 1 bull per year during existing and very short fall-only seasons.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that Proposal 3 be denied and that non-resident hunters be continued to be afforded the opportunity to support the management efforts, subsistence efforts and provide the needed economic engine to best serve the management of caribou in the targeted areas.

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 3: Oppose

**PC 321****Name:** Little, Bryant**Community of Residence:** Eureka, MT**Submission Time:** 1/6/2024 3:55:54 AM**Comment:**

I am commenting for proposal's #3 and #38. I am commenting to oppose these caribou hunting bans to nonresidents. As a nonresident I cherish the opportunity to come hunt the game of Alaska, which in turn brings more money to these communities within the hunt areas. Hunting male caribou does not have the negative impact to the herd that people think it does. I believe in proper management, and when a species is declining in number, something needs to be done, which should be up to state biologists. And in this case banning all nonresident hunting is not the answer.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 322****Name:** Livesay, Mark**Community of Residence:** MISSOULA, MONTANA**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 1:28:37 AM**Comment:**

It's hard to believe that Alaska, of places, is looking to eliminate non-resident hunting privileges. The fees go up and up and we continue to buck up and pay them and non-resident fees are a huge part of the overall funding. Even so, here is yet another act to minimize non-resident hunters. Alaska is VERY happy to take our high tag fee money, in other areas. You get some outside pressure and manipulation and all a sudden non-resident tags are on the chopping block. I never thought that Alaska would bend it's knee to this kind of manipulation. It's really a sad situation. I have been such a fan of Alaska and I have two hunts planned this coming year. I sure hope you reconsider this disaster of a policy.

Limited Impact of Non-Resident Hunting: Non-resident hunters have a minimal impact on the caribou population, primarily harvesting bulls, which are less critical to population growth compared to cows and calves.

Natural Population Fluctuations: The Western Arctic Herd has historically undergone significant population fluctuations, suggesting that the current decline might be part of a natural cycle.

Economic Considerations: Closing non-resident hunting could adversely affect local businesses and services that cater to these hunters, such as charter services.

Conservation through Hunting: Regulated hunting, including by non-residents, can be a tool for effective wildlife management and conservation.

Subsistence Hunting Impact: The proposals do not address the more significant impact of subsistence hunting, which accounts for a much larger annual harvest.

Precedent for Wildlife Management: The closure could set a concerning precedent for wildlife management, potentially leading to more extensive restrictions without clear scientific backing.

Lack of Scientific Evidence: There is insufficient scientific evidence directly linking non-resident hunting to the decline in the caribou population.

Cultural and Recreational Loss: The closure would deny non-residents the cultural and recreational experience of hunting in this unique region.

Potential for Better Management Practices: Instead of outright closure, improved management practices and regulations could be a more effective approach to ensuring the herd's sustainability.

Need for Comprehensive Approach: Addressing caribou population decline requires a comprehensive strategy that considers all factors, including climate change and habitat loss, not just hunting regulations.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 323****Name:** Loar, Richard**Community of Residence:** Port Orchard, Washington**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 12:52:41 AM**Comment:**

Proposal 3 and 38, I oppose these two proposals. One of my dreams to hunt Alaska.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 324****Name:** Los, Ryan**Community of Residence:** Touchet wa**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 12:58:27 AM**Comment:**

The minimal amount of animals and affect on them of non resident hunters is negligible to these herds. Also the loss of revenue of non hunters to small villages would be impactful on them.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 325

Name: Lockett, William

Community of Residence: Idalou, TX

Submission Time: 1/5/2024 9:27:42 PM

Comment:

Hello,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to proposal 3 and 38. I do not believe there is enough scientific evidence to support the closures. Nonresident hunters take such a small portion of harvest that it does not effect the population significantly. These proposals will hurt the local economies while not benefiting caribou. Better predator management would significantly help the caribou population than these proposals.

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 1: Support Proposal 2: Support Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 4: Support Proposal 5: Support Proposal 6: Support Proposal 7: Oppose Proposal 8: Oppose Proposal 10: Oppose Proposal 11: Oppose Proposal 12: Support Proposal 13: Support Proposal 14: Oppose Proposal 15: Oppose Proposal 16: Support Proposal 17: Support Proposal 18: Support Proposal 22: Support Proposal 25: Oppose Proposal 28: Support Proposal 29: Support Proposal 30: Support Proposal 31: Support Proposal 33 Support Proposal 36: Support Proposal 37: Support Proposal 38: Oppose Proposal 39: Support Proposal 40: Support Proposal 41: Support Proposal 42: Support



PC 326

Name: Lujan, Adam

Community of Residence: Albuquerque, NM

Submission Time: 1/4/2024 7:11:51 PM

Comment:

I would like to voice my opposition to proposals 3 and 38 which would eliminate the opportunity for non-residents (such as myself) to potentially hunt caribou on the units listed on state lands. There has already been a drastic limitation in the state for non-resident hunters with the ban on federal public lands with little to no science to back the decision or proposal at hand. The numbers and facts provided by the ADFG help to clarify and encourage a collaborative effort to better understanding the complex causes of the caribou herd dynamics to then work towards sound solutions instead of proposals such as 3 and 38 which appear to be merely based on preferential treatment and a not-in-my-backyard mindset.

The harvest numbers speak for themselves (non-resident hunting is insignificant to the population dynamics) and outfitters and guides may be the most interested and involved members of the local public (along with the locals reliant on subsistence living) to help find solutions as their livelihood depends on those game species. I urge the Board of Game to be objective in their review of comments and facts to inform their decision on this matter.

It is difficult to hear the very compelling and passionate concerns from local residents or special interest groups about an issue but it is even harder to ensure sound, defensible decisions are made with the relevant facts. If all special interest groups got what they were after because they are loud or seemingly the majority, then there would be no fact based decisions, no need for review boards or decision makers, and we would be left with the whimsical, fleeting, short term solutions to complex problems which serve neither man, animal, nor land. Good work and thank you for your service.

Respectfully,

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 327****Name:** Lund, Abby**Community of Residence:** Ketchikan, AL**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 3:17:08 AM**Comment:**

It does not make sense to restrict hunting opportunities for out of state hunters while allowing residents and locals to kill cows. Please use best management practices and consider limiting take of cow calves by residents rather than limiting take if bulls for any 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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 328****Name:** Lundquist, Gus**Community of Residence:** Denver, CO**Submission Time:** 1/10/2024 3:32:21 AM**Comment:**

Addressing caribou population decline requires a comprehensive strategy that considers all factors, including climate change and habitat loss, not just hunting regulations. There is insufficient scientific evidence directly linking non-resident hunting to the decline in the caribou population. Regulated hunting, including by non-residents, can be a tool for effective wildlife management and conservation. Non-resident hunters have a minimal impact on the caribou population, primarily harvesting bulls, which are less critical to population growth compared to cows and calves.

While I believe the health of the herd should be considered above all else, these proposals will not address that issue, and the economic impact must also be considered. If the goal is to protect local Alaskans, devastating their businesses certainly does not accomplish that.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 329****Name:** Lynam, Rylan**Community of Residence:** Moose, Wyoming**Submission Time:** 1/11/2024 8:20:56 PM**Comment:**

I'm opposed to proposals #3 and #38. As a non-resident of Alaska these two proposals would limit access to hunting opportunities for myself and others. Please do not pass these proposals.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 330****Name:** Mabbott, Hannah**Community of Residence:** Hermiston, OR**Submission Time:** 1/7/2024 11:21:03 PM**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the ballot measures limiting and/or removing nonresident hunting opportunities in the State of Alaska, specifically those for Caribou and other Ungulates.

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 1: Oppose Proposal 2: Oppose Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 4: Oppose Proposal 5:
Oppose Proposal 6: Oppose Proposal 7: Oppose Proposal 8: 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 190: Oppose Proposal 209: Oppose



PC 331

Name: Macias, Marco

Community of Residence: Chula Vista CA

Submission Time: 1/9/2024 12:19:53 PM

Comment:

Opposition to prop 3 & 38. Making decisions off emotion rather than science is how ecosystems are ruined. We've seen it happen in states like California. Stop making decisions off your emotions and rather what will

Actually benefit the herds.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 332****Name:** Majerus, Jeremiah**Community of Residence:** Rice, Minnesota**Submission Time:** 1/6/2024 12:15:27 AM**Comment:**

As a nonresident that has enjoyed the beauty and animals of unit 23 I strongly oppose any and all proposals that limit nonresidents in anyway. It is becoming increasingly difficult for us to hunt in any western state without hiring a guide or spending an obscene amount of money to fairly chase game on OUR public land. I cannot emphasize that enough. The land these animals call home is mine, my wife's, my neighbors, and all of ours. I've spent thousands of dollars in your state just to hunt animals in unit 23. This doesn't just include the tag. People are concerned about caribou migrating, to make it easier for residents to harvest? Get out there and work for them like we all do. I'm tired of states taking it out on the nonresidents. Thanks for your time.

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 1: Oppose Proposal 2: Support with Amendment Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 11: Oppose
Proposal 12: Support Proposal 13: Oppose Proposal 14: Oppose Proposal 15: Oppose
Proposal 16: Support Proposal 18: Oppose Proposal 19: Support Proposal 20: Oppose Proposal
22: Support Proposal 23: Support Proposal 25: Oppose Proposal 26: Support Proposal 28:
Support Proposal 29: Support Proposal 33 Support Proposal 36: Support Proposal 37: Support
Proposal 38: Oppose Proposal 39: Support Proposal 40: Support Proposal 42: Support

**PC 333****Name:** Mallory, Justin**Community of Residence:** Clayton, California**Submission Time:** 1/12/2024 10:12:48 PM**Comment:**

Oppose proposal #3 and #38. Non-resident caribou opportunities are the smallest factor affecting the caribou numbers and are dwarfed in comparison to the resident hunters impact and environmental factors.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 334****Name:** Mann, Calvin**Community of Residence:** Apple valley, mn**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 12:24:42 AM**Comment:**

These recommendations make zero sense biologically and based on harvest surveys nonresident hunting has close to zero effect on these area's populations or travel routes. This is purely a political play to keep people out.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 335

Name: Manuta, Perfecto

Community of Residence: Reno, NV

Submission Time: 1/13/2024 12:16:06 AM

Comment:

Please, do not get rid of non-resident hunting for caribou. I don't see the benefit for resident/subsistence hunters, if this were to be passed. There will be a good portion of funding from the department that will be cut and businesses that will be effected because of this. If we are looking for a solution for the decline in caribou population, I say we look elsewhere for the answer because I think stopping non-resident from hunting for caribou will not be the solution. Non-resident hunters for caribou is minimal. Thank you for holding the space for comments.

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 1: Support with Amendment Proposal 2: Support Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 4: Support Proposal 5: Support with Amendment Proposal 6: Support with Amendment Proposal 7: Support with Amendment Proposal 8: Oppose Proposal 10: Oppose Proposal 11: Oppose Proposal 12: Support with Amendment Proposal 13: Support with Amendment Proposal 14: Oppose Proposal 15: Support with Amendment Proposal 16: Support Proposal 17: Support Proposal 18: Support Proposal 19: Support with Amendment Proposal 20: Support Proposal 21: Oppose Proposal 22: Support with Amendment Proposal 23: Oppose Proposal 24: Oppose Proposal 25: Oppose Proposal 26: Oppose Proposal 27: Support with Amendment Proposal 28: Support with Amendment Proposal 29: Support Proposal 30: Support Proposal 31: Oppose Proposal 32: Support with Amendment Proposal 33 Support Proposal 34: Support Proposal 35: Support Proposal 36: Support Proposal 37: Support Proposal 38: Oppose Proposal 39: Support Proposal 40: Support Proposal 41: Support Proposal 42: Support with Amendment Proposal 190: Support Proposal 209: Support with Amendment

**PC 336****Name:** Marchant, Kent**Community of Residence:** Eagle River, Alaska**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 6:32:54 AM**Comment:**

Changing or limiting the number of nonresident tags is a poor idea as these hunters bring significant revenue to the state. Opening currently closed sheep units to archery only units will create very minimal pressure on these more delicate herds in tough ranges.

Expanding predator hunts is always a plus for the prey animals and will allow more opportunity for residents and nonresidents to harvest both predator and prey animals, as more predators are taken the prey populations will flourish allowing more opportunities for 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 1: Support Proposal 2: Support Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 4: Oppose Proposal 5: Oppose
Proposal 16: Support Proposal 17: Support Proposal 18: Support Proposal 19: Support
Proposal 20: Support Proposal 25: Oppose Proposal 28: Support Proposal 29: Support
Proposal 30: Support Proposal 31: Support Proposal 32: Oppose Proposal 33: Oppose
Proposal 34: Support Proposal 35: Support Proposal 36: Support Proposal 37: Support Proposal
38: Oppose Proposal 39: Support Proposal 40: Support Proposal 41: Support Proposal 42: Oppose

**PC 337****Name:** Marks, Braden**Community of Residence:** Ontario, Ca**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 2:35:33 PM**Comment:**

I oppose 3 and 38. Don't take hunting away from non residents. It will also ruin your economy

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 338****Name:** Mauger, Calvin**Community of Residence:** Pueblo, Colorado**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 12:31:58 AM**Comment:**

Please oppose prop 3 and 38. These bills would destroy access to nw Caribou hunters. These bills are not scientific. The population is not dropping because of non resident hunters. Non resident hunters have one of the smallest statistical slices for Caribou mortality. It's just a fact. Please don't pass 3 and 38 because they will not accomplish their stated goals and are just a waste. It would also make non residents think again about ever going to a state that appears to hate them.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 339****Name:** May, Andy**Community of Residence:** Adrian**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 6:47:58 PM**Comment:**

I strongly oppose #3 and #38. We are losing hunting opportunity across the US at an alarming rate. We need to fight to keep these opportunities no restrict them further. If the heard is in trouble I would rather support going to a draw system or restricting technology on the weapon. ie (limitations on rifle scopes, calibers, or even limiting technology on archery gear). Possibly a harvest quota. We cannot lose these opportunities because it becomes a domino effect for other states restricting opportunity also. If we want hunting to be around for the future we have to fight to keep these opportunities alive.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 340

Name: McAllister, Kerri

Community of Residence: Vine Grove, Kentucky

Submission Time: 1/10/2024 11:58:17 PM

Comment:

I oppose #3 and #38

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 38: Oppose



PC 341

Name: McCloskey, Cole

Community of Residence: Madison, WI

Submission Time: 12/29/2023 6:24:09 PM

Comment:

Non-Resident hunters were reduced from 5 caribou to one bull caribou in 2015 in conjunction with a reduction in season. There is nothing left for the non-resident hunter to sacrifice, short of eliminating all access and opportunity. Grizzly bears and wolves do far more damage than hunters. On top of that, a significant amount of commerce will be lost for Nome and other Alaskan communities.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 28: Support



Name: McCutcheon, James

Community of Residence: Benicia, California

Submission Time: 1/13/2024 12:26:51 AM

Comment:

Both of my Grandparents lived and worked in Glenallen AK they owned and ran the Caribou Hotel and Restaurant in that town. I can tell you firsthand that they depended on the hunters income to make it through the winter. Thank You Jim McCutcheon

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 1: Oppose Proposal 2: Oppose Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 4: Oppose Proposal 5: Support Proposal 6: Support with Amendment Proposal 7: Support with Amendment Proposal 8: Support with Amendment Proposal 10: Support with Amendment Proposal 11: Support with Amendment Proposal 12: Support with Amendment Proposal 13: Support with Amendment Proposal 14: Support with Amendment Proposal 15: Support with Amendment Proposal 16: Support with Amendment Proposal 17: Support with Amendment Proposal 18: Support with Amendment Proposal 19: Support with Amendment Proposal 20: Support with Amendment Proposal 21: Support with Amendment Proposal 22: Support with Amendment Proposal 23: Support with Amendment Proposal 24: Support with Amendment Proposal 25: Support with Amendment Proposal 26: Support with Amendment Proposal 27: Support with Amendment Proposal 28: Support with Amendment Proposal 29: Support with Amendment Proposal 30: Support with Amendment Proposal 31: Support with Amendment Proposal 32: Support with Amendment Proposal 33: Support with Amendment Proposal 34: Support with Amendment Proposal 35: Support with Amendment Proposal 36: Support with Amendment Proposal 37: Support with Amendment Proposal 38: Support with Amendment Proposal 39: Support with Amendment Proposal 40: Support with Amendment Proposal 41: Support with Amendment Proposal 42: Support with Amendment Proposal 190: Support with Amendment Proposal 209: Support with Amendment



PC 343

Name: McDonald, Logan

Community of Residence: Laurel, Montana

Submission Time: 1/2/2024 7:14:10 PM

Comment:

I oppose proposal #3.

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 2: Oppose



PC 344

Name: McDow, Brandon

Community of Residence: Burnet, Texas

Submission Time: 1/8/2024 3:43:19 AM

Comment:

I oppose the proposed closures in Proposal #3 and Proposal #38 for non resident caribou units. This closure would mean cutting of non residents to explore one of our countries last remaining wild places. Not to mention letting wildlife go unsustainably managed by regulated hunting.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 345

Name: McElrea, Brian

Community of Residence: Salt Lake City, Utah

Submission Time: 1/9/2024 3:48:41 PM

Comment:

I am writing today to express my opposition to proposal number 3 and proposal number 38.

Although ungulate populations will fluctuate over the years based on multiple factors, these proposals of closing down massive amounts of hunting to non-resident hunters would set a precedent that is very concerning. And, at the same time doesn't account for other significant factors in overall population number such as substance hunting and the impact that is having to these caribou herds.

Non-resident hunters have a very limited impact on the caribou populations and stimulate massive economic impact in the state of Alaska.

For these reasons and many others, please oppose proposals 3 and 38.

Thank you,

Brian McElrea

Non-Resident Hunter

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 346****Name:** McGuire, Rob**Community of Residence:** Fort Wayne, IN**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 9:41:16 PM**Comment:**

I am writing in response to proposals 3 and 38. As an American Hunter, I oppose the closure of the hunt to Non-Residents. The cause of the decline in herd numbers will not be fixed by this action, and the difficulty for the non-resident hunter to legally get the hunt back will be great.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 347****Name:** Mckeithen, Matthew**Community of Residence:** Tampa, FL**Submission Time:** 1/6/2024 6:51:28 PM**Comment:**

I spent time traveling to hunt Caribou in Kotzebue and had hands down the greatest trip of life. We saw hundreds of caribou and harvested a mature bull. All the money that is brought into the community to hunt these animals has a positive impact for the locals. Taking these privileges away to hunters and the generations to come would be a shame.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 348

Name: McPherson, Chattan

Community of Residence: Moses lake, Washington

Submission Time: 1/3/2024 4:52:48 AM

Comment:

I oppose proposal 3. Non resident opportunities in many states are being limited and reduced. We need to support opportunities for non residents.

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 1: Support Proposal 3: Oppose



PC 349

Name: McRae, Alex

Community of Residence: Nampa, Idaho

Submission Time: 1/7/2024 2:20:17 PM

Comment:

I oppose closing down the hunting to non residents in proposal three. Being a member of this country I don't believe there should be resident and non resident hunting lands. It's all our land. I can differences in the number of tags but not a complete ban.

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 2: Support Proposal 3: Oppose

**PC 350****Name:** Meckert, Kyle**Community of Residence:** Barrington, Illinois**Submission Time:** 1/6/2024 8:36:59 PM**Comment:**

I'm writing about proposal 3 and 38 which eliminates non resident hunters from hunting a portion of a specified area. Herd numbers may go down a regulations should be put in place to ensure a sustainable population. Limiting tags is an obvious choice. The concern is that if non residents lose the opportunity to hunt these areas now, will we ever gain it back? Please do not remove non resident opportunities otherwise they may be lost forever.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 351****Name:** MEDCALF, JUSTIN**Community of Residence:** Otis orchards WA**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 3:40:35 AM**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposition 3 and proposition 38. As a non resident hunter this would extremely limit my ability to come to Alaska and hunt. Alaska is the last great state in this great country please don't take away our out of state opportunities in these areas!

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 352

Name: Melocik, Bradley

Community of Residence: ANCHORAGE

Submission Time: 1/8/2024 5:25:27 PM

Comment:

Excluding non residents of which kill so few animals, is a slippery slope. Need to reduce take of cows and calves first.

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 1: Oppose Proposal 2: Support Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 4: Support Proposal 5:
Support with Amendment Proposal 6: Oppose Proposal 7: Oppose Proposal 8: Support Proposal
10: Oppose Proposal 36: Support Proposal 37: Support Proposal 38: Oppose
Proposal 42: Support



PC 353

Name: Mendoza, Samuel

Community of Residence: Loganville, Georgia

Submission Time: 1/8/2024 4:58:36 PM

Comment:

I oppose any action that limits the rights of American citizens to hunt the beautiful state of Alaska. Alaska is a beautiful place where I have always dreamed to hunt one day. That's part of my American dream.

To limit the hunting rights of non-resident hunters would not only crush the dreams of Americans all over our great nation, but would also hurt conservation as a whole, thus hurting the animals of Alaska in the long run.

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 1: Oppose Proposal 2: Oppose Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 4: Oppose Proposal 5:
Oppose Proposal 6: Oppose Proposal 7: Oppose Proposal 8: 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 190: Oppose Proposal 209: Oppose

**PC 354****Name:** Mesker, Drew**Community of Residence:** Cincinnati, OH**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 8:12:55 PM**Comment:**

Proposal #3 and Proposal #38.

These proposals make no sense and I am strongly opposed to them. First off there is no scientific proof that non-resident hunters killing only bull caribou are the reason for the decline in this population. This herd of caribou has historically fluctuated in numbers over many years. The numbers in these proposals list only the last 5 years, which is not a long term view. Further, non-resident hunters kill a tiny fraction of the amount of caribou in this area compared to sustenance hunters, yet this proposal does not address that. It seems logical that limiting the killing of cows and calves would have a greater impact on improving the population numbers, yet non-residents can only shoot bulls. This proposal feels like it is being submitted by people who don't want non-resident hunters in their area, and they are using this decline in the caribou population as an excuse to push their agenda.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 355

Name: Metcalf, Michael

Community of Residence: Anchorage, Alaska

Submission Time: 1/3/2024 1:17:57 AM

Comment:

as a non-resident living in Alaska about to gain Alaska residency I feel it is important to offer non-resident hunting in limited amount. Especially when there's no limits on resident harvest I recommend limiting non resident tags but an all out closure of non residents when residents have basically no limits doesn't seem to make sense

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 1: Support Proposal 2: Support Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 4: Support Proposal 5: Support with Amendment Proposal 6: Support Proposal 7: Support Proposal 8: Support Proposal 10: Support Proposal 11: Support Proposal 12: Support Proposal 13: Support Proposal 14: Support Proposal 15: Support Proposal 16: Support Proposal 17: Support Proposal 18: Support Proposal 19: Support Proposal 20: Support Proposal 21: Support Proposal 22: Support Proposal 23: Support Proposal 24: Support Proposal 25: Oppose Proposal 26: Support Proposal 27: Support Proposal 28: Support Proposal 29: Support Proposal 30: Support Proposal 31: Support Proposal 32: Support Proposal 33 Support Proposal 34: Support Proposal 35: Support Proposal 36: Support Proposal 37: Support Proposal 38: Oppose Proposal 39: Support Proposal 40: Support Proposal 41: Support Proposal 42: Support



PC 356

Name: Michalek, Matthew

Community of Residence: Laingsburg

Submission Time: 1/11/2024 6:28:51 PM

Comment:

Hello.

My name is Matthew Michalek and I am very concerned about the possible closure to non-resident hunters in Alaska. This is very much the last frontier and I hope to enjoy it hopefully for my 40th birthday in a few years if it is still open. I believe NR hunters have a very minor impact on the herd numbers and overall health. With that very small impact you are trading off a large economic impact for what we are willing to pay for tags, hotels, airfare, meals, shipping, taxidermy, and everything else that not just the hunt but travel to the area includes. This is quite a bit of money and jobs the locals would be out on for not much change in herd dynamics. Please keep this area open for hunting!

Thank you for your time,

Matthew Michalek

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 2: Oppose Proposal 3: Oppose
Oppose Proposal 38: Oppose

Proposal 36: Oppose Proposal 37:



PC 357

Name: Miller, Bill

Community of Residence: Preston ID

Submission Time: 1/2/2024 4:34:15 AM

Comment:

I am against proposal three. I feel that caribou hunting is being over harvested from residents and they should have their numbers reduced more than what is being proposed. Non residents take very little Caribou and bring lots of resources to the area and members of the community.

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 3: Oppose



Name: Miller, Debbie

Community of Residence: Sitka, Alaska

Submission Time: 1/12/2024 7:34:50 PM

Comment:

In support of Proposals 6, 7, 8, and 10: I support Alissa Nadine Rogers' proposal for a 5-10 year moratorium on the hunting of the Mulchatna Herd, to be reviewed every five years. This herd is in serious decline due to climate change, disease, overgrazing in the past, and poaching. A moratorium would help the herd recover. At the same time, I urge the Board of Game and department to immediately suspend the five-year Intensive Management Plan for the Mulchatna Herd.

The Intensive Management plan for the Mulchatna Herd allows the killing of an unlimited number of bears and wolves in the calving grounds during calving season. By way of regulation, this culling plan was adopted without any public vetting in January of 2022, in opposition to what department biologists had recommended based on science. As a result of this illegally adopted regulation, an excessive number of 99 bears were killed in May and June of 2023. This is the worst example of wildlife management that I can remember in my nearly 50 years of living in Alaska.

I support the subsistence lifestyle of Alaska's Indigenous people. I've hunted and fished over the years and know the importance of hunting for rural residents and getting food on their plates. That is why I also support Proposals 7, 8 and 10 which extends the moose hunting season and bag limit for local residents in Unit 18. There is a surplus of moose and an actual need for people to hunt them because they are exploding in some areas. Climate change is a benefit for moose with more shrub habitat available. But it is not as suitable for caribou. I urge the Board to support and pass Proposals 7, 8, and 10 which will benefit local residents, help control the moose population, and take the pressure off the struggling Mulchatna Herd.

This approach saves the department money. The State of Alaska should not be spending a half-million dollars, killing an unlimited number of bears and wolves from a helicopter with shotguns, when predation is not a significant cause why the Mulchatna Herd is in decline. Don't make the bears and wolves easy scapegoats. Causes for the herd's decline have been well documented by ADFG's own biologists and other scientists who have voiced their opposition to the IM bear-killing plan. It's also very troubling that the IM plan was conducted without having a current bear census for the calving region, nor any cap or threshold on the number of bears slaughtered by ADFG. This is reckless wildlife management.

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 6: Support Proposal 7: Support Proposal 8: Support Proposal 10: Support



PC 359

Name: Miller, Douglas

Community of Residence: Warsaw ohio

Submission Time: 1/5/2024 1:44:08 AM

Comment:

Please do not close the caribou hunting. Most of us nonresidents can't afford a guide. This is a tradition for us to hunt together

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 360

Name: Miller, Greg

Community of Residence: La Center, Washington

Submission Time: 1/12/2024 3:42:42 AM

Comment:

Proposal 38: I oppose.

Reasoning:

Caribou management plans should focus only on proposals that use proven herd recovery methods and that will make a material difference in the long-term health of the herd. Please consider the follow perspectives below.

Nonresidents may only harvest a single bull caribou. They cannot harvest cows. The nonresident bull caribou harvest is just over 1/10 of 1% of the total herd. This is a minuscule number relative to the total herd size and has no material impact on total herd population for a herd as big as the WACH.

In contrast, subsistence harvest is between 10,000-16,000 caribou annually. This represents around 6-10% of the herd every year. Subsistence harvest also includes cow harvest. Depending on the yearly migration timing & location, cow harvest can be significant (10%-40%). Unfortunately, firm numbers are difficult to secure. All parties who have a sincere vested interest in caribou herd health should be supportive and required to provide accurate harvest statistics. A temporary moratorium of cow harvest would have the greatest impact on herd recovery.

During periods of declining herd populations predator management should also be strongly considered. There is an abundance of wolves and grizzlies/ brown bears in the unit. All these species prey heavily on caribou, especially calves.

It is unfortunate, that proposal 38 appears to be focused more on the exclusion of a specific stakeholders rather than on the most important topic of heard health and recovery. The WACH is a national treasure that is not for the benefit of a single group but for all.

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 38: Oppose



Name: Miller, Greg

Community of Residence: La Center, Washington

Submission Time: 1/12/2024 6:01:36 AM

Comment:

Proposal 3: I oppose.

The reasoning presented suggests a focus on proven herd recovery methods and making a material difference in the long-term health of the caribou herd, particularly the Western Arctic Caribou Herd (WACH). Here are some key points to consider:

Nonresident Harvest Impact: The argument emphasizes that the nonresident bull caribou harvest has a minimal impact (just over 1/10 of 1%) on the total herd size. This suggests that restrictions on nonresident harvest may not be a significant factor in herd recovery efforts.

Subsistence Harvest Concerns: The significant subsistence harvest (6-10% of the herd annually) is highlighted, with the inclusion of cow harvest. The suggestion of a temporary moratorium on cow harvest is presented as a potential impactful measure for herd recovery. Accurate harvest statistics from all parties are deemed crucial for effective decision-making.

Predator Management: The argument advocates for considering predator management during periods of declining herd populations. The abundance of wolves and grizzlies/brown bears is noted as a threat, especially to caribou calves. This suggests that addressing predator populations may be crucial for the long-term health of the herd.

Critique of Proposal 3: The argument criticizes Proposal 3, stating that it seems to focus more on excluding specific stakeholders rather than addressing the core issue of herd health and recovery. The WACH is portrayed as a national treasure that should benefit all, emphasizing the need for inclusive and comprehensive management plans.

In summary, the proposed approach advocates for a holistic strategy that involves addressing subsistence harvest, accurate data collection, and considering predator management, while expressing skepticism about proposals that seem to prioritize excluding stakeholders over the broader goal of herd recovery and health.

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 3: Oppose

**PC 362****Name:** Miller, Patrick**Community of Residence:** San Marcos, California**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 2:05:44 AM**Comment:**

I believe hunting should be available for all people. There are a very small number of non-resident tags and these tags should remain available to non-residents.

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 3: Oppose

**PC 363****Name:** Miller, Ryan**Community of Residence:** Copperas Cove, Texas**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 3:45:42 PM**Comment:**

Please keep the NE hunting opportunities for Caribou OPEN. The harvest of this small number of bulls will not have an adverse affect of the total population. The money NR hunters bring to these communities is critical to them and their prosperity. It is also a critical event for many of those who travel there and can be life changing. I am OPPOSED to closing or REDUCING this opportunity for non residents.

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 1: Support with Amendment Proposal 2: Oppose Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 4: Oppose Proposal 5: Oppose Proposal 6: Oppose Proposal 7: Support with Amendment Proposal 8: Oppose Proposal 10: Oppose Proposal 11: Support with Amendment Proposal 12: Support Proposal 13: Support Proposal 14: Support with Amendment Proposal 15: Support with Amendment Proposal 16: Support Proposal 17: Support Proposal 18: Support Proposal 19: Support with Amendment Proposal 20: Support with Amendment Proposal 21: Support with

Amendment Proposal 22: Support Proposal 23: Oppose Proposal 24: Support with Amendment
Proposal 25: Oppose Proposal 26: Support Proposal 27: Support Proposal 28: Support Proposal
29: Support Proposal 30: Support Proposal 31: Support with Amendment Proposal 32: Support
with Amendment Proposal 33: Support with Amendment Proposal 34: Support with Amendment
Proposal 35: Support Proposal 36: Support Proposal 37: Support Proposal 38: Oppose Proposal
39: Support Proposal 40: Support Proposal 41: Support Proposal 42: Oppose



PC 364

Name: Millward, Alex

Community of Residence: Provo, Utah

Submission Time: 1/11/2024 5:48:23 PM

Comment:

I am opposed to the closure proposals listed. This will be devastating to all those who conduct business in the area. Other measures can be taken to increase population and heard health

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 1: Oppose Proposal 2: Oppose Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 4: Oppose Proposal 5:
Oppose Proposal 6: Oppose Proposal 7: Oppose Proposal 8: 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 190: Oppose Proposal 209: Oppose



PC 365

Name: Mitchell, Matt

Community of Residence: Evansville

Submission Time: 1/9/2024 12:14:05 PM

Comment:

Limited Impact of Non-Resident Hunting: Non-resident hunters have a minimal impact on the caribou population, primarily harvesting bulls, which are less critical to population growth compared to cows and calves.

Natural Population Fluctuations: The Western Arctic Herd has historically undergone significant population fluctuations, suggesting that the current decline might be part of a natural cycle.

Economic Considerations: Closing non-resident hunting could adversely affect local businesses and services that cater to these hunters, such as charter services.

Conservation through Hunting: Regulated hunting, including by non-residents, can be a tool for effective wildlife management and conservation.

Subsistence Hunting Impact: The proposals do not address the more significant impact of subsistence hunting, which accounts for a much larger annual harvest.

Precedent for Wildlife Management: The closure could set a concerning precedent for wildlife management, potentially leading to more extensive restrictions without clear scientific backing.

Lack of Scientific Evidence: There is insufficient scientific evidence directly linking non-resident hunting to the decline in the caribou population.

Cultural and Recreational Loss: The closure would deny non-residents the cultural and recreational experience of hunting in this unique region.

Potential for Better Management Practices: Instead of outright closure, improved management practices and regulations could be a more effective approach to ensuring the herd's sustainability.

Need for Comprehensive Approach: Addressing caribou population decline requires a comprehensive strategy that considers all factors, including climate change and habitat loss, not just hunting regulations.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 366

Name: Mobley, Austin

Community of Residence: Wasilla alaska

Submission Time: 1/3/2024 6:17:50 AM

Comment:

Oppose 3 and 38

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 367

Name: Moeller, Jason

Community of Residence: Sioux Center, IA

Submission Time: 1/4/2024 7:49:35 PM

Comment:

As a non-resident interested in hunting opportunities, I am vehemently opposed to closing access for hunters like me. I am opposed to proposals #3 and #38. I would love to bring commerce to AK and take home meat. Thank you for your consideration.

Jason

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 368****Name:** Mollineaux, Robert**Community of Residence:** ketchum, Idaho**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 3:57:02 AM**Comment:**

Proposals #3/#38

After looking at the harvest stats for these units, it seems to me that limiting or doing away with non-resident tags would do very little towards maximizing carrying capacity. The non-residents harvest very little compared to the subsistence hunters making up about 3-4% of total harvest with a majority of punched tags on bulls. In my home state we are also struggling with maintaining populations of mule deer after a brutally long winter last year. I do not believe that limiting tags which then cuts revenue is the right call in these situations. Habitat and Mother Nature are typically the biggest players when it comes to the vitality of a herd and funding for the further conservation and protection of these animals should be a priority. It is very important to keep intact these natural food systems going forward because the procurement of wild sustenance is vital to the perpetuation and preservation of the habitat these animals and resources come from. That being said, if you truly believe that in the big picture you these herds are floundering and the answer is to cut back non-resident by all means go ahead. I do caution you though that the repercussions may be wider and farther reaching then you imagine. I think the better more sustainable perspective is one that sees the long term protection of these resources not the short term humming and hahhing of some residents who may not have the rest of the United States or ironically even their own future in their own best interest. Bottom line: I think it is short sighted and out of step with the North American Conservation Model.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 369

Name: Moma, Luke

Community of Residence: Denver, CO

Submission Time: 1/9/2024 8:10:08 PM

Comment:

see attached

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 2: Oppose Proposal 3: Oppose
Oppose Proposal 38: Oppose

Proposal 36: Oppose Proposal 37:

As an Alaskan native who was born and raised in the state, I strongly oppose proposals #3 and #38, which aim to restrict non-resident hunting in certain units. Having spent my formative years in the Alaskan backcountry, I intimately understand the unparalleled beauty, extensive access, and diverse wildlife that inhabit these lands. Despite no longer residing in the state, I continue to contribute to Alaska's economy as a non-resident hunter, investing both time and resources every fall. It is imperative that we resist any unwarranted limitations imposed by those unfamiliar with the critical balance between conservation and the rights of responsible hunters. Preserving our hunting rights and land access is not just a personal commitment; it's a defense of a heritage deeply rooted in the Alaskan wilderness. Detailing a number of valid reasons that support the strong opposition of proposals #3 & #38:

1. **Limited Impact of Non-Resident Hunting:** Non-resident hunters have a minimal impact on the caribou population, primarily harvesting bulls, which are less critical to population growth compared to cows and calves.
2. **Natural Population Fluctuations:** The Western Arctic Herd has historically undergone significant population fluctuations, suggesting that the current decline might be part of a natural cycle.
3. **Economic Considerations:** Closing non-resident hunting could adversely affect local businesses and services that cater to these hunters, such as charter services.
4. **Conservation through Hunting:** Regulated hunting, including by non-residents, can be a tool for effective wildlife management and conservation.
5. **Subsistence Hunting Impact:** The proposals do not address the more significant impact of subsistence hunting, which accounts for a much larger annual harvest.
6. **Precedent for Wildlife Management:** The closure could set a concerning precedent for wildlife management, potentially leading to more extensive restrictions without clear scientific backing.
7. **Lack of Scientific Evidence:** There is insufficient scientific evidence directly linking non-resident hunting to the decline in the caribou population.
8. **Cultural and Recreational Loss:** The closure would deny non-residents the cultural and recreational experience of hunting in this unique region.
9. **Potential for Better Management Practices:** Instead of outright closure, improved management practices and regulations could be a more effective approach to ensuring the herd's sustainability.
10. **Need for Comprehensive Approach:** Addressing caribou population decline requires a comprehensive strategy that considers all factors, including climate change and habitat loss, not just hunting regulations.



PC 370

Name: Monaghan, Barney

Community of Residence: Magnolia Springs, Alabama

Submission Time: 1/12/2024 11:31:12 PM

Comment:

I am opposed to Proposals 3 and 38 seeking to close Caribou hunting in certain units to Non-Residents. I believe this is a flawed proposal that limits the least impactful population of hunters in relation to the biological impact of those hunters, but which will undoubtedly have an economic impact well beyond the benefits. A more effective approach would be to develop a plan to reduce the negative impacts of resident and non-resident hunters while continuing to provide opportunities to enjoy the resource and provide an economic value to the State of Alaska.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 371****Name:** Moore, Joel**Community of Residence:** Parker, CO**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 4:36:55 AM**Comment:**

I have been saving to hunt caribou and moose in Alaska, if proposal 3 & 38 pass I'll be looking to hunt in Canada since Americans are going to be unable to hunt Alaska. Overall I can't even understand how 250 mostly bulls being shot will be banned when 14,000 cows/calves are shot annually by locals. Some of the dumbest ideas for wildlife sustainability ever.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 372****Name:** Moore, Kyle**Community of Residence:** Anchorage ,Alaska**Submission Time:** 1/2/2024 3:54:01 PM**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 3. Closing caribou hunting to non residents when their take has little effect on the population makes no sense. This only hurts opportunity and takes their business away from the state of Alaska.

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 3: Oppose

**PC 373****Name:** Moore, Seth**Community of Residence:** Troy, MT**Submission Time:** 1/2/2024 11:56:32 PM**Comment:**

Proposal number 3 and proposal number 38 make no sense from a wildlife management perspective.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 374****Name:** Moors, Nathan**Community of Residence:** Carlton, Minnesota**Submission Time:** 1/4/2024 3:47:49 AM**Comment:**

I oppose proposal #3 because I want to hunt caribou in Alaska, I don't want outfitters to go out of business and I believe that banning out of state hunters is unethical

I oppose proposal #38 because I want to hunt caribou in Alaska, I don't want outfitters to go out of business and I believe that banning out of state hunters is unethical

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 28: Oppose



PC 375

Name: Morales, Freddy

Community of Residence: Salem, Oregon

Submission Time: 1/8/2024 8:31:26 PM

Comment:

The proposal 3 and 38 are limiting so much non-residential access to hunting caribou and will lead to bad game management. These to proposals have little to no logical evidence that supports that non-residents are having a negative impact on the caribou population, with the decrease of tags, resident boat charters will be hit financially in a way that will lead to financial hardship for tons and tons people who rely on this for income.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 376****Name:** Morley, Kimball**Community of Residence:** Spanish Fork, Utah**Submission Time:** 1/6/2024 7:09:32 AM**Comment:**

So one of my dream hunts I have been planning is a Caribou hunt in Alaska. The state of Alaska is a dream of a place as everyone knows. Going through with this proposal will end a lot of non-residents dreams. Along with that it will element the funds that we as non-residents provide. As a non-resident I know it's a lot for me to say, but with me being this bold I do think that having this remain available for all will be benefiting those who want to hunt but also those of Alaska. The funds can be used for so much good. I do think that Alaska has been and is doing so many good things in their wildlife department. I especially love how serious the regulations are on all species, if all other states didn't allow all the emotions into the decisions of wildlife and completely neglect the biologists who have given so much time and effort into the ins and outs of all things wildlife. We have taken emotion over fact in some cases out in the west and I would hate to see a state like Alaska fall like some of these others. I hope Alaska knows how much everyone who's a red blooded American, who's passions lie in the outdoors cares for its future and well being.

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 1: Support Proposal 2: Support Proposal 3: Support Proposal 4: Support Proposal 5: Support Proposal 6: Support Proposal 7: Support Proposal 8: Support Proposal 10: Support Proposal 11: Support Proposal 12: Support Proposal 13: Support Proposal 14: Support Proposal 15: Support Proposal 16: Support Proposal 17: Support Proposal 18: Support Proposal 19: Support Proposal 20: Support Proposal 21: Support Proposal 22: Support Proposal 23: Support Proposal 24: Support Proposal 25: Support Proposal 26: Support Proposal 27: Support Proposal 28: Oppose Proposal 29: Support Proposal 30: Support Proposal 31: Support Proposal 32: Support Proposal 33 Support Proposal 34: Support Proposal 35: Support Proposal 36: Support Proposal 37: Support Proposal 38: Support Proposal 39: Support Proposal 40: Support Proposal 41: Support Proposal 42: Support Proposal 190: Support Proposal 209: Support



PC 377

Name: Morris, Andrew

Community of Residence: Thornton, Colorado

Submission Time: 1/12/2024 1:04:22 AM

Comment:

Regarding Proposals 3, 4, 5, 38, and 37.

I oppose Proposals 3 -5, and 38. I am in favor of Proposal 37.

Eliminating non-resident hunting of caribou in any of the proposed units has no basis in science, and wildlife management decisions should be 100% based on science. There is a perception locally that non-resident hunting is causing a negative effect on caribou populations via migration route changes, but there is no evidence to support that, and the number of non-residents hunting and their harvest is biologically insignificant as the AKDFG had pointed out in their departmental reports. Also, Proposals 3, 4, and 5 are far too broad in their geographic scope and includes units that harbor other herds that can sustain harvest other than the WAC herd.

I am in favor Proposal 37, restricting resident harvest to 4 with only 1 cow allowed per year, from the current 5 caribou per day. Cow harvest is detrimental to populations, whereas bull harvest typically isn't. The AKDGF supports this Proposal as well because it is scientifically based and may help the WAC herd recover its population.

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 3: Oppose Proposal 4: Oppose Proposal 5: Oppose
Support Proposal 38: Oppose

Proposal 37:



PC 378

Name: Morrison, Kenneth

Community of Residence: Lubbock, Texas

Submission Time: 1/2/2024 5:48:45 AM

Comment:

Proposal 38.

I oppose this proposal because as an avid hunter and outdoorsman it is my dream to one day be able to draw a Caribou tag in Alaska and go hunt. I understand conservation and am happy to pay money every year to try and draw a tag in Alaska knowing that the money I spend trying to draw these hunts is going towards bettering the habitat and support for wildlife. Please do not eliminate non resident hunting in unit 23. Even if it means charging more money to put in for the draw then what is currently required.

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 38: Oppose



PC 379

Name: Morse, Bryce

Community of Residence: PULLMAN

Submission Time: 1/13/2024 6:28:37 AM

Comment:

Limited Impact of Non-Resident Hunting: Non-resident hunters have a minimal impact on the caribou population, primarily harvesting bulls, which are less critical to population growth compared to cows and calves.

Natural Population Fluctuations: The Western Arctic Herd has historically undergone significant population fluctuations, suggesting that the current decline might be part of a natural cycle.

Economic Considerations: Closing non-resident hunting could adversely affect local businesses and services that cater to these hunters, such as charter services.

Conservation through Hunting: Regulated hunting, including by non-residents, can be a tool for effective wildlife management and conservation.

Subsistence Hunting Impact: The proposals do not address the more significant impact of subsistence hunting, which accounts for a much larger annual harvest.

Precedent for Wildlife Management: The closure could set a concerning precedent for wildlife management, potentially leading to more extensive restrictions without clear scientific backing.

Lack of Scientific Evidence: There is insufficient scientific evidence directly linking non-resident hunting to the decline in the caribou population.

Cultural and Recreational Loss: The closure would deny non-residents the cultural and recreational experience of hunting in this unique region.

Potential for Better Management Practices: Instead of outright closure, improved management practices and regulations could be a more effective approach to ensuring the herd's sustainability.

Need for Comprehensive Approach: Addressing caribou population decline requires a comprehensive strategy that considers all factors, including climate change and habitat loss, not just hunting regulations.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



Name: Morse, Jaykob

Community of Residence: Rock Island, WA

Submission Time: 1/11/2024 11:20:06 PM

Comment:

I oppose proposal's 3 and 38. Taking away non-resident hunts is a huge detriment to charters and can be a large loss in revenue to the state. I have family in Wrangell that shrimp and they have already expressed much displeasure with the recent changes in the shrimping dates and regulations. Please take into consideration common sense approaches. Eliminating non-resident hunting doesn't move the needle enough to make it a viable option. Instead it will hurt local businesses that bank on the non-resident hunter. We have seen multiple instances of cutting seasons and the negative impact it can have on animals and humans. As a hunter of Washington state, I am currently battling this in my state and would not wish this upon any state. Hunting may not have as many voices as it used to, but we are still here. Any sort of cutting of seasons or tags only brings on more cuts, season elimination and poor rule making. Hunters support rules made with common sense that can have an impact. Please do not eliminate non-resident hunting for caribou, it can quickly turn into eliminating all non-resident hunting. As a lot of residents in Alaska are aware, hunting is a way of life. Many people outside of Alaska do not get the opportunities your resident's get and pay dearly for those chances. Please do not take them away

In proposal 4, lower cows to 2. When cows are killed there is nothing to help replace it. A bull has a chance to breed with another cow to make another cow or bull. Killing cows essentially ends any future breeding opportunities

In proposal 6, change the time frame to every 2 years. Any number of factors can make a difference. The more it is monitored, better decisions can be made

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 1: Support Proposal 2: Support Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 4: Support with Amendment Proposal 5: Support Proposal 6: Support with Amendment Proposal 7: Support Proposal 8: Support Proposal 10: Support Proposal 11: Support Proposal 12: Support Proposal 13: Support Proposal 14: Support Proposal 15: Support Proposal 16: Support Proposal 17: Support Proposal 18: Support Proposal 19: Support Proposal 20: Support Proposal 21: Support Proposal 22: Support Proposal 23: Support Proposal 24: Support Proposal 25: Support Proposal 26: Support Proposal 27: Support Proposal 28: Support Proposal 29: Support Proposal 30: Support Proposal 31: Support Proposal 32: Support Proposal 33 Support Proposal 34: Support Proposal 35: Support Proposal 36: Support Proposal 37: Support Proposal 38: Oppose Proposal 39: Support Proposal 40: Support Proposal 41: Support Proposal 42: Support



PC 381

Name: Muckerman, Nicholas

Community of Residence: Inkom, ID

Submission Time: 1/12/2024 3:02:48 AM

Comment:

I am opposed on 3, 4, 5 and 38.

I am in favor of 37 to restrict bag limits for locals to 4/year in unit 23.

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 3: Oppose Proposal 4: Oppose Proposal 5: Oppose
Support Proposal 38: Oppose

Proposal 37:



PC 382

Name: Mulder, Koltin

Community of Residence: Wahpeton ND

Submission Time: 1/11/2024 7:36:12 PM

Comment:

I oppose proposal 3 and 38. The closure of this to non residence will not have an impact on the herd as the average take is 250 males. Herds are managed by cow and calve population. Hunters for other hunters as well as conservation.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 383

Name: Mulder, Kristina

Community of Residence: Robinsdale MN

Submission Time: 1/12/2024 6:06:45 PM

Comment:

Hello

I strongly oppose proposal 3 and 38.

I enjoy hunting Alaska each year to take in its beauty and wildlife.

I was shocked to see that there is a possibility of closing this area to non-residence. First because of the fact that non residence make up for such a small number of the caribou taken and the fact that the non-residence are taking adult males. This closure would not effect the overall herd number.

I am also concerned as when an area is closed to a group for hunting, it is rarely ever opened backed up to that group even if the effected herd number goal is met. It remains closed to that group and is either not hunted or left to just the people that the area was not closed to.

I strongly oppose proposal 3 and 38.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 384

Name: Mullen, Timothy

Community of Residence: Gasport ny

Submission Time: 1/4/2024 4:35:32 AM

Comment:

Hello. You guys should follow the North America model for wildlife management and not make up your own rules as you go. Follow the wildlife biologist who you pay to manage these animals

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 1: Oppose Proposal 2: Oppose Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 4: Oppose Proposal 5:
Oppose Proposal 6: Oppose Proposal 7: Oppose Proposal 8: Oppose Proposal 10: Oppose



PC 385

Name: Mullooney, Richard

Community of Residence: Anchorage

Submission Time: 1/12/2024 1:00:12 AM

Comment:

I support the following positions I have selected on proposals

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 1: Support Proposal 2: Support Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 4: Support Proposal 5:
Oppose Proposal 6: Oppose Proposal 7: Support Proposal 8: Support Proposal 10: Support
Proposal 11: Support Proposal 12: Support Proposal 13: Oppose Proposal 14: Oppose Proposal
15: Oppose Proposal 16: Support Proposal 17: Support Proposal 18: Support Proposal 19:
Support Proposal 20: Support Proposal 22: Support Proposal 23: Support Proposal 24: Oppose
Proposal 25: Oppose Proposal 26: Support Proposal 27: Support Proposal 28: Support Proposal
29: Support Proposal 30: Oppose Proposal 31: Support Proposal 32: Support Proposal 33:
Oppose Proposal 34: Support Proposal 35: Support Proposal 36: Oppose Proposal 37: Oppose
Proposal 38: Oppose Proposal 39: Support Proposal 40: Support Proposal 41: Support Proposal
42: Support Proposal 190: Support



PC 386

Name: M Wittmier, Amanda

Community of Residence: Port orchard

Submission Time: 1/10/2024 6:11:25 AM

Comment:

I oppose proposal #3 and #38 with the following concerns.

There is potential for better management practices- instead of outright closure, improved management practices and regulations could be a more effective approach to ensuring the herd's long term sustainability.

There must be a need for a comprehensive approach in addressing the caribou population decline requires a comprehensive strategy that considers all factors, including climate change and habitat loss, not just hunting regulations.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 387

Name: Myers, Jason

Community of Residence: Williamsville, IL

Submission Time: 1/13/2024 3:24:42 AM

Comment:

Limited Impact of Non-Resident Hunting: Non-resident hunters have a minimal impact on the caribou population, primarily harvesting bulls, which are less critical to population growth compared to cows and calves.

Natural Population Fluctuations: The Western Arctic Herd has historically undergone significant population fluctuations, suggesting that the current decline might be part of a natural cycle.

Economic Considerations: Closing non-resident hunting could adversely affect local businesses and services that cater to these hunters, such as charter services.

Conservation through Hunting: Regulated hunting, including by non-residents, can be a tool for effective wildlife management and conservation.

Subsistence Hunting Impact: The proposals do not address the more significant impact of subsistence hunting, which accounts for a much larger annual harvest.

Precedent for Wildlife Management: The closure could set a concerning precedent for wildlife management, potentially leading to more extensive restrictions without clear scientific backing.

Lack of Scientific Evidence: There is insufficient scientific evidence directly linking non-resident hunting to the decline in the caribou population.

Cultural and Recreational Loss: The closure would deny non-residents the cultural and recreational experience of hunting in this unique region.

Potential for Better Management Practices: Instead of outright closure, improved management practices and regulations could be a more effective approach to ensuring the herd's sustainability.

Need for Comprehensive Approach: Addressing caribou population decline requires a comprehensive strategy that considers all factors, including climate change and habitat loss, not just hunting regulations.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 388

Name: Naas, Andrew

Community of Residence: Grand forks, North Dakota

Submission Time: 1/2/2024 2:28:36 PM

Comment:

With dreams of hunting in Alaska, this would be detrimental.

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 3: Oppose



PC 389

Name: Nash, James

Community of Residence: Enterprise

Submission Time: 1/7/2024 11:13:01 PM

Comment:

Please keep the non resident hunting opportunity OPEN for caribou. The harvest of such a small number of bull caribou is not affecting the total population. However, the money brought to local communities and the state by these non resident hunters is significant. I am OPPOSED to closing or reducing this hunting opportunity for non residents.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 390

Name: National Park Service - Alaska Region
Community of Residence: Anchorage, Alaska

Submission Time: 1/12/2024 8:56:36 PM

Comment:

see attached

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 39: Oppose Proposal 40: Oppose Proposal 41: Oppose



United States Department of the Interior
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Alaska Region
240 West 5th Avenue, Room 114
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

January 12, 2024

Mr. Jerry Burnett, Chairman
ATTN: Alaska Board of Game Comments
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Board Support Section
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, Alaska 99811-5526

Dear Chairman Burnett,

The National Park Service (NPS) appreciates the opportunity to comment on proposals for the Western Arctic/Western Region being considered by the Alaska Board of Game. Below are our recommendations on proposals that affect or have the potential to affect NPS areas. We recognize and support the State's primary stewardship role in wildlife management, while ensuring that federal laws and regulations applicable to the NPS are upheld.

Proposal 2, 3, 4, 5, 36, 37, 38: NPS Recommendation: Neutral

Proposals 2, 36, and 37 would reduce the bag limit for residents from five caribou per day to four caribou total, one of which may be a cow in Game Management Units (GMU's) 23 and 26A. Proposal 3 and 38 would close all nonresident hunting in GMU 23. Proposal 4 would align caribou harvest and seasons with 26A remainder to reduce cow harvest in southern GMU 26A and GMU 23 north of and including Singoalik River Drainage.

The NPS has partnered with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and others to document recent declines and changes in migratory habits of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd, and we recognize the challenges facing those who depend on these caribou as a primary source of sustenance, both culturally and physically. While the current population size is not unprecedented, the environmental conditions facing the herd largely are unprecedented. Regulatory bodies must emphasize reductions in harvest, especially cows, while considering the needs and practices of local residents. We further encourage and actively support efforts improving harvest reporting to allow for the evaluation of impacts of regulation changes. The NPS is and will continue to be actively engaged with the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group and supports actions consistent with the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Cooperative Management Plan's "Preservative Declining" management level.

Proposal 39, 40, 41: NPS Recommendation: Oppose

These proposals would lengthen the brown bear hunting season in GMU 23 for residents from eight months a year (1 August – 31 May) to year-round. The NPS has concerns with these proposals that would further liberalize brown bear harvest. In 2021, the NPS collaborated with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and others to survey brown bears in GMU 23. The survey suggested that no increase in the brown bear population had occurred, and current densities are not considered high. This information, coupled with inherently low brown bear reproductive rates that are exacerbated in the arctic, should be considered when evaluating these proposals. If the Board adopts any of these proposals, we request that NPS lands be excluded.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments on these important wildlife regulatory matters. Should you or your staff have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Grant V. Hilderbrand

Grant Hilderbrand
Associate Regional Director - Resources
National Park Service - Alaska Region
240 W. 5th Avenue
Anchorage, AK 99501

cc:

Superintendents, National Park Service, Alaska Region
Regional Director, National Park Service, Alaska Region
Kristy Tibbles, Executive Director, Alaska Board of Game, ADF&G
Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

**PC 391****Name:** Neathawk, Jacob**Community of Residence:** Nederland, CO**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 1:21:28 AM**Comment:**

Non-resident hunters have a minimal impact on the caribou population, primarily harvesting bulls, which are less critical to population growth compared to cows and calves.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 392****Name:** Neff, Adam**Community of Residence:** Cashmere, WA**Submission Time:** 1/11/2024 5:52:24 PM**Comment:**

I request that you don't close more hunting opportunities for Non-Residents (proposals 3 and 38). There is no justifiable scientific evidence that supports this reduction. First off caribou herds are known to fluctuate, what we're seeing today is nothing that hasn't already been documented in the past. Second, NR are already limited to bulls, which are the population drivers and NRs harvest such few animals in a given year that it statistically doesn't- COULDN'T- make a difference at a population level. And lastly, if the working group is worried about caribou, it needs to focus on cow harvest, which is almost exclusively done by residents and locals. Or do nothing, the herd population may be significantly lower than it was just a few short years ago, but it's just barely under the objective size. The working group is making a mountain out of a mole hill and ignoring the historical record. Please reject Proposals 3 and 38. Thank you.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 393****Name:** Nemeth, Dennis**Community of Residence:** Roscoe, Illinois**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 1:04:37 AM**Comment:**

I do not think that proposals 3 and 38 should be passed. Nonresident hunters spend lots of money hunting in Alaska supporting many people and do not impact the resources significantly. I know that the states are responsible for game management but the game belongs to all US citizens and especially on federal land should be accessible to everyone.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 394****Name:** Newberg, Randall**Community of Residence:** Bozeman, Montana**Submission Time:** 1/12/2024 3:44:39 AM**Comment:**

I oppose Proposals 3 and 38. They will not make a difference in the trends of these caribou herds and this "feels good to say we did something" efforts take focus away from the real problems facing caribou. All parties, including caribou, benefit from focusing on solutions that will make a difference to rebounding caribou numbers. If these proposals would have a benefit to subsistence hunters and their dependence upon caribou, I would support these proposals. But, the proposals do nothing other than distract from the bigger problems, thus I oppose those proposals.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 395

Name: Nicodemus, Ryan

Community of Residence: Hermiston, Oregon

Submission Time: 1/8/2024 1:16:23 PM

Comment:

Please keep the non resident hunting opportunity OPEN for caribou. The harvest of such a small number of bull caribou is not affecting the total population. However, the money brought to local communities and the state by these non resident hunters is significant. I am OPPOSED to closing or reducing this hunting opportunity for non residents.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

**PC 396****Name:** Nielson, Mike**Community of Residence:** Hurricane, Utah**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 4:44:04 AM**Comment:**

I object to Proposal 38 specifically the closing of unit 23 to non resident hunters. If you want to increase caribou numbers (and moose numbers) allow for non-resident non guided Grizzly Bear hunts in this unit. The bear population is out of control. Limit the harvest of Caribou to the natives and the residents. They don't need to kill multiple caribou every year. Closing this unit down to non residents is absurd. This resource isn't owned by Alaska. This is an American resource.

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 1: Support Proposal 2: Support Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 4: Support Proposal 5: Support Proposal 6: Support Proposal 7: Support Proposal 8: Support Proposal 10: Support Proposal 11: Support Proposal 12: Support Proposal 13: Support Proposal 14: Support Proposal 15: Support Proposal 16: Support Proposal 17: Support Proposal 18: Support Proposal 19: Support Proposal 20: Support Proposal 21: Support Proposal 22: Support Proposal 23: Support Proposal 24: Support Proposal 25: Support Proposal 26: Support Proposal 27: Support Proposal 28: Support Proposal 29: Support Proposal 30: Support Proposal 31: Support Proposal 32: Support Proposal 33 Support Proposal 34: Support Proposal 35: Support Proposal 36: Support Proposal 37: Support Proposal 38: Oppose Proposal 39: Support Proposal 40: Support Proposal 41: Support Proposal 42: Support



PC 397

Name: Nolan, Emily

Community of Residence: Stevens Point WI

Submission Time: 1/6/2024 5:04:23 AM

Comment:

3 and 38:

By shutting it down it goes beyond wildlife conservation and onto the side of politics

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 398

Name: Norge, Brian

Community of Residence: Powhatan, Virginia

Submission Time: 1/2/2024 11:55:42 PM

Comment:

Comments in regards to Proposal 3.

Having just read the literature on the suggested changes in Unit 23, and the aforementioned closing of the units to non-residents. If there is no perceived biological or herd impact on the miniscule amount of Non-residents who participate in the hunt each year, why change it?

The Alaska government and Alaska residents benefit from Non-residents coming to Alaska to spend money in the local Alaskan economy, and not to mention that Non-residents like myself save/are saving money for years to be able to have these experiences, in the last great wildlife area on Earth.

Hunting is the best form of conservation there is. Hopefully Alaska remains as the one state who makes wise choices on animal management.

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 3: Oppose



PC 399

Name: North, Alec

Community of Residence: Massachusetts

Submission Time: 1/8/2024 9:57:59 PM

Comment:

To whom it may concern,

It is no secret that Alaska is or perhaps was the final frontier. As a young man with large outdoor adventure dreams this is yet another door being closed without significant evidence to back it up. There is no evidence to prove that caribou populations are declining enough to warrant Too many states make poorly advised season closures or restrictions based on modern culture movements. The economic ramifications of closing non resident caribou hunting will also surely be felt.

Proposals 3 and 38 will choke out guide services and more than likely force them out of business. Despite what many non hunters say hunting and specifically bowhunting are certainly not dying off. Thousands of new hunters join the ranks each year, and many develop a thirst for adventure. These people keep a multi billion dollar industry thriving year after year, and provide countless dollars for conservation. If hunting were to eventually die off the nails in the coffin would be lack of opportunity. These proposals would be another opportunity lost for the common man with big dreams.

Being a bow hunter has changed the overall trajectory of mine and many other lives. These people seek adventure and wish to live lives purely and how god intended. Often times we have a disdain for modern culture and long for a time when life was simple and technology wasn't so suffocating. Alaska along with few other places provides a glimpse into our past. They are a place to pay homage to our human heritage in a world where that is all but forgotten. However when the fruit no longer dangles from a high branch, we look to other shores. Removing nonresident caribou hunting may be that fruit someone like me was looking for, you just never know.

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 400

Name: Nottestad, Ryan

Community of Residence: GLENDIVE mt

Submission Time: 1/2/2024 11:43:27 PM

Comment:

I would vote no on proposal 3 and no on proposal 38 please

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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose
