



PC 601

**Name:** Tigyi, Andras

**Community of Residence:** Atlanta Ga

**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 12:22:51 AM

**Comment:**

As a nonresident hunter I do not want to see these areas closed to hunting for nonresidents

*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

---



PC 602

**Name:** Tippetts, Jack

**Community of Residence:** LAS VEGAS

**Submission Time:** 1/12/2024 4:25:07 PM

**Comment:**

As non-resident, non-sustenance hunter, I would like to have the opportunity in the future to harvest a Caribou in the state of Alaska for myself and my children. I believe there are other approaches than can be implemented to help with the migration corridors such as limiting aerial access and transport to and from hunting grounds, however cutting off the revenue to the State of Alaska from non-resident hunters will have other affects. Coming from a city that depends largely from tourism, imposing a restrictions to tourist or in this case hunters will cripple the economy of our city. Henceforth, non-resident hunters contribute to small business in the area; food, lodging, transport, guiding services, meat processing, shipping, etc. A caribou is a beautiful animal and removing the opportunity for out of state hunters to harvest and be able to showcase these animals back home would be a shame. Thank you for your 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

---



**Name:** Tjelta, Ian

**Community of Residence:** Sheyenne, ND

**Submission Time:** 1/7/2024 11:43:57 PM

**Comment:**

Please keep this non-resident hunting opportunity open. The small number of caribou taken by non-resident hunters has a minimal impact on the overall population. However, the economic impact of non-resident hunters in these small local communities cannot be understated. Hunting is used as a valuable and beneficial conservation tool around the world, supporting both local wildlife and communities. It would be a shame for Alaska to overlook this fact. As such, I oppose the closing of 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 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 604****Name:** Tombleson, Dustin**Community of Residence:** Georgia**Submission Time:** 1/11/2024 2:31:45 PM**Comment:**

Proposals 3 and 38 seem to be an attempt to address the concern of a decreasing Western Arctic Herd. However, to ban non-resident who have a tiny fraction of the harvest would have little effect. According to Alaska's own studies, the decline has been due to a lower survival rate for females. The vast majority of non-resident take bulls, and that is typically a few hundred. This proposals would be ineffective in addressing this. These areas for non-residents allow for opportunities to go and experience one of the last great frontiers of the U.S. To take that away would economically hurt those who are guides and transporters, expeditors, taxidermist, hotels, etc.

*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 605****Name:** Tonlino, Luke**Community of Residence:** Otis, massachusetts**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 2:18:34 AM**Comment:**

I oppose proposals 3 and 38 for the following reasons

**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 606

**Name:** Tramblie, Trevor

**Community of Residence:** Centralia, Washington

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 5:44:39 AM

**Comment:**

Please keep caribou hunting opportunities for non residents! 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 607

**Name:** Trego, Brayden

**Community of Residence:** Cedar City Utah

**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 1:46:55 PM

**Comment:**

I am completely opposed to proposal 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 608

**Name:** Tronson, Jayke

**Community of Residence:** Star, ID

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 1:34:35 AM

**Comment:**

To whom it concerns,

It appears as though there is no supporting evidence for the closure of non-resident hunting in proposals 3, 25, and 38. Non-residents are a great source of funding for conservation in Alaska, as well as the local economy. Furthermore, the number of harvests by non-res. are so few, it is hard to see how cutting the funding they bring would be the responsible action towards helping the population numbers.

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 10: Support Proposal 11: Support    Proposal 18: Support  
Proposal 19: Support Proposal 20: Support with Amendment Proposal 21: Support Proposal 22:  
Support Proposal 23: Support Proposal 24: Support Proposal 25: Oppose    Proposal 38:  
Oppose Proposal 39: Support

---



PC 609

**Name:** Troyer, Abe

**Community of Residence:** Libby MT 59923

**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 11:52:18 PM

**Comment:**

It's disappointing to see Alaska consider restricting non-residents in #3 and in #38, I support keeping access to federal lands open to nonresidents for hunting, fishing, and other activities

*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 610

**Name:** Truman, Rusty

**Community of Residence:** Price, Utah

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 12:45:38 AM

**Comment:**

In opposition to proposals #3 and #38. Removing nonresident hunting will have almost no impact on number of caribou harvested, 250 to 300 bulls typically. By contrast subsistence hunters are harvesting closer to 10000 caribou, both sexes. Dropping subsistence hunter limits from 5 down to 4 would have a much more substantial impact. This would still allow both subsistence hunting and nonresident hunting and not cause the huge economic impact on the locals that service the nonresident hunters. Limiting female harvest for the subsistence hunters by some degree would help bolster caribou numbers by protecting the baby factories. If you want to build numbers you need to reduce female harvest. I am a nonresident and hope to someday get the opportunity to come and hunt caribou in Alaska, eliminating that opportunity because it is easy to pick on the nonresidents when their harvest impact is so minute is a travesty. Thank you for your consideration.

Rusty Truman

*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 611

**Name:** TUMBERG, JUSTIN

**Community of Residence:** BEND, or

**Submission Time:** 1/11/2024 6:57:25 PM

**Comment:**

I oppose proposals 3 and 38. There is no evidence to support any impact to caribou herds caused by the approximately 250 bulls taken annually by non local hunters. The cause of this decline is clearly linked to the survival rate of mature cows, of which up to 5 per day are allowed to be taken by local hunters. These proposals are not based on any scientific data, will eliminate a significant opportunity for many non local hunters who also take all of and rely on the meat, and will do absolutely nothing to help this herd recover.

*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 612

**Name:** Tupen, Colton

**Community of Residence:** Snohomish, WA

**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 9:18:40 PM

**Comment:**

As a non-resident whose dream is to come hunt Caribou in Alaska, I strongly oppose both Proposal #3 and #38. Not only do I believe that science does not warrant the closure, I fear that this infringement on hunters rights will only lead to a snowball effect, stripping rights from resident hunters in the future. Non resident hunters have little to no impact on populations and closing non resident hunting could adversely effect local businesses who depend on the revenue gained from non residents. I urge you to deny these proposals due to a lack of scientific evidence and consider 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 2: Oppose Proposal 3: Oppose  
Oppose Proposal 38: Oppose

Proposal 36: Oppose Proposal 37:



PC 613

**Name:** Tyrrell, Luke

**Community of Residence:** Fairbanks, Alaska

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 7:23:21 AM

**Comment:**

The minimal harvest by nonresident hunters in the region has little to no effect on the overall Caribou 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





PC 614

**Name:** Unmacht, James

**Community of Residence:** New River, Arizona

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 2:35:14 AM

**Comment:**

I appreciate the need for resident subsistence hunting opportunities for caribou, however address the real issue, the harvest of cows and calves! If you really want to help the herd and work to sustain the caribou population into the future, stop or reduce that exercise. The minuscule harvest from non-residents is not a factor in the reduction of caribou numbers, but it will diminish the positive economic impact to the local area and at the same time, eliminate a hunting opportunity for many.

*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 615

**Name:** Urie, Ryan

**Community of Residence:** Severance, Colorado

**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 2:13:38 AM

**Comment:**

This is not about science based wildlife management but clearly about pushing nonresidents out in favor of a free for all. Strongly oppose the removal of nonresident hunting ability which in most cases happens once a lifetime. The total number of caribou are not in trouble due to the very limited harvest of bulls while residents are able to harvest multiple animals, cows included. Let's skip emotion and politics here and utilize sound wildlife management and biology to support any proposal moving forward.

*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

---



PC 616

**Name:** Vallotton, Jason

**Community of Residence:** Redding ca

**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 4:48:21 AM

**Comment:**

I oppose banning measures 3 and 38. I think non residents should be able to hunt the herds in Alaska as long as it is done ethically.

*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 8: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

---



PC 617

**Name:** VanAlstine, Brett

**Community of Residence:** Palatine, IL

**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 1:41:08 AM

**Comment:**

Please listen to those that care. Use common sense and science in the decisions.

*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 618

**Name:** VanArsdale, Craig

**Community of Residence:** Soldotna, Alaska

**Submission Time:** 1/10/2024 10:57:15 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 1: Support with Amendment Proposal 2: Support Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 4: Oppose Proposal 5: Oppose Proposal 6: Oppose Proposal 7: Support Proposal 8: Support Proposal 10: Support Proposal 11: Support Proposal 12: Oppose Proposal 13: Support Proposal 14: Oppose Proposal 15: Oppose Proposal 16: Support Proposal 17: Support Proposal 18: Oppose Proposal 19: Support Proposal 20: Support Proposal 21: Support Proposal 22: Oppose Proposal 23: Oppose Proposal 24: Support Proposal 25: Oppose Proposal 26: Oppose Proposal 27: Support Proposal 28: Oppose Proposal 29: Support Proposal 30: Support Proposal 31: Support Proposal 32: Oppose 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 Proposal 42: Support Proposal 190: Support

(Proposal 1)

I SUPPORT this proposal. In the event that the area is re-opened to Full Curl harvest it is opened as an Archery Only area by registration permit. Archery hunting provides increased opportunity while reducing the amount of harvest. The Board of Game and ADFG should utilize this as a test area to observe the population as it rebounds from past weather related sheep population declines. To address the BOG/Department's current view point that Archery Only Seasons are allocative and a concern for Subsistence I would also support a split season structure in which the season was Archery Only the first 22 days of the season and Any Weapon the last 20 days of the season. Allowing Archery hunters the first 22 days and Any weapon the last 20 days would greatly reduce the hunting pressure on Full Curl Rams while still allowing opportunity for hunters who enjoy different means of harvest.

(Proposal 2)

I SUPPORT this proposal. A significant number of cows are harvested by local hunters and it is not sustainable with the herd at these low numbers. This proposal also includes all relevant areas for the WAH.

(Proposal 3)

I strongly OPPOSE this proposal as Non-Resident harvest is insignificant at less than 300 bulls on average annually. This proposal is ridiculous considering resident locals kill thousands of cows a year which IS significant! Cow harvest needs to be limited to allow the herd to stabilize.

(Proposal 4)

OPPOSE

(Proposal 5)

OPPOSE

(Proposal 6)

OPPOSE

(Proposal 7)

SUPPORT

(Proposal 8)

SUPPORT

(Proposal 9)

SUPPORT

(Proposal 10)

SUPPORT

(Proposal 11)

SUPPORT

(Proposal 12)

OPPOSE

(Proposal 13)

SUPPORT

(Proposal 14)

OPPOSE

(Proposal 15)

OPPOSE

(Proposal 16)

SUPPORT

(Proposal 17)

I SUPPORT this proposal to increase the brown bear quota to 2 bears. Few hunters will harvest 2 bears. The bear population is healthy and we should allow hunters who are willing to harvest 2 bears the option to do so.

(Proposal 18)

I OPPOSE this proposal. The WAH warrants a reduce in harvest not an increase.

(Proposal 19)

SUPPORT

(Proposal 20)

SUPPORT

(Proposal 21)

SUPPORT

(Proposal 22)

OPPOSE

(Proposal 23)

OPPOSE

(Proposal 24)

SUPPORT

(Proposal 25)

I strongly OPPOSE this proposal. The department provided statistics that show only 2 moose have been harvested by non-resident hunters in the last 5 years. I hope the BOG sees these proposals for what they are. There is zero basis besides the desire to see ZERO non local hunters in their communities.

(Proposal 26)

OPPOPSE

(Proposal 27)

SUPPORT

(Proposal 28)

OPPOSE

(Proposal 29)

SUPPORT

(Proposal 30)

SUPPORT

(Proposal 31)

SUPPORT

(Proposal 32)

I strongly OPPOSE this proposal. Most of the Caribou taken by aircraft are in August and the Caribou migration typically does not occur until October. Once again this proposal has nothing to do with caribou migration but is simply another attack on non-local hunters. Locals are simply putting a spin on these proposals as a guise for their desire to see zero non-local participation in the units that their communities zip codes reside.

(Proposal 33)

I strongly OPPOSE this proposal. There is less than 1 Full Curl Ram harvested in this area per year. Therefore there is ZERO merit for this proposal. Full Curl management is working and there are no proven studies to show otherwise that would give support to proposals of this nature.

(Proposal 34)

I SUPPORT this proposal. In the event that the area is re-opened to Full Curl harvest it is opened as an Archery Only area by registration permit. Archery hunting provides increased opportunity while reducing the amount of harvest. The Board of Game and ADFG should utilize this as a test area to observe the population as it rebounds from past weather related sheep population declines. To address the BOG/Department's current view point that Archery Only Seasons are allocative and a concern for Subsistence I would also support a split season structure in which the season was Archery Only the first 22 days of the season and Any Weapon the last 20 days of the season. Allowing Archery hunters the first 22 days and Any weapon the last 20 days would greatly reduce the hunting pressure on Full Curl Rams while still allowing opportunity for hunters who enjoy different means of harvest.

(Proposal 35)

SUPPORT

(Proposal 36)

I SUPPORT this proposal. A significant number of cows are harvested by local hunters and it is not sustainable with the herd at these low numbers.

(Proposal 37)

I SUPPORT this proposal. A significant number of cows are harvested by local hunters and it is not sustainable with the herd at these low numbers.

(Proposal 38)

I strongly OPPOSE this proposal as Non-Resident harvest is insignificant at less than 200 bulls on average annually. This proposal is ridiculous considering resident locals kill thousands of cows a year which IS significant! Cow harvest needs to be limited to allow the herd to stabilize.

(Proposal 39)

SUPPORT

(Proposal 40)

SUPPORT

(Proposal 41)

SUPPORT

(Proposal 42)

SUPPORT

(Proposal 190)

SUPPORT







PC 619

**Name:** Vanderheyden, William

**Community of Residence:** Loveland

**Submission Time:** 1/11/2024 1:33:55 AM

**Comment:**

I oppose proposals #3 and #38 which close Non-Resident Caribou Hunting in Northwest Alaska. There is insufficient scientific evidence that the harvest of 250-300 bulls by non-residents would have any impact on the herd size going forward. Limiting cow and calf harvest overall seems to be the correct scientific approach to having a positive impact on the population. I have archery hunted caribou in Northwest Alaska three times, taking two bulls, and found it to be an amazing place. It has given me an appreciation of the vast wilderness there and the need to protect it. Hunters are conservation minded and I believe allowing a small number of non-resident hunters to continue to hunt the area provides an awareness of the value of the area worldwide and the need to protect it.

Thank you,

Bill Vanderheyden

*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 620

**Name:** Varriale, Brent

**Community of Residence:** Fruitland, Idaho

**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 4:54:15 AM

**Comment:**

I am commenting on proposals: 3, 5, 15, 20, 23, 25, and 36-38. I am fortunate enough to have made many trips to the great state of Alaska. My sons and I will be hunting caribou in a unit unaffected by these proposals in August. We are very excited to make this trip together.

I understand the importance of the Western Arctic Herd to Alaskans and the need to increase its population to sustainable numbers. I do however, disagree with the proposal to eliminate non resident caribou hunting in the proposed units. Eliminating non resident hunters will do little to increase herd numbers. Non residents harvest bulls only and the The Alaska Fish and Game staff opinion states " the limited number of bulls harvested by nonresidents is believed to be biologically insignificant and the department is generally opposed to unnecessary reductions in hunting opportunity that is not biologically driven." It also implies that decreasing resident bag limits would more likely lead to significant harvest reduction.

I understand the reliance of Alaskans on subsistence hunting but It appears the elimination of non resident caribou hunting will have little affect on maintaining the resource for Alaska residents and non residents alike.

Thank you for your consideration.

Brent Varriale DVM

---



PC 621

**Name:** Vater, Jordan

**Community of Residence:** Fort Collins, CO

**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 9:31:09 PM

**Comment:**

I would like to OPPOSE proposals 3 and 38. Nonresident hunters bring significant revenue to Alaska and have long contributed to the outdoor industry there. They account for an extremely low percentage of caribou harvest every year, and it cannot be scientifically argued that nonresident hunters are responsible for the declines in caribou population. This is simply a case of taking the opportunity away from those of us who dream of someday being able to experience the wilds of Alaska and one of its iconic species. It stands on the more “reasonable” end for a do-it-yourself hunt.

If you’re truly worried about sustainable harvest and the health of the herds, you would be much better served reevaluating subsistence 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 622

**Name:** Vaughn, Troy

**Community of Residence:** Oceanside, CA

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 2:38:27 AM

**Comment:**

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.

*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 623

**Name:** Vawter, Kellen

**Community of Residence:** San Diego, Ca

**Submission Time:** 1/12/2024 3:42:30 PM

**Comment:**

I am writing in opposition to proposals 3 and 38. Both proposals are, in my opinion, short sighted and detrimental to the state, the hunting community, and potentially the animals. The following are reasons why I oppose these proposals:

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.

Thank you,

Kellen Vawter

*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 624

**Name:** Vella, Kevin

**Community of Residence:** El Dorado, CA

**Submission Time:** 1/4/2024 4:05:53 AM

**Comment:**

I would like to comment opposing proposal #3 and proposal #38. Nonresident take of caribou in this region is a mere percentage of the overall harvest. Closing the season to nonresidents will not increase the herd, but will only negatively impact local economies that rely on nonresident 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 625

**Name:** Vest, Lee

**Community of Residence:** Kiana

**Submission Time:** 1/4/2024 11:47:20 PM

**Comment:**

Prohibit helicopter netting of caribou and only allow airplane, drone, satellite counting them to reduce herd stress and calving damage. Utilize boat and rope harness to sample caribou in water only to limit herd impact and wildlife harassment. Close all nonresident caribou hunting in unit(s) to include state land in unit(s). Increase bear baiting, black bear hound hunting and intensive area predator trapping opportunities for wolves, black bears and brown bear to decrease predation of caribou and calf(s).

*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: Oppose Proposal 3: Support Proposal 4: Oppose Proposal 5: Oppose Proposal 6: Oppose Proposal 7: Support Proposal 8: Support Proposal 10: Oppose

Proposal 11: Oppose 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: Oppose Proposal 21: Support Proposal 22: Support Proposal 23: Support Proposal 24: Support Proposal 25: Support Proposal 26: Oppose 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: Support Proposal 39: Support Proposal 40: Support Proposal 41: Support Proposal 42: Oppose Proposal 190: Support Proposal 209: Support

---



PC 626

**Name:** Vest, Marlene

**Community of Residence:** Kiana

**Submission Time:** 1/4/2024 11:12:35 PM

**Comment:**

Prohibit all helicopter net gun capture of caribou in lieu of satellite, airplane, boat sampling to reduce stress, hardship on herd, migration, route, and harm to caribou. Stop all non-resident hunting in unit including state land(s) where trash and debris is left non-remediated while polluting our environment. Allow black bear baiting, black bear hound hunting, and intensive year round brown bear trapping with snare(s), traps, and airplane predation area opportunities. Increase wolf hunting, trapping, and snaring predation area opportunities. Prohibit airplane transport, guiding, aerial spotting during caribou season for hunting purpose(s) in unit.

*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 36: Oppose Proposal 37: Oppose Proposal 38: Support Proposal 39: Support Proposal 40: Support Proposal 41: Support Proposal 42: Oppose

---





PC 627

**Name:** Viager, Shane

**Community of Residence:** Fairbanks Alaska

**Submission Time:** 1/11/2024 1:01:00 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 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 628

**Name:** Vierra, Alexander

**Community of Residence:** Reno, NV

**Submission Time:** 1/11/2024 11:53:14 PM

**Comment:**

To whom it may concern,

Regarding proposals 3 and 38, I believe there is insufficient evidence that non resident hunters are a main contributing factor of caribou decline, thus calling for closures for non resident hunts. There are many other variables that can be effecting caribou herd numbers, including habitat, environmental temperatures, predation, and long hunt season dates. I believe non resident hunters positively contribute to Alaska's economy, as well as to wildlife as a whole, in regards to proper management of multiple species.

Thank you for your consideration in opposing proposals 3 and 38.

Sincerely,

Alex Vierra

*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 629

**Name:** Vivian, Chad

**Community of Residence:** Castle Rock, CO

**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 5:01:37 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

---



PC 630

**Name:** Vogt, PJ

**Community of Residence:** Hayward, Wisconsin

**Submission Time:** 1/2/2024 8:27:08 PM

**Comment:**

Please Do not eliminate non resident Caribou hunting. It will accelerate the decline of the Caribou population; less value - less resources to manage the species

*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 631

**Name:** Voice of the Arctic Inupiat

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage, AK

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 1:40:22 AM

**Comment:**

January 12, 2024

State of Alaska Board of Game

Western Arctic/Western Region Meeting, January 26-29, 2024

SUPPORT 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou

The Voice of the Arctic Iñupiat (VOICE) supports Proposal 4: 5 AAC 85.025 which implements hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou to align Unit 26A and Unit 23. Proposal 4: 5 AAC 85.025 was borne from a series of local hunter meetings to address the then conservation concern of the Teshekpuk caribou herd (TCH). Since the plan was proposed and adopted by this body in 2015, the TCH has stabilized. This proposal has a proven track record of success. This proposal is limited to Unit 26A and Unit 23, minimizing the impact to management of other caribou herds within the Western Arctic caribou herd range. This proposal also takes into consideration the real need to feed families in locations where grocery store access is not only minimal but cost exorbitant.

VOICE is a non-profit organization that was established in 2015 by the region's collective elected Iñupiat leadership to speak with a unified voice on issues impacting the North Slope Iñupiat, their communities, their economy, and their culture. Today, VOICE is comprised of twenty-four member entities from communities across the North Slope – including tribal councils, municipal governments, and Alaska Native corporations. Together, we speak as one on behalf of our region to promote and advocate issues for the benefit of our communities and our people. In March 2023, VOICE Board of Directors passed a motion to support the North Slope Borough Department of Wildlife Management (NSB DWM) in their efforts to ensure the people of the North Slope have the opportunity to provide sustenance and material for their families and communities, which they get from caribou.

The Western Arctic caribou herd (WACH) is in decline and action needs to be taken to address the decline. Proposal 4: 5 AAC 85.025 comes from the North Slope Fish and Game Advisory Committee, an entity that dealt with a similar issue of the decline in the TCH within the last decade. Since this body adopted this proposal in 2015, the TCH stabilized and has since increased. There are no more conservation concerns with the TCH. Therefore this proposal has a proven track record.

This proposal includes the calving area and the northernmost range of the WACH. Harvest is split between the TCH and WACH within this area and Proposal 4 aims to reduce cow harvest within this portion of their range while still allowing hunters the opportunity to meet the needs of the communities they harvest for. Through a series of community hunter meetings, the NSB DWM the importance of cow caribou to the recovery of the WACH and hunters largely agreed the proposal is an appropriate regulation change given the conservation concern.

Living in rural Alaska is very expensive. Food that is not obtained by hunting or fishing, is flown in, resulting in very expensive groceries. Further, the availability of groceries is weather dependent. One can take 100 dollars to a local grocery store in rural Alaska and feed a family of four for a meal or two. Or you can take that same 100 dollars to buy fuel and ammunition and go hunt. And if successful, feed your family and other community members for months. Our hunters provide for so many more people than their immediate families, they provide for the community members and those who cannot provide for themselves.

North Slope Iñupiaq culture is deeply intertwined with the natural environment. Food sovereignty and security is extremely important to maintaining our subsistence-based Inupiaq culture, communities, and people on the North Slope. VOICE fully support the proven method of bag limits and seasons presented in 5 AAC 85.025. Thank you for your consideration of the seven communities within the North Slope that will be affected by this proposal and others presented at this meeting.

Quyanak,

Nagruk Harcharek

President

*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 4: Support

---



January 12, 2024

State of Alaska Board of Game

Western Arctic/Western Region Meeting, January 26-29, 2024

**SUPPORT 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou**

The Voice of the Arctic Iñupiat (VOICE) **supports** Proposal 4: 5 AAC 85.025 which implements hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou to align Unit 26A and Unit 23. Proposal 4: 5 AAC 85.025 was borne from a series of local hunter meetings to address the then conservation concern of the Teshekpuk caribou herd (TCH). Since the plan was proposed and adopted by this body in 2015, the TCH has stabilized. This proposal has a proven track record of success. This proposal is limited to Unit 26A and Unit 23, minimizing the impact to management of other caribou herds within the Western Arctic caribou herd range. This proposal also takes into consideration the real need to feed families in locations where grocery store access is not only minimal but cost exorbitant.

VOICE is a non-profit organization that was established in 2015 by the region's collective elected Iñupiat leadership to speak with a unified voice on issues impacting the North Slope Iñupiat, their communities, their economy, and their culture. Today, VOICE is comprised of twenty-four member entities from communities across the North Slope – including tribal councils, municipal governments, and Alaska Native corporations. Together, we speak as one on behalf of our region to promote and advocate issues for the benefit of our communities and our people. In March 2023, VOICE Board of Directors passed a motion to support the North Slope Borough Department of Wildlife Management (NSB DWM) in their efforts to ensure the people of the North Slope have the opportunity to provide sustenance and material for their families and communities, which they get from caribou.

The Western Arctic caribou herd (WACH) is in decline and action needs to be taken to address the decline. Proposal 4: 5 AAC 85.025 comes from the North Slope Fish and Game Advisory Committee, an entity that dealt with a similar issue of the decline in the TCH within the last decade. Since this body adopted this proposal in 2015, the TCH stabilized and has since increased. **There are no more conservation concerns with the TCH.** Therefore this proposal has a proven track record.

This proposal includes the calving area and the northernmost range of the WACH. Harvest is split between the TCH and WACH within this area and Proposal 4 aims to reduce cow harvest within this portion of their range while still allowing hunters the opportunity to meet the needs of the communities they harvest for. Through a series of community hunter meetings, the NSB DWM the importance of cow caribou to the recovery of the WACH and hunters largely agreed the proposal is an appropriate regulation change given the conservation concern.

Living in rural Alaska is very expensive. Food that is not obtained by hunting or fishing, is flown in, resulting in very expensive groceries. Further, the availability of groceries is weather dependent. One can take 100 dollars to a local grocery store in rural Alaska and feed a family of four for a meal or two. Or you can take that same 100 dollars to buy fuel and ammunition and go hunt. And if successful, feed your family and other community members for months. Our hunters provide for so many more people than their immediate families, they provide for the community members and those who cannot provide for themselves.

North Slope Iñupiaq culture is deeply intertwined with the natural environment. Food sovereignty and security is extremely important to maintaining our subsistence-based Inupiaq culture, communities, and people on the North Slope. VOICE fully support the proven method of bag limits and seasons presented in 5 AAC 85.025. Thank you for your consideration of the seven communities within the North Slope that will be affected by this proposal and others presented at this meeting.

Quyanak,



---

Nagruk Harcharek  
President





PC 632

**Name:** Wagner, Andrew

**Community of Residence:** Longmont, Co

**Submission Time:** 1/6/2024 12:31:31 AM

**Comment:**

Proposal 3

Good evening,

I'm writing to express my displeasure with the proposal to continue to close the units mentioned in proposal 3 to nonresident bull caribou harvest.

A small non resident bull harvest of approx 300-400 animals a year is insignificant to herd health and declining caribou populations. 300 bull caribou removed from a population of 155k is a .19% reduction of the herd. Not only is this statistically insignificant, but there is no science in Alaska or anywhere else across the US that supports the notion that a responsible harvest of mature males from a population has a negative effect on overall caribou herd health.

Additionally there is no science to support the idea that bush planes carrying nonresidents has effected caribou migrations or herd health.

I urge the board to continue to allow nonresident bull harvest for the western Arctic caribou herd and not proceed with closing the units noted in proposal 3.

Sincerely,

Andrew Wagner

*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:** Walker, William

**Community of Residence:** Minnesota

**Submission Time:** 1/12/2024 1:59:02 AM

**Comment:**

Please reconsider implementing 3&38. I firmly believe that this will decrease the opportunities for people to live the experience of Alaska. I for one feel that this will limit my any hunting in 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 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 634

**Name:** Wallace, Lee

**Community of Residence:** Eufaula Oklahoma

**Submission Time:** 1/6/2024 3:45:41 PM

**Comment:**

We have finally had the opportunity to plan a trip to Alaska. We had decided to do a diy caribou hunt on the hall road. But with these closing of the units to non residents will hurt our opportunity. The proposal #3 and #38 will kill this opportunity. We are on a mission with this hunt to see if it would work for a hunt with our kids. We also are all traditional bow hunters. We know the opportunity to harvest a caribou with traditional equipment is about a 10 percent chance. But it's not just the opportunity to harvest a caribou. It's the trip to the last true frontier. I sure hope the opportunity is not squashed. I would love the opportunity for an alaskan adventure. Thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion.

*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 635

**Name:** Wallace, Ryan

**Community of Residence:** Roseville, California

**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 3:31:25 AM

**Comment:**

I oppose propositions #3 and 38. Science should dictate regulation. Prohibiting non-resident hunting will negatively impact the local economy without positively impacting the herd. If the science supports changing regulations, it would be across the board, not virtue signaling by closing to non resident opportunity.

*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 636

**Name:** walter, brian

**Community of Residence:** dallas

**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 7:09:17 PM

**Comment:**

As to Proposal #3 and #28

Non-Residents are currently allowed to take one bull Caribou. This harvest opportunity is offered in a reduced season. Non-resident hunters bring business to Alaska. Meals, lodging, entertainment, shipping of game and gear, supporting guides and support staff in rural village economies.

I agree with the following game management practices;

- limit residents annual harvest to 4/5 annually, with a focus on bulls and limiting the harvest of cows
- more focus on predator control, particularly that of over-the-counter grizzly tags
- mandatory and enforceable registration of all hunters, regardless of tribal and resident status
- education and enforcement of proper reporting of harvested game by subsistence (resident) hunters

Thank you for allowing Non-Residents to hunt in Alaska. I have enjoyed my 5 hunts to Alaska (Brown Bear, Grizzly Bear, Sheep, Moose, and of course Caribou). I would like to hunt more in the future and have recommended to my friends to come with me. I have spent over \$70,000.00 for my five hunts over the years. The majority of my money has gone to Alaska residents. Please keep encouraging this economic activity for your state.

*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 637

**Name:** Ward, CJ

**Community of Residence:** Inman, SC

**Submission Time:** 1/4/2024 3:27:38 PM

**Comment:**

Regarding proposals 3 and 38.

As an avid hunter who has maintained a long term goal of hunting caribou in Alaska and contributing to the economy of the local communities there, and as an American citizen wherein wildlife are held in the public trust, I am strongly opposed to these proposals. Limiting the access of non resident hunters will do nothing to slow the decline of the herd, but it will hurt people in the local communities who depend on the income provided by non-resident hunters. I urge you to reject these proposal.

*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 638

**Name:** Ward, Preston

**Community of Residence:** Sandy, Utah

**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 6:45:05 PM

**Comment:**

I clearly oppose proposal 3 and 38. I am not in support of limiting non resident opportunities for multiple reasons.

**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 639

**Name:** Warren, Remi

**Community of Residence:** Reno, NV

**Submission Time:** 1/6/2024 8:35:34 PM

**Comment:**

Proposal #3. I oppose closing the season to non-resident hunters. On the grounds that non-resident harvest does not substantially effect population but does provide substantial economic benefits.

Proposal #38. I oppose closing the season in unit 23 to non-residents. If there is a season and the area supports harvest of any kind then those living outside the area should have the opportunity to hunt as well.

*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 640

**Name:** Watson, Chase

**Community of Residence:** Ft. Lupton Colorado

**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 5:51:06 AM

**Comment:**

I am specifically against Proposal 3 and 38. I would like the opportunity to hunt ever part of Alaska that I would legally be able to and have the same opportunity we all have to hunt on lane I (we) all own

*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 641

**Name:** Watson, Jared

**Community of Residence:** BREEZY POINT, MN

**Submission Time:** 1/5/2024 8:26:48 PM

**Comment:**

Greetings from MN,

As a nonresident hunter, I have dreamed for years about an Alaska hunting adventure. Many average working men and women view Alaska as a dream destination and life changing experience to hunt some of the best animals in a place unlike any other in America. Regarding Proposal 3, Proposal 5, Proposal 25, Proposal 38; I would ask that you do not limit and/or eliminate that hunting opportunity for nonresidents. I know many hunters that might only be able to afford a trip to Alaska once in their lifetime, I would love to see as much opportunity as possible preserved and be available to those of us that have/are saving money for our dream hunt.

Thank you for your time,

Jared

*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 5: Oppose  
Oppose

Proposal 25: Oppose

Proposal 38:





PC 642

**Name:** Weber, Coltin

**Community of Residence:** Kalispell, Montana

**Submission Time:** 1/7/2024 11:36:04 PM

**Comment:**

Proposal numbers 3 and 38. I oppose both. The herd numbers will not be in jeopardy of declining with the number of bull tags given to non-resident hunters. The amount of support this offers to the smaller and larger communities of Alaskan residents will suffer.

*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 643

**Name:** Weiby, Karl

**Community of Residence:** Firestone, CO

**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 6:58:48 PM

**Comment:**

Banning non resident caribou hunting while still allowing residents to take multiple animals in the same unit makes no sense at 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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

---



PC 644

**Name:** Weiby, Karl

**Community of Residence:** Firestone CO

**Submission Time:** 1/6/2024 12:54:40 AM

**Comment:**

With regards to proposal 3 and 38, I appreciate the thought of slowing and or stopping the depletion of caribou in the listed units. Termination of non resident hunts and seasons may be the worst possible choice. More so when there are residents able to harvest multiple caribou per season. Some which I believe are females. This seems to be the lazy answer. Put your heads together and do what's right and find a reasonable solution for everyone involved. Every year it's something that gets taken away and it never comes back. Reduce tags given, make it bulls only, limit residents to one animal, make it a draw hunt. Thanks for your time

Karl

*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 645

**Name:** Wendt, Kirby

**Community of Residence:** Darrington, WA

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 5:31:55 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 646

**Name:** Wenner, Theodore

**Community of Residence:** Roswell, New Mexico

**Submission Time:** 1/7/2024 11:30:30 PM

**Comment:**

I am writing in opposition to proposals 3 and 38. I am opposed to reducing non resident hunting opportunities and don't believe the small number of bull caribou killed will significantly effect the population as a whole, but it will negatively affect local communities who gain income jobs etc. from catering 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

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 647

**Name:** Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group

**Community of Residence:** Noorvik

**Submission Time:** 1/12/2024 7:56:50 PM

**Comment:**

The Western Arctic Caribou Herd (WACH) Working Group submitted two proposals in April of 2023, both of which are currently under consideration. These proposals recommend changes to caribou regulations due to data from ADF&G wildlife biologists that illustrate a decline in the WACH [Proposal 2: EG-F23-208 and Proposal 3: EG-F23-209].

At our annual meeting in December, we again learned from ADF&G biologists of the herd's continued decline. The 2023 photo census for the WACH was 152,000 down from 164,000 in 2022, 188,000 in 2021, and 244,000 in 2019.

We are commenting today to reaffirm our support for Proposal 2 and Proposal 3. We are reaffirming our support of these proposals because we see the immediate need to address the current herd decline by limiting the harvest of both bulls and cows by both resident and non-resident hunters to allow the herd population to recover.

Furthermore, the WACH Working Group reviewed other proposals under consideration, and we do not support Proposal 5. We understand that the intent of Proposal 5 is to reduce liberal harvest limits for residents while also continuing to allow access for all hunters (non-resident) by instituting quotas and enhances monitoring. However, we stand by our Proposal 3. We believe that if harvest reductions are placed on Alaskans to allow the herd to recover, there also should be reductions for non-resident hunters.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments.

Vern Cleveland, Chair

Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group

*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: Support Proposal 5: Oppose

---



PC 648

**Name:** Whatley, Jordan

**Community of Residence:** Eaton, Colorado

**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 2:02:02 AM

**Comment:**

I opposed proposals #3 and #38 for closure of non resident caribou hunting. I believe the evidence suggests that the herd can support resident and non resident hunters at this time. Even if that means limiting non residents on tag allocation. This would be a better option than fully closing the area to them. 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 649

**Name:** Wheeler, Chase

**Community of Residence:** Sandusky, Michigan

**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 8:48:57 PM

**Comment:**

Stating my disapproval and wish to declare opposition to proposal 3 and proposal 8. Please do not disallow non residents amazing opportunity to hunt in 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 650

**Name:** Whitmer, Alex

**Community of Residence:** Sparks, NV

**Submission Time:** 1/11/2024 9:28:23 PM

**Comment:**

I oppose prop 3 and 38 for the closure of caribou hunting 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 651

**Name:** Whitwam, Charles

**Community of Residence:** Pacifica, CA

**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 8:04:15 PM

**Comment:**

The closure would deny non-residents the cultural and recreational experience of hunting in this unique region. Furthermore, I'm just not seeing how the population is affected by the small non-resident take. Keep the non-resident hunt.

*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 652

**Name:** Wilcox, Christian

**Community of Residence:** Artesia, New Mexico

**Submission Time:** 1/7/2024 11:49:10 PM

**Comment:**

I do not support the closure of Non Resident Caribou hunting on proposal #3 and #38. Non Residents play a vital role in funding and maintaining wildlife conservation at the state level. In most cases across our great country Non Resident hunting is not the result of declining herd numbers. Other measures should be taken first before a hunting closure. Such as, a non resident permit cost increase for the hunting area where there is a declining herd. Non Resident regulation proposals should first be a reduction in tags, have a maturity size on take of game, and a bull (male) harvest.

*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 653

**Name:** Wilkinson, Kyle

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage, Alaska

**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 12:07:15 AM

**Comment:**

To whom it may concern,

My name is Kyle Wilkinson. I am an Anchorage, Alaska resident. I work as a fly fishing guide during the summer and work in food production for use in the outdoor industry and outdoor recreation during the winter. I am also the co-host of an outdoor-based podcast. I am writing in with my comments for the following proposals.

Proposal 3:

I oppose Proposal 3. I do not agree with closing all caribou hunting opportunities for nonresidents in Units 21D Remainder, 22, 23, 24B Remainder, 24C, 24D, and 26A. As a resident, I have friends and family that have expressed interest in coming to Alaska to harvest caribou. Without future access to these lands, their options become more limited.

From the January 3, 2022 Outdoor Life article "Western Arctic Caribou Herd Numbers Drop to 188K: What Does That Mean For Hunters?," Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG) biologist Alex Hansen is summarized as saying that nonresident hunters only make up for 2-7 percent of the total harvest for the Western Arctic Caribou Herd, or 250-300 animals. This tells me that nonresidents have minimal impact on the herd population.

If this proposal were to become regulation, I do not believe that it would have a difference on affected caribou herds. I also fear that if this proposal does become regulation, this will be one more step towards closing hunting access to residents of Alaska that may not live directly in the area. One of the reasons my family and I moved to Alaska was to have more hunting opportunities. I do not want to see these opportunities taken away in the future. I oppose Proposal 3.

Proposal 38:

I do not agree with Proposal 38 on closing all caribou hunting opportunities for nonresidents in Unit 23. As I mentioned before, I have friends and family that have expressed interest in coming to Alaska to harvest caribou. Without future access to these lands, their options become more limited.

Again, I refer to the the January 3, 2022 Outdoor Life article Western Arctic Caribou Herd Numbers Drop to 188K: What Does That Mean For Hunters?. ADFG biologist Alex Hansen is summarized as saying that nonresident hunters only make up for 2-7 percent of the total harvest for the Western Arctic Caribou Herd, or 250-300 animals. This tells me that nonresidents have minimal impact on the herd population.

If this proposal were to become regulation, I do not believe that it would have a difference on affected caribou herds. I also fear that if this proposal does become regulation, this will be one more step towards closing hunting access to residents of Alaska that may not live directly in the area. One of the reasons my family and I moved to Alaska was to have more hunting opportunities. I do not want to see these opportunities taken away in the future. I oppose Proposal 38.

Thank you for your time,

Kyle Wilkinson

*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 654

**Name:** Will, Cody

**Community of Residence:** Valley springs California

**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 3:32:55 PM

**Comment:**

No on 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 655

**Name:** Williams, Jacob

**Community of Residence:** Albany Oregon

**Submission Time:** 1/10/2024 4:15:34 PM

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposals #3 and #38. For the following reasons:

**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.

**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.

Thank you,

Jacob Williams

*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 656

**Name:** Williams, Lucian

**Community of Residence:** Dallas, Texas

**Submission Time:** 1/12/2024 4:27:31 PM

**Comment:**

I am looking to plan an Alaskan caribou hunt in the coming years and the closure of these units would make this dramatically harder.

It is hard to believe that the approx. 400 non resident hunter are having a population level impact on the herd when the WAH harvest accounts for 95% of the animals taken off the land. The non residents that are traveling to the state add jobs and spend hard earned money for the experience.

If the goal is to manage the herd and increase the numbers I would expect the department to focus on the number of breeding age cows that are taken each season as this will have the largest impact on the herds population numbers.

*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 657

**Name:** Williams, Rodney

**Community of Residence:** Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

**Submission Time:** 12/29/2023 5:36:59 AM

**Comment:**

I am opposed to Proposal 3. I have hunted large game in Alaska as a non-resident alien on three different occasions. And I have successfully hunted caribou in Alaska. I cannot understand why anyone would think that prohibiting caribou hunting by non-resident hunters will make any difference to the sustainability of caribou hunting in Alaska. Sure it will be popular with some locals. But surely the substantial, almost obscene amounts of money that us foreign hunters plow into our Alaskan hunting has to be beneficial to the Alaskan economy and , conservation.

If the decline in the caribou population is that severe then perhaps the number of permits issued needs to be reduced and the fees attached increased across the board. Surely the value of a caribou is substantially more than the value of its meat.

I really hope that you don't exclude foreign hunters from fulfilling our dreams of hunting Alaska. I accept that we have to pay through the nose for the privilege but to prohibit us from hunting caribou won't help the caribou. But it will help the anti hunting mob.

Regards

Rod Williams.

( this submission was made on my phone while travelling overseas. Please excuse the typos)

*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 658

**Name:** Williams, Sean

**Community of Residence:** Plano, Texas

**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 5:45:39 PM

**Comment:**

Closing nonresident caribou hunting in these units will not have an effect on caribou herd populations, and sets a harmful precedent for the future of caribou hunting in Alaska. There have historically been increases and declines in caribou populations and blaming the recent decline on nonresident hunting pressure is not and cannot be supported by science. Nonresident caribou hunting only accounts for a small/negligible number of caribou being taken out of the herd every year, with resident subsistence harvest being the majority of caribou harvests per year. The cow harvests by residents, although important to the native people for a source of food and supplies, would be the only reasoning (Hunting related) for declines in populations. Climate, plays a much higher and more important role in the increases and decreases in animal populations than hunting ever will in this instance. Increasing habitat quality is the only way to increase animal populations, and habitat quality is largely controlled by climate patterns.

Another reasoning these proposals would be harmful to Alaska and not helpful to caribou populations is the amount of money the state would lose out on in nonresident tag sales and tourism (traveling hunters). There are countless businesses that depend on nonresident hunters

every year for their livelihoods, the effect on Alaska's income as a whole could be catastrophic to the local economies.

Lastly, it has been proven that conservation through hunting has been the most effective method for conservation of wildlife and their habitat. Hunted contribute a majority of wildlife funds through tag sales and donations to conservation agencies. If you take that hunting opportunity away, you lose the conservation effort that comes along with it. The decrease in animal harvest that would be observed from eliminating nonresident hunting would be inconsequential to the amount of funding for conservation that would be lost as a result, and the subsequent decrease in caribou numbers that would follow these losses would more than negate the harvest decrease, resulting in a net loss.

*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 659

**Name:** Williams, Trent

**Community of Residence:** Green River, WY

**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 4:02:04 PM

**Comment:**

To whom it may concern,

I'm writing in to OPPOSE proposals 3 and 38 which aims to ELIMINATE nonresident hunting opportunities in a slew of Alaska units. The nonresident harvest is BEYOND minuscule in the total caribou harvest in these units. If these proposals go through, it will eliminate a way of life for many of the RESIDENTS in the area by losing out on lost revenue. Frankly, it would be a shame for a "trip of a lifetime" to be taken away by so many Americans who long for the day they can visit Alaska and go on their caribou hunt.

I understand the caribou herd in these areas have been on the decline, but eliminating nonresident hunting opportunities IS NOT the answer.

-Trent Williams

*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 660

**Name:** Willis, Alex

**Community of Residence:** Kearny, Arizona

**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 7:10:37 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 661

**Name:** wilson, ethan

**Community of Residence:** WEST PALM BEACH, FL

**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 12:23:42 PM

**Comment:**

It doesn't make sense to me. Why close down the units for non-resident caribou hunters? Residents have a harvest limit of 10 on one license. A non-resident getting one tag that costs \$650 supports wildlife conservation and ALASKA 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 38: Oppose



PC 662

**Name:** Wilson, Matt

**Community of Residence:** Hanover, NH

**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 6:16:04 PM

**Comment:**

Proposals 3 and 38 will close hunting opportunities to non residents which is a poorly considered proposal for these reasons:

**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:** Winter, Jamison

**Community of Residence:** Redfield, SD

**Submission Time:** 1/11/2024 5:44:46 PM

**Comment:**

I am writing to put forth my comments on a handful of proposals for the upcoming session. Firstly, I am in opposition to Proposals 3 and 38 which would eliminate all non-local hunting throughout the bulk of the western arctic herds range. Although this population has shown decline in recent years, caribou herds are often cyclical in nature and are not being impacted by non-resident harvest. Non resident harvest of a few hundred bulls annually in no way changes the viability of the this herd. I am in support of Proposal 5 which appears to be a measure to address local concern, while allowing a level of use by non-residents. This limited harvest of a single bull would have no detrimental impacts on the western arctic herd, but would limit some of the non-resident pressure throughout the zone, hopefully reaching a level of compromise for all parties involved, until such a time as the herd has rebounded sufficiently to allow harvest and



PC 663



non-resident access through harvest tickets as it was previously. I am also in support of Proposal 2 which would limit overall harvest by residents in the western arctic herd, and would reduce adult cow harvest, which is by far the most impactful way to manage a declining population of big game. Allowing high rates of survival for adult cows, will be key to a rebounding of this 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 2: Support Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 5: Support Proposal 38:  
Oppose

---



PC 664

**Name:** Witt, Carson

**Community of Residence:** Oregon

**Submission Time:** 1/6/2024 12:48:49 PM

**Comment:**

No change to non-resident caribou opportunities in units 22,23,24c,24d,26a,21d,24b

*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 665

**Name:** Wojta, Jerald

**Community of Residence:** Delaware, Ohio

**Submission Time:** 1/4/2024 4:41:23 AM

**Comment:**

To Whom It May Concern,

Alaska has always been a dream destination for me to visit, and indeed hunt, and it greatly concerns me that Proposals #3 and #38 would remove my ability to hunt caribou as a non resident. I have been saving for an Alaska hunt for some years and specifically one for caribou, so I may have the chance to witness the beautify of your state and the potential of taking an animal that I could only dream of growing up in the Midwest. These Proposals would not only eliminate my life long aspirations, but those of many like me who have spent years of hunting the hardwoods and farmlands in places such as Ohio, hoping for an opportunity for something grander. So please, I humbly ask that you reject these proposals. I ask that you please reason with the data on how many caribou are taken by non residents annually (250) and see that this is non threatening to total heard populations when making your decision as well as considering what it means to individuals such as myself to have this opportunity. Thank you for your time, I greatly appreciate it.

Best,

Jerald Travis Wojta

*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 666

**Name:** Wood, Guston

**Community of Residence:** Grenville, New Mexico

**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 12:24:57 PM

**Comment:**

Hi,

I'm Guston Wood. I'm a resident of New Mexico that have a current caribou hunt booked outside of nome AK for the 2024 season. We've had this trip planned for 5 years. Saving and preparing for our adventure. I would really hope you reconsider your proposal to stop out of state hunters. It's a great revenue source locally as well as at the state level. As an outfitter myself, I know what the burden of losing out of state hunters would cost my business in New Mexico. Please reconsider!

Best,

Guston Wood

Pasamonte Hunts

*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 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

---



PC 667

**Name:** Wright, Nick

**Community of Residence:** Mekinock, ND

**Submission Time:** 1/6/2024 5:50:55 PM

**Comment:**

In regard to proposal 3 and 38, the numbers do not support the nonresident closure. In that region, nonresidents kill 300-400 caribou. That is a fraction of the total number of caribou harvested. This proposal is not based on harvest numbers and science. This proposal is derived from emotion.

*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 668

**Name:** Wyatt, Luke

**Community of Residence:** Clarksville, Tennessee

**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 7:27:47 PM

**Comment:**

Proposal #3 - I, Luke Wyatt, am opposed to proposal #3.

Proposal #38 - I, Luke Wyatt, am opposed to Proposal #38.

There are other possible means of improving wildlife management for caribou other than closing these units down for non-resident hunters. The North American Wildlife Conservation Model has shown to be the pinnacle solution around the world when it comes to managing wildlife and this proposal goes against the science and evidence that has been proven by this model over the last century.

*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 669

**Name:** Yardley, Justin

**Community of Residence:** Franklin, Idaho

**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 12:28:55 AM

**Comment:**

Doesn't make sense to blame declining caribou population on non residents when they can shoot one and non residents can shoot 5. Making non residents not able to hunt is foolish and is not going to be thing that could really affect your problem. How about cutting residents down to 2-3.

*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 3: Oppose

---



PC 670

**Name:** Younkin, Nathan

**Community of Residence:** Confluence PA

**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 12:42:49 AM

**Comment:**

As long as the population supports it eliminating funds from non resident hunting licenses sales that can be used to fund more conservation makes absolutely no 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 3: Oppose

Proposal 33: Oppose

---



PC 671

**Name:** Youree, Jamison

**Community of Residence:** Hurst, TX

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 2:20:45 AM

**Comment:**

As non resident hunters lose access to hunting ground in their home states like I have, I ask that you consider allowing as many tags as the scientific evidence allows. I've always looked at Alaska as a destination I've dreamed of hunting. Seeing proposals 3 and 38 that limit Caribou hunting hurts the dream I've had since my teens. Please do not let politics play a part in the conservation plan that your state puts in place like so many other states have done. It hurts the outdoor/hunting community on too many levels. The more tags that are taken away from non residents, the more crowded Alaska residents will feel at their local hunting spots. Please follow the science and not the narrative that fits for the week. Thank you for your consideration of my comments and for what you do in 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 672

**Name:** Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council

**Community of Residence:** Fairbanks

**Submission Time:** 11/28/2023 1:35:36 AM

**Comment:**

The Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council supports Proposal 6 with the following amendments:

Establish a hunting moratorium for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd in Unit 18 for up to 5 years or until the herd reaches a population threshold of 30,000 to 60,000 caribou. The moratorium will be reviewed yearly by the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council and the State Fish and Game Advisory Committees in Unit 18. Once the population threshold is reached, hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou will be as follows: 1 bull caribou, open season dates delegated to the area manager.

The Council supports this proposal with amendments because the Mulchatna herd cannot currently support harvest and hunting needs to stay closed to rebuild the herd. Caribou are an important subsistence food in the region. The moratorium needs to be reviewed regularly so hunting can be re-opened as soon as the herd reaches levels that can support some harvest. Additionally, local people should be involved in management decisions.

*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 with Amendment

---



PC 673

**Name:** Zakoworotny, Andre

**Community of Residence:** Woodbridge, CT

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 12:14:04 AM

**Comment:**

IM WRITING TO OPPOSE PROPOSAL #3 and #38, FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

**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 674

**Name:** Zatarain, Enrique

**Community of Residence:** Grand Junction, Colorado

**Submission Time:** 1/12/2024 2:12:09 AM

**Comment:**

I am a non-resident who has hunted Alaska and plans to hunt Alaska in the future. The northwest region of Alaska is a hunt of a lifetime that allows non-residents to do a "Do it yourself" hunt at a reasonable cost. The caribou population downturn is not due to non-resident hunting pressure. Non-resident hunters also provide significant revenue to the state for the tags. Also, the businesses and services in those areas will lose significant revenue from transporters to lodging to food services. Losing this opportunity reduces the hunting opportunity which reduces participation for hunting. The less participation from hunters we have the harder the management of animal populations will become.

*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 675

**Name:** Zelina, Joshua

**Community of Residence:** Idaho Falls, ID

**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 12:43:31 PM

**Comment:**

I am in opposition of these proposals as a non-resident with family in Alaska. Hunting is extremely important to my family, and these proposals would greatly limit the opportunities for my family, and future family, 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 676

**Name:** Ziegler, Ben

**Community of Residence:** Wisconsin

**Submission Time:** 1/10/2024 10:58:00 PM

**Comment:**

I am commenting about proposal 3 and 38. The evidence of harvest and numbers need to come into play with this decision. Only a handful of bulls are killed by non resident hunters each year coming to Alaska on “dream hunts” trying to take in all Alaska has to offer. Thousands and thousands of cows and calf’s are killed yearly by subsistence hunters with no proposed change just doesn’t make sense to me. I understand that subsistence hunters require the meat to survive but there must be better alternatives than closing the hunting to only non residents when hunting without a guild is Alaska is already restricted enough for nonresident hunters.

Please make the right decision.

*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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

---