



PC 101

**Name:** Clark, Ricky

**Community of Residence:** Ashland, OR

**Submission Time:** 1/11/2024 6:23:05 PM

**Comment:**

I'm writing to oppose proposal 38- regarding the closure of nonresident hunting in unit 23. While the caribou population in the unit is declining the nonresident harvest is of minimal impact. Something like 250 caribou per year are harvested in the unit by nonresident hunters, and the majority of those are likely bulls.

The many thousands of animals killed by resident hunters are surely more detrimental to herd health, as there are numerous instances of heavy cow and calf 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 38: Oppose

---



PC 102

**Name:** Cleveringa, Brad

**Community of Residence:** Orange City, Iowa

**Submission Time:** 1/6/2024 3:43:34 PM

**Comment:**

I would encourage you to vote no on the bills to cancel non resident caribou hunting. I believe there are many ways to manage the herds in a better way other than removing non residents. Non resident hunters target trophy bulls and make very little impact on the cow herd which is necessary to maintain a healthy bull to cow ratio. I would recommend regulating the amount of cows harvested per year by resident hunters. Also, non resident hunters bring more money per tag compared to resident hunters just based on the price of the tag. Alaska needs non resident hunters to help boost the economy in some of the more rural areas and I feel that eliminating them would be a huge mistake.

Thank you for your consideration!!!

Sincerely,

Brad Cleveringa

*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

---



PC 103

**Name:** Cloke, Austin

**Community of Residence:** El Cajon, California

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 1:28:26 AM

**Comment:**

In response to #3& #38: 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:** Coleman, Skyler

**Community of Residence:** Sonoma, Ca

**Submission Time:** 1/10/2024 2:10:02 PM

**Comment:**

I oppose #3 and #38. See below talking points:

**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 105

**Name:** Collier, Christopher

**Community of Residence:** Cody, Wyoming

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 2:53:30 AM

**Comment:**

There is a lack of scientific evidence to support that non-resident hunting has any significant effect on Caribou population. Also, other means such as the reduction of cow harvests would put more Caribou on the landscape and be a benefit to all parties.

*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 106

**Name:** Comment, Matt

**Community of Residence:** Warrenton, Virginia

**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 4:31:59 PM

**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. The Western Arctic Herd has historically undergone significant population fluctuations, suggesting that the current decline might be part of a natural cycle. There is insufficient scientific evidence directly linking non-resident hunting to the decline in the caribou population. The closure could set a concerning precedent for wildlife management, potentially leading to more extensive restrictions without clear scientific backing.

*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 107

**Name:** Conley, Jacob

**Community of Residence:** Charlottesville, Virginia

**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 12:59:11 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 1: Support Proposal 2: Support Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 4: Support Proposal 5: Support Proposal 6: Support Proposal 7: Support Proposal 8: Support Proposal 10: Support Proposal 11: Support Proposal 12: Support Proposal 13: Support Proposal 14: Support Proposal

15: Support Proposal 16: Support Proposal 17: Support Proposal 18: Support Proposal 19:  
Support Proposal 20: Support Proposal 21: Support Proposal 22: Support Proposal 23: Support  
Proposal 24: Support Proposal 25: Support Proposal 26: Support Proposal 27: Support Proposal  
28: Support Proposal 29: Support Proposal 30: Support Proposal 31: Support Proposal 32:  
Support Proposal 33 Support Proposal 38: Oppose

---



PC 108

**Name:** Connall, Calvin

**Community of Residence:** Soldatna, AK

**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 5:25:57 PM

**Comment:**

I oppose both bills, non-resident hunters help bring money to our economy. There is little evidence showing decline of populations is due to out of state hunters. Find the real root cause

*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:** Conrad, Cedric

**Community of Residence:** Soldotna, Alaska

**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 1:26:51 AM

**Comment:**

I don't support proposal 3

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

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

---





PC 110

**Name:** Coordinator for the Kobuk Valley Subsistence Resource Commission, NPS

**Community of Residence:** Kotzebue, AK

**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 8:05:34 PM

**Comment:**

see attached letter from KOVA SRC and the FACA summary of meeting

*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

---



# United States Department of the Interior

## National Park Service

Kobuk Valley National Park, Western Arctic Parklands,  
PO Box 1029  
Kotzebue, AK 99752  
Phone (907) 442-3890



## KOBUK VALLEY SUBSISTENCE RESOURCE COMMISSION

Dear Board of Game,

To address the Proposals 36 and 37, The Kobuk Valley Subsistence Resource Commission (KOVA SRC) **opposes** the proposal as written.

KOVA SRC supports a meaningful reduction in caribou harvest to protect the longevity and health of the declining Western Arctic Caribou Herd. The commission is very concerned about the on-going decline. However, commission members are concerned that this number is too drastic and will not be maintained in the communities. Furthermore, this reduction in harvest to 4/year per hunter does not align with the Inupiaq Value of sharing. The food security of the villages this commission represents is of great concern.

- Smaller villages have less opportunity to earn outside income beyond a subsistence economy
- Fuel in our villages can reach \$18/gal, meaning that sharing is often done among those with the mobility to get out on the land and cover distances
- Obtaining non-subsistence food is incredibly expensive.
- Late migration means that when the caribou do arrive, sometimes after several years, the bulls are in rut. Hunters would always choose the bulls, but with their meat effected by the rut, the only option to obtain food is to go after the young bulls, and unfortunately the cows.

The Kobuk Valley Subsistence Resource Commission supports a reduction, but asks that you consider implenting community harvest quotas to better reflect the Inupiaq values and way of life in this region. This would be an opt in, with the smaller villages—most impacted by a reduction—being the best candidates for successful use.

We ask that the board do an assesment regarding community harvest using the sustainbale harvestable limit (currently 7300 animals), most recent subsistence data, and the current population of each village to determine this quota. We ask that the quota be a percentage of the sustainable harvset, thus changing each year based on the WACH population count. We request that the board conduct tribal consultations in each village, in person, to determine which villages would like to opt in to this model.

We do support the reduction of harvest in cows and think that the 1/year per hunter, or the percentage equivelent to that in the case of a community quota, is good in that it reduces cow harvest, but allows leaway for hunters who may have no other choice in their harvest opportunity.

Finally, the Kobuk Valley SRC **supports** Proposal 38, closing the state hunting lands in unit 23 to non-resident hunters. This summer a lot of hunters were pushing up onto state lands and there was widespread concern across the region that this contributed to the delay of the migration. Hunters coming in have large amounts of money and are able to follow the herd, while access for families relying on subsistence food has been limited due to issues such as fuel cost and the migration. While the herd remains in decline and local hunters are working towards solutions to both conserve the population of the herd and feed their families, outside hunting should not be allowed.

Thank you,  
Kobuk Valley Subsistence Resource Commission  
Chair, Tristen Pattee  
Vice Chair, Merle Custer

Members:  
Shield Downey  
Gordon Newlin  
Benny Westlake  
Rosa Horner  
Nellie Griest

## Summary of Federal Advisory Committee Meeting

<b>Committee Name:</b>	Kobuk Valley National Park Subsistence Resource Commission
<b>FACA Designated Federal Officer:</b>	Raymond McPadden, Superintendent WEAR
<b>SRC Chair:</b>	Shield Downey
<b>Meeting Dates:</b>	Oct 30 and 31, 2023
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	Kotzebue, AK (Heritage Center)
<b>Summary of Meeting:</b> <i>(Summarize the meeting, how many members in attendance, topics discussed, any input from members of the public, etc.)</i>	<p>The Kobuk Valley Subsistence Resource (SRC) is a nine-member advisory committee was statutorily created by Congress under provisions within Section 808 of Public Law 96-487, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA). The SRC met in the National Park Service (NPS) visitor center in Kotzebue, Alaska, on October 30 and 31. Meeting began at 1:05pm October 30, adjourning at 4pm. And re-began at 9:03am October 31, adjourning at 12:05pm.</p> <p>Present: Chair Shield Downey, Secretary of Interior; Benny Westlake, Governor of Alaska; Merle Custer; NWRAC; Tristen Pattee, NWRAC; and Gordon Newlin, Secretary of Interior</p> <p><b>Absent:</b> Nellie Griest, Secretary of Interior; Rosa Horner; NWRAC; Enoch Mitchell, Governor of Alaska</p> <p>Quorum was achieved with 5 members: Two members were delayed due to flights but made it in prior to action items.</p> <p>Members gave report from their local areas. All updates from agencies were provided. Several actions were taken.</p>
<b>Recommendations:</b>	<p>Interest in community harvest quotas, especially for small villages.</p> <p>Assistance in tangible food security needed (who is going to pay for people get beef if there is no caribou hunting allowed?)</p>
<b>Decisions:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Re-appointments to SRC and elections <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members confirmed desire for re-appointment</li> <li>• Tristen Pattee elected as Chair</li> <li>• Merle Custer elected as vice-Chair</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. WP24-28/29/Proposal 36/37: oppose and letter to boards written during meeting</li> <li>3. WP24-30/31/Proposal 38: support</li> <li>4. WP24-01: support</li> <li>5. SRC comment re: d-1 lands: Support writing letter to BLM urging maintaining d-1 land protection</li> <li>6. Travel to Board of Game meeting in Kotzebue: Merle Custer was selected to represent the SRC.</li> </ol>

<p><b>Comments:</b> <i>(Use this field to add any additional comments or to explain why there were no decisions or recommendations made at the meeting. Attach any SRC recommendation or comment letters)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4/caribou a year will not be well recieved</li> <li>• Caribou are in Ambler, open water currently preventing movement to Shungnak, etc. Arrived in Ambler Oct 15. Ambler is harvesting for community as well as sending meat to other communities</li> <li>• NANA trespass program was unable to provide meat at end of season as is tradition; rough year with high water and boat accidents on logs.</li> <li>• Major concern over food security: price of fuel; people cannot afford sugar or to send beef to villages; economy is subsistence not cash</li> <li>• People in villages do not waste meat</li> <li>• Fishing was bad this summer due to high water on the Kobuk; people set nets under ice and are doing well now.</li> <li>• Beavers are getting worse</li> <li>• Current icy weather not good</li> <li>• Lots of big wolves at Onion Portage</li> <li>• Tribal consultation by OSM/FSB on proposals is needed</li>   <li>• “Caribou Soup” book well recieved, members mention that other generations (ex: adults 20s-50s) would like it. Can it be digital too?</li> <li>• Sand Dunes Access Trail discussed</li> <li>• Beavers: in delta by Noorvik; smells like beaver urine; 12-15 beavers per beaver house; Merle says he likes to eat beaver, but its not super common.</li> <li>• Excitment at Gidding’s Trail update; excitement in Doug Anderson’s collection being cataloged and interest in seeing the Onion Portage photos and having community (Ambler) helping identify them; interest in waysign that tells the story at Gidding’s Cabin</li> </ul>
<p><b>Prepared by:</b></p>	<p>Emily Creek, Cultural Anthropologist and Subsistence Coordinator, KOVA 907-412-0229</p>
<p><b>FACA Group Federal Officer NPS Alaska Region</b></p>	<p>Dillon Patterson, AKRO</p>
<p><b>Date:</b></p>	<p>11/2/2023</p>

Contact NPS staff via email use the following email address format: emily\_creek@nps.gov



PC 111

**Name:** Costello, Michael

**Community of Residence:** Sacramento, California

**Submission Time:** 1/11/2024 7:43:51 PM

**Comment:**

Hello, I am opposed to #3 and #38.

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

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

These rules create a class system for hunters which is unjustified. WILDLIFE belong to all citizens and public access to hunt on Federal or State PUBLIC lands must be maintained with equitable rules that apply to all residents and non-residents.

If the caribou herd is at risk, apply mgmt protocols to all residents, all non-residents and maintain equitable access & opportunity for citizens.

*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 112

**Name:** Cotner, Connor

**Community of Residence:** Boise, ID

**Submission Time:** 1/12/2024 11:53:32 PM

**Comment:**

Proposals #3 and #38 could set a concerning precedent for wildlife management, potentially leading to more extensive restrictions without clear scientific backing. There is insufficient scientific evidence directly linking non-resident hunting to the decline in the caribou population.

*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 113

**Name:** Cowley, Mike

**Community of Residence:** Utah

**Submission Time:** 1/12/2024 3:53:51 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 114

**Name:** Cox, Phil

**Community of Residence:** AUBURN, CA

**Submission Time:** 1/10/2024 7:27:35 PM

**Comment:**

Based on the information in the article, here are ten talking points on why proposals #3 and #38 should be opposed:

**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 115

**Name:** Craig, Briley

**Community of Residence:** Kremlin, Oklahoma

**Submission Time:** 1/6/2024 4:47:08 AM

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal #3 and #38 due to potential evidential impacts caused by lack of hunting and the loss of funding for the caribou species in those units for conservation and studies that would soon follow after non resident hunting is closed. Also the loss opportunity for the state to make money on tags and hunters coming to the 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 38: Oppose



PC 116

**Name:** Craig, Todd

**Community of Residence:** Rapid City SD

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 1:47:36 AM

**Comment:**

I'm writing to oppose proposed rule (3) and (38) sorry but the evidence is just not supported by the science.

Thank you.

---



PC 117

**Name:** Crawford, Ethan

**Community of Residence:** Delta Junction, Alaska

**Submission Time:** 1/2/2024 6:53:48 AM

**Comment:**

As a new resident of the state I have always dreamed of hunting caribou. This change in proposal 3 won't affect me, but I know it could certainly affect friends and family who also wish to hunt here in the near future. I also believe that closing opportunities to nonresident hunters is a mistake as it will reduce the money coming into the state from relatively wealthy out of state hunters.

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

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

---



PC 118

**Name:** Cruz, Matthew

**Community of Residence:** Leander, Texas

**Submission Time:** 1/2/2024 9:39:30 AM

**Comment:**

Management of wildlife is not possible without revenue. Out of state hunters provide economic benefit to the state and intimately the local community in which they chose to hunt. A reduction of tags issued to our of state hunters until populations are at a sustainable level is a fair compromise that all hunters can get behind but eliminating them completely is never an effective long term solution as we have seen from Africa to Texas border lands.

*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 119

**Name:** Cubin, Frederick

**Community of Residence:** Casper, WY

**Submission Time:** 1/5/2024 11:14:45 PM

**Comment:**

In regard to proposals 3 and 38 which seek to limit or end non-resident caribou hunting in Alaska, please do not pass these proposals. It has been a dream of mine to someday travel to Alaska and harvest one of these majestic animals. I do not believe that the science demonstrates that non-resident hunting is harming this fantastic resource. Please vote "No" on both of these proposals.

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

Proposal 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

---



PC 120

**Name:** Cunningham, Andrew

**Community of Residence:** Spring Creek, Nevada

**Submission Time:** 1/2/2024 3:43:28 PM

**Comment:**

Proposal 3-5 AAC 82.025.

I am opposed to this proposal. I believe Alaska has done a great job regulating their big game species. Specifically, non resident hunts. I do not believe closing it is the answer. This brings nonresidents into the state that spend money in Alaska on more than just hunting. I think completely closing it would be detrimental to the local economy

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

Proposal 3: Oppose

---



PC 121

**Name:** Curry, Jimmy

**Community of Residence:** Gunnison CO

**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 9:23:38 PM

**Comment:**

I oppose banning non residents ability to hunt caribou as I believe these limited opportunities have no effect on the caribou herds. Also these tags bring in tourism dollars to outfitters and other local businesses. Caribou is a dream hunt of mine and as a us citizen I should be able to do so on federal ground.

*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 122

**Name:** Curry, Noah

**Community of Residence:** Boise, Idaho

**Submission Time:** 1/2/2024 4:40:35 AM

**Comment:**

Proposal 3 follows a disturbing pattern amongst western states to limit and falsely correlate non-resident hunting with declining game-herds/declining quality huntings.

Non-residents financially carry the burden and add to rural communities in multiple facets, from lodging to gas station foods, we prop small communities upwards.

*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 123

**Name:** Curry, Noah

**Community of Residence:** Boise, Idaho

**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 12:34:40 AM

**Comment:**

I think the banning/restriction of nr caribou hunting is ignorant and only will hurt the economic future and cultural heritage of hunting in small Alaskan communities.

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

Proposal 3: Oppose

Proposal 37: Oppose Proposal 38: Oppose

---



PC 124

**Name:** Curtis, David

**Community of Residence:** Granite Colorado

**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 4:41:00 PM

**Comment:**

I am a lifelong hunter. I strongly oppose prop 3 and 38. I'm all for wildlife and believe something should be done even if it means less opportunity. But closing hunting to non res hunters is just wrong.

*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 125

**Name:** Cypers, Josh

**Community of Residence:** Stockton, Utah

**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 7:17:00 PM

**Comment:**

The proposed closures of caribou hunting to non residents makes no logical recovery sense when residents are allowed to kill 4 animals per day and allows for the killing of cows in that process. Making non residents and outfitters pay the price for over harvesting on residents and predators parts is a poor conservation tactic

*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 23: Oppose

---



PC 126

**Name:** Dalrick, Aaron

**Community of Residence:** Cheyenne

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 2:23:13 AM

**Comment:**

Proposals 3 and 38 are targeting NR hunters as if NR hunters are the reason why the caribou populations are low. Time and time again, hunters are attacked for this issue when there are other underline issues typically related to habitat management. Doing away with NR hunters for these proposals will do the following:

- Enables other states to attack NR hunters and inevitably R hunters to close hunting access.
- Cause NR hunters to bunch up in other available units, creating increased hunting pressure, more damage to the landscape and increased illegal activity such as poaching or shooting an animal the same day if flew in.
- Creates the illusion that this is progress. Until we keep the cows and calves healthy to sustain the population, the local hunters that would be eligible to hunt it will still see a drop in population.
- Loss of revenue to local flyers, transporters, guides, etc.

Invest in the landscape and putting more caribou on the mountain is how we address this issue. Please oppose 3 and 38.

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

Proposal 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

---





PC 127

**Name:** Dalton, James

**Community of Residence:** The Woodlands, Texas

**Submission Time:** 1/5/2024 9:12:52 PM

**Comment:**

Proposal #3 and Proposal #38 - I am opposed to these proposals. These will decrease hunting opportunities for non-residents, thereby decreasing revenue for the state of Alaska. My family is from Alaska (Wrangell and Unalaska), and I do not want to see the state lose revenue that these tags would bring. As such, please consider terminating these proposals and not going forward with 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 128

**Name:** Damm, Phil

**Community of Residence:** Savery, WY

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 3:56:26 AM

**Comment:**

This comment is in regards to Proposals 3 and 38 specifically. Closing seasons to non-residents won't affect caribou populations. With only a couple hundred bulls and relatively few cows harvested on these licenses, closing this opportunity will only serve to hurt local businesses servicing these hunters. We know that bulls don't make calves, and they can be harvested as surplus with no effect on the population. In light of the thousands of caribou being harvested through other means, it would make much more sense to limit the non-resident licenses to "bull only" and limit the people harvesting thousands of cows in some fashion 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 129

**Name:** Darnell, Tristan

**Community of Residence:** Thornton, Colorado

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 1:18:39 AM

**Comment:**

My name is Tristan Darnell, a 27 year old native resident of Colorado. I am submitting this form in opposition of Proposal #3 and Proposal #38. My grandfather hunted caribou in Alaska's Mulchatna River Basin in the 1980s; and I grew up idolizing the stories of the great frontier of Alaska. It has always been a dream of mine and many others in the lower 48 to make it up to Alaska to experience the amazing opportunities the state has to offer to outdoorsmen. I know it's not the fault nor responsibility of Native and Resident Alaskans to empathize; but outdoorsmen and our lifestyle are under attack in majority of the states in the lower 48. I may be lucky to make it up to experience your great state once before I'm too old to do so; solely due to the immense cost required for such an adventure. That means I would have the opportunity, not the guarantee, of harvesting one Caribou in my lifetime, and fulfill a lifelong dream of doing so. For this reason, I oppose Proposal #3 and #38. Thank you.

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

Proposal 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

---



PC 130

**Name:** Davis, Cameron

**Community of Residence:** Edmond, Oklahoma

**Submission Time:** 1/6/2024 2:37:50 PM

**Comment:**

I'm opposing the proposals #3 and #38 due to shutting down opportunities for nonresident hunters. Ample opportunities should continue for non-resident hunters and not be restricted. Many hunters willing to incur the cost and time off work to travel to Alaska, making plans sometimes years in advance, respect the animals and the land we are hunting and shouldn't be penalized by limiting the opportunities to hunt these fantastic, beautiful animals.

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

Proposal 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

---



PC 131

**Name:** Day, Jacob

**Community of Residence:** Hamilton, OH

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 2:03:07 AM

**Comment:**

I am in opposition to proposals 3 and 38 for the following reasons:

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.

*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 132

**Name:** Deal, Aaron

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

**Submission Time:** 1/5/2024 8:38:02 PM

**Comment:**

Hello,

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments. Reading the proposals 3 and 38 are concerning as a non resident. As the department of fish and game in Alaska sees the harvest of bulls as biologically insignificant, i would urge you to keep this open. As it's not a direct impact to the heard numbers for conservation, and it brings in funds to the state, allowing this to move forward would be a detriment in many ways.

Thank you,

Aaron deal

*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 133

**Name:** Dean, William

**Community of Residence:** Eagle Mountain, Utah

**Submission Time:** 1/4/2024 3:31:41 AM

**Comment:**

As an AK non-resident, I am totally opposed to proposals 3 and 38. I've dreamed of hunting caribou in AK for the last 20 years and hope to be able to do it one day in at least one of those areas near Kotzebue. I've read much about caribou hunting in those areas specifically and clearly, non-resident hunters are having extremely minimal impact on the caribou numbers in the Western Arctic herd.

It's obvious to any 3-year old that a 5 caribou PER DAY "limit" for subsistence hunting is the real issue here.

Plenty of "subsistence" hunting will continue to provide for AK's natives (as it should) without allowing 5 caribou per day. -It's beyond ridiculous.....

*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 134

**Name:** DeAngelis, Max

**Community of Residence:** Prescott, Arizona

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 12:52:07 AM

**Comment:**

Taking away these hunting rights and experiences from non residents would be awful and according the science would not help the populations.

*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 135

**Name:** Deaton, Tucker

**Community of Residence:** Charleston, SC

**Submission Time:** 1/10/2024 4:07:57 AM

**Comment:**

I am writing to oppose proposals 3 and 38. As a nonresident coming to Alaska on a moose hunt this fall I know first hand how much money non residents put into the local economy when we come to hunt. I hope that the opportunity to go on such adventures won't be taken away unless there is sufficient scientific evidence that it's absolutely necessary. I don't believe it's necessary in this case and I'm worried about taking away hunting opportunities as the first line of defense when populations dip. There are other ways to help these herds and taking away the small harvest of nonresidents will not have a large enough impact to justify the loss of hunting 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 136

**Name:** DeLong, Matt

**Community of Residence:** Portland, OR

**Submission Time:** 1/7/2024 11:42:41 PM

**Comment:**

I respectfully oppose proposals 3 and 38 which aim to close non-resident caribou hunting. I don't believe the scientific evidence and AKFG data supports these proposals as nonresident hunting closures will not appreciably help the population. Reduction in cow harvest is a necessary step given struggling reproductivity, but reducing a small number of bull tags will not solve this. Furthermore, the money and engagement of nonresident hunters can help Alaska when we're part of the solution far more than ostracizing this 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 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

---



PC 137

**Name:** Demi, Ethan

**Community of Residence:** Pennsylvania

**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 10:40:04 PM

**Comment:**

I oppose #3 and #38 because of the lack of facts. This is not biology based wildlife management. We've come to expect this in Washington and Colorado, but not Alaska. Listen to the facts and the biologist.

*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 138

**Name:** DeNicco, August

**Community of Residence:** Missoula, Montana

**Submission Time:** 1/7/2024 3:02:52 PM

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposals 3 and 38, which would effectively eliminate nonresident caribou hunting in northwest Alaska. I understand the declining caribou population in the region is a serious concern, but eliminating nonresident hunting will not help reverse this trend. Basic wildlife management principles tell us that the female portion of an animal population determines population growth or decline. Nonresident hunters can kill one bull per year, with about 250 bulls killed per year by nonresident hunters in the entire region. Meanwhile, resident and subsistence hunters can kill up to 5 caribou per day, many of them cows and calves. Their annual harvest in the region is as high as 14,000 caribou some years. Banning nonresident hunting in the area would also have a significant economic effect on Alaskans who make their living from nonresident hunters, including transporters, pilots, guides, and hotel/restaurant operators.

In summary, proposals 3 and 38 will do nothing to reverse the decline of caribou populations in northwest Alaska. They would have a negative economic effect on the small communities in the area. Please deny these shortsighted proposals.

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

Proposal 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

---



**Name:** Denzin, Jay

**Community of Residence:** Firth Nebraska

**Submission Time:** 1/6/2024 10:03:50 PM

**Comment:**

My son and I have dreamed of hunting Caribou in Alaska. Sure would be a shame to shut that down completely. I just don't understand why that would be necessary. Please reconsider.

*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 140

**Name:** Deuschle, Andrea

**Community of Residence:** Toledo, OH

**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 11:44:55 AM

**Comment:**

Proposal 3 and 38. I am opposed.

**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 141

**Name:** Dexter, Kyle

**Community of Residence:** Rexburg, Idaho

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 1:56:31 AM

**Comment:**

I am opposing proposal 3 and 38. I have never hunted in Alaska before and we finally have planned a trip to do so and now we come to find out that we might not be able to do this. This is very disheartening.

*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 142

**Name:** Dickerson, Trevor

**Community of Residence:** Mapleton, UT

**Submission Time:** 1/2/2024 2:45:51 PM

**Comment:**

I lived in a Alaska for 2 years and frequently return to visit often for recreation in the outdoors and hunter experiences. I'm always amazed at the geographic size of Alaska and all that it has to offer. It is always a stark reminder of how small we really are and how vast this creation is for us. I strongly oppose the prop 3 that is currently being discussed. The non resident hunter is not the problem, the limits currently set forth for the resident hunter seem pretty high and I would be very interested the see the reports of how many residents are reaching the limit of 5 caribou. But we don't have the data and need all animals harvest to be reported, by both resident and non resident. I understand the subsistence lifestyle and the drive for survival. But as a non residence and have hunted in many regions of the state, I will often donate all game meat to the locals as they are the ones needing the food and are so generous to help assist in guiding and outfitting the hunting communities. The brown bear need to be managed better and provide over the counter tags for hunter in this region to help with the predators that have a year around season on caribou. Please don't support prop #3, consider both sides in change and realize that the hundreds of thousands of caribou move, change and adapt to their surroundings. These animals are there for our own good and both the non resident and resident needs to enjoy what we all have been given and blessed to enjoy. You can't simply can't just look at one demographic and think it is going to really make a huge change. Consider all parties and consider those who have studied the caribou heard and those locals who spend countless days guiding in the field. These guides are the ones attending this meeting and voicing their concern because they see first hand how the Caribou behave and migrate. Listen to them please and don't approve #3, thank you!!

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

Proposal 3: Oppose

---



PC 143

**Name:** Dodd, Sean

**Community of Residence:** Castle rock, Colorado

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 3:12:18 AM

**Comment:**

Hello,

I oppose 3 and 38. I believe there is a lack of scientific evidence that shows nonresident hunters have an impact on caribou. I am a sportsman who desires to eventually hunt in these areas. I want to be able to recreate and enjoy the state of Alaska in the future. Thanks for the consideration.

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

Proposal 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 144

**Name:** Doolin, Mitchel

**Community of Residence:** Palmer, Alaska

**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 1:33:59 AM

**Comment:**

I feel like Alaska does, and has done, a great job managing it's wildlife for all users. That being said I think some of the recent proposals are over reactions to the past few hard winters. That in combination of no assurances that anything will return to the current structure makes it difficult to support.

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

Proposal 1: Support Proposal 2: Support Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 6: Oppose

Proposal 17: Support Proposal 33: Oppose Proposal 34: Support Proposal 36: Support

Proposal 37: Support Proposal 38: Oppose



PC 145

**Name:** Dowson, Dylan

**Community of Residence:** MISSOULA

**Submission Time:** 1/5/2024 9:55:57 PM

**Comment:**

I am against the closures of Proposals 3 and 38 (closing NR caribou hunting).

As a non-resident, it is a goal of mine to come to AK and hunt caribou. This closure would make it more difficult and put even more pressure on other areas. Thank you for considering the public's comments on the matter.

*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 146

**Name:** Draper, Casey

**Community of Residence:** Scipio, Utah

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 3:21:44 AM

**Comment:**

I oppose #3 & 38 because, 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 147

**Name:** Dressel, Miles

**Community of Residence:** St. Louis, Missouri

**Submission Time:** 1/6/2024 4:13:18 AM

**Comment:**

Proposal 3 & 38

I am against not allowing non-resident's to hunt NW Alaska Caribou. My first reason being that you can take away people's jobs such as guides, outfitters, butchers, and more by eliminating a large portion of people that go through NW Alaska which are a good portion non-residents. My other comment I would like to say is how many non-residents are really going which is "hurting" the heard or are residents complaint about out of state hunters. This is a dream of mine to hunt Caribou in the Alaskan Tundra and by eliminating where people can go, how many more do you think have the same goal as me.

*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 148

**Name:** Duncan, Cameron

**Community of Residence:** Wisconsin

**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 6:25:50 AM

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal numbers 3 & 38. These proposals don't have any scientific evidence to back up a approval vote. Outdoorsman are the vital root to our nations/world's conservation program. An approval on those proposals would cause detrimental harm to our caribou herds, funding for habitat sustainment, and the local economy

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

Proposal 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

---





PC 149

**Name:** Duncan, Eric

**Community of Residence:** La Center, WA

**Submission Time:** 1/12/2024 3:59:41 PM

**Comment:**

I am opposed to proposals #3 & #38 and would like to make the following points:

**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:** Dury, Drake

**Community of Residence:** Desoto, IL

**Submission Time:** 1/11/2024 9:44:52 PM

**Comment:**

The concern I have is the lack science pertaining to the effective nonresidents have as a whole on the population seeing that nonresident take is low. I could see offering reducing cow tags as the problem of this herd seems to be adult cow retention. This herd had also historically undergone great changes in population so there could be other factors involved instead of eliminating all nonresident tags which appear to not the cause of the problems. On top of this the absences of these tags would decrease revenue from the Fish and Game department as well as take income from businesses and communities that benefit from the visitors in these remote towns using gas station, logistic services, and grocery stores. Let's figure out the problem before we just ban things.

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

---



PC 151

**Name:** Dwyer, Christian

**Community of Residence:** New Hartford, CT

**Submission Time:** 1/2/2024 7:14:13 AM

**Comment:**

I do not support and oppose propasal 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 152

**Name:** Dwyer, Christian

**Community of Residence:** New Hartford CT

**Submission Time:** 1/10/2024 1:35:04 AM

**Comment:**

I do not support the banning of no resident hunting of caribou

*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 153

**Name:** Dykes, Brian

**Community of Residence:** Chico, CA

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 3:03:55 AM

**Comment:**

I am a hunter and father, and one day hope to hunt myself, and with my sons in Alaska and as non residents oppose any restrictions on those opportunities for the belies reasons.:

- 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.

- Brian Dykes

*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 154

**Name:** Edgar, Scott

**Community of Residence:** Ketchikan, Alaska

**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 3:50:11 AM

**Comment:**

We are opposed of #2,#3 and the fact it's up at all is ridiculous.

*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 18: Support

Proposal 19: Support Proposal 20: Support

---



PC 155

**Name:** Edson, Jake

**Community of Residence:** Otsego, MN

**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 5:12:24 AM

**Comment:**

Current scientific data does not support these proposals and would have disastrous effects to the public's ability to experience Alaska's natural resources.

*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 156

**Name:** Eisenach, Kurt

**Community of Residence:** sheridan wy

**Submission Time:** 1/11/2024 7:37:46 PM

**Comment:**

Proposal #3. I am in strong opposition to this closure of Caribou hunting in these many areas. There is no scientific reasoning or need to stop the harvest of bull caribou by nonresident hunters in these areas. The removal of the small number of bulls taken by nonresidents is not in any way detrimental to the overall population of caribou in this herd. One bull breeds many cows and the lack off bulls is not the reason for any population decline. This change would only be a feel good band aid and not impact the herd #'s in any way.

proposal #38 closure of caribou hunting in area 23 for nonresidents, If there is a population decline in 23 then ceasing harvest of cow caribou would biologically support the herd far more effectively than removing the bull harvest by nonresidents. Protect the cows and you have the best possibility to recover your numbers. The removal of a few hundred bulls by nonresidents is a minor part of a herd of 164000. That bull harvest has no statistical affect on the reproductivity of this herd. Your problem rests elsewhere. You are just punishing those that have no political power behind their voices in this matter.

*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:** Eldridge, Nic

**Community of Residence:** Portland, OR

**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 12:03:48 AM

**Comment:**

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

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

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

---



PC 158

**Name:** Ellington, Jamison

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

**Submission Time:** 1/12/2024 6:53:37 PM

**Comment:**

I would like to start by thanking whomever for allowing all voices to be heard on this situation. It is very important to hear from both sides and take meaningful action that is in best interest of the Caribou.

There is no argument that the population of Caribou in Alaska is in decline, however, banning non resident hunting is not the best way to go about helping that. Its a rash idea and truly comes from a places of laziness or ineptitude. Its the easiest action to take but will deliver almost negligible results.

In my opinion it will take work and sacrifice from residents and non-residents alike. Limiting the number of non-residents allowed to hunt for 3-5 years, while reducing the overall number of Caribou allowed to be harvested by residents as well. I understand that residents should absolutely have priority but not sole authority. Ultimately, a closure to non-residents would negatively impact the residents of the towns, merchants, pilots, lodging, etc. with the lack of revenue brought in by out of staters.

I think more comprehensive management from the state is required. Along with more research on Caribou.

I strongly oppose proposals 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 159

**Name:** ELLIS, JACOBMICHAEL

**Community of Residence:** Kennewick, WA

**Submission Time:** 1/10/2024 11:35:35 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 160

**Name:** Ellison, Will

**Community of Residence:** Midland, TX

**Submission Time:** 1/4/2024 4:36:31 PM

**Comment:**

Hello, I am a nonresident who has hunted Alaska multiple times. I take my meat home and use it to feed my family. I also pay taxes for access to federal land and my nonresident fees support fish and game and via the PR act. The proposed closure of the Northwest Caribou hunting to nonresidents is a short sighted proposal that will do more harm than good. Nonresidents are already restricted to bulls only and take only a couple hundred animals per year. Removing this harvest would have no impact to the caribou herd. It would however remove dollars spent not only locally but also in places like Fairbanks or Anchorage. It would also increase hunting pressure in other parts of the state. I will not able to bring meat home to my family which is also what locals want. The herd should be managed with science and not drawn along residency lines. I enjoy Alaska and supporting the state. It is a shame things are moving in the direction to limit opportunities in the 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 38: Oppose

---



PC 161

**Name:** England, Sam

**Community of Residence:** Kennewick, WA

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 3:03:33 AM

**Comment:**

Regarding proposals #3 and #38- Please follow the data and allow non resident hunters have an opportunity at harvesting caribou! 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 162

**Name:** Ericson, Brandon

**Community of Residence:** Chatfield, Minnesota

**Submission Time:** 1/2/2024 10:30:06 AM

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal #3. Limiting non resident take will have zero impact on herd populations when residents are allowed to take 5 caribou a day and can also take by methods of using a snow machine.

*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 163

**Name:** Erwin, Clint

**Community of Residence:** Roseville, California

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 12:06:45 AM

**Comment:**

Non-resident hunters have minimal effect on the population changes we are seeing. Not to mention the commerce that would be taken away. Lots of small business owners will feel the effects of non residents not being allowed to hunt in said units. I oppose.

*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:** Estrella, Gilbert

**Community of Residence:** Mesa, AZ

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 2:45:23 AM

**Comment:**

Commenting on Proposals #3 and #38:

**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 165

**Name:** Evans, Cody

**Community of Residence:** Santa Rosa, Ca

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 3:22:56 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.

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

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

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

Don't let the American Dream die in Alaska as it is in the rest of the US, be on the right side of history.

*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 166

**Name:** Evans, Tommy

**Community of Residence:** Turlock, CA

**Submission Time:** 1/7/2024 9:29:39 PM

**Comment:**

I am writing in opposition of proposal 3 and 38. When looking at the harvest data non resident hunters do not seem to have anywhere close to the impact on the herd that subsistence hunters do. These proposals seem like a ploy to shut down hunting opportunity so that certain people will have control of the herd.

*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:** ewing, chauncey

**Community of Residence:** Durango

**Submission Time:** 1/7/2024 6:21:55 PM

**Comment:**

Hello there,

I Am a non-resident guide in Alaska and have been guiding up there for the last 15-years, wonderful place. I would like to see the non-residents be able to continue to hunt caribou in all the units they are wanting to shut down for non-residence hunts. Put to a draw or bag limit. I am for management give 70 % to residents and 30% to non- residents. Don't cut us out completely.

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

---





PC 168

**Name:** Fabian, Justin

**Community of Residence:** Stratford, Iowa

**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 12:05:42 AM

**Comment:**

I'm writing to oppose proposal 3. Although I agree harvest cuts are necessary to the recovery of the caribou herd in question, I don't see it necessary to completely remove non-resident hunting opportunities in the affected regions. I propose non-resident opportunities be limited to reflect a percentage of the available tags sold. Either by lottery or quota system, the desired results can be achieved. I trust that this will be considered by the board at the meeting.

*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 169

**Name:** Fairbanks, Ricky

**Community of Residence:** Thayne, Wyoming

**Submission Time:** 1/2/2024 3:19:22 AM

**Comment:**

Proposal #3

Closure of non resident hunting of the western arctic caribou herd. While caribou herds have been declining in the recent past, I do not believe that non resident hunting has any affect on this happening. Herds are propagated by cows. No non residents can kill cows. An insignificant number of bulls are killed each year by non residents. While I would be all for closures if hunting were the cause, I cannot get behind closures for the sake of closures.

*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 170

**Name:** Farnik, Mitchell

**Community of Residence:** Lochbuie, CO

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 7:06:12 AM

**Comment:**

No on Proposals 3 and 38

**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.

**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.

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

**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.

**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 171

**Name:** Fejes, James

**Community of Residence:** Nome AK

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 2:00:25 AM

**Comment:**

Please see the attached form i listed the proposal and then put my comments below each 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 1: Oppose Proposal 2: Support Proposal 3: Oppose Proposal 4: Support Proposal 5: Support Proposal 18: Support Proposal 19: Support Proposal 20: Support Proposal 21: Support Proposal 22: Oppose Proposal 23: Oppose Proposal 24: Oppose Proposal 25: Oppose Proposal 26: Support with Amendment Proposal 27: Support Proposal 28: Support Proposal 29: Support



PC 172

**Name:** Felton, Todd

**Community of Residence:** McCleary, WA

**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 12:45:38 AM

**Comment:**

I think eliminating non resident hunting is a mistake. I think the abundance of your issues are predators and the bag limits for 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

### PROPOSAL 3

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

Close nonresident caribou hunting in Units 21D Remainder, 22, 23, 24B Remainder, 24C, 24D, and 26A as follows:

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Data from biologists at ADF&G illustrate that there has been continued decline in the Western Arctic caribou herd (WACH). The July 2022 photo census estimated 164,000 caribou in the Western Arctic caribou herd which is down from 188,000 in 2021. Census numbers for past years: 2020 – no census; 2019 – 244,000; 2018 – no census; 2017 – 259,000; 2016 – 201,000. In the two years between the 2019 and 2021 census, the herd declined nearly 12% per year. Additionally, data shows that the cow survival rate is at 71% in 2021, well below the herd's average of 81% (1981-2020). ADF&G presented this information to the WACH Working Group in December 2022.

At its annual meeting the WACH WG assigned the management level "Preservative, Declining" to the herd based on the current census (within the range of 130,000-200,000) and adult cow survival rate less than 80%. In doing so, the WACH WG sees the immediate need to address the current herd decline by limiting caribou harvest to allow the herd population to begin to recover.

In a separate proposal, the WACH WG proposes a reduction in harvest for resident hunters. The working group feels that if harvest reductions are placed on Alaskans to allow the herd to recover, there should also be harvest reductions for non-resident hunters.

Currently, in the game management units identified above, nonresident hunters are allowed to harvest one (1) bull per year. The WACH WG proposes to close caribou hunting in Units 21D Remainder, 22, 23, 24B Remainder, 24C, 24D, and 26A to nonresidents.

PROPOSED BY: Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group, Vern Cleveland, Chair (EG-F23-209)

Strongly Oppose:

I believe the the ideas in proposal 2 will more than make up for the loss of the herd.

Reducing the resident take from 20 caribou to 5 caribou and not allowing cows to be taken will bring these areas in line with responsible management that non residents have been practicing for years.

The current regulations having non residents harvesting less than 5% of the total, while bring in 90% more revenue than residents to the area.

What is also needed in more open regulations to the wolves and bears that are eating the majority of caribou.

Comments by James Fejes Registered Guide Unit 22

### PROPOSAL 25

5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Close the nonresident moose hunting season in Unit 22C as follows:

Unit 22C - Moose - Nonresident - No Open Season.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Address the nonresident moose hunt in Unit 22C. Currently Unit 22C is under a registration moose hunt with a strict quota system that is often met within the first two days. Many Nome area hunters are not getting a moose.

According to ADF&G data in 2022, 539 registration moose permits were issued to local area residents with 33 moose harvested in Unit 22C. Unit 22B West of the Darby's, Unit 22D Kuzitrin/Pilgrim/Teller, Unit 22D Remainder are all under a registration moose hunt and quota, in all of these units the nonresident moose hunt was the first hunt to be removed from regulation. This would imply local ADF&G staff are being allocative regarding the Unit 22C nonresident moose hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Kawerak, Inc. Melanie Bahnke President (EG-F23-305)

\*\*\*\*\*

Strong opposition:

Changes to the current regulation would not accomplish the goal of increasing the moose harvested by residents.

The non-resident harvest historically has accounted for less than 1% of people hunting in the area. However, the actual harvest numbers are substantially lower than that. I believe the real issue isn't the non-resident hunters, but the bears and wolves.

According to the last AF&G moose calf collar study  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the 80 moose calves tagged were killed in the first 6 months by these predators. This correlates to a very high moose mortality rate, equalling a very low moose harvest opportunities.

Another point of opposition would be, since no registered guides are taking non-residents moose hunters in unit 22C. Meaning that all of the people coming and hunting are doing so with family or friends in the Nome area. This would deprive the public of sharing this resource with them.

Comments by James Fejes Registered Guide

PROPOSAL 26

5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Lengthen the nonresident moose hunting season in Unit 22E by two weeks, to open on August 15 as follows:

Expanding the season in order to disperse hunting pressure, as well as allowing hunters opportunities on other species, brown bear and caribou that are in more abundance in August.

Nonresidents: Unit 22E - One bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on at least one side by permit DM855 August 15 [SEPT 1] through September 14.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? DM855 is a drawn hunt limited to ten nonresident moose tags, with the hunting season between September 1-14. Most of these nonresidents have contracted with registered guides to help with their hunt. In the past three years, the number of registered guides in this area has tripled, thus creating competitive hunting practices.

These particular two weeks in September also reduce the successful targeting of other migratory species since caribou have already moved on, and brown bears are seeking other food options along the coast in September.

PROPOSED BY: Justin Horton (EG-F23-303)

\*\*\*\*\*

Oppose in it's current form:

Unit 22E DM855 moose tags are primarily harvested using registered guide services. As a guide in this exact area for more than a decade, opening the moose season two weeks early would only harm the trophy quality of the animal. Also with the warmer weather of august more likelihood of waste from spoilage from improper meat care. Moose in this area traditionally don't strip out until the last few days of August or first days of September. This year we encountered large moose not stripped out into hard horn until the second week of September.

I would support adding an additional two weeks on to the end of September 15-30.

Comments by James Fejes, Registered Guide

#### PROPOSAL 27

5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.

Align the resident seasons for brown bear in Unit 22D and 22E with those in Unit 22B as follows:

Units and Bag Limits

(20) Unit 22(C)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bear every regulatory year by registration permit; or

1 bear every regulatory year by registration permit only

...

Resident

Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)

Aug. 1 – June 30

[AUG. 1 – OCT. 31] [APR. 1 – JUNE 30] (subsistence hunt only)

Remainder of Unit 22

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

2 bears every regulatory year by registration permit; or

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

2 bears every regulatory year

...

Aug. 1 – June 30 [15] (subsistence hunt only)

Aug. 1 – June 30 [15]

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? Changing the resident season dates for brown bear in Units 22D and 22E would align the season with Unit 22B. Currently, the registration subsistence hunt (RB699) and general season hunt season for Units 22D and 22E end on June 15, while seasons in Unit 22B end on June 30, which creates unnecessary confusion for hunters and adds complexity to the regulatory language in the regulations book. The registration subsistence hunt (RB699) and registration hunt (RB670) for Unit 22C closes from November 1 to March 31. This proposed season change aligns the season dates for the registration subsistence and other registration permit hunt in Unit 22C with the other hunts in Unit 22B, 22D, and 22E. This should resolve confusion in the hunting regulations.

Changing the resident season dates for brown bear in Unit 22C would align the season with Unit 22B. Currently the season for Unit 22C is managed by a split fall and spring season, while the season in Unit 22B ends on June 30. The split season in Unit 22C creates unnecessary confusion for hunters and adds complexity to the regulatory language in the regulations book. Very little harvest of brown bears occurs in Unit 22 during November – March so this extended season is not anticipated to have a biological concern.

This proposed season change should resolve confusion in the hunting regulations. Unit 22C brown bear hunting would still be managed by a quota according to the combined harvest under the RB670, DB685, and RB699 permits.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F23-061)

\*\*\*\*\*

Support:

I support this to reduce confusion with the hunting regulations and to increase the harvest opportunities for successful bear harvest

Comments by James Fejes Registered Guide

PROPOSAL 28

5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.

Change the Unit 22D and 22E nonresident brown bear drawing permit hunt to a general season hunt as follows:

I am recommending changing drawing tag DB690 to an over-the-counter tag beginning August 1, 2024. Nonresidents: Unit 22D/E - One bear every regulatory year [BY PERMIT] August 1-June 15.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The brown bear population in Unit 22D and Unit 22E has been increasing, and harvest is low. Currently, the nonresident hunters that apply for the Unit 21 available nonresident bear tags are traveling to this area to primarily hunt caribou and moose in the fall, with the bear being a bonus species. The caribou tags are over the counter, and moose tags are now a draw. Moose hunters unsuccessful in the draw but successful in drawing the brown bear are not coming to take advantage of the drawn brown bear tag. Changing from a draw to an over-the-counter tag would allow more nonresidents to purchase a metal locking tag and hunt for brown bears in Unit 22D and Unit 22E. This increases revenue for Alaska and the local area and potentially the harvest of more brown bears by guided nonresidents.

PROPOSED BY: Justin Horton (EG-F23-302)

\*\*\*\*\*

IN Support:

I'm in support of anything that can accomplish a more open accessible non resident bear harvest. Whether it be increasing the permit number or making a general season. Our moose depend on this action being made swiftly.

The resident hunters are mostly concentrated closer to the Nome area and the smaller village residents are not wanting to spend \$8.00 a gallon to shoot bears farther from nome. It is imperative that a higher number of tags are issued or a mechanism where the people who draw bear tags but don't get drawn to hunt moose and decide not come hunting can put their tags back into the system.

Comments by James Fejes Registered Guide

PROPOSAL 29

5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.

Increase the number of brown bear drawing permits available in Unit 22B for DB685 to 40 permits, or change DB685 to a registration permit as follows:

I would like the Board of Game to keep the draw hunt number DB685 for Unit 22B and to issue 40 nonresident permits or make Unit 22B a registration hunt. Registration would be better and cheaper for the department.

Every year since the DB685 was adopted it has been undersubscribed. Every year, ADF&G has to go back and forth between draw results and issue undersubscribed permits creating more paperwork and work for both the department and users. As a commercial operator this is difficult at times, but I also understand this is just the cost of doing business. I would like Board of game to not include Unit 22C nonresidents, but to be on a separate DB or RB number. This would allow additional user opportunities for both areas and there not being a biological concern. I don't see a problem with this, nor will see an increase in harvest. This would simply allow nonresidents for an increase of opportunity. If adopted, please make the registration via online or in person at any ADF&G office. If the board does not increase or make Unit 22B a registration hunt, I would ask the board not to change anything to DB685.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? DB685 includes both Unit 22B and Unit 22C and they issue 27 permits for grizzly for nonresidents. Any left over permits after the draw period become undersubscribed. DB685 was adopted in 2012 and has been undersubscribed every year. Twentyseven permits are being issued between the draw and undersubscribed application periods and not all of them are being used. The problem is once they are issued, an individual like myself cannot not book another hunt because of no permits left over. A lot of these permits are being issued and not being filled. In this area there is a one



bear bag limit for nonresidents and two bear for residents per regulatory year. There is definitely not a biological concern for grizzly in Unit 22B. As for a matter of fact many locals have told me to harvest more bear. The harvest has been around fifteen bears annually between Units 22B and 22C. Units 22B and 22C should be separated. A majority of the pressure is in Unit 22C around the Nome area. Unit 22B is a much much larger area (164.46 miles by 85.67 miles) than Units 22C (74.55 miles by 38.14 miles) and far more remote than Unit 22C. ADF&G has had one emergency closure in Unit 22C when 25 bears were harvested. I believe with the size of Unit 22B and the number of bears in Unit 22B, it could handle 45 bear harvests.

PROPOSED BY: James Smith (EG-F23-204)

\*\*\*\*\*

Support this amendment:

I would support this amendment as written with either changing the area to registration or increasing the harvest to 40 bears.

Or another idea would be to disconnect 22B remainder to align with the guide use areas. The current guide use area for 22b has the area split in 2. One being GUA 22-05 that is west of the Darby mountains and GUA 22-06 that's east of the Darby mountains. The area east of the Darby mountains is very hard to access geographically and therefore receives very less hunting pressure. The area FG doesn't have the resources to conduct areal surveys in the area. So we don't have any official data but as a guide operating in the area doing private surveys. I see a very healthy bear population that would warrant either a higher quota or registration.

Comment by James Fejes Registered Guide



PC 173

**Name:** Fidler, Tim

**Community of Residence:** Siloam springs, AR

**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 3:41:18 PM

**Comment:**

Please do not close the caribou hunting to nonresidents. The opportunity should be for all Americans. Tim Fidler

*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 174

**Name:** Finch, Roman

**Community of Residence:** Meridian, idaho

**Submission Time:** 1/11/2024 7:40:30 PM

**Comment:**

I do not support eliminating the nonresident hunting 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 175

**Name:** Flander, Cal

**Community of Residence:** Minnesota

**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 4:28:21 AM

**Comment:**

The closure is a little harsh and rash reaction. I think it's a very least. You need to collect more evidence before making the decision for a total closure.

*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 176

**Name:** Fonseca, Zack

**Community of Residence:** Port Angeles, WA

**Submission Time:** 1/11/2024 1:22:05 AM

**Comment:**

I do not support proposals #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 177

**Name:** Forward, Paul

**Community of Residence:** Kotzebue, AK and Girdwood, AK

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 2:23:31 AM

**Comment:**

Hello,

I am a nearly lifelong Alaskan resident and more almost a decade now have split my time between living/working in Kotzebue and Girdwood. I have been an avid hunter since 2012.

I am writing in support of:

Proposal 1 and 34: I strongly support this proposal. We must consider alternative management strategies for sheep going forward in our state and transition to archery only hunting areas is a perfect step for any area where over harvest and/or under population may be a concern. There is much speculation about whether full curl management is an adequate strategy and combining it with archery only will preserve or expand hunting opportunity with minimal affect on sheep populations as is outlined in the proposal. If it opens, just make it a little more challenging and everyone will have a great time out there but with almost no harvest. It's an easy win-win!

I am strongly OPPOSED to proposition 33:

In the majority of areas open for proposal this cycle the non-resident sheep take is much higher than that of residents. As a result, limiting resident hunters like will have a very small affect on sheep populations while creating significant decrease in hunter opportunity for Alaskan residents. It would be much more effective to move toward draw or registration hunts for non-residents given the extremely high success rates in many areas. The only way that the current every 4 year approach for non-residents would have an affect on sheep harvest would be to limit any guide who's client has killed a sheep from guiding again for 4 years since the guide is really the the hunter in those situation.

Furthermore, maintaining the non-resident harvest (existing 4 year regulation has no effect on guided success rates) while limiting resident harvest rates would seem to be contrary to the Alaska constitution which prioritizes resident hunter access to game resources.

As above, if harvest must be limited, it would be much more equitable to maintain or expand hunter opportunity by allowing all hunters, resident and non-resident to hunt every year but with archery equipment only. Everyone could still hunt and have a great time in the mountains but the harvest impact on the resource would be greatly decreased. Just make it a little more difficult and everyone wins!

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

Proposal 1: Support Proposal 2: Support Proposal 5: Support with Amendment  
Proposal 33: Oppose Proposal 34: Support

---



PC 178

**Name:** Frazer, Kevin

**Community of Residence:** Billings, Montana

**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 6:07:21 PM

**Comment:**

Hello, I am writing in today regarding proposals #3 and #38. I strongly oppose both proposals! As far as I understand some locals are pushing these proposals with the argument that non-resident hunting is hurting herd numbers. I would argue that subsistence hunting and killing multiple animals per person is a FAR greater detriment to herd numbers than the small number taken by non-residents each year. This is an emotional argument and an emotional decision and is NOT backed by science! Herd numbers of all species fluctuate up and down and the same thing is happening with these caribou herds. You will not fix or improve anything by taking away the ability for non-residents to come hunt these caribou. On the other hand you will greatly hurt numerous outfitters, charter services, guides, meat processors, and the economy in these small towns and villages that have HUGE boosts every year from non-resident hunters money! Again I would like to make very clear that I oppose this idea completely and ask that you look at the science and not make an emotional decision. Thank you for taking the time to read this.

*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 179

**Name:** Freel, Tyler

**Community of Residence:** Fairbanks, Alaska

**Submission Time:** 1/2/2024 10:12:09 PM

**Comment:**

I would like to respectfully voice strong opposition to proposal 38, which would eliminate non-resident caribou seasons in Unit 23. Despite declining herd numbers, closing the season to non-residents entirely would, by the department's own writings on the WACH, do nothing to slow that decline. Especially considering the over-reaching federal closures that have undoubtedly curtailed much of the non-local user harvest, the small number of bull caribou taken by non-resident hunters has arguably no significance—especially compared to even a potentially reduced resident harvest (proposals 36 and 37) that still allow cows to be taken. Taking this remaining opportunity away from non-residents will in no way aid herd recovery, and it won't stop the decline. It will have an economic impact, however, and at a time when federal agencies are grasping for control of our hunting opportunity, we need to have people using the resource and advocating for it.

I would like to support proposal 37, with an amendment to make the bag limit: 4 bulls per regulatory year

*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 37: Support with Amendment Proposal 38: Oppose

---



PC 180

**Name:** Freel, Tyler

**Community of Residence:** Fairbanks, Alaska

**Submission Time:** 1/2/2024 10:41:14 PM

**Comment:**

I would like to respectfully and strongly oppose proposal 3, which would eliminate a non-resident season in the entire northwest quadrant of the state. By the state's own reporting, the harvest of around 250 caribou by non-residents in this region (before the federal land closures) is too low to have any significant impact on the decline or eventual recovery of the Western Arctic Herd, especially considering that they are predominantly bulls.

I would like to support (with amendment) proposal 2, but allow a bag limit of 4 bulls per regulatory year, no cows. Cows are the driver of the population, if we want to adjust hunting regulations to allow the herd to recover, we need to stop shooting cows.

I would like to support proposal 1. It was a mistake to close the western brooks range to sheep hunters, and we have seen exponentially more opportunities eliminated by the federal subsistence board. Allowing archery hunting of sheep in this area would have zero impact on the population, but would allow a net increase of opportunity for hunters.

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

Proposal 1: Support Proposal 2: Support with Amendment Proposal 3: Oppose

---



PC 181

**Name:** French, Gavin

**Community of Residence:** Whitehall Montana

**Submission Time:** 1/6/2024 6:24:37 AM

**Comment:**

I am opposed to proposals #3, and #38. Being a non-resident with a dream to hunt caribou in Alaska, the shut down of non-resident caribou hunting is something I disagree with. It will lower state revenue from non-resident hunting licenses 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 182

**Name:** Froelich, Kyle

**Community of Residence:** Federal Way, Wa

**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 7:42:45 PM

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposals 3 and 38, which propose the closure of caribou hunting for non-residents in significant portions of northwest Alaska. These proposals are misguided, unnecessary, and would have significant negative consequences for both residents and non-residents alike.

**Lack of justification:** Proponents of these closures haven't provided compelling evidence that non-resident hunting poses a threat to caribou populations. Current caribou populations in the affected areas are considered stable or increasing, and harvest levels, including non-resident harvest, are well within sustainable limits. These closures appear to be driven by a desire to limit competition rather than sound conservation principles.

**Negative impact on non-residents:** Proposals 3 and 38 would unfairly and unnecessarily restrict the hunting opportunities of thousands of non-resident hunters who travel to Alaska each year to experience the thrill of caribou hunting. Many contribute significantly to the local economy through hunting fees, guide services, travel expenses, and equipment purchases. These closures would create economic hardship for businesses and communities that rely on non-resident hunting tourism.

**Discrimination against non-residents:** These proposals raise concerns about discriminatory practices against non-resident hunters. While hunting regulations should prioritize conservation, these closures go beyond that and appear to unfairly target one user group without sufficient justification.

**Limited effect on subsistence:** Proponents claim these closures are necessary to protect subsistence uses, but current regulations already prioritize subsistence needs. Closing areas to non-residents is unlikely to have a significant impact on caribou availability for subsistence hunters.

**Alternative solutions:** Instead of drastic closures, Alaska should focus on collaborative management strategies that ensure sustainable caribou populations while addressing any legitimate concerns about competition between user groups.

I urge the Board of Game to reject Proposals 3 and 38.

I encourage the Board to implement evidence-based management strategies that address any specific concerns about caribou populations or user group conflicts without unfairly restricting hunting opportunities.



I call for increased collaboration and communication between all stakeholders, including resident and non-resident hunters, subsistence users, and wildlife management agencies, to find solutions that are fair, sustainable, and beneficial to all.

Proposals 3 and 38 are harmful and unnecessary. They represent a missed opportunity for collaborative management and threaten the economic and recreational benefits of caribou hunting for both residents and non-residents. I urge the Board of Game to reject these proposals and focus on solutions that are fair, sustainable, and inclusive.

*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 183

**Name:** Fullarton, Christopher

**Community of Residence:** Eau Claire, Wisconsin

**Submission Time:** 1/1/2024 5:23:52 PM

**Comment:**

I do not support closing Caribou hunting to non-residents. Based on information provided on the Alaska Fish and Game, reducing out of state hunting does not solve the problem of reduced caribou heard. Rather, limiting resident tags and understanding the oscillating swings that occur every 25+ years. Please don't limit non-resident hunting as many organizations, communities, and families rely on this revenue. There are other ways to build the heard.

*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 184

**Name:** Fuller, Devon

**Community of Residence:** Jackson, MI

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 4:20:10 AM

**Comment:**

Proposal 3 and 38 should have much more scientific evidence before occurring. There doesn't seem to be a good reason for this besides removing opportunities for hunting.

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

Proposal 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

---



PC 185

**Name:** Fusco, Max

**Community of Residence:** Fairbanks, Alaska

**Submission Time:** 1/3/2024 1:08:35 AM

**Comment:**

Closing hunting for nonresidents recognizes the concerns regarding conservation efforts, but contends that a complete ban on nonresident caribou hunting may have detrimental consequences. By allowing nonresident hunting under regulated conditions, local economies, cultural practices, and wildlife conservation can be positively influenced.

I. Economic Implications:

1. Tourism and Revenue Generation:

a. Nonresident hunters contribute significantly to local economies by spending on accommodation, food, transportation, and related services. Their absence could lead to a decline in tourism revenue, affecting businesses and employment opportunities that depend on this industry.

b. Hunting outfitters and guides, who cater to nonresident hunters, may face financial burdens and potential closures if the ban is imposed. This would impact their livelihood.

The very fact that the limit for subsistence hunting went down from 5 caribou a day to four caribou PER DAY tells me that recreational hunting isn't the problem.

*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 186

**Name:** Gabbert, Myron

**Community of Residence:** Willcox Arizona

**Submission Time:** 1/10/2024 1:05:29 AM

**Comment:**

I disagree with shutting down any hunting on public lands. That impact less than the substance hunting which should be looked at a lot closer.

*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 34: Oppose

---



PC 187

**Name:** Galde, Tim

**Community of Residence:** Marysville, Wa

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 1:33:16 AM

**Comment:**

I oppose proposals 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 188

**Name:** Gallagher, Chris

**Community of Residence:** Susanville CA

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 1:05:09 AM

**Comment:**

I am opposed to 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.

Non-residents don't want to lose this hunting 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 189

**Name:** Garvey, Hank

**Community of Residence:** Newburyport MA

**Submission Time:** 1/12/2024 12:13:48 PM

**Comment:**

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

Along with this the discrepancy between the amount of harvest by subsistence hunters vs non resident hunts being 10,000 to 250(bulls). This might be a bigger issue when it comes to the decline of animals as subsistence hunters kill a drastically larger portion of the breeding population.

There is no point in taking away non resident hunting opportunities and economic growth to the state. There are other ways to help the 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 2: Oppose Proposal 3: Oppose

Proposal 32: Oppose

---



PC 190

**Name:** Gary, Robert

**Community of Residence:** Hamilton, Montana

**Submission Time:** 1/9/2024 10:29:25 PM

**Comment:**

I adamantly opposed number three and number 38. The decision to not allow non-residence to hunt. This needs to be stopped. This is an attack on all hunting rights in Alaska not just for non-residence.

*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 191

**Name:** Genereux, Nicholas

**Community of Residence:** Crookston

**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 3:51:18 AM

**Comment:**

I am very much opposed to the closure of non-resident bull caribou hunting in proposal 3 and 38. The number that are harvested has very little to no impact. If your looking to increase the number of caribou the limit for local residents and substances hunters you must first limit or eliminate the hunting of cow and calve caribou. Otherwise if saving possibly a couple hundred caribou will do nothing. If cow and calve caribou was eliminated first and was still a major decline then and only then could I see any reason to closing non-resident, and non-local hunting.

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

Proposal 3: Oppose

Proposal 38: Oppose

---





PC 192

**Name:** Genz, Frederick

**Community of Residence:** Onalaska, WI

**Submission Time:** 1/6/2024 11:08:46 PM

**Comment:**

Proposal #3 & Proposal #38

I oppose the closure of non-resident caribou hunting in these units. Unless it can be BIOLOGICALLY shown that there is an immediate need to limit the harvest to subsistence use only there should not be a broad closure of hunting by non-residents. If the science shows that there is a need to limit non-resident hunting in these units then a draw system should be implemented to control the NR hunting pressure.

*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 193

**Name:** Gibbons, Michael

**Community of Residence:** Phx Az

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 12:42:40 AM

**Comment:**

Out of state hunters are a very small % of take here. Also you are shooting cows which is what will INCREASE the herd! Someone did not use their brain when putting this 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 194

**Name:** Gill, Ray

**Community of Residence:** Mesa

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 12:07:01 AM

**Comment:**

I am planning on a hunting trip in the near future. But this proposition keeps me from realizing this

*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 195

**Name:** Gillespie, Daniel

**Community of Residence:** Fairbanks, AK

**Submission Time:** 1/2/2024 11:43:09 PM

**Comment:**

I do not agree with closing more hunting opportunities down in Northwest Alaska while still allowing the harvest of cows by residents. How does the data support this?

*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 196

**Name:** glaicar, jim

**Community of Residence:** nashville Tennessee

**Submission Time:** 1/13/2024 2:02:33 AM

**Comment:**

proposal 3-38

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

Proposal 38: Oppose

---



PC 197

**Name:** Gogno, Jacob

**Community of Residence:** Kunkletown, PA

**Submission Time:** 1/11/2024 12:51:12 AM

**Comment:**

I am opposed of #3 & #38

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

*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 198

**Name:** Gordon, Barbara

**Community of Residence:** Boise, Idaho

**Submission Time:** 1/8/2024 9:18:45 AM

**Comment:**

After researching and reviewing information pertaining to Proposal #3 and #2, AND Proposal #28 my response is as follows:

I OPPOSE PROPOSAL #3 for these reasons:

- Non-Resident hunters had a severe reduction in Caribou limits in 2015, as well as a shortened Caribou hunting season. They were reduced from 5 Caribou yearly to a single bull Caribou per year.

In Game Management Unit (GMU) 22 D/E they are allowed one bull (no cows) during the hunting season of August 1st - September 30th.

- The Caribou harvested by Non-Resident hunters were 4 to 15 per year for a ten-year period (2012 -2022) which is an extremely small percentage of the total amount harvested from GMU 22 D/E.

---

I SUPPORT PROPOSAL #2 for these reasons:

- Going back almost 40 years, regulations show that Alaskan Residents were and still are able to harvest 5 caribou EVERY DAY and are allowed to take Cows from July 1 - March 31 and Bulls year round (no closed season).

- Lastly, despite concern for declining caribou herd numbers, resident winter hunters requested to use snow machines for hunting caribou. This was granted with a new regulation in 2014 allowing snow machine use for Caribou hunting and shooting them

from a non-moving snow machine.

I STRONGLY OPPOSE PROPOSAL #3 WHICH WILL HAVE LITTLE EFFECT ON WACH POPULATION AND SUPPORT PROPOSAL #2 WHICH WILL ALLOW THE WACH TO REPLENISH IF RESIDENTS ARE COMPLIANT.

---

I SUPPORT PROPOSAL 28. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.

I support Proposal 28 which would change the brown bear permitting system to an over the counter tag rather than the current Draw system DB690 beginning August 1, 2024 for NR in Unit 22D/E for one brown bear every regulatory year, August 1 - June 15 season.

I SUPPORT IT For the following reasons:

**\*\*Brown bear population and predator abundance contribute to the declining numbers of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd (WACH).**

**\*\*Current numbers of Brown Bear harvests are not adequate to control predatory take of these Caribou and lack of NR brown bear harvest can be partly attributed to the current NR brown bear permitting system which is very inefficient with low chances of a permit being drawn.**

A documented Caribou decline in herd numbers for the Western Arctic Caribou Herd. The brown bear has shown to be the leading cause for the mortality of Caribou calves in nearby herds:

The Anchorage Daily News reported on June 10, 2023 that nearly 100 Brown Bears were killed by Alaska Fish and Game in an aerial predator control hunt during a one month period this year (May -June 2023) in an attempt to restore numbers in the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.

**\*\*Studies “presented to the Board of Game in January 2022 indicated that predators, mostly brown bears, were responsible for nearly 90% of newborn calf deaths between 2011 and 2021.- June 2023).” The bear were shown to contribute 46% to Caribou calf mortality in this herd.**

Although the studies presented were in the Mulchatna Caribou Herd which is a different unit than the WACH, I would encourage the Board of Game to be proactive rather than reactive as the same thing is reportedly happening in Units 22D/E:

**\*\* Alaska Fish and Game numbers show that the WACH Cow yearly mortality averaged 59% predator caused between the years 2017 and 2022.**

**\*\*In that same time period, Fish & Game reporting show an average of 16.8 brown bear were harvested yearly by combined efforts of Resident and Non-Residents.**

**\*\*2015 surveys with subsistence hunters from the village of Noatak completed by a University of Alaska Fairbanks Master Student reveal that the majority of the village hunters responding feel that bears have a high negative impact on caribou migration (page 139) and wish sport hunters would hunt other big game such as bear (page 165); Master thesis by G. Halas: Caribou Migration, Subsistence Hunting and User Group Conflicts to Caribou Migration.**

**\*\*The principal predators for caribou calves are brown bears, wolves, and golden eagles; (Whitten et al., 1992)**

PROPOSAL 28 would make purchasing a brown bear permit more attractive for NR hunters which would increase sales and generate more revenue for the State of Alaska WHILE CONTRIBUTING TO THE DECLINE OF THE BEAR PREDATOR CAUSED MORTALITY OF CARIBOU IN UNIT 22 D/E BECAUSE:

\*\*A Moose hunt is the NR attraction for fall hunting in Unit 22D/E.

\*\*A non-resident must first buy a hunting license for Alaska and then also pay for applying for the moose draw (and some will apply for the bear draw but hesitate as there is a low success rate to be drawn for either permit).

\*\*If not drawn for the NR moose permit but successful on the draw for a brown bear tag, a NR hunter most likely won't go to hunt bear in this area but will wait and hope to later coordinate a moose hunt with a bear hunt as a bonus for a combination hunt.

\*\*If they were successfully drawn for the bear hunt, they would have to "set out" for a year per regulation and then try the Moose/Bear coordination draw process all over after the wait period.

Changing from a draw to an over the counter tag would allow more NR to purchase locking tag for brown bears in Unit 22D and Unit 22E while still placing a limit on the number of tags.

These hunts are difficult to coordinate and plan and even more so with a draw system in place rather than an over the counter tag permit.

Thank you for this consideration. Barbara Gordon

*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 28: Support

---



**Name:** Gordon, Bruce

**Community of Residence:** Boise, Idaho

**Submission Time:** 1/12/2024 4:49:02 AM

**Comment:**

I SUPPORT PROPOSAL #2 which would reduce the amount of caribou residents are able to harvest in a year.

This would have the BIGGEST IMPACT on repopulating the Western Arctic Caribou Herd (WACH)

WHY is the Western Arctic Caribou Herd (WACH) not repopulating? One reason is that the resident subsistence hunters have for at least 40 years or longer, been able to take 5 caribou per day for 365 days per year.

Many Alaskan residents have a cultural heritage of hunting with boats and sled dogs, but for nearly 10 years regulations have allowed resident hunters to hunt with snow machines which go at a fast rate of speed and harass and weaken those that survive, leaving them vulnerable to predators and sickness.

NEXT

I OPPOSE proposal #3 which would close all caribou hunting to Non Residents (NR) in units 21D Remainder 22, 23, 24B, 24C, 24D and 26A

LEAVING IT OPEN TO NR TO HUNT CARIBOU ALSO ALLOW THESE HUNTERS THE ABILITY TO HUNT THE PREDATORS THAT GO AFTER CARIBOU (wolves, wolverine and the Brown bear which contributes to the most caribou kills of the 3 predators) CLOSING IT ALSO TAKES AWAY PREDATOR HARVEST BY NR

I URGE YOU TO EVALUATE:

1)The TOTAL Caribou harvested by Non-Resident hunters are 4 to 15 per year during the ten-year period of 2012 - 2022 .... an extremely small percentage of the total amount harvested from GMU 22 D/E.

This small percentage can be attributed to the "hit" NR caribou hunters received in 2015 when the caribou hunting season was shortened to August/September and limits reduced to one bull per year,

2) how much money is generated by the sales of NR caribou tags/permits and ancillary hunting needs or requirements? This all contributes to the Alaskan economy as every dollar spent will be further spread out approximately 7 times to other businesses.

The state of Alaska makes a great sum of revenue from NR hunters.

3) how many caribou tags or permits are sold to NR;

The TOTAL Caribou harvested by Non-Resident hunters are 4 to 15 per year during the ten-year period of 2012 - 2022 .... an extremely small percentage of the total amount harvested from GMU 22 D/E.

While NR caribou hunt season has been shortened to August/September and limits reduced to one bull per year,

NEXT

I SUPPORT PROPOSAL #28 regarding the NR hunting season and bag limit for Brown Bear because the population of Brown Bear in Units 22D & 22E have increased which can partially be attributed to the very few Brown Bear that have been harvested by NR in these units according to Alaska Fish and Game harvest reports.

The majority of NR hunters are hunting moose and caribou and by making the Brown Bear permit an over the counter (OTC) this will make it more appealing and easier for NR to coordinate/plan a hunting trip that includes Brown Bear in this area.

Some of the BENEFITS this proposal would have for the State of Alaska is that an easier permitting process for this species in this area will draw more NR hunters to Alaska generating a larger revenue to the State along with managing the bear population which is the leading predator for the declining Western Arctic Caribou herd.

Thank you for considering my views as a Non Resident hunter,

Bruce Gordon

*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 25: Support

---





PC 200

**Name:** GORDON, JACE

**Community of Residence:** Evanston , Wyoming

**Submission Time:** 1/6/2024 3:09:36 PM

**Comment:**

PROPOSAL 3 – 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Close nonresident caribou hunting in Units 21D Remainder, 22, 23, 24B Remainder, 24C, 24D, and 26A. I understand the protection of a declining herd and think it's great you are taking action. I ask that you please just reduce the number of permits for non-residents, not a complete closure. When proposals are put into place like this, things change and it's very difficult to get them back. If that's not possible, maybe a timeline included in the proposal of when the non-residents would be allowed to apply again.

Thanks for your consideration.

-Jace

*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

---